

Date: Thursday 11 December 2014  
Location: The Chamber, City Hall  
Hearing: MOPAC Challenge - Quarterly Performance

Start time: 10:00am  
Finish time: 11:30am

## Members:

Stephen Greenhalgh, Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime (Chair)  
Faith Boardman, MOPAC Challenge Member  
Jonathon Glanz, MOPAC Challenge Member  
Keith Prince, MOPAC Challenge Member  
Helen Bailey, Chief Operating Officer, MOPAC  
Linda Duncan, Chair of MOPAC/MPS Audit Panel  
Rebecca Lawrence, Director of Strategy, MOPAC, presenter

## Guests:

Stephen Otter QPM, Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary, HMIC  
Duwayne Brooks, MOPAC Critical Friend (Stop & Search)  
Christine Matthews, Chair MOPAC Stop & Search Community Monitoring Network  
Alex Carlile, Chair of the London Police Ethics Panel

## Metropolitan Police

Commander Richard Martin, Intelligence & Covert Policing  
Chief Superintendent Mike Gallagher, Firearms Unit  
Commander Stephen Watson, Criminal Justice, Crime Management & RTPC  
DCS Fiona Mallon, Intelligence & Covert Policing.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** The sun is shining on City Hall today and I'm going to now fix my chair so it doesn't fall backwards. Good morning everybody, apologies for the glasses, they are a necessity because I've caught my son's cold. I've tried to fend it off for about a week, but it's going around the family and unfortunately I cannot therefore wear contact lenses, but there you go. Don't I look intelligent with my new glasses?

**Lord Alex Carlile (Chair of the London Police Ethics Panel):** You do.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Well, looks can be so deceiving, Lord Carlile. Anyway, I'm delighted that we're here today at City Hall, because I think this is a landmark day, a day which shows the power of transparency and I think we've got a stellar group of guests. I won't introduce you, but to set the -- because we've got a lot to cover and we can introduce as we call you to present. But I think it's so powerful to look at tactics that are vital to policing, that if not used appropriately or proportionately can erode public confidence.

So, part of today is making the London public aware of how these tactics are used to keep them safe. To be absolutely transparent about their usage right across London, to rattle through more data around stop search than ever before. Excellent data around deployment and firing of taser, looking at firearms. And, for the first time, I think ever, a public review of the use of another very important tactic, undercover policing. So, a really good opportunity for the public to know more about how important this is in the Metropolitan Police Service fight against crime.

And, I have to commend the team at MOPAC, Rebecca Lawrence and her team, and you're going to be presenting a PowerPoint aren't you Rebecca? And also, the dashboard, which presumably will go up on the MOPAC website at the end of today.

**Rebecca Lawrence (MOPAC Director of Strategy):** Absolutely.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** So, over to you Rebecca, do you want to take us through the slide deck?

**Rebecca Lawrence (MOPAC Director of Strategy):** OK. If you look at the first page of the dashboard. On the first page of the dashboard, we have a stop and search. And it gives data on the volume of stops, stops by ethnicity, the reason for stops and the outcome. And it gives data when we see it across the Metropolitan Police Service and broken down by borough. We'll just wait for that to come up.

So, that's the first page of the dashboard. The chart in the top left hand corner shows that the total volume of stops in the Metropolitan Police Service has more than halved, from approximately 570,000 in April 2012, to 266,000 this October. And at the same time, the percentage of stops resulting in arrests increased from 8.3% to 18.1%.

But as you see from the pie chart at the bottom, the main outcome from stops is still no further action. The chart shows changes over time, and it also shows stops by ethnicity and how that's

changed over time. You will see that stops still take place against black Londoners. That is the highest ethnicity grouping. But that has also reduced over time.

In April 2012, there were 143 stops against black Londoners per 1000 of the population, compared to 58 per 1000 of the population in October 2012. The dashboard shows borough variations, and finally it shows reasons for stops. So, you will see in the bar chart at the bottom that over half of all stops relate to drugs. That varies by borough, it's actually 74% relating to drugs in Tower Hamlets.

That is the first page of the dashboard. If we move to the second page of the dashboard, that for the first time places stop and search by borough. Again, you can show that over time. And it looks at how that compares to confidence. You can see there isn't a direct correlation, but we still think that this is an important thing to show and to monitor over time.

If we move to your slide packs, that drills down into some stop search data in more detail. The first slide there shows borough variations. It shows Westminster with the highest number of stop and searches, but still a reduction. And it shows that all boroughs have seen a reduction in stop and search since April 2012 with the exception of Lambeth.

The next slide gives the results from survey data, both the Public Attitude Survey, and the 2013 Youth Survey to show what Londoners think of stop and search. And it shows that although 75% of London residents agree with the use of stop and search, that falls to just over half amongst younger people.

People are more positive about stop and search as a tactic if they haven't experienced a stop. But they have a more negative view of police and lower levels of confidence if they have experienced a stop. There is a correlation between stop and search and recent criminal activity by those stopped. And there is a difference in how young people and BME individuals experience stop and search.

But the most important point for all groups is that they are confident in the tactic if the police have a good reason to use it and if people are treated politely during the procedure.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Great presentation. So, I just wanted to just throw open a question and then hear from Lord Carlile. I know you're very keen to take this forward with London Policing Ethics Panel. And also from Duwayne Brooks, who obviously I've sought as a critical friend around the use of stop search.

It seems to me, should we be concerned about the relatively high level of no further action? Because my understanding of stop search as a policing tactic is it's supposed to be a disruptive tactic, it is supposed to take drugs, guns and knives off the street. That is my understanding of it as a tactic. But what should we be looking for? We've seen some progress, but how far are we along the journey to get this to be appropriately and intelligently used right across all the streets of London? Lord Carlile, what are your thoughts?

**Lord Alex Carlile (Chair of the London Police Ethics Panel):** Well, I think my first thought in answer to your last question and this is going to be a platitude I'm afraid is that you are

some way along the journey. You will never reach the end of the journey, because there is no perfect solution. But definitely you are further along the journey than when you started.

I think the first comment I would really make is that the fact that 80% of the public who are stopped and searched are not arrested is of course mitigated for the public by the arrest of 20%. However, that mitigation only works if all 100% are treated with courtesy and clarity wherever possible. And ethics and simple good manners often coincide almost as synonyms.

From that, I would deduce as a general conclusion, that customer services in the Metropolitan Police Service should keep its methodology under review at all times, to ensure that there is consistency in the customer service approach towards encounters at whatever level it takes place. You said a few moments ago, it's the first minute that matters in many encounters.

So, what does an officer have to ask himself ethically? It's something like this, "Is what I am doing necessary, not of interest to me, but necessary to achieve the legitimate policing objective that I am pursuing with the least effect on the normal lives of the citizens whom I am encountering."

Just adopting some conclusions from the United States, the so-called LEED system. And that stands for Listening, Explaining, and Equity in the sense of a lack of bias and clarity about police action, and Dignity by the police officer for him or herself and for the public. These seem to me to be sound principles to follow. And equity includes even-handedness, whomever the encounter is with, however undesirable they are or may appear to be. I've got lots of very undesirable looking friends who are among the most upright citizens of all. Many of them, by the way, are in my own political party.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** You sell them so well.

**Lord Alex Carlile (Chair of the London Police Ethics Panel):** I think that training at a very local level is extremely important. And public involvement wherever possible in training and understanding what the police do is vital. If I give an example from my own experience.

Somewhere in rural Wales where I used to be an MP, the police station was closed down and moved into the school. And the relationship between the youngsters in that high school and the police changed overnight and for the better. And in fact, it increased the number of young men and women wanting to be police officers to an impossibly high level for that area.

I think the keeping of statistics is very important, and I do not believe that the statistics currently available go anything like far enough. My advice would be that statistics should be kept that correlate stop and search arrest to charging decisions and convictions. And that that can be done by better coordination with the Crown Prosecution Service.

The final point I think I would make in answer to your question, is that it does no harm from time to time --

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Can I just take on that point, because it is a good point. Because I have met members of the judiciary who say

that the use of this tactic is not the arrest rate, but the number of people for whom there is a judicial outcome. Is that how far we should go, or should we just be aware of how this connects with the rest of the criminal justice system?

**Lord Alex Carlile (Chair of the London Police Ethics Panel):** No, I think that the judicial outcomes are very important, because you get a completely different set of statistics from judicial outcomes from arrests. I don't know off the top of my head how many arrested people are convicted, but it is a minority for sure. And that would be a salutatory set of statistics that might have some effect on the ground.

The final thing I wanted to say was that I think it does no harm for those who are responsible for the police, including, in London, the Commissioner himself, to remind the public from time to time that they have a responsibility to reciprocate by courtesy and understanding in their dealings with the police.

And one can do this without being sanctimonious. It is a very important piece of the narrative, and narrative is everything in relations between the public and the police. It is a very important piece of the narrative that is not conveyed often enough.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** That is incredibly helpful. Duwayne, I want to call you in if I may, because I'm then going to ask my colleagues to fire some questions. I think we should do it tactic by tactic. But Duwayne, we saw a seismic drop in the levels of confidence that young people have in the use of this tactic, and you've heard Lord Carlile's comments around the importance of equity and dignity. What are your thoughts on how we can see a greater level of confidence, particularly amongst younger people in order to get this important tactic to work more effectively?

**Duwayne Brooks, MOPAC Critical Friend (Stop & Search):** I think we need to look at how the police behave, as Lord Carlile said, in that first minute of the encounter. Most young people believe that they are going to be stopped because of their colour, or because of drugs. And from the figures we have got today, we can see over the past two years, 50% of all stop searches are for drugs.

Now, when I was a young person, I was stopped numerous times and that was always the reason. You may have a bag of cannabis or you may have drugs. And I lost respect for the police, and young people lose respect because of those reasons. Now, I think we should be looking at why stop searches are at 50% for drugs. Because in my opinion, that's lazy policing.

And the reason I say that is because if you look at Southwark, Southwark has had 16,000 stops. 50% are for drugs. Now, they have 21 safer neighbourhood teams. And only six of those neighbourhood teams have drugs as a priority. Bromley, 22 safer neighbourhood teams, none of those safer neighbourhood teams have drugs as a priority. Yet 45% of all their stop searches are for drugs.

If we look at Tower Hamlets, 8,000 stops this year, 75% for drugs. Only seven out of their twenty safer neighbourhood teams have drugs as a priority. So I think if we want to tackle confidence amongst young people, we need to tackle lazing policing.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** So, a couple of powerful points. Commander Watson, are you going to take this up, do you think this is lazy policing?

**Commander Stephen Watson (Criminal Justice, Crime Management & RTPC, MPS):** Can I, rather than address the issue of lazy policing first, I will perhaps come to that last, because I firstly would echo the point about the quality of the encounter. Because ultimately, whatever we do -- and the point I think is well made in the statistics -- by definition, we are stopping fewer people than we have done before. And of the people we stop, we are arresting more than before.

So, if the future perfect is you would only stop people committing criminal offences, you would detect those offences and arrest them, then this wouldn't be a contentious issue. The fact that, as I think Lord Carlile pointed out right at the outset, we are never going to get to that future perfect, but we are edging towards it, at least in trending terms. The quality of the encounters therefore must be at the forefront of what it is that we do.

And I would point both to the broad acceptance of the public, so the thick end of three quarters of people, the last survey would suggest that they recognise that this is an important power and they support the police's use of it. We have also seen a very significant reduction in the complaints that people make when they are subject to stop and search.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Just on complaints commander Watson, I think there is a challenge in that we need to get more data. This is the first cut of the dashboard, and I think that Lord Carlile is right about the criminal justice bit. But equally on the complaints, the data I have seen shows some worryingly low levels of complaints.

I remember that the riots started in Tottenham, and the level of complaints in the London borough of Haringey are so low, I would say it looks like people have stopped bothering to complain. And so actually low levels of complaints is not necessarily a marker of confidence, but a lack of confidence in that a complaint will go anywhere.

**Commander Stephen Watson (Criminal Justice, Crime Management & RTPC, MPS):** It is an interpretation you can put on it chair, but what I would suggest is that probably the same dynamics pertained to the issue of complaints last year as they did the year before. And of course, we've seen a 65% reduction in complaints over the two years. And I would also introduce the point that this isn't, and can't be, something that we do in isolation and in the absence of transparency. Hence, I think, the really important role of community monitoring panels within boroughs.

But without missing the point about lazy policing and drug searching, I promised I'd come to that last. I think the fact of the matter is we still see more searches for drugs than we would want. We have set targets to suggest to people that actually, a full 20% of our searches should be in pursuit of violent crime and weapons.

40% around neighbourhood type crimes, which sometimes can involve drugs, because some issues around neighbourhoods pertain to antisocial behaviour and people gathered in certain

locations smoking cannabis, etc etc can underpin antisocial behaviour. It is a perfectly legitimate thing for people to do.

As to whether or not the proportion of drugs searches can be fairly described as simply lazy policing I think, however, is a subjective view. Because if you try and unpick why it is that we do more drug searches than not, the truth is that firstly we are targeting -- and the statistics bear out our success in what we are doing -- violent crime and the crimes of most concern to Londoners.

Police officer can't ignore possession of controlled substances. It is still unlawful, and we have a duty to uphold the law in that regard. Possession of controlled substance is very often easier to detect than somebody who is walking around with a knife in their pocket, because there are attendant behaviours, there are smells, there are reports that are made to police. There are locations that people will frequent for the purposes of drug use, again making the point that that is very often linked to antisocial behaviour.

And so, there are going to be a number of occasions where police officers will come into contact with people who use drugs. And in those circumstances, it is legitimate for them to be stopped. We, I think, are increasingly seeing however, that proportion reducing, as befits our focus on violent crimes.

And so, hopefully that isn't a complacent answer, but I would personally suggest that lazy policing is an unfair characterisation of what we're doing.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Commander Watson, that's very helpful and a very clear direction that we will probably see a reduction in the proportion of stop searches for drugs over time, and it is trending the right way. And it would be good actually, Rebecca, if we could have the complaints data in future iterations, and certainly try to join up the almost impossible task of the wider criminal justice system to see how this works with other agencies. How many of these arrests lead to charges and then to convictions. Keith, do you want to come in?

**Keith Prince (MOPAC Challenge Member):** Yeah, just a couple of questions. The first one is to Commander Watson. As we've seen, and as you said, the volume of stop search is reducing. However, that isn't the case in Lambeth. And I just wondered whether there was an explanation as to why it was increasing in Lambeth, where across the whole of the Metropolitan Police Service, it is reducing.

**Commander Stephen Watson (Criminal Justice, Crime Management & RTPC, MPS):**

Yes, I think it is certainly the case that Lambeth is the single borough from the 32 London boroughs where we are seeing an increase in the level of stop searching over the past 12 months. I think it is important just to track it back a little further.

In 2010/11, there were 15,000 searches in Lambeth. That fell in 2011/12 to just over 10,400. And we've seen that then increase to the 13,740 mark that we've seen over the past 12 months. So there is an uplift from 2011/12, which runs contrary to everywhere else in the Metropolitan Police Service, but it is still at a much lower level than occurred going back to 2010/11.

And in looking at the short term trends from the period in this year, June through August, September through November, we are seeing something in the region of a 10% reduction. So, I think that uplift that we see in Lambeth is also starting to tail off. And also, I think importantly in Lambeth, the percentage of positive outcomes, arrests that are derived from the stop searches has also increased to the 18% Metropolitan Police Service average.

So, in the fact that they are still discharging more stop searches than elsewhere, there isn't a falloff in their arrest rate, that is improving as well. As to why more in Lambeth, it is of course no secret that Lambeth is a challenging borough in terms of the level of crime linked to gangs related criminality and violent crime. And as has just been described, that is increasingly the focus of what it is we try to do. As a result of issues in Lambeth over the last 12 months, we have frequently deployed asset from the rest of the Metropolitan Police Service into Lambeth to bolster their local efforts.

And I know, for example, that 23% of all stop searches within Lambeth were completed by the TSG for example. It's not a suggestion that the TSG are conducting their stop searches inappropriately, I would argue that they are appropriately being conducted. But it's just an indication of the number of additional people we have pushed into Lambeth to deal with local issues. And I think if you look at the correlation between deployed capacity and their crime trends and the things that they've been tackling in Lambeth, you would argue that there is some success.

As those things have come more towards the norm, I think that is the reason why you are seeing the stop searches starting to fall again, because that same number of people are not being employed in Lambeth as they were in the earlier part of the year.

**Keith Prince (MOPAC Challenge Member):** Thank you. And if I could just ask a question of Duwayne Brooks please? And also Christine Matthews might want to come in on this. We know that the community monitoring groups provide local oversight for the boroughs, but one of the difficulties we have, and you will know this better than most Duwayne, is engaging with younger people in that process. Do you have any suggestions as to how we can engage better with young people and get young people to be more engaged with that process?

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Christine, it would be great if you could come in on this actually. Thank you so much for what you do --

**Christine Matthews (Chair, MOPAC Stop & Search Community Monitoring Network):** Right, it's been one of the hardest challenges to get young people to engage with the police. Across London, my deputy and I have been going around looking at as many boroughs as we can, and we have come up with some things that have been happening.

Waltham Forest has a young group established where they meet the new police recruits, to explain the problems they perceive with stop and search. And I think that's going very well. Southwark held a football match last year with Millwall. Sessions with the police, interactive, which I think went down very well, we went and watched that.

Richmond, they have the youth crime conference and a survey with young people, where young people are asking other young people of what they think about stop and search. And I think

rather than having older people doing that, it's young people and I think that has grouped very well.

In Merton, we are hoping in the New Year, if we get our bid from MOPAC, we are going to arrange for 120 young people to play football with the police. The criteria of that is they have to come to do stop and search, so there is going to be an interaction with young people, and we are going to try and get many people more involved at the younger level.

So hopefully that will -- but it is one of the hardest problems we've had is to get young people to come.

**Keith Prince (MOPAC Challenge Member):** Duwayne do you have any suggestions, being the youngest person here I think?

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** It's all relative Duwayne.

**Duwayne Brooks, MOPAC Critical Friend (Stop & Search):** I think what the chair has said is very important, and I think the work that is being done, I can't criticise that work in any way. I wish things like that were being done when I was that age. And we do need to do a bit more if possible, but we need more help and assistance from MOPAC, and I think if we do have that, we will be able to get more young people involved in their local stop and search monitoring groups.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Well Christine, Duwayne, we've got to redouble our efforts to increase and ensure that the quality and excellence we see in some boroughs is really available right across London. Are there any boroughs where we don't have very active stop search monitoring groups? Because, Christine, you started off with all the very positive areas, Merton, Waltham Forest, Richmond. Any places where we really need to focus on to improve the level of stop search monitoring?

**Christine Matthews (Chair, MOPAC Stop & Search Community Monitoring Network):** We have visited 19 of the boroughs so far, out of 32. All groups are at different levels and our aim is to get everybody to a standard. Not all boroughs have the same issue, and I think that's one of the big problems, that people perceive the 32 boroughs, but not one model will fit all. And I think we can sit here and discuss that, but what we put out, it will not fit all boroughs. The inner boroughs have different issues to the outer boroughs.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Well I certainly wouldn't, and I hope my office is not, encouraging a one size fits all approach to this. Because having gone around all 32 London boroughs on multiple occasions to talk about policing issues, there is one thing that strikes you unless your eyes are shut, or you can't see well like I can't see particularly well today, you certainly wouldn't want to have the same approach in Richmond as you would in a Bromley or a Southwark or a Haringey or a Waltham Forest.

But I would ask if we can formalise some of the overview that we get on stop and search monitoring, so we know what is going on and we can provide targeted support. I think that would be really helpful, and I encourage my officers and Natasha to support those efforts. But can I turn to Steve Otter, because I know we've got a load of other tactics. Steve, this is a first

attempt to shine a spotlight of transparency on stop and search. How are we doing here in London, is this behind the rest of the country, is this a good start, what is your view?

**Stephen Otter (QPM, Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary):** Well I wanted to perhaps bring some context from an HMIC point of view in relation to the purpose of stop and search.

We believe stop and search should be both effective, in other words it should have effect in some way or other, and that isn't necessarily an arrest. It might be that actually as long as there is reasonable grounds -- and it is the reasonable grounds that shows us that it is effective -- actually not having an arrest is an effective outcome, because a part of the purpose of stop and search is to avoid arresting people unnecessarily.

At its heart, it is whether or not the officer has reasonable grounds to suspect. And our study in 2013 showed that nationally, a quarter of the million stop and searches carried out annually, the police had not written down sufficient information to show that they did have reasonable grounds. Now in London, actually London was better than the average. In other words, it was only 15% didn't have reasonable grounds.

But, that points to an issue that I think the leadership of any police organisation should be concerned about. It is the quality of the encounter, it isn't just fairness and respect, although of course they are really important. The quality of the encounter is that the officer actually has reasonable grounds to suspect that that person has on them an item. And too often we found that it was used in a sort of pseudo social control situation.

Cops were resorting to it, and I think Duwayne called it lazy policing, I would probably call it habitual policing. But they are probably very similar. I think there is too much of that. Now, what's going on in London, I have to say, is we think the best in the country. The leadership shown in London really understands the problem.

I don't think it yet has got to grips with the effectiveness question, and that is that you know how satisfied are the leadership that the officers -- and London has 40% of England and Wales' stop and searches. So if there are a million a year, 400,000 of those million are happening in London. So, it is really important that London gets it right. So, how satisfied is the leadership, or the Sgt on duty that the officer who has carried out several stop and searches that day, has actually had reasonable grounds to suspect.

And therefore, they would be effective as long as they have carried it out fairly and with respect, I would suggest that that's a good outcome. We don't think there is sufficient attention to the supervision of stop and search. It is one of the most intrusive activities an officer carries out, and it is carried out too often in a rather haphazard and habitual way.

So, it does need more attention. We think though, that in London the strategy is right. I would warn you against thinking that somehow success looks like a 100% arrest rate. That's not the case, in fact that might suggest it's not being used effectively. It won't be 100%, we don't know what the right level is. So the test much be, in each encounter, have they got reasonable grounds?

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** That is incredibly helpful, so we will keep looking with laser like precision in the future, to check that we move closer to 100% where there are reasonable grounds, and recognising that the follow up to the encounter is critical as well. Lord Carlile, you have heard comments now from a number of our esteemed guests. You had the first word, before you go, can you have the last word on stop and search?

**Lord Alex Carlile (Chair of the London Police Ethics Panel):** Yes. I'm sorry, as you know I apologise for having to leave early. Two observations on what has been said. First of all what Stephen Otter said just now, I do some work in Northern Ireland. It has now been accepted in Northern Ireland that members of the public should be able to access reasons for a stop and account on all occasions. And it has been well publicised, there have been two consultations, and I think it is playing out well.

The second point is arising from what was said about Waltham Forest, and we can learn from good practice in some boroughs in London. I go back to looking at the creation of the current Prevent strategy and counter-terrorism policy. In 2010/11, Waltham Forest was already a centre of good practice. And indeed, the good practice in Waltham Forest was taken to the United States, to the Whitehouse, where they tried to roll out some of the good practice there.

And the reason it worked well, and I saw it for myself, was that there was community consultation at a senior level and missing out no stakeholders. So that I was present at a sort of cabinet meeting where the borough commander was present, and also two Imams, a Catholic priest, Relate and a number of other organisations. And a new sort of understanding developed to such an extent that the row that I heard was between the two Imams. Which is a very healthy sign, so I think that kind of community engagement is vital.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Yes, and actually the point you make Alex is critical, in that we are not seeing the public confidence boost that we would like right across London. But we are seeing tremendous results in public confidence in Waltham Forest. And they top the London league table on community engagement. And we know from all the academics, Betsy Stanko and her colleagues that one of the major drivers of the public's confidence in the Metropolitan Police Service will be the quality of the kind of engagement you have just described, so that's a really powerful point that the rest of London can learn from.

Can we move on to the next tactic please? Rebecca, take us through that at a canter.

**Rebecca Lawrence (MOPAC Director of Strategy):** The next tactic, and it is page 2 of the dashboard, is tasers. The dashboard shows taser deployments by borough, by ethnicity, compared with most similar forces and it gives us data on age and gender.

There is an important point of definition first, which is what a taser deployment means. It means, "A taser present at an incident, but there may be more than one taser per incident or per person encountered." And the taser can be used in a variety of different ways, ranging from passive, just drawing, to active use including red dot and firing.

The first point to note is the comparison with most similar forces, where it shows that the Metropolitan Police Service currently deploy more taser than most similar forces. But they actually fire least, it has the lowest percentage firing rate, at 11.5%.

The dashboard gives an overview of every London borough, taser deployments since 2010, looking at the volume and split and it shows that there has been an increase in deployment rates but firings have reduced and also deployment rates in the last six months are reduced, compared to the equivalent period the year before.

We see an overview by ethnicity. We do see that 36% of deployments this year were against black Londoners, which is a high volume compared to proportion per population, 30% of Londoners in the 2011 census data are black. We also see that over 50% of all taser deployments are against 19 to 35 year olds. But in all of this page of the dashboard, I think there is an important data issue, which is that the data is still relatively new, and it measures numbers of deployments, not numbers of individuals. Therefore it is important that we turn to the slides, where we have done a further drill down of analysis.

So, I will take you briefly through the slides. That first slide there shows the increase in deployment. It tracks the rollout of taser as a capability in borough offices, but it also shows that the proportion of firings is still relatively low. So, by October 2014, although there were 992 deployments, the firing rate was 11.5%.

If you turn to the next slide, it shows that officers in different roles have different deployment and firing rates. So, Lambeth had 155 deployments in this period, calendar year 2013. But the majority were by specialist officers. Whereas if you look at Richmond, it has 28 deployments which were all by borough officers. And the range of tactics used will depend on the type of officers, with specialist officers having a higher firing rate.

If you turn to the next slide, that shows where we've broken down actual firings by gender and ethnicity. And so although the bar chart in the dashboard shows a high proportion of deployments against black individuals, in this slide, it shows that firing rates are broadly similar across males and females, and broadly similar across ethnicities.

And when you turn to the final slide here, it shows that firings also are broadly similar across age categories, but firing rates are lowest for the under 18's. This page also indicates interesting data on the flagging by officers of whether those at a taser situation have emotional or mental distress, with 42% being classified by officers as having those characteristics. But in all of these, the measurement processes are being adjusted and standardised across the Metropolitan Police Service.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Great data, very interesting. So, one of the takeaways I had was the Metropolitan Police Service firing very low as a proportion of the total number of deployments compared to similar forces. Is that right?

**Rebecca Lawrence (MOPAC Director of Strategy):** Yes, that's right.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Right, who would like to comment on it, Commander Watson, is it down to you, because a lot of these are in borough aren't they, you know would you like to talk about taser --

**Commander Stephen Watson (Criminal Justice, Crime Management & RTPC, MPS):** I think Mike is talking generally, but I can support him within the individual boroughs.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Mike then, you go ahead, sorry. Mike, you kick off.

**Mike Gallagher (Chief Superintendent Firearms Unit, MPS):** I suppose the key point to note there is that despite the rollout and the increased availability of taser as a tactical option for officers, particularly borough officers that the deployment and firing has remained low, and actually has decreased over time. I think that's a really important point to note.

I suppose the second note really, is around the occasions which officers will consider the use of taser as a tactical option. And in terms of that, there is a very, very clear threshold around violence and the threat of violence for our specially trained units, our TSG officers and our firearms officers. And then for our armed officers who have the availability of taser as a less lethal option. And I think it is important to note that their availability in both of those instances allows us the tactic to resolve a particular situation and reduce the risk of harm to the individual, to the public and to officers themselves.

In terms of the proportionality data that has been alluded to, this, in terms of the volume of data, this now is the first year that we have data across boroughs following the rollout. So that really gives us an invaluable emerging evidence base with which to have a much greater understanding at borough level around the use and deployments.

And as we move to a position of actually finessing this data even more, we will be able to look at individual deployments against individuals, rather than as currently constructed, where if two officers are operating and take out their taser passively or otherwise, it gets recorded as a multiple incident effectively.

So, you've got some really good developing information which will be really helpful in terms of our ability to scrutinise and understand how taser is being deployed --

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Sorry, I didn't quite understand that, so when numerous officers are called to an incident, how does that get recorded?

**Mike Gallagher (Chief Superintendent Firearms Unit, MPS):** If two officers are present with taser, that would get recorded as two officers, so that would be two deployments effectively.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Ah, so as one incident but two deployments, because two people are there?

**Mike Gallagher (Chief Superintendent Firearms Unit, MPS):** Yes.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** And that can be a bit confusing I think, certainly for the public.

**Mike Gallagher (Chief Superintendent Firearms Unit, MPS):** Absolutely, and if there are four it amplifies it even more. But from this year, we will be able to address that, so going forward, we will be able to provide much more succinct for next year.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Okay, we will have to retrospectively do some analysis then, to -- is that possible or do we just have to start again?

**Mike Gallagher (Chief Superintendent Firearms Unit, MPS):** we may be able to do some back tracking, I think it might take a considerable piece of work, but certainly going forward, we will be able to have that more granular view.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Right, Linda, our head of audit. Thank you for coming along Linda. Any comments on this, any thoughts, any questions?

**Linda Duncan (Chair of MOPAC/MPS Audit Panel):** Yes, I think Mike, if I can just point your attention once again to Lambeth and the level of deployments in Lambeth compared to the rest of the London boroughs. Do you have a thought on some of the underlying reasons for that, and also the level of deployment, because I understand there are four levels of deployment before they actually fire the taser? And the differential between those passive measures versus firing of tasers, and the use of those?

**Mike Gallagher (Chief Superintendent Firearms Unit, MPS):** This is a very pertinent point. I mean, there is variation as you quite rightly identified across boroughs. And one of the influencing factors of that is the availability of taser within certain boroughs. Our territorial support group, who are one of the key groups who have access and availability of taser and armed response vehicles, armed officers, they will be intelligently deployed to particular boroughs and the boroughs which tend to have the most deployments are Tower Hamlets, Lambeth and some of those inner city boroughs.

So, we will have more availability in there, and therefore the likelihood of that being available as a tactic is going to be higher than say, Richmond, Kingston and such like that do not have the specialist officers available to them, they will just have the borough based officers with the availability of taser, so the first point is the availability of taser in there, because there are more officers with that capability, which will increase the potential.

What is quite interesting is your second point. That in those boroughs, the inner city boroughs where we have deployments but not moving towards firing, it tends to be those inner city boroughs. And that will be influenced by the availability of other options. So, a territorial support group, intervention point with the taser because other officers will be quickly available to support. That will often prevent it escalating through to a firing.

Whereas on the outer boroughs, quite often we will see the reverse occurring, that they would be more likely to move towards a situation of firing the taser, because there won't necessarily be

support from colleagues that will allow other de-escalation options. And actually, interestingly enough, when we compare that nationally, there is a similar picture. So, in the urban conurbations where there is more resource available and other tactical options available to support the deployment, you will see less firing. Whereas in the more rural areas, where taser is deployed, it is more likely to go for firing as well.

**Linda Duncan (Chair of MOPAC/MPS Audit Panel):** So, coming back to your point about, if there are four people at the incident then that's a recording of four --

**Mike Gallagher (Chief Superintendent Firearms Unit, MPS):** Yes, and that will particularly amplify it for you then, because it is mainly territorial support group officers who are deployed, and as you will be aware, they deploy particularly as a unit, and in each unit there will be two pairs.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Well, quite clearly that distorts the figures doesn't it, in terms of the percentage fired. Because what you really want to know is how many incidents you need to resort to firing a taser, as opposed to how many officers, you know I mean that's essentially -- I think that, with some urgency needs to be wrinkled out, doesn't it Linda?

**Linda Duncan (Chair of MOPAC/MPS Audit Panel):** Yes, I think so. I mean, I think my second point is also -- and it relates back to a question that was asked of stop and search, which was around the underlying reason for taser deployment. And what processes are you able to put in place to record the underlying reason for those deployments, and will that be made available publicly?

**Mike Gallagher (Chief Superintendent Firearms Unit, MPS):** There are very, very robust accounting and governance procedures in place around every time a taser is withdrawn. So, even the drawing of a taser will require completion of a form. Each and every form is then individually supervised by a supervisor. Within each borough, we have a member of the senior leadership team responsible for reviewing all taser deployments, so they will provide a quality assurance process at a borough level. And that is then escalated upwards within the government structures for firearms that looks across the piece, which is led and chaired by the Assistant Commissioner.

So, there is significant governance both at an individual level, at borough level and higher. And as the maturity of the data grows and develops, we will be able to have a much greater understanding of how it is deployed within a borough. And we will be able to have those conversations with our borough colleagues, to understand more about how it is being deployed and used within their boroughs. Particularly around. . . .

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Can I ask a question about taser training? Because I think I share only one thing with assembly member Jenny Jones, which is that we both visited the taser training facility. And I must say, I was incredibly impressed with the training that officers receive. And the training facility, when I visited it, it was in White City, and they are trained to use taser in a number of scenarios where clearly there is a major risk of violence. And they use it as a way of trying to defuse the situation, and on occasion, they have to fire.

So, it was you know incredibly powerful to watch, and it is quite clear the importance of the first line supervisor, the Sgt, because I'm not the mayor or a dignitary of any importance, I got to see the people who were actually running the facility. But I have to say, one of the things I am curious about, and I think Commander Watson and Mike, both of you could comment on this, how do officers get selected for taser training? Whether it is within territorial policing, TSG, I mean firearms, it's a less lethal option, so maybe it's more about -- it's probably more for territorial policing, how do you identify which officers are going to receive taser training?

**Commander Stephen Watson (Criminal Justice, Crime Management & RTPC, MPS):**

Initially, it is on the basis of the work that people do as opposed to individual aptitude. So it is distinct from the firearms world, where people would have to volunteer, they would then have to be assessed as to their aptitude, and only then would they access training and if they pass the training would they become firearms officers.

So, it is a little less discriminating in that regard. However, and by that I mean, we would suggest that if you are a response officer, therefore you would be the first to deploy within boroughs, because you are most likely to be mobile, have recourse to the kit and we can have that on the ground through the 24 hour cycle.

However, notwithstanding the fact that we are choosing groups of officers as to the function that they perform, all of them are trained in the way that you describe. All of them have to pass muster on the training and if they don't prove adequate to the training requirements and the expectations of their being able to deploy the kit properly, then they wouldn't be authorised to carry it.

So, slightly different to the firearms world for obvious reasons, but actually, there is still a very key responsibility --

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** OK I get the answer, but I have to say, watching officers, and we know after the horrific incident in Harrow that taser got deployed more widely, the red dot challenge and then the whole, "If you drop that knife, drop whatever weapon they have, or I will have to fire 50,000 vaults." I think, I can't remember, but it is enough to want me to run away. But you know it certainly has that huge deterrent effect.

But my concern is -- and this was raised to me by the Metropolitan Police Service Black Police Association in my most recent meeting, is that we do ensure that although, you know with a focus on response, that we have officers, female officers, male officers, white, black minority officers all trained in taser and that it is really taking -- it is based on the role as you say, and that there are opportunities.

Because the implication I got from them was that you have to be mates with someone in the borough command, and then you got recommended for training. And I think we have to -- it's either an urban myth, but it is something that the Metropolitan Police Service needs to dispel, this idea that there is favouritism about who goes on the special training course.

**Commander Stephen Watson (Criminal Justice, Crime Management & RTPC, MPS):** No, and I am quite happy to dispel that myth, and it is a myth. People are chosen by reference to their function. And then, suffice to say, once trained if they pass muster then they are deployed.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** That's helpful Steve, that's helpful. Duwayne, do you want to come in? Shoot away, Sir. Metaphorically shoot away.

**Duwayne Brooks, MOPAC Critical Friend (Stop & Search):** Just a question, can you get some clarification on what deployment means, actually means? Because many response teams officers carry tasers. So, if they attend a scene and do not draw their tasers, is that still a deployment?

**Mike Gallagher (Chief Superintendent Firearms Unit, MPS):** There are seven levels of deployment, but the entry level, the most passive, is the drawing of the taser itself. So that is the entry level into what we would call deployment. Moving up to then to firing.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Red dot challenge though, don't you?

**Mike Gallagher (Chief Superintendent Firearms Unit, MPS):** That's the next escalation up, so it could be a draw, red dot challenge

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** And then you fire?

**Mike Gallagher (Chief Superintendent Firearms Unit, MPS):** There are other ones in between.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Other ones in between.

**Commander Stephen Watson (Criminal Justice, Crime Management & RTPC, MPS):** And I think, chair if it helps, that is where some of the clutter lies within the data, because if you withdraw the taser, that's one deployment. If you then issue the challenge and red dot, that's a second and if you fire, that's a third.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Okay, well that's meaningless to the public, to be honest with you, we've got to find a way of expressing the extent to which you are getting closer and closer to firing. And I think we need to work on some terminology that works.

**Commander Stephen Watson (Criminal Justice, Crime Management & RTPC, MPS):** Definitely, wheat from the chaff is what we're looking for.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** I completely agree, Commander Watson, let's move on to the next intrusive tactic, firearms. Rebecca.

**Rebecca Lawrence (MOPAC Director of Strategy):** Thank you. OK. This firearms dashboard shows two things. It shows what we call the funnel of the number of incidents compared to authorised operations, shots fired, and fatalities of firearms. And it shows firearms activity by borough. It shows that firearm calls and pre-planned operations are reducing year on year, so pre-planned operations went from 1703 in 2010 to 1386 the following year, 1182 in 2012 and 1203 in 2013.

It also shows that those numbers of operations, very low levels of incidents, shots fired and fatalities. So, in 2010, one shot was fired in one incident with no fatalities. 2011, four shots in two incidents, one fatality. 2012, five shots in one incident with no fatalities. 2013, ten shots in two incidents with no fatalities.

When you look at borough usage, you see that Northwest London is top for volume of calls, but this is not historically the case. And we can see that this shift in volume has occurred over the last two years. Again, as with taser, you get more information if you drill further into the data, so that is where we switch to our slide pack, which gives borough trends in bar charts over time. I have to say, there is an adjustment now to the data point in Harrow. But the point remains the same, that there are differences by borough.

So, we see very high numbers in Lambeth in 2010, but coming down significantly. But we see other boroughs where the numbers are lower or they have increased more in recent years. If you turn to the next slide, we have some slides around the morale of firearms officers. So, we have survey responses from staff survey, 2035 responses, over half Metropolitan Police Service.

It shows that officers are proud, but have more negative attitudes to their wider command and organisation and a large number do not believe the organisation has their best interests at heart. That is the 4% you see highlighted in that slide. And if we turn to the final slide on firearms, that's the staff survey results across specialisms of the Metropolitan Police Service.

Where specialist crime operations and specialist operations have the lowest survey responses of officers who would speak highly of the Metropolitan Police Service as an employer, and they feel greatest disconnect with the organisation.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Rebecca, thank you very much indeed for that canter through firearms as an intrusive tactic. Mike, I have to say, I am incredibly impressed with the fact that officers volunteer to do this. To put their lives at risk. They are not ordered to do it, it is not something that is required of the vast majority of police officers. But stepping forward and doing what they do is incredibly impressive. And I think the data speaks for itself. Just that this is not a police force that resorts to the use of firearms lightly, and the number of shots fired is incredibly low and compares very favourably, certainly with any other large urban force.

But, do you want to speak to some of the points that Rebecca has raised? And particularly, the concern around the staff survey.

**Mike Gallagher (Chief Superintendent Firearms Unit, MPS):** Certainly. Like you, I am incredibly proud, this is my second armed command it has been my privilege to lead. And I am, on a daily basis, pleasantly astounded by the professionalism, ability and commitment of our

officers to deliver what is a very, very difficult form of policing, in order to keep Londoners safe from those who want to do the most serious of harm to the public. And that, for me, is incredibly good.

Interestingly enough, we are currently recruiting for my command, the specialist firearms command, who are responsible for armed deployments across London, as well as specialist firearms officers. And despite some of the difficulties around armed policing, some of the challenges which our officers face, we have been inundated with applicants, and very, very strong applicants. So I think that is a healthy sign, in part against some of the statistics you see there.

On a daily basis, our officers, and first and foremost although they do carry a weapon, they are police officers. They provide a considerable contribution to deterrent policing of London. Last year alone, we attended 6000 non-firearms related incidents, so we are out there supporting borough colleagues, and working to keep London safe in the non-firearms area, as well as in terms of firearms as well. And the figures, I think, show for themselves in terms of the very, very few that end up in the ultimate decision of a fatal shooting.

You will see from the statistics, that both spontaneous and pre-planned deployments have reduced considerably year on year, and that trend does appear to be continuing. Some of the reasons for that reduction. Firstly, the level of rigour and assessment that is made each and every time we decide to deploy an armed officer. We have introduced what's called the firearms cadre of senior, superintendent level officers to assess and determine the appropriateness of each and every deployment. And that has certainly contributed to a reduction.

But also, we are a support department, working very closely with our colleagues, particularly in trident, and particularly in the serious and organised and economic crime command. And working with them to take guns off the street, whether that is in relation to gun enabled gangs, or whether it is gun related crime. All of that has contributed to that reduction.

Perhaps finding it in relation to the survey, it does show the incredible pride our officers have. But equally, the concern that they have about the support they receive, particularly where they may have to discharge that weapon, and where that discharge has led to the death of somebody. And I think in terms of that survey, perhaps you need to consider that the context and the timing of that survey was at a particularly difficult time and an area of particular scrutiny, in terms of the inquest arising from the fatal shooting in Tottenham. The media reporting, some of which is not always supportive, and some of the negative, sometimes ill-informed commentary that we see on TV all contribute to that.

But it is really important that we recognise those issues for our officers, and it is important that we, as leaders of firearms officers, and our ACPO colleagues, that we recognise the incredible work that the officer do on a daily basis. Their contribution to keeping London safe, and we promote that. And I can take a little snapshot of a week in the life of an ARV officer and tell you about two incidents where they used their higher level ballistic first aid training. One to a member of the public who was stabbed. They identified a hidden exit wound which the initial first aiders had missed, and it was commented on by the HEMS doctor, the tremendous first aid they performed prior to the arrival of HEMS.

I could tell you a little bit about some working support of trident, taking guns off the street immediately following a shooting. Or I could tell you of the incidents where we responded to domestic violence situations, where a male has taken his family hostage with a knife, where we have been able to defuse those situations and arrest the perpetrator and avoid the use of firearms or taser.

So, incredible work that they're doing, we need to promote that. I think we need to educate particular opinion formers and the media around what firearms officers do and the level of governance and the scrutiny. Indeed, events like this are hugely important in contributing to that. We need to influence the developing debate around how post incident procedures will be managed, working with the IPCC and the college of policing and the national policing lead, to ensure that we get the best evidence following a shooting involving police officers. I think that's the way that the public are best served.

But I think finally, we need to recognise and look beyond the gun. It is very easy sometimes just to see the carbine or the glock, and not see the person behind the gun. And each of those officers is a mum, dad, brother, sister who have chosen to do this on our behalf, and we should rightly be incredibly proud of what they do, and how much they deliver for London.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Absolutely Mike, I have to say, I echo again what you say about the dedication and commitment of these officers. And it is very interesting that the culture is that when you have -- you can't get a more lethal thing than a gun. It is certainly more than a taser, and it is preventative, it is used to prevent things from happening. It's so important, isn't it? And I guess you know we mustn't forget that.

Equally, we won't forget the bravery of the officers. But so unlike other forces, you don't shoot to kill, you shoot to stop don't you. And the videos I've seen show incredibly courageous firearms officers that, once they have shot someone, then administering lifesaving first aid. So that ballistics training that they have is also incredibly important. But, Jonathan, do you have any questions or comments?

**Jonathon Glanz (MOPAC Challenge Member):** Yes I do, if I may. I'd just like to pick up on some of the points that you talked about, the overall reduction. Is that level across the whole of London, or are there differences in different areas? And if so, are those differences similar to the sort of issues that you referred to in the taser use, relating to more rural, or out of London constituencies and boroughs and those in the centre?

**Mike Gallagher (Chief Superintendent Firearms Unit, MPS):** You very correctly interpreted the statistics. I mean, there is variation across London, and if we look at some of the boroughs where there remains the higher level of deployments, they are those boroughs where there is perhaps greater gang activity, higher levels of violence and that will obviously influence both in terms of spontaneous incidents and the pre-planned incidents.

And that certainly is the case towards outer London, where there perhaps are lower levels of those, either the prominence of gangs or violent crimes. That will mean there will be fewer deployments. I think it is important to note your overall reduction, even in those boroughs where the levels are still high. So, those boroughs where we are actively working in support of

trident and in support of SC07, and indeed respond to spontaneous incidents, we are seeing broadly a reduction but there are variations across the piece.

**Jonathon Glanz (MOPAC Challenge Member):** The other point which I really just wanted to tease out was the issue of the geographical size of some of the boroughs. Are there issues in relation to the timing of deployments, and how long it takes to get an armed response out from a central point to some of the areas in the more outlying districts?

**Mike Gallagher (Chief Superintendent Firearms Unit, MPS):** As you can imagine, we intelligently deploy, so our armed response vehicles are located across London. We do provide coverage across London and we do ensure, or aim to attend calls anywhere in London, 90% of the time, within 12 minutes and even tighter response time in central London. But that does require us to intelligently deploy, and we are present in particular boroughs to a greater extent than other boroughs. But the coverage is across the board, and we have a very high achievement of our 90% target.

**Jonathon Glanz (MOPAC Challenge Member):** Just one further point, the officers that we see patrolling large transport hubs or sometimes in central areas with very visible use of those guns, are they all part of your team, or are there other teams that come into assist in certain circumstances?

**Mike Gallagher (Chief Superintendent Firearms Unit, MPS):** No, the policing of the railway network is undertaken by the British Transport Police, and the British Transport Police now have, for a number of years, had their own firearms section, and the officers you will see at railway stations will almost in their entirety be the officers from the British Transport Police.

Having said that, our officers will, if those dedicated BTP officers aren't available, respond too. But the passive deployment and patrolling that you've seen is undertaken by British Transport Police.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Thank you, that's helpful clarification. Certainly one of the tactics that I saw you preparing for was in the eventuality of what they call a marauding terrorist attack. And hopefully, we will never see that on the streets of London, but one of the Sgt's who was conducting the training in Gravesend talked about potentially a move -- you have three officers in an armed response vehicle. Is there any prospect of that being reduced, or what is the thinking on that?

**Mike Gallagher (Chief Superintendent Firearms Unit, MPS):** We deploy in threes for very good tactical reasons. Most of our tactical options are based around the three number, so if we want to do a stop of a person on foot, who we suspect of having a firearm, three gives us the most tactical options in being able to present both an armed capability response, but most importantly a non-lethal option, so we can present, in a typical situation, two carbines or two firearms, plus the less lethal option, so we always have that option available. But there are other tactics which are built around three as you move onto vehicles.

Outside London, there are many forces that operate two person vehicles. However, when they need to do an intervention that requires a specific tactic, they have to brigade first. So whilst they may have two in the car, they will have to brigade to a four maybe, in order to deliver a

three package. We have been asked by management board to make sure that London is not out of step unduly with the rest of the country. We have done a considerable amount of research and bench marking across the country, and we are due to take that paper back to management --

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Keep us apprised of that, because clearly that is something that is controversial. As you say, it may restrict your options, but I think London would like to -- that's an operational decision of course, but it would be nice to be apprised of what the final plan is. Thank you very much indeed Mike. Steve, you just heard two tactics, before we move to the last intrusive tactic, undercover, any comments about how we are approaching, trying to throw this spotlight of transparency, following the lead of the Home Secretary, who is obviously trying to get greater transparency over a whole variety of things including police complaints. Any comments on what we have said today and seen on taser and firearms?

**Stephen Otter (QPM, Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary):** No, I think exposing this in the way you are into a public space is very good indeed. Just to say that we haven't been monitoring or scrutinising the use of firearms and taser up until now, but with the new all-force inspections every year, this is going to be an area that will be reported on in each of our inspections each year.

So, we will start to get a view, not just of the data, but actually how it is working in practice in every force in England and Wales, so hopefully, that can give you more information to use in this type of space.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** That's very helpful Steve. Can we move onto the last tactic, undercover policing. Certainly I remember my very first meeting of the Police and Crime Commission focussed on the use of undercover policing, and it seems to be a subject that is returned to virtually every time I appear. Rebecca, what is happening with undercover?

**Rebecca Lawrence (MOPAC Director of Strategy):** Thank you. Well, this final page of the dashboard shows data around undercover policing. It is fair to say that we have a series of bimonthly meetings with the Metropolitan Police Service, in which they show us considerably more data, so that you can assure yourself of the appropriateness and effectiveness of the tactic. But because of the nature of these operations, there is a limit to what can be put in the public domain. But here for the first time, you do see a number of data in the public domain.

It shows the types of undercover operations broken down by area against which they are deployed. And it give a number of usage and arrests. So, it shows here that there has been a 56% decrease in the number of operations between April to October 2014, compared to the same time period the year before. It also --

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** But hang on a minute, so what you are saying is the number of undercover deployments between those six months, versus the same period last year, has more than halved?

**Rebecca Lawrence (MOPAC Director of Strategy):** Has declined by 56%.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** 56% and we know that approximately half the England and Wales undercover deployments happen in London, and we have a halving of half the number of undercover police deployments in the country?

**Rebecca Lawrence (MOPAC Director of Strategy):** That is correct.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** That's a significant change, isn't it?

**Rebecca Lawrence (MOPAC Director of Strategy):** Yes. It also shows the number of arrests. In that same time period, there were 519 arrests, compared to 572 the year before. It shows the greatest proportion of operations are around acquisitive crime, whereas the greatest proportion of arrests is for drug offences, 62%.

It shows over that time period, 1140 items of property seized, and it shows there was activity directed against 180 gang members. You are right that the authorisation processes are important here, and hence in the slide pack, we have a slide around the authorisation processes. This shows that the Metropolitan Police Service authorised approximately 50% of undercover operations nationally. It shows the changes brought in on 1 January to the raising of the authorisation level to that of Assistant Commissioner, but it shows some of the changes to authorisation and supervision since inspections and reviews by the office of surveillance commissioner and by HMIC.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** OK, who wants to sort of respond and take us through, so Commander Martin, I think this is your time to explain to us what the data dashboard shows. This is probably the first time there has been this kind of public sharing of information around this tactic, so I think it is a historic moment. Any comments on the data?

**Commander Richard Martin, (Intelligence & Covert Policing, MPS):** No, I think it is unusual for us to put it in the public domain. I think that's really healthy and I think as Rebecca said, there is obviously a limit to what we can put out publicly. There has been a great amount of change over the last sort of 12 to 15 months. Obviously I think as we've already said, the authority levels have lifted, what was once authorised by superintendents at the lower level of undercover policing is now all authorised by a commander, ie me.

So, for all undercover operations that are deployed, they all come through me. So, we've got a greater consistency. And I have to say, I think the authority levels being lifted is a positive area. In relation to supervision, we've had a number of reviews as you know. Not just from HMIC, which was a national review, but we've also had peer reviews done by other operations to make sure we are effective. One of the things we have increased in London, and that will be towards some of the drop that you see, is that we now have much greater supervision over the operations that we were delivering.

So, as you know there are two types of operation in undercover policing. There is the advanced one, which is the more intricate one. That has always been extremely closely supervised. We had a peer review some time ago that looked at the lower level end of the foundation unit. And

whilst those operations were supervised, they said there was some stretch that was going on with the supervision. And what I wanted to make sure was that we have absolutely tight control and tight supervision around those operations.

So, as we have redesigned the unit, those operations have dropped. But we have now successfully put a bit in to increase numbers within the teams, so I expect that to grow.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Can I just check, sorry to cut across you. I think the public need to understand the fundamental driver of the drop in the number of deployments. Sure, the arrest rate hasn't dropped dramatically, but it has dropped somewhat. Is it fair to say that the 56% drop is because the number of deployments previously, in a previous year, some of them were unnecessary, or is it because of the requirements around supervision mean that there is a capacity issue to do undercover deployments?

Because certainly when I've spoken to senior police officers, Mark Rowley, Cressida Dick, what they have told me is that there is a limited resource to undercover. So, the limitation is the amount of times you have the tactic to be able to use, simply because there is a central resource, you have to bid for the resource and frankly, I think London needs to know. Is it because you don't have the supervisory capacity that you need to maintain that level of deployment, or is it because they were unnecessary?

**Commander Richard Martin, (Intelligence & Covert Policing, MPS):** No, they're not unnecessary, there is the capacity issue around supervision. There is also a capacity issue around the number of undercover officers that we have, a little bit like Mike was talking about with the firearms piece and some of those bits, is a lot of reviews, you know voluntary people, people do this undercover, extremely dangerous job and it is voluntary. A lot of that has been on top of their ordinary operations.

So, what we've changed in the last month is we've started to build more dedicated units and more dedicated teams. So, supervision, yes. Authority levels, that has had an impact, because obviously we've lifted the authority level that means there is less flexibility. But actually the outcomes, as you will see, are not much different to last year, so we are much more pinpointed. We have a much more effective tasking process and a lot of the work the teams are doing is, before you can even think about applying for an undercover operation, there is a detailed planning meeting with my tactical advisers.

So, what we are doing is sometimes, those operations have different tactics we can use, other than the very intrusive method of deploying undercover officers.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Faith is the absolute expert on undercover, I have to say, I pay tremendous credit to Faith for briefing me in the first instance around the upcoming HMIC review, which is obviously now reported. Are you surprised at the dramatic drop in the number of deployments following on from the inspection? Because I think you were closely involved with it, Faith. Do you want to comment on this?

**Faith Boardman (MOPAC Challenge Member):** I do find the degree of a drop surprising, yes. I would have anticipated some element, but this is greater than I would have expected. It

might be helpful if we asked Steve Otter for comments, is this an impact from the review itself, or is it a national trend?

**Stephen Otter (QPM, Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary):** No, it's not a national trend. But I don't know is the answer. We haven't looked at the Metropolitan Police Service since we did the inspection. We were clear that, particularly at the foundation level -- and I think it's a mistake to think that because they are higher volume, the foundation operations, they are somehow less risky. We think they are still very risky, officers operating undercover.

And in London, too often I think at the end of a tour of duty. So, there was an issue about welfare. And in situations which are, frankly, still very dangerous for that officer, and still put them at risk. And so, we felt that there was a level of supervision nationally that was agreed, and it wasn't present in London.

Now, I don't know -- I mean you'll have to ask the Metropolitan Police Service, because I have no idea whether that should or should not result in a drop of the number of operations. My judgement is that if it is necessary and proportionate to carry out these operations, they should continue. The Metropolitan Police Service has a quarter of the police officers of England and Wales, it is always going to have more operations because it is the capital city. So, I think it is a good question that you need to ask, and I can't answer the question.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** It clearly sounds like it is a capacity issue, there is a capacity issue around supervision and not the demand and the need for the deployments. And therefore, I am actually concerned by this.

**Faith Boardman (MOPAC Challenge Member):** I think that is a reasonable concern. But you were telling us earlier that you were in the process of recruiting and looking at the numbers. How long will that process take?

**Commander Richard Martin, (Intelligence & Covert Policing, MPS):** Well actually, the review that we're doing into the whole of covert policing has already identified the growth we feel that we need, that's being supported at the change board and now we are in the process of obviously finalising that design and bringing those people in. I think increased supervision is really important, I think Steve's point is absolutely right, that foundation level deployments are no less tricky and no less dangerous than advanced, in fact sometimes they are even more tricky, because you are, and we were, using officers after their full time duties, which is what we're stopping doing now.

So, we are enhancing the welfare and support that we have for the officers, so that dip is not unexpected, but what will happen is that will grow as we move forward through the year. But I also think the important part about outcomes, and it really is important, that despite that drop, we have had more convictions this year than we had the previous year. And of course, not every operation will end in a positive outcome, because sometimes the operations are right, they are proportionate, they are necessary, but not always do we get the evidence that we want. So I think it is important to focus on that.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Well, Commander Martin, I think that is a note actually for us to say how impressed we are that again, police

officers volunteer to do incredibly dangerous things on behalf of the public. It is very good that we've got this first stab at shining the spotlight of transparency on a tactic that clearly is so critical, to catch the drug barons, the online paedophiles, other people that put us at risk, including presumably terrorists, you know it's a tactic that is used in the fight against terrorism.

And, I guess we hope to see that increase in the number of deployments if there is demand and if it is proportionate, we hope to see that rise in the next few months, and congratulate the Metropolitan Police Service that -- I think it is around 1500 convictions as a result of this tactic. It is a huge credit to your organisation, and I hope that you do have the capability that you once had come back in the next few months, and we will keep an eye on this.

But thank you very much indeed all of you for coming along. It is a first, I think the objective for us is that we return to this, when is the next time we will return to this, Rebecca?

**Rebecca Lawrence (MOPAC Director of Strategy):** We haven't got it set, but in six months.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Well, I think every six months, there's policy on the hoof Duwayne. Every six months we will return to this, probably not every quarter, but every six months I certainly want to go back in the middle of 2015 and see how things have changed. And I want to congratulate everybody that has come for setting out just where we are. And hopefully this gives some confidence that the police are using these intrusive tactics for the benefit of the public, and thank you very much indeed all of you for coming along this morning.