

MINUTES

London Music Board

Tuesday 19 September, 3.30pm-5.30pm

U+I, 7A Howick Place, London, SW1P 1DZ

Board attendees:

- Amy Lamé, Night Czar, Mayor of London (Chair)
- Justine Simons OBE, Deputy Mayor for Culture and Creative Industries, Mayor of London
- Paul Broadhurst, Night Time and Music Manager, Greater London Authority
- Tim Spires, Senior Policy Officer - Cultural Education & Music, Greater London Authority
- Chris Calvert, Senior Press Officer, Greater London Authority
- Harjeet Sahota, Night Time Coordinator, Greater London Authority

- 15 members of the London Music Board (names withheld under Chatham House Rules)

Guests:

- 18 guests (names withheld under Chatham House Rules)
- Tina Dandridge, Metropolitan Police
- Ian Graham, Metropolitan Police
- Paul Holmes, City of London Police
- Stuart Jenkins, Metropolitan Police
- Stuart Simpson, Metropolitan Police
- Roy Smith, Metropolitan Police
- Jack Karet, Head of Non-Screen Creative Industries, DCMS

Secretariat:

- Rollo Maschietto, Project Manager, Sound Diplomacy

ACTIONS

- **A full list of actions relating the Form 696 review can be found in Summary (3.18)**
- **GLA to arrange a progress meeting for late November/early December**

1. Welcome and Introductions

1.1 Amy Lamé welcomed everyone to the meeting.

2. Approve minutes of the last meeting

2.1 The minutes were approved.

3. Form 696 review

3.1 Justine Simons, Deputy Mayor for Culture and Creative Industries, gave a welcome on behalf of the Mayor and to confirm his support for the review. City Hall want to show to the world that London is open to a range of talent and that we truly are a global music city.

- 3.2 The Mayor is a great champion of London's grassroots music scene, its fantastic venues and its emerging talent and is committed to promoting the breadth and diversity of talent, and making sure that all Londoners can access it.
- 3.3 City Hall is looking forward to working together with board members and guests to support the review of Form 696 and arrive at a place where the industry, DJs and musicians, boroughs and the police are content.
- 3.4 **It was agreed that this part of the meeting would be held under Chatham House rules. The purpose of this meeting is to provide a safe space where people can talk frankly and openly without fear of any repercussion. The purpose of the meeting is to assess the value of the form 696 risk assessment process and understand any unintended consequences of the process and whether any changes need to be made.**

Met Police perspective

- 3.5 Supt. Roy Smith and Ian Graham from the Met gave the context for the review and thanked everyone for taking the time to attend this session. Everyone is coming from a common starting point of wanting events to be safe. The review process is underway and nothing is off the table, including the withdrawal of the form.
- 3.6 The purpose of Form 696 is to identify risk and suggest options that can mitigate that risk.
- 3.7 The form is voluntary in all but a handful of cases, where it is a condition of a venue's licence. The 696 process can provide assurance for a venue if working with a new promoter.
- 3.8 In 2016, 2,247 events were assessed by Form 696. One event was cancelled by the police. 14 events were cancelled by the venue or promoter. As the decision to cancel these events was not taken by the Met, they don't hold information on the reasons for the cancellations. No assessed events to date in 2017 have been cancelled by the Met.

Form 696 process

- 3.9 Form 696 is processed through the central licensing system which brings back intelligence to grade an event before being returned to the local unit. The types of risk that might be identified from an assessment could relate to the venue, the area, the promoter, the artist, the expected audience or other intelligence. Feedback is given on how any risks may be mitigated, including increasing the number of security staff or altering the search regime for the venue.
- 3.10 The gap in guidance issued by central licensing and the understanding of it by local police teams was raised as a concern. The Met acknowledged that any local decisions to insist on form 696 being used for an event would be a matter for the local policing team.

Industry Feedback

3.11 Venues spoke about their experiences of form 696:

Venue A

- 250k people attend 160 events at the venue each year.
- Submission of Form 696 is a condition of their licence.
- Generally finds the process ok but very much a one-way process with not much feedback provided by the police.
- As an information gathering tool, can't think what else could replace it.
- A lot of acts are automatically returned medium risk as they are from overseas.

Venue B

- Venue has to complete Form 696 for all Temporary Event Notices.
- Has never had any feedback from a 696 assessment.
- Was also told that it would be pulled in for licence review if anything happened within 50 metres of the venue during a grime show.

Venue C

- Venue does not have form 696 as a condition of their licence.
- Only completed two assessments in the past year, but both were for grime shows. This assessment was requested from the promoter by the police.

3.12 Artists and promoters spoke about their experience of form 696:

- Artists have seen a reduction in risk level returned based on being more established in career.
- The term 'risk' is subjective and onus is on a promoter to decide when completing the form.
- Point raised that artists rated as high risk for one event stay high risk even if events are safe, affecting their 'credit score'. Also affected if a venue repeatedly cancels events based on feedback.
- No way for a venue to know whether a fight will break out or not, impossible to predict.
- Promoters don't want trouble at events and want to work together with the police to ensure event safety.
- One promoter is required by local police to complete a form each time despite events having the same line-up. Would like to complete a form once a year.
- Concerned that this requirement is due to BAME names being given on the form.

3.13 Broader issue was raised about the difference between 'club shows' and 'live shows', and why music events are being treated differently to other cultural events. It was noted that the music industry didn't specifically ask for the form. Does something similar happen with political rallies in venues or other types of event?

3.14 UK Music said that a broadening of the form was not the answer, and asked what gap the form is plugging, where intelligence already exists?

Perception and language

- 3.15 There is a perception problem that needs to be addressed. Why would a young promoter go to the police for advice? Barriers need to be broken down. Use of a risk assessment form shouldn't deter aspiring talent.
- 3.16 The question of data highlighting disproportionate targeting of genres was asked. How do you avoid bias or over-policing of certain genres if no accompanying guidance is given?
- 3.17 A number of points around language were raised, including the inclusion of 'DJ/MC' on the form. Also, how useful is it to describe an event as 'low', 'medium' or 'high' risk without further information? The police noted that they perhaps have underestimated the use of language on the form and the communications around it.

Summary

- 3.18 Justine Simons summed up the conversation:
- This is the first step, not the only step
 - Nothing is off the table and the Met is listening openly to all views
 - The form should be renamed
 - **ACTION:** A review of the questions asked, and the language used, on the form should be undertaken to make sure it's clear and nothing contentious is included
 - **ACTION:** The Met offered to set up an Independent Advisory Group to look at the process. This was also undertaken during the review of the Met's Stop and Search procedures
 - **ACTION:** Clear guidance on the form's use, and how risk levels are assessed, should be published and shared amongst promoters, venues and artists
 - Make sure all parties in the process have the right information, from artists to Met officers in individual boroughs, so that interpretation is consistent
 - Make clear to artists and promoters that their 'risk rating' isn't harmed by return of one High/Medium Risk assessment when all other assessments before or after have been low risk.
 - **ACTION:** Expand the Promoters' Forum to include others, including artists and venues. Also ensure emerging talent/promoters aren't excluded from that forum.
 - Keep the process under regular review, possibly through the expanded forum
- 3.19 As part of the timeline, smaller focus groups are being held soon. A meeting was also proposed for late November to update on progress before the end of the review.

4 General Updates

- 4.1 Development of a campaign for summer 2018 to celebrate London's music scene continues. Conversations with partners will take place over the next month or so.
- 4.2 An extension of the mapping of grassroots music venues, to include production and rehearsal spaces, is being undertaken as part of the Cultural Infrastructure Plan.

- 4.3 The Busk in London summer programme was successful, including International Busking Day and the Gigs young buskers' competition. Gigs was won this year by 16 year-old Josh Gleaves from Havering.
- 4.4 The Mayor's Music Fund rebranded in July to the London Music Fund, to better reflect its work across every London borough and gain additional support. The Mayor is the patron of the fund and has given a grant of £151,000 to the fund which will support an aspiring young musician in every borough, whose families can't afford the cost of weekly music tuition, on a four year scholarship.