

London Assembly Police and Crime Committee – 23 May 2019

Transcript of Item 6 – Hate Crime

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): We now move to the main business item, which is a discussion with invited guests on hate crime in London. I would like to welcome all our guests. Can I ask you to briefly introduce yourselves? Can I start off with you, Dave?

Dave Rich (Head of Policy, Community Security Trust): My name is Dave Rich. I am Director of Policy at the Community Security Trust (CST).

Jemma Levene (Deputy Director, Hope Not Hate): My name is Jemma Levene. I am Deputy Director of Hope Not Hate.

Louise Holden (London Deaf & Disabled People's Organisations Hate Crime Partnership): My name is Louise Holden. I am the Partnership Manager at Inclusion London for the London Deaf & Disabled People's Organisations Hate Crime Partnership.

Henrietta Doyle (Policy and Campaigns Officer, Inclusion London): My name is Henrietta Doyle. I am Policy Officer at Inclusion London, which is a disabled people's user-led organisation.

Superintendent Waheed Khan (Metropolitan Police Service): Good morning, everyone. My name is Waheed Khan. I am a Superintendent with the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) and I am the MPS's hate crime lead.

Iman Atta OBE (Director, TellMAMA): Iman Atta, Director of TellMAMA, Measuring Anti-Muslim Attacks.

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): Thank you. We have four sets of questions. I am going to lead off on the first set of questions, which is about encouraging victims of hate crime to come forward and report.

Just to set the scene, reports of hate crime are increasing. In your experience, is this because of an increased willingness to report or is it a measurable increase in the number of offences taking place? This question is directed at all of you, if I can start off with you, Dave?

Dave Rich (Head of Policy, Community Security Trust): The antisemitic hate incidents and hate crimes reported to CST specifically have been at record high levels for the last three years. The patterns that they show lead us to believe that there is genuinely an increase in the number of incidents taking place, but there is probably also an increase in the willingness and motivation to report these incidents. These both come from the same drivers. We have seen so much talk in public and in political life about antisemitism and so many front-page stories over the last two or three years, and this increases the number of antisemitic incidents and hate crimes because it puts the issue in the minds of offenders. It also motivates people to report because people in the Jewish community are more concerned and more worried about antisemitism and they are more likely to want to have something done about it.

Jemma Levene (Deputy Director, Hope Not Hate): We have seen rising hate crime incidents since the referendum vote and that has not gone down yet. Echoing really much of what Dave has said, in terms of general awareness raising meaning that more people are reporting, there are pockets where that is not the case. For example, eastern European communities in London, particularly the Romanian community, lack infrastructure for reporting and lack confidence in reporting.

Generally speaking, another thing that we would flag is that some of the sources of hate crime are coming from specific engineered campaigns that are being escalated on social media and beyond. It is important not just to look at the levels but to look at where it is coming from and whether there is an engineered campaign behind that.

Henrietta Doyle (Policy and Campaigns Officer, Inclusion London): Currently, recorded disability hate crime is actually dropping. It did rise. In 2013 there was only 110 recorded. This rose to 612 in May 2017 but dropped down to 419 in April 2019, which is 4.6% fewer than the previous year.

We think there is a reason for this. There was a very good initiative in the MPS to raise the response and improve the first frontline response of the police. It was called Disability Hate Crime Matters and the Disabled People's Organisation gave briefings to the police. Following those briefings there was a rise, but since those briefings have stopped there has been a drop. We are very keen for those briefings or a similar initiative to continue in the MPS. It is absolutely crucial. They stopped after the cuts and the restructuring, but I heard from MPS officers that there are good initiatives taking place, which made me positive that it is going to be embedded in the MPS.

It is crucial. That frontline response from the police when someone actually has the courage to come forward to report a hate crime is really vital.

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): Can I just clarify something? Did you say at the beginning that the number of reported crimes has dropped?

Henrietta Doyle (Policy and Campaigns Officer, Inclusion London): Yes. In May 2017 it rose to 612 and in April 2019 it had dropped down to 419, which is a 4.6% drop again from last year.

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): Is that a drop in terms of online hate crimes reported as well?

Henrietta Doyle (Policy and Campaigns Officer, Inclusion London): To be honest, I just got the figures. I do not know. It is what is recorded and reported to the MPS. I do not know the differentiation between the two. It is just disability hate crime.

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): I do not want to press you on this, but the information that I have in front of me - and this is national survey of England and Wales - says that online hate crime against disabled people has risen by a third in the last year.

Henrietta Doyle (Policy and Campaigns Officer, Inclusion London): Yes, my colleague was mentioning that, but I am talking about London and what is recorded by the MPS. Yes, again, as you said, nationally there is a rise.

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): Nick, we are talking about reporting of hate crimes increasing. In your experience, is this because of an increased willingness to report or a measurable increase in the number of offences taking place?

Nick Antjoule (Head of Hate Crime Services, Galop): Thank you. I suspect that in large part - or at least an element of it - is increased reporting. However, I know that we and lots of other anti-hate crime organisations in London generally are saying that it is ramping up. The divisions between communities are driving prejudice and an escalation in the scale and seriousness of hate crimes that we are seeing is very noticeable. In terms of just very practically, the types of issues that we are helping people with are far more extreme than we would have seen, say, three, four or five years ago. To my mind, that is having huge impacts on communities. Also, it is a real demonstration of the need for us all to work together better, to think about what is driving it and to be working with those people who are victimised to try to get them the response they need.

Superintendent Waheed Khan (Metropolitan Police Service): Good morning, everyone. I would agree that there are a number of factors that lead to the reason why we are seeing more reporting to us. Some of it is around the confidence. People have the option of being able to either approach the police directly or via the partners that we have. Some are around the table here. As a member of the public, if you do not feel confident that you want to approach a police officer, you can approach one of the partners. That is one way that we have seen an increase in reporting.

We also need to take on board that certain events will also maybe lead to an increase in reporting. We know, for example, that following the referendum back in 2016, we saw a spike in the number of hate crimes. That is something that we need to take on board. I would agree with what is being said, but we need to take on board that there are a number of factors rather than one particular factor that we can point to.

Also, the other thing to say is that from a policing perspective, there is an increased awareness. Officers are more aware and better trained in terms of dealing with incidents of hate crime as well.

Iman Atta OBE (Director, TellMAMA): I agree with what my colleagues have just mentioned. There is a global rise in hate across the world. In anti-Muslim hatred, what we have been seeing in the last three years there is a significant increase in reports coming into us but also into police forces. There is better awareness in police forces in flagging and addressing hate incidents and hate crimes.

There is more work on a partnership level between different organisations and referrals between the partner agencies that we have because, when we look at hate crimes, we have to look at the intersection of identities that we have. It might be that an individual who is from the lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) community has reported to Galop, but that individual has been attacked as well for their Muslim identity and so they will be referred onwards to us. There is an increase in referrals, an increase in awareness, an increase in the police's awareness in flagging these hate crimes.

Brexit has shed a light on what racism is in the United Kingdom (UK) and therefore people are coming more forward to report hate incidents and racism.

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): Moving on, if I can start with you, Iman, how is hate crime experienced by the victims you support? Does it tend to be verbal harassment and physical abuse or is it aggravated or motivated crime? Can you give us a flavour of the cases you get? And the same question to Dave [Rich], Nick [Antjoule] and Henrietta [Doyle].

Iman Atta OBE (Director, TellMAMA): The cases that we get take place in two different forms. There are the street-level cases, the majority of which are abusive behaviour, name-calling. We are seeing more attacks that are demonstrated in physical aggression and more attacks on institutions, on mosques, whether it is vandalism, whether it is arson attacks. We have seen this following the murder of [Fusilier] Lee Rigby [22 May 2013] but we continue to see it following trigger events and because institutions are visible. When someone is visible, they are being attacked for their identity.

What we see in the online world, if I can talk about it, is the silent impact on victims. It is the psychological impact that happens when victims are abused online, when you cannot locate the perpetrator, when this ongoing hatred goes on. That carries a huge psychological impact that unfortunately victims carry on. At street level it is abusive behaviour, physical aggression and vandalism on institutions and in the online world it is really what is happening in terms of hate speech and the impact on both levels that victims carry on through that journey and how we within our work at TellMAMA support those victims through this journey.

From the moment victims come into us, reporting, whether it is reports that they face online or at street level, we take them through a journey to provide them with a holistic approach. It might be that it is a multiple agency approach, working with other agencies, and it might be that it is an approach only and solely from our anti-Muslim perspective through our work. We provide them with emotional support, counselling, advocacy and lobbying, as well as taking them through the criminal justice system if there is enough evidence that is corroborated to take it further.

Dave Rich (Head of Policy, Community Security Trust): It is a very similar picture with antisemitic hate crime. We get a whole range of types of antisemitic incidents and hate crimes reported to us, but I would say the single most common type involves a random Jewish person walking down the street. They may be somehow visibly Jewish because of what they are wearing or carrying and another random person walking or driving past shouts antisemitic abuse at them. If they are unlucky the person tries to throw something at them and if they are very unlucky the person tries to throw a punch. Most of the incidents we have reported to us are verbal or written antisemitism, but it is that kind of random interaction or it is targeted antisemitism directed at Jewish organisations and at synagogues and very much in the last year or two at prominent Jewish public figures, especially those in political life or who are commenting on politics. Of course, there is an increasing amount on social media. You get the same patterns repeated on social media in terms of targeting high-profile people or just random interactions.

Again, we try to give the people who report to us a very similar support. In fact, TellMAMA and we produced this guide, *Hate crime: A guide to those affected*, which effectively walks a victim or a witness through the entire process from when they first report to post-conviction, post-sentencing, post-acquittal even. It is a very straightforward guide to everything they may encounter, what is involved in giving a statement, what is involved in giving evidence. We will accompany witnesses and victims to court to give them that kind of support and get them whatever referrals they need. Our approach is very much a victim-centred approach. It really is about what they most need and want in order to come out of the experience feeling safer, feeling heard and feeling like they have got what they want out of that process.

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): We have a set of questions about raising awareness, but if I can ask you at this stage about that guide that you referred to that you have done with TellMAMA, how do you get it out?

Dave Rich (Head of Policy, Community Security Trust): The MPS has been very helpful in helping us to distribute it to their officers. It has been placed in courtrooms as well. It is something that we have online and

we will send an online copy to everybody who report to us. We want to get it out there as far as we can. Those are the different methods. The Crown Prosecution Service (CPS), which helped us to write it, and the police have been very helpful in that respect.

Louise Holden (London Deaf & Disabled People's Organisations Hate Crime Partnership): Disabled people can experience any type of hate crime. The main hate crime is verbal on a daily basis. What we are suggesting is that the figures do not reflect the abuse that people are suffering on a daily basis. They perceive it as part of everyday life. The type of verbal abuse would be, "You should have been aborted. You do not deserve to live. What is it doing?" There is a general attitude that disabled people's lives are less worthy than other people's.

We think that this relates to the rhetoric from politicians reported in the media as saying that disabled people are benefit scroungers and are a drain on society. This was since the Welfare Reform Bill [Welfare Reform Act 2012] was introduced. We have a quote from a disabled woman who said, "I rarely go into town and I do not use my big mobility scooter anymore because of the abuse. I feel safer in my car with the doors locked". It can start off with minor incidents - for example, a neighbour putting bins in front of someone's car so they cannot get in and out of their disabled parking bay - but these things can escalate really quickly.

Disabled people are also called paedophiles and this is not uncommon. They are isolated in their community. They maybe do not act as a general part of the community. It is very common for disabled people to be labelled as paedophiles.

They have been physically attacked, tortured and murdered, and none of these crimes have been identified as disability hate crimes. There was a particular case in 2016 when a woman from Maida Vale admitted three counts of assault on a person with learning difficulties. The perpetrator poured bleach on the woman with learning difficulties, hit her with a frying pan, did not give her food and threw her outside naked. The perpetrator was arrested after the victim was taken to hospital. The victim had been living with the abuser for 14 months. This is a good example of what is called 'cuckooing'.

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): We are going to come to that later.

Louise Holden (London Deaf & Disabled People's Organisations Hate Crime Partnership): Sure.

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): Before I bring you in, Nick, my colleague Assembly Member Hall has a question.

Susan Hall AM: Yes, please. I am absolutely appalled at what you are saying politicians say because, whilst it is very difficult to deal with neighbours who are alleged to have said something, political parties should deal with that. Who? I can honestly say I have never heard that because I would call it out.

Henrietta Doyle (Policy and Campaigns Officer, Inclusion London): I have some quotes. It was by Members of Parliament (MPs) like David Cameron [former Prime Minister]. It started in 2010 when the Welfare Reform Bill was beginning to go through Parliament. I will give you a quote from Iain Duncan Smith [former Secretary of State for Work and Pensions]. It is always reported in a newspaper. It is reported in the media. Iain Duncan Smith said, "We will root out the benefit cheats who pretend to be ill for money. Some people see the welfare state as a money-making scam". That was in the *Daily Express* in 2014. George Osborne [former Chancellor of the Exchequer] and David Cameron have all said similar things on a similar theme.

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): Susan, can you reply and then I do not want to drift away from --

Susan Hall AM: Yes, but I must call this out. He is not actually saying that. He is saying the ones that pretend to be disabled. The people who pretend to be disabled in any way take money away from those who are disabled. David Cameron himself had a severely disabled child. That is why I find it --

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): All right. You have made your point. Susan, please.

Susan Hall AM: It does not matter which side of the political argument it is. That is not what they were saying at that time. They were saying the people that were not and they are the ones that take the money away from the disabled and we do not fund the disabled enough anyway. That is where they were coming from.

Henrietta Doyle (Policy and Campaigns Officer, Inclusion London): Can I come back on that? At the time, disability benefit fraud was very low. For the Disability Living Allowance, which is one of the main benefits for disabled people, it was 0.5%. What happened was that this rhetoric was picked up by the mainstream media and for each week there was a similar story. It created a culture in society that --

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): We do have questions later on about the use of language by politicians. Nick, can I come to you?

Nick Antjoulle (Head of Hate Crime Services, Galop): At Galop within our LGBT-specialist anti-hate crime service, we see a mixture. People experience various different things. Part of it is very serious, life-changing attacks. Part of it is more every day, perhaps verbal abuse that happens every week for five years to someone where they live. The impact will just build up and build up. It is a mixture of things.

To draw out some parts where LGBT hate crime differs slightly, proportionately there tends to be more violence involved in anti-LGBT hate crime than other forms of hate. There is more online abuse, purely when you look at the offences and how they divvy up. When you look at research, there is more sexual violence involved in anti-LGBT hate, specifically involving transphobia or that against bisexual women.

Just to pick up on Louise's [Holden] point about that day-to-day abuse that will build up and has this real risk of escalating very quickly, that is also a big part of our caseload. To my mind, that is one of the real opportunities. For the big portion of our caseload where very serious, life-changing injuries have been caused by really extreme violence, there are far more open doors to getting that person what they need. When there are really serious, sustained forms of hatred that are more ongoing in a harassment context, it can be very difficult. However, when you look at lots of the case studies of hate crimes where they have gone very seriously wrong, like the [Fiona] Pilkington case or many others, it is those things where partnerships need to come together to not miss those opportunities. Things might be seen as antisocial behaviour but actually they can escalate into people's lives being lost very quickly.

Just to pick up on Dave's [Rich] point, we also have two guides, really good competitive ones for LGBT victims of hate crime and professionals. I am happy to share them if that would be helpful.

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): If I can come to you, Iman, TellMAMA has said that the MPS's response following the Westminster Bridge attack prevented a spike in hate incidents. How confident are you that spikes in hate crime can be avoided in the future?

Iman Atta OBE (Director, TellMAMA): The Westminster attack and the very co-ordinated approach that took place between governments, politicians, civil society organisations and police forces and the messages that brought communities together was a model that actually worked for the Westminster attack. The immediate and co-ordinated response, joint communication and the messages coming out from different communities in standing against all types of intolerance and extremism, the rapid assessment that took place from police forces and governmental officials to ensure places of worship were secured and communities were secured. An online assessment through the Home Office and the MPS or the National Police Chief's Council (NPCC) is important to see where the threat is coming from and how to be able to address it. What we have seen following the Westminster attack is that that co-ordinated approach and those messages came out very strongly.

Unfortunately, the UK has been hit following that with further attacks. The response was an immediate response from police forces really to tackle the issue and to address the issue because they were horrific attacks, whether it was the Manchester Arena attack, the London Bridge attack or following that the Finsbury Park Muslim Welfare House attack and the Parsons Green attack. There were a few attacks where all the resources went into the response and the joint messaging that we had seen following Westminster was not all in unity as it was communicated across following the Westminster attacks. That plan of action that the MPS has put together with governmental officials, with Home Office and with communities as well coming together worked very well following Westminster compared to other terrorist attacks.

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): Finally, recorded hate crime across many of the different types has been increasing since 2014/15. What happened then to result in the growth in recorded offences? Can you just explain? Recorded hate crime has increased since 2014/15. At the same time, there was a growth in recorded offences as well. What happened then to result in a growth in recorded offences?

Superintendent Waheed Khan (Metropolitan Police Service): Basically, anything that is brought to our attention is recorded and we will look into it. We are working with our partners to make sure that we are capturing what is reported to us directly and what is reported to them.

I am not sure what the question was. What are you trying to ask, sorry?

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): We had an increase in the reporting of recorded hate crimes over the last five years. At the same time there was also an increase in the growth in recorded offences. Is it because of better police training and procedures?

Superintendent Waheed Khan (Metropolitan Police Service): It is a combination of everything that we have spoken about so far. It is around police officers being more aware of, when they deal with a hate crime, what they need to do. It is about working with our partners to make sure that we have a consistent message. As you were saying, following the Westminster attacks, we had that consistent message so that people had confidence. They know that if they report something will be done about it.

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): Exactly. That is the reason why I am asking this question. We are coming to the under-reporting of offences. After our last session on hate crime, a member of the [former] Metropolitan Police Authority texted me to ask, "Why are we still talking 20 years on about reporting and more reporting?" Of course, we want people to report more, but the debate is still dominated by the fact that we are still asking people to report.

Superintendent Waheed Khan (Metropolitan Police Service): Anecdotally, I am sure everyone will agree around here. As much as we know there has been an increase in reporting, that does not capture the full picture. I think everyone will agree with that. I accept it may have been a debate that is going on for a while, but that does not negate from the fact that we do need to encourage people to come forward and report so that we get a truer reflection of what happens in London.

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): If we just move on to the next set of questions for the next part, which is about under-reporting of hate crimes and encouraging victims to come forward and report, I will hand over to my colleague Assembly Member Pidgeon.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: Lovely. Thank you. What is the biggest barrier to people reporting hate crime? I am trying to understand also if it differs between different groups in the community. Picking up from some of the comments you have already said, it is almost like most victims have some sort of level of resilience and accept everyday racism, hatred or whatever almost as the norm, which is a horrific place to be if that is the case. I wonder. Let us start with Dave and go around the table. What is the biggest barrier?

Dave Rich (Head of Policy, Community Security Trust): Research that has been done on this is primarily by the European Union Fundamental Rights Agency, which did a large survey of Jewish communities across Europe [2018] last year, having done a similar survey six years prior. That found the most common reason given for not reporting is that the person did not think anything would happen as a result. The next most common was that it happens so often. What is the point? It is too much trouble.

Within the Jewish community, you get different sectors where you will get differing rates and different reasons. When we work with students at Jewish schools, there is definitely a lack of understanding of what hate crime is. They will have experienced antisemitism quite often on the bus from kids from other schools without really understanding that that is what is going on and that it is something worth reporting. You can then look at different parts of the community that are perhaps more integrated into wider communal structures or have better or worse engagement with authorities in different ways. You will get different pockets that really need focusing on.

That same European Union survey found that only 21% of British Jews who had experienced antisemitic harassment in the previous five years had reported it to anybody. There is a large problem of under-reporting.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: Thank you for that. Jemma?

Jemma Levene (Deputy Director, Hope Not Hate): Yes, it is a similar pattern across, really. There is a normalisation issue, particularly when it comes to gender and particularly when it comes to young people. What is considered acceptable or normal behaviour has moved so far from what it should be that people are not recognising the hate crime that they are experiencing, certainly not hate speech.

When it comes to some more marginalized communities, particularly new migrant communities, there is a lack of trust in authority and a lack of awareness of how to do it. Language can be a barrier, too. I am really echoing the experience of the Jewish community across all communities that we work with.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: Thank you, Jemma.

Henrietta Doyle (Policy and Campaigns Officer, Inclusion London): Picking up on what you were saying, disabled people often just soak it up and it is not until they go to their Disabled People's Organisation,

maybe with another problem to do with their housing or welfare benefits. It is in the course of a conversation that they might tell of an incident and the staff member will recognise it as hate crime.

The other issue, as I mentioned before, is that sometimes the initial police response is not appropriate. It might be because the person is seen as an unreliable witness. That can happen, particularly with people with learning difficulties or mental health support needs. We have been hearing more recently of two aspects: that it is not recognised by the police as a hate crime, and that it is seen as antisocial behaviour and is put on what the MPS calls Airspace and is not fully investigated. I was at an event where there was a large housing association and they said they have tried to report disability hate crimes and it has been passed back to them as antisocial behaviour that they need to act on.

The other barrier is to do with access needs. There is a range of access needs. If it is a deaf person coming to report a crime at a police station, then a British Sign Language interpreter may be needed. A person with learning difficulties may not understand what is happening and what the process is. They may just be in a state of shock and so not be able to verbalise what is happening. There is a huge need for advocacy at the police stations. There is a disadvantage that follows on from that in that sometimes it can take a while for the advocate or the appropriate MPS staff member to come. It might be a matter of weeks or longer and so there can then be a delay for the whole process of reporting. Also, the reporting venue needs to be local. For disabled people travel can be an issue and so it is important that there is a local venue where it can take place.

Another issue is that the disabled person can be isolated. Sometimes it is a carer or a member of the family that is abusing the person and it is difficult for that person to leave their home, get out and report. That is another issue. Not all disabled people find using the telephone easy. People are different. Also, not all disabled people have a computer and can report online. There is a whole variety of different barriers.

This is why it is so important to have local disabled people's organisations there as a reporting centre because quite often those organisations are already known to the disabled person. The services are fully accessible and sometimes the staff member is known and so it is familiar and much easier for a disabled person to talk about an incident and then get the follow-on support to report, as we call it, to go to the police. We support them through the process of going to the police and then to court if the investigation and court case goes forward.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: Can I just pick up before I bring in Nick the issue of access? Ninety per cent of recorded hate crimes to the MPS came from either a phone call to the police or a visit to a police station. You are talking about access locally. Clearly, police stations have been closed, many of them over recent years. They were not all accessible, I know, but they have been closed. Is that causing an extra barrier for the people you represent in reporting?

Henrietta Doyle (Policy and Campaigns Officer, Inclusion London): It can do. It does not always. If someone goes to a disabled people's organisation, then a staff member can pick up the phone or they can report online. If it is a disabled person themselves and they are not in touch with other support networks and there is not a local station and they do not know about the alternative - because I responded to the consultation and I know there was an intention to set up local, hopefully easy-to-access help - then it can.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: Thank you.

Nick Antjoule (Head of Hate Crime Services, Galop): I would just say firstly that under-reporting is still a huge issue. Just looking at antisocial behaviour, the Government Equalities Office produced a really fantastic piece of research last year [2018] that asked over a 100,000 LGBT people in the UK their opinions on issues

including hate crime. What they found was that just under half of those people who are LGBT had faced some form of hate crime recently and that 91% did not report the most serious incident. That is not 91% under-reporting in general; that is just the most serious incident. There is a huge chunk of very serious, impactful incidents that people are experiencing, and we do not have the systems in place to incentivise them to be able to speak up.

Just to echo what Dave [Rich] was saying about most of the most common barriers, they are the same across the board. One or two that I would add in are normalisation. Like you were pointing out, for people just to feel that some level of hate crime is a normal, accepted part of life is a very widespread experience for lots of LGBT people, alongside lots of people who experience hate crime in general. Also, there is a barrier around recognition and actually people recognising that this is hate crime they are experiencing.

One point where LGBT hate crime is so different is a fear of wasting police time. That is a very common experience for people facing homophobia, biphobia or transphobia.

Just to pick apart the question slightly, under-reporting is still a huge issue. With that said, it has been part of our policy in the UK for almost decades of really changing around that improving reporting and the recording, which is a really important part of this too. What we have not been so great at is the next part of the puzzle. What happens once people actually report? What kind of response do they get?

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: We are going to come to that.

Nick Antjoule (Head of Hate Crime Services, Galop): Great. Thank you.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: Thank you. You are quite right. When I have had people to come to me with homophobic hate crime, members of the public, they have come to me because they do not feel the police are going to believe them. They are almost wanting me to help by advocating on their behalf. Can we come to you, Iman, please?

Iman Atta OBE (Director, TellMAMA): From the Muslim community's perspective and echoing what my colleagues have just mentioned, yes, there is a fear of wasting police time. The element of normalisation comes very strongly through in the outreach events that we do across the country.

Women are the number one victims of anti-Muslim hatred. Of the victims who are reporting to us, 58% are women. They tend to be attacked in two layers: one of sexism because of their gender and two because of their visibility. They say that they have been going down the streets, hearing words and getting abused, but never thought that they could come forward and report it and that it would be taken seriously. They do not know their rights. Definitely, there is no awareness about this. There is no awareness about things being criminal and so people thinking that it will get to a criminal threshold.

The other thing is there is a narrative that is being promoted within certain parts of Muslim communities that the Government is not there to trust [the victim] and authorities are not there to trust and, therefore, do not go and report. That is one thing to look at.

There is an element to look at as well in terms of the lack of follow-up with victims. When victims tend to report, there is sometimes a lack of follow-up and informing them of the process. That victim drops off that network and that victim will tell his family or her family and friends and therefore that will create further

barriers. It is a domino effect. In some instances, victims would have had a poor outcome and, if they had a poor outcome, then again they would not go back and trust the system and report back in.

We need to think really when we are talking about these issues. What happens to this percentage of victims that fall off the system? What support are they getting? Who is supporting them? Where are these reports coming through and how do you create that balance and really provide that support to these victims?

The last thing to mention about Muslim communities is that we have over 3 million [members of] Muslim communities in the UK. They come from super diverse backgrounds. Some of them come from cultures where police forces are not there to help in their countries. That is a huge barrier that we see within certain parts of Muslim communities. They would not even think that police forces are there to support them.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: Very interesting. Thank you for that. Could I come to you, Waheed? We have heard what some of the barriers are. We heard earlier from Henrietta about the Disability Hate Crime Matters programme specifically, which resulted in a significant increase in reporting. What did that programme involve and why did it stop?

Superintendent Waheed Khan (Metropolitan Police Service): I actually cannot say why it has stopped, but what I can say is that the reason why such initiatives exist is to try to make sure that we are having different avenues and different options for people to report so that we can record the hate crime.

From what we have heard, if we just look at what we have heard so far, it is clear that there are a number of barriers that lead to not reporting hate crime. From our perspective, there are probably three things I would say that we are doing to try to address these points.

The first obvious one is to say that we cannot solve this by ourselves and it is about working in partnership with everyone around this table as well as with the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC).

The second thing to say is that we have funding that we received from MOPAC, for example, that we use to engage with the eastern European community, which we find, for reasons that Iman [Atta OBE] put very eloquently, are very reluctant to engage with us in the way that they may do with other people. That is for a number of reasons. It may be because the police forces where they have come from may not work in the same way that we operate here, but we try to engage in the best way that we can. That is another thing that I wanted to say.

I also wanted to say that I will take on board exactly what you have said around points around disability and how police may not provide that initial response always, but to try to make sure that we are now consistent, there is a couple of new approaches that we are introducing. The first one is following something that has been very successful in the domestic violence world, which is around trying to make sure that when an officer attends a scene, there is a certain number of things they have to complete, a checklist in effect. We are looking to do the same approach for hate crime so that when an officer attends anywhere in London for a hate crime, they make sure that they consistent and make sure they deal with that. That should hopefully address some of the points that you are making.

The other point that I would say is that we are developing a booklet for victims of hate crime. This is being translated. You will have seen this as well. It is something that we have developed in partnership with everyone here. The idea behind that is just to try to, again, provide them with a different option and become more aware so that they can come to us. It will be translated into 12 languages.

The point I am going to say is that the police, yes, have improved. There is a lot more that we need to do, but hopefully the changes that you will see coming up in the next few months should make a huge difference in dealing with the consistency point, which will in turn lead to what Dave was saying around the lack of confidence that people in some communities have.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: The MPS has said that many of the hate crimes it records come directly to them, as I said earlier, 90%, but a number of your organisations are there supporting people as third-party reporters. Do you encourage reporting directly to the police or reporting through you and how does that work?

Iman Atta OBE (Director, TellMAMA): When people report into TellMAMA, we ask them if they feel comfortable. The majority of the cases that come into us, people do not feel comfortable reporting to police forces. We take them through a journey where, when we feel that they are comfortable in taking it forward to police forces, we are there to support them. We liaise on their behalf with police forces. As well, when they feel comfortable, we give their contact details directly to police forces to contact them. It depends really on the journey with a victim.

One of the things that we tend to do and push for is sharing success stories with those victims who are super reluctant to report to police forces, specifically if it is a case that is similar to their case, to showcase that the police have acted on this and there has been an arrest at the end of the day or an apology at the end of the day on this case. That again further builds that trust that is currently lacking between victims and police forces.

If I look at really why it is important for people to have third-party reporting services like us and other partners, it is because it is very community focused. It is in the heart of the communities. Different organisations have access to community members. They hold events with different community members and that is where the intelligence and the reporting come in. We do send strong messages to the communities we support. They might be nuanced based on the insight and the research and the dynamics of each and every strength in our organisations. It builds further trust in our organisations with the communities when we deliver our service and we follow that journey with the victims who are reporting to us and providing them with the support. It speaks for itself. Builds and empowers communities.

One of the things not to forget is really that cross-partnership [working] that we are doing ourselves, whether it is with the Jewish community, with the LGBT community, with the disabled community, as well as other partner agencies that we work with. It is very important to give the victim the holistic approach on that journey.

Last but not least, it is quite effective when communities feel that they have someone representing them and speaking on their behalf. It empowers them in one way, but on another side it gives them a space where they make their voice heard that sometimes is not. So many of the victims that come into us, despite the fact that they do not want to go to police forces, will ask us to write about the incident that they have been through and post it on our website. A lot gets picked up by the press on this as well as by police forces that actually come to us and say, "We did not know this happened. How can we help?" That actually builds further on that impact and trust with the victim when they see that the police forces are interested in following on this and have approached us to talk about this.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: Whilst it is only 10% of cases coming via your third-party organisations, you are saying there is an awful lot more coming through the door that you are just supporting and who do not want to report and do not want that sort of outcome. Is that the same for you, Nick?

Nick Antjoule (Head of Hate Crime Services, Galop): Firstly, I should say that our stance is about empowerment. It is about saying, "Here are some options", and totally supporting people in the choices they make and helping to inform those choices.

We do lots of lots of talking with Waheed's team. Literally every other day more or less, my team is chatting with his team.

Superintendent Waheed Khan (Metropolitan Police Service): The only thing I would say is that from our perspective, from the policing perspective, the absolute priority is to make sure that the report is received. However, when that is received, we are more than happy. We understand people may not come to the police directly for a variety of reasons, but as long as that report is received, then we can collate that and we can work out what the trends and so forth are. Yes, you are absolutely right. We have a central team that will liaise with all the partners to make sure that the reports we receive are collated and acted upon.

Nick Antjoule (Head of Hate Crime Services, Galop): Reporting is a really key part of this, but what it does not necessary flag up is lots of cases that are dealt with by the MPS and we will be doing joint work supporting that person to report in the first place but also coming through process, supporting them in the courts and everything to either side of that. It may well be that we speak to someone and they say, "Actually, yes, I would like to get it logged, but actually that whole process of having to find myself in court is something that literally is not possible for me", or they are so fearful of being targeted because of who they are already. Opening themselves to an authority figure further can leave them feeling difficult, which is people's fear.

I know that the MPS does fantastic work, but when you think about the fact that it is still in many people's living memory when the police were not there to help them and when being LGBT was against the law and the police's job was literally to arrest them. It is a very difficult thing to overcome. Very often, we will help people to report and to get things logged down to help them through that process, but also lots of work just getting stuff recorded anonymously or just to get it recorded, and we will help them with the impact of what has happened, emotional support, getting them moved, getting the perpetrator challenged, helping with the financial impact of what happened, yes.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: Louise, do you want to say something on that?

Louise Holden (London Deaf & Disabled People's Organisations Hate Crime Partnership): I really echo what my colleagues have said there. The short answer is, yes, we definitely want people to report. The barriers are previous poor experiences with the police, particularly for the disabled community, if they have had previous negative experience or they have been resident in a care home or supported housing or they have a really big care package. Authority figures are a big part of a disabled person's life. There is a general fear of repercussion.

We are set up a bit differently to the others. Our local disabled people's organisations are not just there to help people report hate crime. They are a completely holistic service. It is really through building up trust with that person. Initially the person may not want to report. They may just want support to get moved away from the perpetrator. We had a particular case where it was someone's daughter and they wanted to move away from their neighbour, who was also disabled and who was the perpetrator.

Yes, we would definitely want people to report. We know it is really under-reported. With disability hate crime, the percentage is so low of [cases] actually getting to court and it is a lengthy process and it takes a real toll on someone. Quite often, if they are seen as a reliable witness and if they are prepared to go through it and they are supported through an advocate, they still may not want to follow through with that just because of the stress. Having more advocacy support is so important for disabled people.

We have two disabled people's organisations as members of the Community Alliance to Combat Hate (CATCH) partnership. This partnership is quite new and so we have been developing relationships. It has been so positive and with the MPS as well, but we all recognise that it could be better. Thanks.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: Lovely. Thank you. Jemma, Dave, did you want to add anything on this third-party reporting and what benefits it has?

Jemma Levene (Deputy Director, Hope Not Hate): I would like to add as an organisation that does not report for victims. What we do if we do get reports in is tell people to call the police or to be in touch with police, but we also let them know about appropriate community-based agencies like CST, TellMAMA and Galop. We are about to launch a hub that has been funded by the Building a Stronger Britain Together programme from the Home Office, which is called When Hate Comes to Town. This is looking much more at the bigger impact on communities but in that it will have a hub that links to all the different partner agencies. I did not know about your two guides and so they will now get included in that content. That is great.

I also want to talk about the fact that hate crime does not ever just have one victim because it leaves a whole community fearful and fear of hate crime is an issue in and of itself. Using the antisemitism example, because it has been so much in the public arena, the impact of that on a whole community needs to be taken into account as well. The more we talk about hate crime, whether it is responsible reporting or not, the more fearful an impacted group will be. It is not just an individual victim of a hate crime we need to look at. We need to look at how to work with communities and to build resilience. Of course, that is something that we do, but it is not really relevant to this particular discussion.

Dave Rich (Head of Policy, Community Security Trust): To answer the original question, yes, we always encourage people to report to the police. If they do not want to, we will offer to do it on their behalf. Quite a lot of people will initially contact CST rather than the police because it is easier and quicker. If we offer to make that report on their behalf, that also answers that need.

There are some people who simply do not want to go down the criminal justice route at all and they contact us because they want to tell someone. They want that experience to be logged and recorded and recognised and to be official.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: It is known that something has happened, yes.

Dave Rich (Head of Policy, Community Security Trust): Perhaps there is other support and referral that they are looking for that is not criminal but that we can still help them with. If those people again come through that process and get the satisfaction and the outcome they need without having had contact with the police, then that is still a success even if it does not go down as a recorded offence or a prosecution.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: Also, it is helping you in terms of trying to get more accurate data on what is really going on. Thank you for that.

Sian Berry AM: I have one question about third-party reporting in that case. Are there any significant gaps? TellMAMA, Galop and the CST are all third-party reporting groups already. Is there a disability one and are you trying to get one set up? Hope not Hate mentioned that some eastern European groups in London might benefit from being able to --

Louise Holden (London Deaf & Disabled People's Organisations Hate Crime Partnership): Shall I answer first? Our partnership is made up of 19 different organisations. They are all disabled people's organisations. Some of them are third-party reporting centres and some provide direct hate crime advocacy. Others provide training and awareness raising for disabled people themselves to recognise that they have been victims.

In general, there is not enough evidence. We cannot call on research to show that that is an effective way of providing another option. What I would say is that we would like to have more evidence. We would like more research about around that issue for disabled people. What we know from being a disabled people's organisations ourselves is that when people present to a disabled people's organisation, it will not necessarily be around hate crime. It will be around something else.

There was one case where a young man came in to use the social group and over a matter of months he started disclosing what was happening to him. It was extremely serious and violent and had been prolonged. They had taken over his flat and there were lots of different things. It was only after getting him to understand what was happening to him that he felt confident to report. When he reported, two police officers attended straight away, but he had communication issues and so he then had to wait about three months to see a specialist officer who could take his statement. In that time, he was still living with those perpetrators. They are still in his environment.

Disabled people would not necessarily see a third-party reporting centre and attend and say, "Yes, I want to report a disability hate crime". They are more likely to come to a disabled people's organisation about something else and then, through the course of building up trust, they would disclose. It is better to have lots of different avenues for people to report but we do not have enough data on whether that is good for disabled people.

Jemma Levene (Deputy Director, Hope Not Hate): I do not know yet whether the outcome of an application process that the Home Office put together has resulted in a project for eastern Europeans. I know that we applied. There was a wide application. We did not get the funding. I do not know if the outcomes of the funding addressed specifically the eastern European community. We had applied for somebody to build a bilingual website in English and Romanian specifically for the Romanian community.

The Polish community in Britain tends to be better supported. There is more infrastructure. It has more of a historical basis. It is the newer eastern European communities that we are more concerned about in terms of not having the infrastructure and, again, going back to what has been said several times already in terms of that distrust of authority and not really necessarily seeing themselves as a permanent community yet, which means that they are not investing from their side, either, and so not really feeling like an established part of London society yet. That is not true for all eastern Europeans living here, but there is an attitude of, "We do not know whether we are here for good and so why would we invest time in creating these kinds of infrastructures?" It is not just about hate crimes but across the community, everything, and also not having community figures whom people see within the eastern European communities that people relate to as leaders. That is an issue, too.

Sian Berry AM: We also have quite good links with the Gypsy and Traveller community within the London Assembly. Do they have third-party reporting? You might not know. The police might know.

Jemma Levene (Deputy Director, Hope Not Hate): Yes, they do. They have two or three. I do not know how effective they are or how well used they are, but they do exist.

Iman Atta OBE (Director, TellMAMA): There is one for the Polish community or eastern European community. It is called the Eastern European Resource Centre. But we and CST as well as the National Police Chiefs' Council (NPCC) hate crime leads have met with them and have shared with them best practices and how things work. They have started doing the work. Yes, there is one, but the infrastructure is not yet fully on and it is a part-time third-party reporting agency.

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): We have to move on, but one very quick question to you, Henrietta, about cuckooing. You talked earlier about cuckooing, which is often a feature of disability hate crime. What could housing providers in particular do to make sure that alternative housing provision is available for victims of this type of crime?

Henrietta Doyle (Policy and Campaigns Officer, Inclusion London): By 'alternative provision', are you talking about support?

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): Yes.

Henrietta Doyle (Policy and Campaigns Officer, Inclusion London): I will explain what 'cuckooing' is. It is when, basically, a disabled person's home is taken over by people who may be involved in drug dealing or prostitution. They appear to be friends with that person and move in and then take over their premises.

As far as support, it can be a disabled person's organisation if they are there. Otherwise, it is the usual means of contacting and reporting. The trouble is that the person does not realise it is a crime and can put up with it for years. I am not sure if I am grasping your question.

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): My question was very specific, and you can write to us later. Do housing providers have a role to play in helping people who are being exploited by gangs? We have to move on and so can you be brief?

Louise Holden (London Deaf & Disabled People's Organisations Hate Crime Partnership): There is an absolute role for housing. Housing is really important for the disabled community. They are more likely to be on a low income and be long-time residents of that community and so moving is very traumatic for somebody. The housing associations really need training on recognising hate crime and then supporting to report that. Thank you.

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): Yes. If you have more ideas, write to us later about more training.

Keith Prince AM: This is to all the panel. I might start with you, Dave. In your experience, what works well in building awareness of hate crime? Do you think enough attention is being given to awareness raising and preventing hate crime before it happens rather than responding after an incident?

Dave Rich (Head of Policy, Community Security Trust): In terms of what builds awareness, there are different ways to spread that. Publicity of successes is always good. As Gemma said earlier, any publicity about the existence of hate crime risks actually affecting community confidence, and so it is very important to use the right language and the right message and to bear in mind both the confidence of the individual in an individual case and the confidence of a community.

We have also seen in proactive publicity campaigns about hate crime that the posters have then become targets for hate crime themselves. That is something to bear in mind. It is not a reason not to do it, but it is something for the people running the campaigns to be aware of.

One of the problems specific to antisemitic hate crime and Islamophobic hate crime as well is that nobody knows how many convictions there are. There is no CPS data. We cannot even tell the community that X number of people were successfully prosecuted last year for antisemitic hate crime and so X percentage led to a conviction.

Part of the work of encouraging reporting is definitely encouraging awareness of what comes out of reporting and what the benefits are of reporting. It is not just about raising awareness of the existence of hate crime. It is about raising awareness of what benefits a person to report it.

Keith Prince AM: Thank you.

Jemma Levene (Deputy Director, Hope Not Hate): I have a slight question. When you are thinking about preventing it happening in the first place, are you talking about educating potential victims of hate crime or are you talking about educating people who might be attracted to committing a hate crime?

Keith Prince AM: I did not mention education at all, actually. What I was asking for is your experience of what works well in building awareness of hate crime. Is enough attention being given to awareness raising and preventing hate crime before it happens rather than responding? It is more about what you think works well in building awareness and whether we are concentrating on that side of it rather than the reactionary side. It is about being more proactive than reactive.

Jemma Levene (Deputy Director, Hope Not Hate): In that case, really echoing a lot of what Dave [Rich] said, the CST has been particularly good within the Jewish community at explaining the importance of reporting in order to build up a wider picture. That is something that anybody can replicate across the piece. Particularly perhaps in terms of the LGBT community, you never know when what might feel like wasting police time to you stops a far worse crime happening to the next potential victim. Educating minority communities or impacted groups about the importance of being a piece of the jigsaw in terms of building up that picture of the kinds of crimes that are being committed, the spaces they are being committed in, whether that is online or offline, is very important. It is getting that message out that even if you feel quite resilient and you are not bothered, which goes back to something you said about schoolchildren, "I am not bothered. I am hard enough. Somebody shouted something antisemitic or Islamophobic at me on the bus, but I do not feel the need to even tell my mum and dad". It is getting people, especially young people, to understand that it helps to stop worse attacks. That is a message that should be used across the piece.

Keith Prince AM: Thank you. Louise, did you want to add to that?

Louise Holden (London Deaf & Disabled People's Organisations Hate Crime Partnership): Yes, thank you. What we have found works really well is having training packages that are delivered by disabled people

for disabled people. We are lucky enough to have received funding from the National Lottery over the next four years to develop a range of modules, but that works fundamentally well.

I must say that the input we have heard from the MPS has been fantastic and the hate crime co-ordinators that have attended some of our events now get it. Once you get it, you cannot un-get it. There is just a shift in attitude. They are really engaging with disabled people directly and hearing their experiences.

The British Transport Police were completely unaware of the levels of hate crime that occurred on a daily basis for people. They attended one of our events and now are really engaged. That helps disabled people feel more confident to report to the police because they have met them.

Nick Antjoulé (Head of Hate Crime Services, Galop): To touch on your point around prevention, to my mind there are two things. One is really good-quality preventative work with victims of hate crime. Working to empower them, working to give them the skills and the self-worth, reducing isolation and all those other things help to create an environment where people have a really huge impact on hate crime and also working to challenge those things helps keep them safer from it.

The second thing is working with offenders. I know that that may seem like the wrong end of the picture. I know you were thinking about before hate crimes have been committed, but there are not huge amounts of prosecutions of hate crimes. It could be far better, but we are talking about many thousands each year. For all of those people who have been found guilty of committing hate crimes, there is no work with them to challenge the reasons why they have committed them. This person hated this community so much that they were motivated to commit acts of violence and abuse against them. There is nothing thinking about how to unpick that. How do we go on to work with that person to prevent them from committing hate crimes again? To my mind, that is not a quick win necessarily but is something that really could use some investment to be thinking about how we look at being smarter about preventing those crimes.

Keith Prince AM: What you have said there is probably one of the most poignant things of the whole meeting today because, if someone has already committed a hate crime, it is quite likely that they will commit another one. If we are not trying to get inside their heads to find out what makes them tick, we are not going to do that prevention work, are we? Would you have any suggestions as to how we might work with those people and what we might do?

Nick Antjoulé (Head of Hate Crime Services, Galop): I have two things. One is a crossover with victims' work, which is about restorative justice, where it is appropriate and where it is risk-assessed and victim-led. It can be a really powerful healing experience for victims, certainly alongside criminal justice, not instead of it. That can be very useful in terms of helping challenge prejudicial opinions.

The second thing that probably is the bigger one is proper offender workshops. Within the field of domestic abuse, a very core part of the solution to domestic abuse is investing in really good-quality risk assessment work with offenders and work to challenge the misogyny that drives people to commit domestic abuse. That is a thing that would be really useful to be learning from.

One thing I would be very keen to avoid is some of the very big organisations that do offender work, the big corporate organisations that will just sweep in and do bits of that work, maybe would not be appropriate for this. It would need to be very carefully done in a very proper community way that takes account of the different complexities of this work. A very careful piece of work within the voluntary sector would be my preference for how that would happen.

Keith Prince AM: Thanks. Very helpful. Thank you very much.

Superintendent Waheed Khan (Metropolitan Police Service): There is a role certainly for the proactive in terms of raising that awareness as much as there is for the reactive. In fact, in some ways, if we get the reactive side correct, that should lead to more of an increase in awareness and confidence in the proactive awareness side. They both go hand in hand.

I agree with what has been said so far certainly on the awareness, the education and all of that that has been said. There is a role for that. From our perspective as the police, it is about raising confidence. Some of that is from highlighting the successes. Where we have successfully prosecuted someone, we should make more of that. Some of that is around how we engage with our communities and the point around working with our disability partners. We know that that leads to a deeper understanding with police officers, as well as developing those relationships. There is that side as well.

Finally, I would say that it is about communication. As much as everyone around this table will probably produce their material that they share with the community, the police need to be doing something like that as well. We are developing, as I have said earlier, something that will be in multiple languages as well as Braille.

Keith Prince AM: Perhaps I could ask another question of you? It is about recorded offences. It is difficult to provide a figure on how many hate crimes have taken place in the capital because one offence might have more than one hate flag attached to it, apparently. Is there any way that the MPS could look at how hate crime is recorded so that we could have an accurate figure?

Superintendent Waheed Khan (Metropolitan Police Service): We have a central hate crime team and what they do on a daily basis is they will look at all of the hate crimes that have been recorded across the MPS, those that have been flagged, and then their job is to try to make sure they identify the trends that support those investigations, working with our partners as well. Yes, that is what they are doing and increasingly we will find that that should resolve a lot of the issues that were just mentioned.

Keith Prince AM: Thank you. Sorry, did you have anything to say, Iman?

Iman Atta OBE (Director, TellMAMA): Sharing good results on success stories is good to highlight what is happening. That is true. It is good to highlight really building more awareness around hate crimes, but there are positive messages as well around social cohesion and the balance that we need to really sometimes pick on when we are talking about hate crimes. Sometimes we talk about hate crimes and then that gives a negative impact on communities. We need to find that balance at difficult times in our communities and societies. As much as a report is minor, for us it is important for people to report it because we map the reports that we get and, with the reports that we get as well from police forces, we look at where the community tensions are and where the hotspots are. We work with police forces and partner agencies to disseminate messages to support communities before tensions arise and before there is a spike following a terrorist attack. We know that it is going to happen, but we should have messages out and disseminated to communities to do some prevention work from actually an increase in hate crimes.

I can say that in the recent two years there has been significant work and partnership with police forces. When we get intelligence from communities about an incident taking place within Muslim communities, we inform police forces and there is an immediate response and a common message to the communities to ensure safeguarding and security measures are in place. Likewise, when police forces get that knowledge, they tend

to share it with us. That collaboration and that partnership work is important. As much as it is important with the criminal justice system, it is important across the different strands because sometimes it is antisemitic hate crimes that are maybe most demonstrated by Muslim communities or anti-LGBT and, likewise, anti-Islam hatred is demonstrated by Jewish communities. Those communities coming together to stand collectively against hatred and coming out with positive messages is an important role that we play to the wider society in really how we tackle together the hatred and prevent it.

Keith Prince AM: Thank you. Going back to the Superintendent, I understand that the MPS Hate Crime Diamond Group is working on a plan for awareness raising in schools. Do you know what progress is being made on that so far?

Superintendent Waheed Khan (Metropolitan Police Service): Yes, the Diamond Group is a forum where we meet all of our partners and we discuss a number of initiatives and how we can work together, and that is one of them. That I would say is imminent. We are towards the end of that process and that should be rolled out very soon, I would say in the next month or so.

Keith Prince AM: Thank you. Then to the rest of the panel with the exclusion of the Superintendent on this occasion, have any of you had any interaction with the MPS hate crime liaison officers (HCLOs) and, if so, what has their impact been so far on awareness and reporting of hate crime?

Iman Atta OBE (Director, TellMAMA): Yes, we have had several interactions with HCLOs. They do tend to inform communities about hate crime and ways of reporting. We as well have trained some of the HCLOs on what we see in the picture of anti-Islam hatred and that gives them as well an insight into how to approach and speak to Muslim communities as well as other communities. The interaction so far has been good.

One of the things that we need to be careful of and always look at is really the experience and expertise that these liaison officers have and whether we lose them halfway through that role or not and how to maintain that experience. We might train 30 officers today and meet with them, but if something happens and resources are cut and they drop off the system, what happens to the new ones coming in? Where does that learning journey that those officers have built already go? How does that work in the handover and moving forward?

Nick Antjoule (Head of Hate Crime Services, Galop): I am really optimistic about HCLOs. It is a new role and I know that lots of them are still getting their feet under the table. I know that we have had conversations with lots of them and have dealt with lots of cases jointly with lots of them already. I am really optimistic. They are great. I know my team is really pleased to have them there.

There is one thing that I am really keen on. I know that Basic Command Units (BCUs) have lots of autonomy over how they allocate resources and so the last thing I want is, six months down the line, for those roles to disappear or to have someone nominally a HCLO but actually have no hours attached to the work, which is a real danger.

Keith Prince AM: Thank you.

Louise Holden (London Deaf & Disabled People's Organisations Hate Crime Partnership): We have had really good interactions with them. They are called Hate Crime Co-ordinators now. It has been really positive and so we are really encouraged by it.

I will echo what Nick said. We did have experience where, because there is so low reporting of disability hate crime, it has been lumped in with other types. There was one Hate Crime Co-ordinator who was covering three different strands of hate crime over numerous boroughs because of the new BCUs. That is a hell of a lot of work.

As long as the police officer who has been given that role has been properly trained. We cannot stress enough the Disability Hate Crime Matters initiative that was so successful a couple of years ago. It just worked so well, and I know that they are going to be looking into developing something along those lines. It was a briefing. We would like to see it embedded as part of the induction for those officers so that they do not lose the learning. Thanks.

Keith Prince AM: Thank you.

Jemma Levene (Deputy Director, Hope Not Hate): There are actually more Hate Crime Co-ordinators for boroughs than HCLOs, although I have dealt with one on a personal level when my children experienced antisemitism.

Dave Rich (Head of Policy, Community Security Trust): From our perspective it is definitely useful, and it has been useful to have nominated officers at borough or now BCU level who have that hate crime responsibility because they sit between dealing with the individual officer who is dealing with an individual case that we are working on and dealing with the central MPS hub. It is at that intermediate level.

I will just echo what others have said. There is a concern with the new BCU structure. Each HCLO has a lot of ground to cover. Because the Jewish community in London is not distributed evenly across the capital but it is concentrated in two or three of the BCUs, that is perhaps an exaggerated problem.

Keith Prince AM: That was helpful. Thank you.

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): I want to come in now. This is a specific question to you, Jemma. I have your excellent report here [*The People vs The Elite: State of Hate 2019*]. I must say that there is some excellent work there. Let us look at this issue in a wider context. What do you think have been the main qualitative changes in recent years? What are the drivers for the rise of hate crime? In particular, do you think there are links between the growth in hate crime and the rise of far-right extremism?

Jemma Levene (Deputy Director, Hope Not Hate): Yes, there definitely are links. With the undermining of people's trust in authority and willingness to engage trust in politicians but actually trust in any authority figures, there has been a massive falling off of figures in committees whom people will engage with and will trust. Like you say, people versus the elite as a narrative has meant that people do not feel that they have the necessary relationship with their local councillor whom they would see to complain to or drop into their local police station. They would express their anger either online or offline instead. Definitely, that erosion of engagement with all the civic structures that are there to help people has meant that the people who are angry enough to commit a hate crime are more likely to do that as a result. I guess we can go even further back than that to look at people's sense of economic security and people's sense of aspiration having been completely eroded. There are feelings of frustration and feelings of not having an opportunity and not having a voice and all of those things feed into hate crime.

In terms of the growth of the far right, as we have been saying for some time, the violent far right has shrunk in the last decade but the core of it is much more violent and dangerous than it has been before, not just from

National Action but from splinter groups from National Action and other groups like that. It is also younger and there is a sense of spurring each other on. There is a glorification of violence. There is a glorification of rape as a tool of violence, which is happening in closed encrypted groups. That is spilling out. What is also happening is every time an attack happens, there is that need for one-upmanship to make the next attack seem worse. On top of that, there is the sharing of content. People who might not want to necessarily commit an act of violence will be comfortable watching acts of violence online and sharing insightful content. That will obviously spill into offline hate and both verbal and physical attacks. Yes, it is a really worrying state of affairs and it is difficult to see the way forward in terms of re-engaging people with civic society and re-engaging people with a system that they feel they can trust.

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): In your report, you comment about the way that Parliament has handled the Brexit process. I must say that the survey is not favourable to any party, but there is a report in the *Guardian* two days ago entitled "Racism rising since Brexit vote". It was a nationwide survey. Are you aware of this report? It came out two days ago.

Jemma Levene (Deputy Director, Hope Not Hate): I am sorry. I am not sure if I have seen it.

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): I was just trying to draw the link between what you have said in your in your report, which came out much earlier this year, and this survey, which was reported in the *Guardian* this week. It was a very in-depth survey about rising racism and racist attacks since the Brexit vote of 2016.

Jemma Levene (Deputy Director, Hope Not Hate): That is exactly what all our polling is showing in terms of attitudes. They have hardened since 2016. There is a real gap in the middle in British society now between people who have hostile views and people who are more positive about things like multiculturalism and have more positive views of minority groups in general. Yes, since the Brexit vote there has definitely been a hardening of views and it also was an enabler. The rhetoric that was used by the leave campaign enabled people to say things and the win by the leave campaign enabled people to come out and say things. Straight after the referendum we saw stickering and leafleting specifically targeting minority groups, not just eastern Europeans but other minority groups, too. That rise in hate crime, as I am sure everybody here knows, has not gone down since.

Our analysis is that whatever the final outcome of the Brexit process, it is not good news because, if we end up having a second referendum, people who are passionate leavers will be very angry and that will spark violence. If we go down a road where we do end up staying in Europe somehow, that would spark violence. If we do leave, then what will happen is the people who are most passionate about leaving will also be with the communities who are most likely to be impacted economically. In the long term it is not good either way for those communities.

Sian Berry AM: Chair, can I just raise a point of information related to what was just being discussed? Those are very relevant points that you make and you might expect members of different parties with different views on things like the outcome of negotiations and the referendum to join in and make comments at this point. We will not because we have been given quite clear guidelines about the fact that it is election day today. We are just being clear that we probably will not carry on despite how relevant you think that is. We have rules in this Chamber.

Jemma Levene (Deputy Director, Hope Not Hate): I totally agree. If I may just say, that is absolutely right and I appreciate you saying that. What we do need to all be aware of is the way the tone has changed in the last three years and the impact that that is having on wider society.

Sian Berry AM: We can discuss more frankly when it is not an election period.

Andrew Dismore AM: This is a question for Mr Khan. Without straying into the rights and wrongs of what is going on today, we have seen a lot of attacks, verbal and occasionally physical, on MPs and politicians. Do you see those as hate crimes? It seems to me that they are motivated in the same way in some respects as other hate crimes against a class of people.

Superintendent Waheed Khan (Metropolitan Police Service): If someone reports something as a hate crime, then we will investigate it and will review whether it constitutes a hate crime, but it is difficult for me to comment on individual cases. The Commissioner [of Police of the Metropolis] has made clear that if someone --

Andrew Dismore AM: No, I am talking about this as a class. Politicians are not a protected group in the same way as people who have faith or ethnicity, but what we have seen over the last few months in particular, certainly, since the murder of Jo Cox [MP], has been - and you had identified this - this relationship between certain groups and authority. We have seen plenty of it in the media. Would you perceive those as hate crimes or as just crimes or not as crimes at all?

Superintendent Waheed Khan (Metropolitan Police Service): What I would say is that our job as the MPS is to facilitate lawful protest, lawful views and freedom of expression to extent that it does not breach another kind of law. Where hate crime is identified and if any speeches or any actions that are done can constitute a hate crime and that is brought to our attention, then absolutely we will look into it. However, as a homogeneous group, I guess, the answer would be that we would have to look at the individual circumstances and balance that with the fact that we do need to take into account the fact that people have freedom of expression so far as it is possible without breaching other laws.

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): Can I ask you, Iman, if you support the All-Party Parliamentary Group's call for the introduction of a definition of Islamophobia and do you think this would be helpful in tackling hate crime against Muslims? In the interests of time, can you try to be as quick as possible?

Iman Atta OBE (Director, TellMAMA): From a TellMAMA perspective, we welcome a definition to be put in place. As an organisation, our role is not to create a definition. Our role is to support victims of hate crime. However, we welcome the robust discussion that is currently in place around a definition for anti-Muslim hatred.

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): Finally, Waheed, your thoughts on gender-based hate crime. A number of UK police forces are recording misogyny or gender-based hate crimes. Is this something you would like to see in London?

Superintendent Waheed Khan (Metropolitan Police Service): In London, the Commissioner has made clear that we abide by the legislation that outlines what constitutes a hate crime. Anything that does not constitute or fall within the definition that we follow, we would still investigate it, but for the purposes of hate crime we follow the legislation. I do know that there is a review going on that has been led by the Law Commission, but as it stands, the Commissioner is clear, that we will investigate those things that fall within the definition that exists at the moment.

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): OK, we will leave it there. Moving on to the next section, which is support for victims, the role of the third sector, and I will hand over to Susan.

Susan Hall AM: This is a much shorter section and they are mainly to you, Nick, if I may. How does the work you and other organisations carry out through the CATCH consortium differ from the other support roles you provide?

Nick Antjoulle (Head of Hate Crime Services, Galop): If I give you a quick overview of what CATCH is, if that will be helpful.

Susan Hall AM: Broadly, we know, because we have had a very good briefing here.

Nick Antjoulle (Head of Hate Crime Services, Galop): Fantastic, very good. Yes, how it differs would be the fact that it is leading specialist, community-based hate crime support services with a huge track record of being based within communities, being specialist in working with those communities' needs, being based within those communities and having that huge wealth of expertise. Obviously, the fact that it deals with all strands and the fact that it deals with all boroughs is a really huge boon. It is really fantastic to be able to deal with whoever is facing hate crime in the way that they need to be dealt with. The fact that it can be intersectional, so all the specialist organisations within CATCH have worked very hard to be safe places for people from whatever set of identity communities that they belong to.

One of the things that has made it come out with such fantastic results is the fact that it is so victim-focused, focused on helping people to cope, recover and helping with empowerment, so through emotional support and through practical help. Just to give you some statistics around what it has actually produced, 76% of CATCH clients feel more able to cope as a result of the support they have had, 87% have improved wellbeing, 88% feel more empowered as a result of it, which is a really huge testament to that really careful professional support work and advocacy work that those advocates do.

Susan Hall AM: How does it differ from your other work that is not within CATCH?

Nick Antjoulle (Head of Hate Crime Services, Galop): CATCH is essentially very careful in-depth advocacy work and so it will be helping people to report and assisting them through the investigative process. It will be supporting them on the day of court. It will be helping them with all the other things around that person's experience that impacts them as a result of their experience. That would be the key thing that makes a difference to other support services, that kind of intersectional co-operation between leading services, giving a very professional in-depth advocacy service.

Susan Hall AM: How many victims has CATCH supported to date?

Nick Antjoulle (Head of Hate Crime Services, Galop): To date, I do not have it off the top of my head, but this year just gone, it was just over 400. As a bit of context, CATCH was initially a pilot project.

Susan Hall AM: Yes, in two boroughs.

Nick Antjoulle (Head of Hate Crime Services, Galop): We are still on that same level of funding. Even though CATCH partners are doing their best to be able to cover pan-London with whatever capacity they have right now, it is worthwhile knowing that is within that very limited capacity and still keeping to very careful

in-depth work. What we would love to be able to do is to be able to offer CATCH properly and to be able to promote CATCH and give the best opportunity to everyone who needs it, to be able to access it.

Susan Hall AM: I was going to ask you: do you actually work with victims of hate crime who do not report it?

Nick Antjoulé (Head of Hate Crime Services, Galop): Yes, absolutely.

Susan Hall AM: You do. That is included in the 400, is it?

Nick Antjoulé (Head of Hate Crime Services, Galop): Yes.

Susan Hall AM: In what period of time is that?

Nick Antjoulé (Head of Hate Crime Services, Galop): That was just last financial year.

Susan Hall AM: The last year, OK. How many advocates does CATCH have?

Nick Antjoulé (Head of Hate Crime Services, Galop): There is one CATCH advocate within each of the partner services. Within CATCH, that is seven. It is worth saying, like I was saying about very limited capacity, they are on a very small number of hours. It is proportional roughly to the amount of hate crimes, the kind of caseload. For instance, with race, because there are proportionately more race hate crimes committed and reported, there is more capacity within that and there is a differential there. There are seven advocates, but different and quite modest actual hours within them. What would be fantastic is to be able to actually scale up to the really proper level of capacity that London needs.

Susan Hall AM: Most of them are part-time?

Nick Antjoulé (Head of Hate Crime Services, Galop): Yes.

Susan Hall AM: This must have been a mistake: I read that on some of the funding arrangements, £168,814 was for a part-time caseworker to support LGBT victims of hate. That is not right, is it?

Nick Antjoulé (Head of Hate Crime Services, Galop): No. That sounds wrong to me, yes.

Susan Hall AM: £168,000?

Nick Antjoulé (Head of Hate Crime Services, Galop): No. Certainly --

Susan Hall AM: I must say I was a little concerned. I thought, "I can train for that". It is part-time as well. I do not know where that came from, but we will certainly look into it. You can absolutely assure me that that is incorrect?

Nick Antjoulé (Head of Hate Crime Services, Galop): Yes.

Susan Hall AM: How do you find these caseworkers and how do you train them?

Nick Antjoulé (Head of Hate Crime Services, Galop): I am aware that there are other CATCH partners at the table. I do not know if either of you fancy coming in.

Dave Rich (Head of Policy, Community Security Trust): Sure. Speaking for CST's caseworker, we advertised and recruited as we would do for any post. The training is delivered partly by ourselves, based on our 30-odd years of working on antisemitic hate crime and the experience that we have. The advantage of the CATCH partnership is that we can also ensure our caseworker gets training and awareness from the other CATCH partners, which expands their understanding of different strands of hate crime. We also access online training modules. There is an online training course called Facing Facts, which is very good for delivering hate crime training, so there are plenty of different training options out there.

Susan Hall AM: Fine, thank you. If I can ask the Superintendent, what impact has CATCH had on the MPS's ability to investigate hate crimes?

Superintendent Waheed Khan (Metropolitan Police Service): In line with what I said earlier around our working with partnerships, CATCH has been really beneficial in the sense that people who may not want to approach us, the police, can go directly to colleagues within CATCH. It has been beneficial in the sense that we can capture reports that may otherwise not have come to us, so it has been helpful in that way from our perspective in terms of capturing the reporting.

Susan Hall AM: Good. That is good news. Back to you, Nick. CATCH was originally piloted, as you have mentioned, in Westminster and Hackney, now operating across the whole of London. How has the organisation changed to meet the increase in the scope of this work?

Nick Antjoulle (Head of Hate Crime Services, Galop): We are entering our fourth year, I think it is, and like we were talking about earlier, the scale and nature of hate crime has really ramped up. It would be great to be able to give that proper level of capacity to be able to deal with the need out there. As it is, we have changed to account for working with as many boroughs as we are able to within the current capacity and certainly lots and lots with MOPAC and with the MPS. Both of them are really fantastic allies for the partnership. As it is, that borough spread, which is very even across London, relatively speaking, we have not had the capacity to be able to go out and actually tell victims about the CATCH service. It has happened very organically. Because lots of the partners within CATCH have that trust and that track record working with communities, it is something that very naturally we have plenty of people to work with.

Now, what we have not been able to do, because the service would be overwhelmed, is to actually go out to communities across London, including every single borough, and to be saying to people in a really in-depth way, "This is a service that is here and that could really benefit you." As it is, within current capacity, that would be very difficult because the last thing we want is for the advocates to be overwhelmed.

Susan Hall AM: OK, actually it has not gone all the way around yet?

Iman Atta OBE (Director, TellMAMA): It depends. Some of us, as organisations, we do work pan-London and pan-UK and so that message will go out through us, but not necessarily through every single organisation that is part of CATCH. There is disparity between what organisations have got in terms of resources and what they can really deliver on the ground within the CATCH framework. That relates to your question: what do they do differently outside CATCH? That is the element where the outreach that other organisations have the capacity to do across London can take that CATCH message across with them.

Susan Hall AM: You are going to say no, I am sure, but does CATCH have the resources it needs to deliver as hate crime is rising? You are saying basically you do not have the resource to do that?

Nick Antjoulé (Head of Hate Crime Services, Galop): We have the resource to be able to deal with those cases that really need some in-depth expert advocacy. We have the capacity to be doing that. What we do not have the capacity to be doing is to be able to meet the need fully in the way that it really needs and deserves.

Susan Hall AM: How much is CATCH funded by? MOPAC funds you. Is that right?

Nick Antjoulé (Head of Hate Crime Services, Galop): Yes, that is right. I cannot give you the figure off the top of my head, I am afraid, but I could provide that afterwards, if that is helpful.

Susan Hall AM: Another figure I have is £350,000 for the advocacy service delivered by the CATCH consortium. Does that seem about right to you?

Nick Antjoulé (Head of Hate Crime Services, Galop): I do not have that figure off the top of my head, I am sorry.

Iman Atta OBE (Director, TellMAMA): Over two years.

Speaker: Yes, over two years, £175,000.

Susan Hall AM: It is £175,000 a year, right - thank you from the lady in the audience - and that pays for seven part-time advocates?

Nick Antjoulé (Head of Hate Crime Services, Galop): That is right.

Susan Hall AM: In an ideal world, how many advocates would you need?

Nick Antjoulé (Head of Hate Crime Services, Galop): In an ideal world, we actually have a proposal that we put forward to MOPAC about how we would scale up with several different options there, which I would be very happy to share with you, if that would be helpful. Essentially, we would be looking at a number of advocates, ideally a full-time advocate within each of their strands would be absolutely fantastic, with a little more within race hate crime, just because that is where there are more complaints.

Susan Hall AM: Just how part-time are these advocates? Are we looking at one day a week, two days a week?

Nick Antjoulé (Head of Hate Crime Services, Galop): It depends.

Susan Hall AM: Ballpark. How part-time?

Dave Rich (Head of Policy, Community Security Trust): Because there are seven different partner organisations, it might be a different answer for each different organisation. On the one hand you may have some organisations in the partnership where the advocate is part-time and overworked and you may have other organisations in the partnership that have enough of a resource that other staff members who are not paid for by MOPAC can assist in the advocacy, so the imbalance will work in both directions across different partners, if you like. But essentially the issue is CATCH is still running at the same level of funding now as it had four years ago for just two boroughs and we are now trying to work pan-London and at a higher level of

hate crime, so that in itself tells us that we are not able to deliver the same level of service pan-London today as we were delivering in just two boroughs, because the resourcing has not changed.

Jemma Levene (Deputy Director, Hope Not Hate): If I may add to this, one of the consequences of that is that there are off-grid organisations offering support, which will not be anywhere near as professional. It is particularly in the Muslim community, where there are organisations purporting to be a hate crime support reporting service who do not have the experience, the training and the networks that TellMAMA has. While the mainstream is being under-resourced, people will look elsewhere and that can be dangerous.

Susan Hall AM: Yes. The reason I am asking some of these questions is obviously we are a scrutiny committee, we are looking at not only what you do, but also where your funding comes from, should you be requiring more, and whether the taxpayer is getting value for money. When I say part-time, that could be somebody who is doing four days a week or it could be somebody that is doing one day a week. I was trying to get a general look to see if it is good value for money for £175,000. It could be excellent value money. I have absolutely no way of knowing because there does not seem to be an answer. Chair, perhaps we could get some information back just to look because, to be honest, if you are going to go to MOPAC and say, "We need more resources", you are going to have to have this information for them to tell them what you are delivering back.

Iman Atta OBE (Director, TellMAMA): Also it would be good to note, adding to what Dave [Rich] and Nick [Antjoule] have mentioned, that when you get a case, sometimes the advocate does not look at how much work he needs to put into it - or she needs to put into it - because they need to deliver that service to the victim. Though maybe the resources are not enough, at the end of the day, we are victim-centred organisations and we will deliver the service to the end, whether we have the resources or not, because we need to be accountable to the victims that come into us. What we are trying to do in the upscaling is be able to do that without pressuring other resources within the different organisations, where it is possible, to be able to continue to deliver it in the same scale and beyond. That does not mean that if the victim comes to us now and because we have advocates that are on one day or two days that we actually turn victims away and tell them, "Apologies, we are not funded to serve you", if that makes sense.

Susan Hall AM: I understand what you are saying. It was not part of what I was trying to tease out as an answer, but thank you anyway.

Nick Antjoule (Head of Hate Crime Services, Galop): If I just give you a very neat answer, the average would be about three days per week across each of the strands.

Susan Hall AM: Great. That was the answer, thank you very much. Thank you, Chair.

Florence Eshalomi AM: Just one bit - you touched on it already, Nick - it is just looking at all the work that the advocates do. Obviously, in this financial climate, where we know that funding is quite challenging, apart from the funding, what else would you say the biggest challenge is facing the third sector organisations who are supporting the victims?

Nick Antjoule (Head of Hate Crime Services, Galop): Again, I am tempted to defer to other CATCH partners, but just to give you my very brief opinion, at Galop we work with people facing hate crime, domestic abuse and sexual violence. It is really stark, the level of investment and capacity work that has gone into domestic abuse and sexual violence support services. For instance, an independent domestic violence adviser (IDVA) gets roughly a month of training. There has been so much work kind of building up really good quality,

good practice work that sits behind that, huge recognition of the role. For an IDVA, they go to court. They do not have to explain, "This is why I am here." They will be able to get in there and get their client the things they need. When they are working with someone, getting someone housing, there will be an organisation that specialise in working to give that person housing. Working with economic help, there will be an organisation that specialise in that; getting civil remedies.

With hate crime, lots of that is absent. It is a really difficult role that is often very complex, with people who are very high needs. Right now, there has not been a huge amount of investment around the capacity - by which I mean the expertise, the research, the good practice that goes into that role - just yet. Among us there is a huge amount of expertise and grounding in really good professional practice, but there is still a little way to go to get us up to that level that right now is there in the sexual violence and domestic abuse field.

Dave Rich (Head of Policy, Community Security Trust): I would echo that. One of the key challenges at the moment is just the increase in scale. Another challenge is trying to plan for what is going to happen over the next two or three years in terms of all the different various scenarios and trigger events that could cause much bigger increases in that scale and how we plan for that and what kind of political environment we will be trying to carry out our work in in the future. The work across our different communities and different organisations is hugely beneficial. The partnership we have with the MPS and with MOPAC is a really important and valuable part of that, so ensuring that is going to continue. Ensuring that the expertise that we are talking about here and that we have with the specialist hate crime officers and so on also exists with the frontline officers who are dealing with cases on the ground, so from minute one of when a person reports a hate crime, they are getting the right kind of service and support and understanding and they are on the right pathway already.

Louise Holden (London Deaf & Disabled People's Organisations Hate Crime Partnership): The Disabled People's Organisations Hate Crime Partnership was created in response to the pilot from CATCH and the recognition that we needed more localised services for disabled people. Two of our partners are members of CATCH but I do not know how many hours are allocated to those workers. It is in line with the number of reports that are made, is it not, and --

Nick Antjoulé (Head of Hate Crime Services, Galop): Whereas hate crime is generally there, there was a big gap between the different strands. That has slightly evened out in CATCH allocation, specifically because of disability, and it is one of the most prevalent forms of hate crime, despite low reports. It kind of takes account of need in that way, but yes.

Louise Holden (London Deaf & Disabled People's Organisations Hate Crime Partnership): Yes, and we have been having discussions with MOPAC because we have been funding to build capacity, but we are not funded to provide direct services, so we capacity-build to the disabled people's organisations. We are really interested in opening that up wider to the CATCH partnership, as long as the capacity is there for the advocates. What we are concerned about if a disability hate crime matter starts again, we raise awareness within our community and there is no advocates to report and support people through that process, so that is what we feel about it, yes.

Iman Atta OBE (Director, TellMAMA): Something just to add on to what my colleagues have mentioned, there are sometimes messages that undermine the whole agenda of hate crime that we need to look at, so despite the work, the specialism, the expertise that is being built within the different partners, there are sometimes messages that come out from political leaders, sometimes within communities, that undermine the whole agenda that we are all trying to work on. That is something that is definitely a challenge for some of us

in the third sector organisations. There are messages sometimes that come from police forces on hate crime that are sometimes supportive, sometimes not supportive. Again, if we are to tell communities there is a need to come and report, but then they get messages from police forces that hate crime is not important, where does that leave the communities and where does that leave the third sector organisations?

On the element of expertise, and to echo what Nick [Antjoule] has mentioned, as well as what Dave [Rich] has mentioned, it is a unique element and specialist skills that you need within the work, whether it is the advocacy or the casework. Let us not forget the casework itself that the caseworkers provide to the victims as the first point of contact in hate crime. That learning journey is important. Not everyone has those skills. Yes, you will recruit people, yes, you will train people, but you need a certain individual with certain empathy and certain elements of emotional intelligence to be able to recruit, as well as individuals that are able to collect evidence where they need to be, because sometimes we end up doing work to help and support police forces in their investigations.

Florence Eshalomi AM: I suppose it is really supporting the caseworkers and advocates working on the front line, because I note that Galop reported that the proportion of victims who then drop out of the court process is lower than average now, just because they have got that key support with the advocates, which helped in terms of the reporting and the statistics, because am I sure we all know that the reality is that there are still a number of people who are victims of hate crime that do not come forward to report at all. OK, great, thanks. I will leave it there, Chair.

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): One last question in this section and that is from me, just to you, Jemma. Coming at this issue from a different angle, and again looking in the wider context, it is important that as a society we challenge ideology which may contribute to hate crime. We have seen a concerning number of hate crimes at football stadiums in recent months. How concerned are you about the role of what you call in your report 'street-based groups'? As far as this particular sort of problem is concerned, what more do you think sporting institutions can be doing to tackle hate crime?

Jemma Levene (Deputy Director, Hope Not Hate): The street-based groups, you are talking about things Football Lads Alliance (FLA)?

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): Yes, all the different names. They have split off into splinters.

Jemma Levene (Deputy Director, Hope Not Hate): We are doing our usual job of trying to undermine and disrupt those groups. I am more concerned about mainstream attitudes than I am about street groups, in all honesty, and the shift in mainstream attitudes is leaving society more vulnerable than those groups are. In June we will be running another of our Fear and Hope polls, but what we are seeing when we run those kinds of polls is that people's tolerance of violence as a political tool is growing, particularly amongst young people, and people's general hostility to groups - particularly to the Muslim community - is growing, so totally mainstream anti-Muslim views are being held. There is a lot of it in this report and I do not want to bore people with statistics, but that is more of a concern, actually, than the growth of street groups.

When we look at the street groups like FLA, if you look at the profile of the people attending, you are talking about white men in their late 40s, early 50s are the vast majority. These are the same people that came out for the EDL, but they are the kind of - how would you call it - beer and punch-up types. That is not the same as a wave of national hate crime or a wave of change in attitudes. They are people who want to turn up, be with their tribe, as it were, have a good time on their terms and then go home, but that is not what we are really concerned about right now.

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): Can clubs be doing much more to combat some of the --

Jemma Levene (Deputy Director, Hope Not Hate): Football clubs?

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): Yes.

Jemma Levene (Deputy Director, Hope Not Hate): Yes. Sport is always a really good way to break down barriers. Some of the stuff that is being done, to be honest, feels a little bit manicured, if I could say that. Someone like Raheem Sterling [English professional footballer], as a real individual hero, will have much more of an impact than some of the more structural stuff that clubs are doing. What is interesting is that enabling other fans to report hate speech on the terraces is very important. I know that I have been at a football match where I have reported to a steward, given the seat number of the person, who was just being vile, actually - it was not any particular speech, it was just across the piece - and they were able to take the seat number and record exactly who that person was. It is making sure that other fans know. What has happened is there is an attitude shift and people do not like it. More people are going to matches with their families and when it is happening in the stadium it is easier to actually monitor who is doing it, to capture it on CCTV. You have also got to think about what is happening before and after the match as well. Dave, have you got anything you would like to add to this, because your --

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): We are up against time, but --

Dave Rich (Head of Policy, Community Security Trust): Yes, I definitely agree, football clubs can be huge cultural engines of change, if you like, but the clubs do not necessarily have that much control or influence over these kind of street movements, who call themselves FLA. It is a separate issue.

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): Clearly, taking a stronger stand and condemning the activities of such groups, that would help?

Dave Rich (Head of Policy, Community Security Trust): I am not sure it would stop the groups, to be honest.

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): No, it will not stop the groups, but it does help.

Jemma Levene (Deputy Director, Hope Not Hate): The other thing to think about is that not everybody who identifies with something like FLA is necessarily a racist or an unreconstructed racist.

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): No.

Jemma Levene (Deputy Director, Hope Not Hate): You have to be very careful not to marginalise people or to back people into a corner where they then find themselves being identified as something that they are not. When the FLA and the Democratic Football Lads first came out, we monitored them very carefully, but we were very careful not to call them far right groups. They are not far right groups. There are elements within them that are far right, but there is nothing worse than making somebody feel they have been moved to a position further to the right than they even identified as initially.

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): Just going to the other end of the spectrum, in the summary of your report in 2019 you say Al-Muhajiroun, which of course keeps on changing name to evade the law, is likely to become more active. Can you just say a little bit more about that?

Jemma Levene (Deputy Director, Hope Not Hate): Yes. Anjem Choudary is out of prison now, but also there are a whole group of people from Al-Muhajiroun who are now out of prison. While obviously the police are doing everything they can to monitor, I know that the Tower Hamlets Tension Monitoring Group is constantly monitoring and is very worried about a resurgence.

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): Fine. I will now hand over to my colleague, Assembly Member Arbour, to go on to the next set of questions re support for victims and the MPS' response.

Tony Arbour AM: Mr Rich, you have spoken very supportively of the police's role in tackling hate crime. I wonder if the rest of the panel - excluding you, of course, Mr Khan - agree with Mr Rich that, broadly, you think that the police are doing a good job on this. Do any of you think the police are not? How is that?

Louise Holden (London Deaf & Disabled People's Organisations Hate Crime Partnership): I will go first, if you like. The officers that I am in contact with through the Diamond Group, the disability outcome working group, and various other meetings with all the stakeholders, the messages are really positive. The problem is it sometimes does not translate to on the ground and it very much depends on individual police officers, how they are dealing with a report of hate crime. Getting an embedded programme of training for front line officers is really key, but in general, for me, organising the partnership and dealing with the police, a very good relationship.

Tony Arbour AM: All right. Let me go to the next one. We hear very little - and this one is for you, Mr Khan - how other police forces are dealing with hate crime. We know that the satisfaction rates from victims of hate crime has been falling in London, but how do you compare with the rest of the country?

Superintendent Waheed Khan (Metropolitan Police Service): I am afraid I do not have the figures to hand, but what I can say is that we work at a national level with other police forces as well when it comes to making sure we are as consistent as we can be, allowing for the fact that each force is different in terms of dealing with hate crime. We have the NPCC lead, who will make sure that that message is given out to all forces. How that is then implemented is for each force to determine.

Tony Arbour AM: I am not sure I really --

Superintendent Waheed Khan (Metropolitan Police Service): The short answer is I cannot give you statistics because I do not have them to hand. I can certainly provide them afterwards, if that is what you want. What I can say is that we work with them nationally to make sure that, as the police for the UK, we work together with all of our national partners, but each force does have its own autonomy and they will customise the guidance that is given nationally to make sure it reflects their forces' needs.

Tony Arbour AM: There is a feeling - and again, I think it was you who mentioned it, Mr Rich - the transformation from borough-based policing to the BCUs has somehow meant some kind of decline in police response to this kind of thing. Did I understand you correctly?

Dave Rich (Head of Policy, Community Security Trust): No, I said that there is a concern that those HCLOs now have much more ground to cover. I was not suggesting we have observed a decline, just that that is a concern to be aware of moving forward.

Tony Arbour AM: I understand. A couple of others have a view on that. Yes, you [Iman] first, please.

Iman Atta OBE (Director, TellMAMA): We will have to see how the BCUs will work. One of the things that we need to look at specifically is really the unique fingerprint population in each and every borough. Now, if we are lumping boroughs together, each borough has got its unique fingerprint, its unique population that lives in there, its unique problems and issues. We need to think of this, while lumping boroughs together, if we are looking at hate crime, tying it in with far-right activity or extremism, we have to make sure that we are not losing that local expertise from a different borough by lumping them together under the BCUs.

Answering your previous question about how the MPS are in tackling hate crime, from an organisational perspective in TellMAMA, by working with other forces across the country, we can rate the MPS as one of the best police forces in dealing with victims of hate crime, not only from our experience, but also from victims that would have reported to the MPS and have come back to us with their feedback. We are not saying there are no issues or concerns. There are. It is patchy and inconsistent. It is not that every single police officer in the MPS knows what hate crime is and addresses it equally as the other. That is something that we need to look at in terms of training, resources and the capacity that they have within the different forces.

Tony Arbour AM: Thank you for that.

Nick Antjoule (Head of Hate Crime Services, Galop): We are glad to hear you talk about satisfaction. It is a really key part of this. Nationally there is a gap. People who report hate crime tend to feel less satisfied with the response versus people who report crime in general. It is a big gap and that is national. Like Iman was saying, the MPS is a great force. I feel like they are a really key partner for us, and specifically [Detective Sergeant] Tony's [Forsyth, Online Hate Crime Hub] team, which is under Waheed [Khan], does fantastic work. I feel like with the move to BCUs it is a new thing and there are teething issues. What I would say is the norm now for certainly most cases that come through to us, the investigating officer will be that first response officer, generally responsible, and we will sit with them. Right now, before that risk assessment comes in, I am really optimistic about it, that that will be the thing that helps flag up cases that need that additional support. As it is, lots of those investigative officers, response officers, have not had that training, that grounding in the kind of ins and outs of community need and on hate crime more generally just yet. Like I say, this is a new change, it is a big change. Like Iman [Atta] was saying, the MPS is one of the better police forces at dealing with hate crime.

Superintendent Waheed Khan (Metropolitan Police Service): The BCU model, the transformation where all of London, the MPS changed the way they work from front line policing, that was completed earlier this year, so that was when, in March [2019], we can confidently say that all of the different parts of London had gone through their transition. I totally accept the concerns. They are legitimate concerns. What I would say is that we just need to see how this progresses. The model is designed with features in there --

Tony Arbour AM: You are putting it down to teething troubles, are you?

Superintendent Waheed Khan (Metropolitan Police Service): I would not even say there are teething troubles. All I am going to say is that the concerns that have been expressed are something that we are absolutely alive to and they are something that, for example, the model does reflect. The model under which

this BCU was rolled out does mandate you are meant to be having a HCLO in every BCU. Some BCUs have actually gone beyond that. For example, in the north east each of the boroughs within that BCU have their own faith officer in addition to what would be a HCLO. We are trying to be as flexible as we can with the resources that we have, but absolutely, there is no place for complacency. I would say we have got to see how this pans out. The BCU model has only just gone live, but we are absolutely alive to the issues that have been raised.

The point around the risk assessment and the change in approach that we are looking to do, that should make sure that all of London from a BCU perspective is consistent in how it deals with hate crime in a way that it was not perhaps in the past. That would go a long way to providing that assurance. That risk assessment and making sure that we support people consistently when we go to their homes or wherever the incidents are taking place is something that will drive confidence and it is something we have developed with everyone around this table, so it does reflect a collective, collaborative effort.

Henrietta Doyle (Policy and Campaigns Officer, Inclusion London): There is something Imam [Atta] mentioned earlier to do with the priority given to hate crime. We have had anecdotal reports of disability hate crime being reported to police but them saying they are too busy because they are over-stretched. There is the cuts and restructuring, particularly following [Chief Constable] Sara Thornton's CBE QPM [Chair of the NPCC] statement in response to a question about misogynistic hate crime, her saying that they were focusing on violent crime. That has kind of sent a message down. It appears so. I do not have research, but the response of the police, they are not necessarily prioritising hate crime in the way that we would wish.

I do not want to appear negative because there is some very good work and cross-partnership work by the MPS building up in partnerships and we have experienced that through disability hate crime matters, but we have also had reports where it has not been taken up.

Tony Arbour AM: Thank you. I do not really want to prolong this very much - this is for you, Mr Khan - but the response that we have from the MPS in asking about dealing with hate crime, there appears to be a feeling that the rapidity with which an offence is reported is likely to be the most significant thing in determining whether or not you catch whoever it is who has been responsible. Is that in fact the position?

Superintendent Waheed Khan (Metropolitan Police Service): It very much depends on the circumstances of each individual case. For example, if someone was walking along the street and there was a comment made by a passing car, then we will do what we can to try to identify that car, see if there was any CCTV, but sometimes it not be possible; were there witnesses? It very much depends on the circumstances, but when that report comes in, the point I was trying to make is that we will be consistent in how we risk assess. Are there any vulnerabilities or are we providing the support to that victim and are we investigating fully and cohesively in a way that perhaps we did not do in the past? Each circumstance is different. It is difficult for me to say that we will always be able to identify someone or we cannot, because it depends on what is happening.

Tony Arbour AM: Two of the members of the panel, both Dave Rich and Henrietta Doyle, have said it is only when people have talked about it after the event that they realise that a crime has been committed. Have I interpreted both of you correctly on that?

Dave Rich (Head of Policy, Community Security Trust): Sometimes. I would say that is a particular problem with children, with schoolchildren.

Henrietta Doyle (Policy and Campaigns Officer, Inclusion London): It is a problem that happens with disabled people. They might mention an incident in passing, as I said, when they go to a service and they just mention an incident and it is the staff member that recognises it is a hate crime.

Tony Arbour AM: But both of you are, in effect, reporting in a third-party way. By having third-party reporting, does it speed up or slow down the process? In other words, giving Mr Khan's example, somebody comes along, drives past me or walks past me or walks past anybody and says something offensive or does something offensive, such a person is possibly going to muse on the matter and will talk to his friend, who might be a member of one or other of your organisations, in which case, if you like, what they call in crime novels 'the golden hour' - when you report the thing - is lost. What I am trying to suggest is maybe third-party reporting might be a hindrance rather than a help.

Superintendent Waheed Khan (Metropolitan Police Service): The kind of challenge or the thing I would say back to that is that if they had not gone to the third party, we would never know about it.

Tony Arbour AM: That is true, yes, of course.

Superintendent Waheed Khan (Metropolitan Police Service): To be fair, I would rather we learnt about it at some stage and have that as information that we can use to inform where we then deploy our resources rather it not being brought to our attention at all. I would say I am really grateful for the fact that our partners are willing to take on that reporting role.

Tony Arbour AM: On reflect, my question was a foolish one because your answer has dealt with it. Thank you.

Sian Berry AM: I will be as quick as I can, Chair. Yes, sorry that I have to leave a little earlier. I need to leave at 12.30pm, so just very quickly. The Online Hate Crime Hub was launched in April 2017 and I wanted to ask Superintendent Khan about that. If I can ask, just to bring a few questions together for essentially a potted history of what was done, like why it was set up, what it was tasked with, what it achieved, how many cases it took in, what it did in terms of prevention and victim support and how you have measured the success there and the changes that have been made recently.

Superintendent Waheed Khan (Metropolitan Police Service): I cannot give you the statistics, but what I can tell you is this: the Online Hate Crime Hub was set up as a result of funding that we received from MOPAC to try to make sure that centrally there was a hub, in effect, that would look at the activity online. However, things have moved on since then. That funding is no longer being provided, but the decision has been taken by the MPS to still continue with making sure that there is a central hate crime team, so it is not just looking at online activity, it is looking at what happens across the MPS. It is led by our capable colleague, as mentioned by Nick [Antjoule] earlier, [Detective Sergeant] Anthony Forsyth, and what they do is that they will monitor what happens online as well as monitor the daily kind of what is flagged or brought to their attention as hate crime across London, identify trends, work with our partners to make sure that the officers have the material that they need to investigate properly. It has moved beyond that. It was initially an Online Hate Crime Hub. That was in effect merged within a bigger entity that now looks at wider online and offline real-life hate crime.

Sian Berry AM: Essentially it is an intelligence sort of organisation? Not intelligence, but it is for getting the picture of what is going on and that is why you have brought in --

Superintendent Waheed Khan (Metropolitan Police Service): Yes, it is designed as a central point of contact for our partners nationally as well as to look at what happens online but supporting those frontline officers in the investigations in different parts of London.

Sian Berry AM: The Mayor told us at Mayor's Question Time this month that 1,600 cases have been dealt with. Does that sound right to you?

Superintendent Waheed Khan (Metropolitan Police Service): When you say 'dealt with', that is probably a bit vague. I would have to know whether you mean in terms of being reported or whether --

Sian Berry AM: That may be the word. That may be a transcription of what the Mayor said.

Superintendent Waheed Khan (Metropolitan Police Service): Do you see what I mean? I need a bit more accuracy, but in terms of what is reported to us daily, I know roughly what is reported to us on an average daily basis. I am not sure that constitutes that in a year. Was that a year figure you said?

Sian Berry AM: Since it started, actually, so that is less per year. It is 24 months since it was set up.

Superintendent Waheed Khan (Metropolitan Police Service): On average I would say it is probably between 60 or 70 reports per day. My maths is not that great, but whatever that converts to would be your answer.

Sian Berry AM: OK, great. Looking at the statistics overall for hate crime - I will just get my calculator out - I can see that between 1,000 and 1,500 cases per month are being dealt with as crimes; that is the crime statistics. If you are doing 60 to 70 a day, then in a month that would be 1,800. You are basically saying all of them are crimes?

Superintendent Waheed Khan (Metropolitan Police Service): Yes.

Sian Berry AM: You are not dealing with them separately from any other crimes, you are monitoring and keeping an eye on them with that?

Superintendent Waheed Khan (Metropolitan Police Service): We monitor and we provide the support, but the investigation itself is still dealt with by the front-line officers in the borough or the BCU that is responsible for it.

Sian Berry AM: In terms of prevention rather than reported crimes, one of the tasks it had was to speed up the removal of online hate speech, effectively, and I guess material that incites hate crime. You have been giving trusted reporter status to certain groups to flag social media which is not further assessed, it is just prioritised for removal. Is that right? Is that what is happening?

Superintendent Waheed Khan (Metropolitan Police Service): Yes. We work with our colleagues. If something is brought to our attention, then we will raise it with the appropriate teams and then they will work to take it down as soon as possible.

Sian Berry AM: Yes. In terms of identifying that it is hate speech, the reporting group says to you it is hate speech. No one with the MPS goes, "Is it or not?" and then it gets reported to the online service provider, then also maybe somebody looks at it. I am just thinking, when we say 'trusted reporter status', do we take

their word for it and then it goes forwards for removal or is there someone on the way that might downgrade it?

Superintendent Waheed Khan (Metropolitan Police Service): Our team would still look at it and give it a cast-over, but we would act upon the information that we receive from our partners as well.

Sian Berry AM: You have got relationships with some of the service providers now online who are accepting these reports and acting more swiftly than they were?

Superintendent Waheed Khan (Metropolitan Police Service): We still need to work on them to improve them, but yes.

Sian Berry AM: Do you have any statistics or achievements to report in terms of the number of things taken down over time or the different types of hate crimes?

Superintendent Waheed Khan (Metropolitan Police Service): I can provide that. We do, and I know we do, but I am afraid I do not have that to hand. It is something that I am happy to share afterwards.

Sian Berry AM: If we can get that in writing, because it would be really useful to see. Maybe also the speed with which things are removed after they are reported, just to see how it is progressing, because obviously this is an issue. Certainly, as someone who spends a lot of time online, I can see things that I find offensive that I am certain people have reported and they are still there days later.

Superintendent Waheed Khan (Metropolitan Police Service): Absolutely. I can have that shared with yourselves afterwards.

Jemma Levene (Deputy Director, Hope Not Hate): It does depend very much across the platform as well. Some platforms are much more responsive now than others.

Sian Berry AM: Yes, and by platform as well. We will write to you and ask you for some data that we can then study. That would be really useful.

In terms of the finances, you said that MOPAC had removed funding from the project. Is that --

Superintendent Waheed Khan (Metropolitan Police Service): The Online Hate Crime Hub was a pilot at the time. It had proved successful in terms of what it was looking to achieve, but we wanted to continue with that and build upon that success, to take it away from just focusing solely on online hate crime to focus more widely on what happens in London.

Sian Berry AM: It is not MOPAC removing funding, it is MOPAC paying you to pilot. You have seen the benefits and you have just brought it into your regular work?

Superintendent Waheed Khan (Metropolitan Police Service): Into our mainstream working, yes.

Sian Berry AM: That means that MOPAC is not now funding something else, it is that is the result of the pilot work?

Superintendent Waheed Khan (Metropolitan Police Service): Yes. We are not receiving any separate funding to continue with this.

Sian Berry AM: MOPAC is not funding anyone else to do this work?

Superintendent Waheed Khan (Metropolitan Police Service): No.

Sian Berry AM: That is all my questions, if that is helpful.

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): Moving on to the penultimate section - and we will finish in about 15 to 20 minutes - support to victims in the criminal justice process. Can I hand over to you, Andrew?

Andrew Dismore AM: Yes. Perhaps we will start with Dave and work that way around. The MPS Commissioner at our meeting last week or in the last 10 days or so said that many victims of hate crime do not want a prosecution. Do you think that is right?

Dave Rich (Head of Policy, Community Security Trust): Some do, some do not. Some who are initially wary of going down the criminal justice route are happier to do so when they have support from an advocacy organisation. It really varies. Some victims we work with are more interested in a restorative justice outcome than a criminal prosecution outcome. That is very much dependent on it being done well and done properly and being a free choice on their part. It is a bit trite to say it, but the victims who go through a trial and see a conviction and a sentence they are happy with tend to be happier than the ones who go down that route and do not get the outcome they want. Of course, that is unpredictable from the start, but where we work with victims who do go to court and give evidence and get the outcome they want, they are very satisfied, so it really varies.

Andrew Dismore AM: Why do people drop out?

Dave Rich (Head of Policy, Community Security Trust): There can be lots of reasons. Some of the cases we have been involved with, people have dropped out because by the time it has come to court, they have left the country, they do not live here or they have moved somewhere else or something. To be honest, the victims who we work with on an advocacy basis tend not to drop out, so in order to find out from the victims who do drop out why they drop out, you would probably have to go mainly to a group of people who are not in contact with any of our organisations.

Iman Atta OBE (Director, TellMAMA): The process is extremely long, so some of the victims would drop because of the length of the process. They do not want to live through that emotional and psychological impact for a long time following the attack and the incidents that have taken place. Some of the victims say that they did not know their rights, so some victims do not feel comfortable going into the court, seeing the perpetrator sitting in front of them or being in the same room. They are not sometimes even offered the option to come in via video-link - so they do not know their rights - into the court, so that actually they are not physically there or behind a screen and that actually allows them to drop out.

Victims are not kept informed throughout the process, so from the moment they report, sometimes the information getting to them is not up-to-date or not being informed at all and therefore eventually they drop through that process.

Louise Holden (London Deaf & Disabled People's Organisations Hate Crime Partnership): We have covered in other areas just not being believed, the actual incident being treated as antisocial behaviour and not as a crime. The court process can be really traumatising for disabled people. There are physical access issues, because the building may be old. Also, with British Sign Language interpreters not being readily available and the specially trained officers to take the statements to present, quite often the message that it is a disability hate crime gets lost in the court process, so the barrister who is representing may not have that information. If they have an advocate with them, that advocate will make sure that that happens. With domestic violence advocates, that process is quite embedded now and that does happen, and those advocates are supporting all the different processes to [make sure they] follow what they should be doing. Really, we would like the same for hate crime victims, to have a hate crime advocate that goes all the way through the system, but yes. There are no easy to read documents to understand the process. Also, just what people have said, it is just so long for people and they maybe want to start looking at recovering and getting on with their lives and it is too traumatising to go through the whole process.

Nick Antjoule (Head of Hate Crime Services, Galop): For us, working with people, supporting them in court, it is a really big chunk of our advocates' work. It is really time-intensive, really valuable, just because courtrooms are such a hostile environment, especially with the kind of scrutiny that people are under. Being face-to-face with someone who has targeted you in a really intimate difficult way, it is an incredibly brave thing to do. That is not something that everyone chooses to do, but those people that do, having an advocate there to support them, to challenge things when they do not necessarily go right, but also just to be there kind of with them by their side is a really valuable thing.

Like Dave [Rich] was saying, where there is an advocate by their side, certainly attrition is not really something that we see. We go to quite big lengths to achieve that, for instance, helping someone to literally get there on the day, all those very practical things. One thing I would say is there are such huge difficulties with delay. For instance, a case literally yesterday, one of my team was supporting someone in court on their fourth court date. It had been rearranged three times, this was their fourth one, and then it got delayed again. Asking someone to stick with that is a very difficult thing.

One thing that we have seen that is a new thing is protests outside courts. Particularly there is a huge escalation in transphobia and there has been over the last three or four years. We have never seen it before, but it is pretty much a standard part of trans people's experience in going to court now, to have transphobic protestors outside intimidating them, taking photographs of them, carrying transphobic banners. Having an advocate there by their side is a really valuable way of helping someone to get in the door.

Andrew Dismore AM: Is that a specific thing, protests outside court for transphobia, or do Muslim people or Jewish people involved in these [cases] face the same thing?

Dave Rich (Head of Policy, Community Security Trust): In that particular type, it is specific to transphobic cases, but what we have had is cases of prosecutions of far-right activists where there will be a demonstration of their supporters outside the court. That obviously creates immediate safety risks for the people giving evidence and also is very intimidating.

Iman Atta OBE (Director, TellMAMA): Equally the same with far-right groups. We have seen one case where we had protests that were run by far-right groups as well on a case, antisemitic, yes.

Andrew Dismore AM: Can I raise a slightly different issue with Louise and/or Henrietta? That is the prosecutions of disability hate crimes are particularly low compared to other forms of hate crime. You have given us a lot of information. Are there any other reasons why you think this is and how could it be improved?

Louise Holden (London Deaf & Disabled People's Organisations Hate Crime Partnership): There could be some training for the judiciary, because the law is quite complex around hate crime and the different strands. Disability hate crime is an uplift in sentence as opposed to an aggravated hate crime, so we are campaigning for parity in the law, as Galop and other strands are supportive of that. But in terms of right now, it can go all the way through, have all the evidence, go all the way through with the CPS, gets to court and the judge decides that it is not a disability hate crime and so the sentence uplift is not put on to that sentence. There needs to be more awareness around how the hate crime law operates in terms of passing sentence.

Andrew Dismore AM: OK, thanks. We understand that the MPS are developing a new booklet thing to help officers in investigating hate crime, so perhaps I could ask Superintendent Khan how far that has got and then I will ask the others whether they are aware of it and what they think of it.

Superintendent Waheed Khan (Metropolitan Police Service): The risk assessment, the kind of checklist, in effect it has been agreed. It is approved. We are literally just waiting for it to be prepared, printed out, and it is something that we will share with our frontline officers. Probably not printed now, it will be on their tablets, but the point is it is ready in the sense that there is no more work to be done, we are just waiting for the information technology (IT) solution to be delivered.

Andrew Dismore AM: Is that going to be quick?

Superintendent Waheed Khan (Metropolitan Police Service): We are pushing for it as hard as we can. What I have been told is that it has now gone to the outsourcing people that will do the final step, so in terms of policing, what we can do, we have pushed it as far as we can. I am grateful to all of our colleagues around the table for their input in making sure that it reflects what they want it to do as well.

Andrew Dismore AM: Perhaps we could see it in due course?

Superintendent Waheed Khan (Metropolitan Police Service): Absolutely.

Andrew Dismore AM: Just following on from that question then, are you collectively aware of it and have you contributed to it?

Dave Rich (Head of Policy, Community Security Trust): I am aware of it because it was an issue that was discussed at the MPS Hate Crime Diamond Group and it is an example of how that forum is a very useful forum to get community input. I hope having that kind of form in place will mean that victims get a more consistent response from front line officers. Hopefully it will have that outcome.

Henrietta Doyle (Policy and Campaigns Officer, Inclusion London): Can I just say that the initiative is really positive, to have a checklist, but from our point of view, there is nothing that replaces face-to-face explanation or training or briefings from a disabled person to a frontline police officer. I would be concerned if it is totally replaced by a checklist. The briefings that were on disability hate crime are still needed.

Nick Antjoule (Head of Hate Crime Services, Galop): Just to say I feel like it is a really forward-thinking positive thing. I am really pleased about it. I am really optimistic that it will do a lot of good, so it is a really

good initiative. Obviously, it has had lots of input from lots of us around the table. What is there looks very good.

Andrew Dismore AM: Last question. We have talked before about CATCH. How can we embed some of the benefits of CATCH in supporting victims through the criminal justice process? Nick, do you want to comment?

Nick Antjoule (Head of Hate Crime Services, Galop): CATCH has been operating for a good few years now, on the back of decades of work amongst each of the partners. It is about keeping going with CATCH and further embedding it and partnership work with those local services that are currently delivering in boroughs. One thing I am really keen to do is to connect better with local boroughs, including councils and housing providers, like we were talking about before, around having the capacity right now to be doing that work with the cases that really need some expert, in-depth advocacy and us having the capacity to do that. What we do not have the capacity to do right now is to reach into boroughs, to be talking with local authorities, housing providers and those local services to boost up their capacity, but also for those cases that really need it to have a proper route into some specialist services.

Andrew Dismore AM: Anybody want to add anything?

Dave Rich (Head of Policy, Community Security Trust): Just one thing that CATCH has already started to do, which is very beneficial, is to increase awareness amongst officers of the availability and the value of community-based victim advocacy. The more we can roll out that awareness within police officers, the more beneficial it will be.

Louise Holden (London Deaf & Disabled People's Organisations Hate Crime Partnership): From the partnership point of view, it was borne out of evaluation from the pilot for the CATCH partnership, so with disabled people, they really do fundamentally need localised services, so this partnership is formed of the 19 organisations that are developing it. We have the capacity-building, so we provide hate crime training to the advocates. Some of them are funded within CATCH and some are funded by MOPAC and other sources of funding. We have currently seven hate crime advocates. Two of them are in CATCH, so that means there is an additional five across London, but they are not formally part of CATCH. We would really welcome exploring more options to work more formally with CATCH.

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): Thank you. The last section in two minutes and this is to all of you. What one step do you think the Mayor should be taking to reduce hate crime across the capital, looking to the future? I will start off with you, Dave, not giving you enough time to think. Of course you can send in written submissions later.

Dave Rich (Head of Policy, Community Security Trust): If there was one step, then he would already know what it is he needs to do.

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): All right, two steps, but in 15 to 20 seconds.

Dave Rich (Head of Policy, Community Security Trust): A lot of it comes back to leadership, actually. We have talked about policies; we have talked about resourcing. These are all really important, but political leadership, especially at the moment, is vital.

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): Thank you.

Jemma Levene (Deputy Director, Hope Not Hate): Yes, building on that, the language we use and awareness-raising.

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): Great.

Louise Holden (London Deaf & Disabled People's Organisations Hate Crime Partnership): I would say I would like leadership on valuing disabled people within the community as equal members of society.

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): Fine.

Nick Antjoule (Head of Hate Crime Services, Galop): Challenging prejudicial opinions that are growing up within younger people that have not been there previously that are currently growing. That is one of the really key things.

Superintendent Waheed Khan (Metropolitan Police Service): I would echo that. We have spoken about resources and policies, but yes, I would absolutely agree with leadership.

Iman Atta OBE (Director, TellMAMA): Leadership and positive messaging.

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): Fine. Thank you for coming. We just have some formal business to wind up and go through, so thank you for your answers as well. I apologise to you, Nick [Antjoule], for asking a question that you were not aware of at the beginning.