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Witness: Sir Ronnie Flanagan GBE QPM, HM Chief Inspector of Constabulary, gave evidence.

Q1 Chairman: Can I begin the first formal evidence session of the policing inquiry of the Select Committee into policing in the 21st Century and welcome our first formal witness, Sir Ronnie Flanagan. Thank you for coming, Sir Ronnie.

Sir Ronnie Flanagan: Thank you very much indeed, Chairman.

Q2 Chairman: Yesterday in Newark the Select Committee launched the inquiry at a seminar which was attended by a number of Chief Constables, serving officers and other stakeholders. At exactly the same time the Prime Minister and the Home Secretary—I am sure not as a rival to our launch—went to visit Clapham to look at neighbourhood policing. So your presence as our first witness is most welcome. Could I start by asking you whether you feel that the responsibilities as far as frontline policing have changed in recent years?

Sir Ronnie Flanagan: Chairman, I feel they have changed quite significantly. In the course of my recent review I spent some time on what we describe as the frontline. I went to the West Midlands area dressed as a Constable to make sure that the officers knew that I was not there to inspect them. What I really wanted to do was to determine the administrative and bureaucratic burden that falls upon officers today compared to when I fulfilled that function more than 30 years ago. While I am Her Majesty’s Chief Inspector of Constabulary and probably could have been expected to realise fully what has changed, I was nonetheless quite staggered at the bureaucratic burden. Officers showed me a sheaf of documentation that they take out on regular patrol, it was some inches thick, in order to deal with things that might commonly occur, not to deal with things that occur only once every five years. So I think the responsibilities on frontline officers today are all absolutely crucial responsibilities, but the fact that they are so crucial means that we must free up officers from other routine tasks and relieve them of the bureaucratic administrative burden.

Q3 Chairman: Who is responsible for this huge increase in bureaucracy? Presumably Parliament is.

Sir Ronnie Flanagan: In my internal report I drew the analogy between bureaucracy and cholesterol. I said there is such a thing as good cholesterol and therefore there is such a thing as absolutely necessary bureaucracy and the need to keep proper audit trails. What I am talking about attacking is the unnecessary bureaucracy.

Q4 Chairman: We will be coming on to bureaucracy a little later.

Sir Ronnie Flanagan: You asked what is responsible for this. I think society has become risk averse and certainly in policing we have become risk averse. Some of these burdens have been imposed upon us and the police service has taken it further than was ever intended. We can perhaps come to specific examples of that.

Q5 Chairman: Do you think Parliament has passed too many laws on this subject?

Sir Ronnie Flanagan: I think there is a risk of that. When laws are passed and codes of practice are developed as a result of legislation there is also a risk that the police service and other bodies take it further than was ever intended. So I think sometimes it is imposed and sometimes it is self-imposed.

Q6 Chairman: What about public expectations? You obviously conducted a number of surveys during your report. Have they changed? Is there a difference between what the public expects and what the police regard as priorities?

Sir Ronnie Flanagan: What came through in some of the surveys we conducted as to what is important to people was that really what is important to them is outside their front doors in their immediate neighbourhoods. For example, we asked if they wanted the opportunity to participate in formal structures to hold policing to account, but there was
not the appetite that I thought there might be. What they are interested in is their encounter with the police, that it is a good, effective, professional and courteous encounter and when the police are needed in their view the police are available. Those are the sort of very simple things that came through in the surveys that we conducted. In terms of describing that as public expectations, public expectations are high and very localized. Those were the results of the surveys and research that we conducted.

Q7 Chairman: Your predecessor’s report was called “Closing the Gap” and it drew attention to the delivery of protective services such as counter-terrorism. Do you think that the gap has been closed since that report was published?

Sir Ronnie Flanagan: I think the gap is closing. Perhaps I could give you some background to that. Chairman, a previous Home Secretary asked us in the Inspectorate whether the current structure of policing being delivered through 43 different forces for England and Wales is as fit for purpose as it should be in the 21st Century. We were determined in the Inspectorate not to rush immediately to a map and redraw the boundaries or redraw the wiring diagrams of the policing organisation. We were determined to sit down particularly with the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) and define what the risks are in the 21st Century, what must the public be protected against and we came up with this definition of protective services. Then we assessed how the 43 individual forces were currently equipped to protect the public against those risks and we came to the conclusion in that report that in order to narrow the gap a smaller number of what we described as more strategically sized forces would probably be more effective for a whole variety of reasons which I do not think it is worth spending your time going into today. That debate is not on the agenda now. What we are doing in the Inspectorate is determining how forces are collaborating and measuring that to be able to report back to ministers as to whether that is effectively narrowing the gap. So the gap is closing. I would not describe it as closed.

Q8 Chairman: I wonder whether you followed Home Office Questions yesterday when, although both sides of the House supported the recommendations of your review, there was some controversy over whether your report recommended a reduction in the number of police officers. We take the point that in the Inspectorate whether collaboration is determining how forces are collaborating and measuring that to be able to report back to ministers as to whether that is effectively narrowing the gap. So the gap is closing. I would not describe it as closed.

Sir Ronnie Flanagan: Certainly what I was saying was that the increase in police numbers over the past number of years has been a very welcome increase. We had introduced a thing called the Crime Fighting Fund which had associated with it a whole series of rules whereby numbers must not be reduced and I refer specifically to numbers of police officers. I think that was constraining upon Chief Constables. Those rules have been relaxed. I do not think they afforded enough flexibility. In order not to reduce police officer numbers they had the perverse effect of some forces putting officers in positions carrying out functions that some years earlier had been civilianized just in order to demonstrate that police officer numbers had not been reduced. What I am saying in the report is that in the reality of life, based on my contacts with the various political parties, that ongoing increase in police numbers cannot be sustained. What is much more important is to make the very best use of all the skills and to find the best mix of skills in the wider policing family, be those skills discharged by police officers or supporting members of police staff. I am certainly not advocating any reduction in the number of police officers. What I am saying is I cannot see the increase that we have enjoyed over recent years being sustained.

Q9 Chairman: So no more increases, it is not necessary because of your proposals on civilianisation, but no reduction?

Sir Ronnie Flanagan: I do not see, other than possibly a small reduction — the truth is that with that increased flexibility there has already been a small reduction and I am certainly not advocating any significant reduction in police officer numbers. In terms of the improvements in reducing the unnecessary bureaucracy to which I have referred, I have no doubt that through that process we can bring forward the equivalent of some 3,000 officers to be employed on frontline duties.

Q10 Mrs Dean: Do you think the Home Secretary was right to abandon forced mergers in 2006?

Sir Ronnie Flanagan: My view is clear, that if we were starting today I do not think we would end up with a pattern of 43. We did not say in our report that the current structure of 43 forces is unfit for purpose. What we said is that a smaller number of more strategically sized forces would probably be more fit for purpose. This was quite a massive project. If you take the Northern Ireland experience, Chris Patten produced his template for the future on 9 September 1999, in fact that was when he launched his report and that process is on-going today and that is in respect of a police service that delivers policing services to a population of some 1.6 million. It is quite a massive programme of change and I think it requires the most detailed process of change management if it is to come about. It is not on the agenda currently. We will be keeping a very close eye in the Inspectorate on whether collaboration is actually effectively closing the gap. If we come to the conclusion in recommending to ministers that it is not working then it is my view that the whole question of mergers could be back on the agenda at some stage in the future.

Q11 Mrs Dean: Do you agree with the Policy Exchange that the process of instilling a culture of co-operation and collaboration between forces is moving at an unacceptably slow pace?
Sir Ronnie Flanagan: I do not want to single out specific areas. In saying that, if you look at East Midlands, for example, there is a tremendous degree of collaboration and co-operation going on between the five individual police authorities and the five individual forces and in many other areas that collaboration is very welcome, very vibrant and being very enthusiastically engaged, but I do not think we can ever be complacent. Certainly so far as the Inspectorate is concerned, I am determined that we will not be complacent in continuing to drive the need for collaboration.

Q12 Mrs Dean: Can you give us one or two examples of how that co-operation is working in practice?
Sir Ronnie Flanagan: If you take the whole question of the ability to deal with serious crime, in West Midlands, for example, the original idea --- The Inspectorate did not come up with a redrawing of the territorial boundaries. The idea was that chairs of authorities and chiefs would offer their intended solutions. If you look in the West Midlands area where the intention was to bring together Staffordshire, West Midlands, West Mercia and Warwickshire, three forces were keen on that and one force was much, much less keen on that. Notwithstanding that, the fact that they are now collaborating in addressing serious crime and in structures to address the threat from terrorism I think is very welcome and that is replicated across the country in terms of forces coming together both administratively and operationally. In my review, while we can point to good operational collaboration, I think there are savings and efficiencies to be brought about by administrative collaboration in the whole area of procurement, be it of air support, information technology, fleet, issues like that. There is a lot of good, positive work going on but there is a lot more to be done.

Q13 Martin Salter: In the delivery of any public service there are optimum sizes to maximum efficiency and effectiveness whether it is in local government, the health service or whatever. You have been responsible for the police service in Northern Ireland with a population of 1.6 million. We have tiny police forces within that 43. Warwickshire, Bedfordshire and the rest. In your experience what is an optimum size for a police force?
Sir Ronnie Flanagan: I am reluctant to go back to this mergers debate because it is not on the agenda now. In that debate we came up with a size something of the order of 6,000 officers which we said we would be a strategically sized force and one that could consume most of its own smoke. There was always still going to be the need for very close collaboration even with forces of that size.

Q14 Martin Salter: How many forces are less than 6,000 out of the 43 at the moment?
Sir Ronnie Flanagan: Quite a number of them are fewer than that in number. I would need to go through the almanac to give you an exact answer and I can do that very easily rather than just guess, but certainly quite a number are fewer than that. If you take where we are today, the Borough of Westminster is comprised of some 3,000 officers. The borough of Westminster, which is within the Metropolitan Police Service, is bigger than many Shire forces.

Q15 Bob Russell: Chairman, could I encourage Sir Ronnie Flanagan not to revisit the merger agenda even though——
Sir Ronnie Flanagan: Absolutely. I am answering questions.

Q16 Bob Russell: --- Mr Salter wishes you to. The merger proposals would have put Essex with Hertfordshire and Bedfordshire, two counties with whom they have no community of interest whatsoever, not with Kent, yet collaboration between Essex and Kent is probably the best now it has ever been because they had to respond to the merger. Perhaps I could encourage you to encourage police authorities to collaborate and to forget all about mergers.

Sir Ronnie Flanagan: Which is exactly what we are doing. Chairman. I had a meeting with the chairman of Essex recently. I am in very close touch with what they are doing in collaboration with Kent and it is very effective and very encouraging.

Q17 Gwyn Prosser: In the run up to every spending review MPs get lobbied strongly by their Chief Constables. You have made some recommendations to make the future formula more objective and fairer in the longer run. Do you have any views or ideas as to how we can make it fairer in the short run?

Sir Ronnie Flanagan: Obviously the CSR has been set. The good thing about that is we now know what monies we have available over the next three years. So we quite deliberately talked about “in future CSRs” in the review. To be frank, it is going to be very difficult in the shorter term than that to address the funding formula in ways where the monies go to the areas that have to deal with the greatest risk, the greatest threat and the greatest level of potential harm. So in the short-term, quite frankly, I have no magic wand to wave. Forces know where they stand. Mr Russell referred to Essex and I had this conversation with the chairman of Essex Police Authority and he was making the point that while everybody wants more, at least they know what they have and they can get on with it for the time being. Nonetheless, I do think it is an issue that must be addressed in future spending reviews.

Q18 Gwyn Prosser: What is your view of the Policy Exchange’s recommendations to remove the cap on council tax increases?
Sir Ronnie Flanagan: I am not constantly revisiting the merger debate. In the one merger that was voluntary, in other words Lancashire and Cumbria, one of the things that stopped it was this question of

---

1 Sir Ronnie Flanagan has since advised that this figure of 6,000 includes police staff as well as police officers.
precept equalisation. What we are saying in the review is that if voluntary mergers should arise, which is a possibility in some areas, then it is my strong view that the Government should find imaginative ways of equalising the precept, not to prevent such mergers where people want it to happen and, therefore, there should not be capping in such instances.

Q19 Gwyn Prosser: You mentioned in an earlier answer the need to address special issues and special pressures. One of the topical pressures being mentioned by police forces recently is a pressure when there are large numbers of immigrants coming into an area either to settle or as transients, as they do when they come through my area of Dover and Kent. How big an issue is that in your opinion?

Sir Ronnie Flanagan: It depends on the area, but in some areas it is a big issue in terms of the monies that have to be spent by forces on translation and you have seen figures in the media recently in relation to that. Quite substantial monies have to be found. From my point of view diversity is to be welcomed and the richness that diversity brings is to be welcomed, but it does bring with it challenges. In some areas it brings financial challenges.

Q20 Gwyn Prosser: Could the new formula take into account these matters?

Sir Ronnie Flanagan: I think in the future it would have to take into account such matters. Currently it does not really do that. There is always the possibility for forces to make special bids. I am not saying there are unlimited resources. I am not saying that special bids will always be successful. There is the opportunity when special circumstances befall an individual force for it to make a case for additional funding to meet those exceptional circumstances.

Q21 Ms Buck: Population churn, even more so than diversity, has an impact on policing. Another thing that has a major impact on policing resources is the huge variation in the number of people with severe mental health problems. There are some primary care trust areas, for example, that have 12 times the number of people hospitalised for psychiatric illness and so forth than others. Why do you think that the police service has been less than robust in developing working with other agencies to work out that information and using that to help determine the allocation of resources?

Sir Ronnie Flanagan: It is a huge issue. You will recall that as an alternative to the creation of a single inspectorate, which was intended to bring in to one inspectorate the current inspectorates that deal with policing, prisons, probation, the court administration and the Crown Prosecution Service, what has happened is that the five Chief Inspectors in those individual inspectorates have presented a business plan to the three relevant ministers, the Lord Chancellor, the Attorney General and the Home Secretary, for joint inspection over the next three years. I chair the working group of those five Chief Inspectors and the whole question of mental health is something that we are determined to address in our joint inspection work albeit in relation to custody. The legislation gave the Inspectors the ability to delegate responsibilities to each other. For example, in terms of custody facilities within the policing service, I can delegate inspection of that to the Chief Inspector of Prisons. That is an area we are looking at very closely and it is very closely related to the whole question of mental health. Police cells are places of safety and a lot of police time is taken up in dealing with people with severe mental health problems who have not necessarily committed any crime.

Q22 Ms Buck: Why does it take so long to work up an argument around these things? None of this is new.

Sir Ronnie Flanagan: It has not been ignored. I am not suggesting that because in inspection terms we are working much closer than we have ever worked before. That is not to say that the whole issue has been ignored in the past, it certainly has not been ignored in the past, but it is a big issue and it is a big challenge in terms of police resources, as you quite rightly point out.

Q23 Mr Clappison: I would like to follow up what you were saying in response to Mr Prosser about the pressure which is created by migration. You said that this was something which police forces would need more funding to cope with in future and that there were special bids they could make at the moment. What is your judgment as to how well the system is responding to the pressures which are being placed on police forces to cope with migration?

Sir Ronnie Flanagan: I think the police service at large and individual forces are responding quite magnificently to the challenge that they face, as in my experience they always do. Quite properly, the Inspectorate concentrates on where there are areas for improvement, but that must not be seen in any way as taking a negative view of British policing.

Q24 Mr Clappison: How well is the system responding to their need for more funding to cope with these pressures?

Sir Ronnie Flanagan: When I gave my earlier answer it was not necessarily a question of more funding, it was a question of future funding formulae taking into account different challenges in different areas. In the Sixties when police authorities were created some inherited quite healthy estates, some inherited quite healthy bank balances and others inherited debt and deteriorating estates. The funding formula in future spending reviews has to take that into account and has to redress the balance to put in funding in ways that are proportionate to risk, risk challenge, threat and harm. In terms of migration, those are undoubtedly challenges that are not evenly distributed right across the country and therefore I think future funding formulae should take such things into account.
Q25 Mr Clappison: In your report you give some good examples of how technology is increasing efficiency and you draw on particular forces for examples and one imagines that some of those examples, if not many of them, could be extended to other forces. What do you see as being the barriers to spreading good practice in the adoption of technology?

Sir Ronnie Flanagan: I think the potential barriers are that with 43 different Chief Constables all very determined to bring in the very best service that they can to the people to whom they deliver policing services they come up with differing solutions and sometimes these technical solutions cannot properly talk to each other and therefore that represents a potential barrier. We spent several billions on introducing Airwave and I do not think we have fully realised all the benefits that Airwave can bring about. I refer specifically in the report to opportunities for reducing bureaucracy by making better use of technology. One of the things we created in the review was a panel of practitioners, officers from the frontline and we would put emerging recommendations to this panel of practitioners and get their real view of whether, however “whizzy” an idea might sound, it will actually work operationally or not. It was interesting that a couple of proposalsets had recently been transferred from one force to another and they found the suite of documentation that they used was very different because different Chief Constables think that they must take into account different needs and different challenges in their areas. So one of the things I am saying as a prelude to making better use of technology is let us standardise the documentation. Surely it cannot be that different. In the past attempts have been made to do that. The risk is that in order to take everybody’s view into account as to what is important you end up with a much increased form of documentation. I think we need to offset that risk, but I think we need to bring about greater standardisation. In that process I think it is important as well that we get back to a position where officers feel trusted and have the confidence to exercise their individual discretion and their individual professional judgment. You asked what had brought it about and I referred to society becoming very risk averse. With the police service becoming risk averse I think a situation has evolved whereby officers do not exercise their own individual discretion and professional judgment in the way that they should. If they get it seriously wrong they must realise they will be held to account, but I think it is important that they feel confident and that they are trusted to exercise their individual judgment in individual circumstances and not just have to cover their back on every occasion.

Q26 Martin Salter: I want to talk a little bit about workforce modernisation. There has been some criticism of your proposals to increase the proportion of non-warranted personnel and increased civilianisation particularly from the Chair of the Police Federation, Jan Berry, who has said there is a danger that warranted police officers would only then be dealing with confrontational situations, like a paramilitary force, which is a somewhat confrontational sound-byte from the Police Federation as it happens. Other parties have generally taken on board your proposals. How do you respond to the criticism that these proposals might weaken the resilience of a police force in emergency situations and, in particular, your proposal to transfer for a temporary period of time the power of arrest to non-warranted police personnel in order to cover emergency situations?

Sir Ronnie Flanagan: That is not a specific recommendation in our review. The first point I would like to make is that nothing in my report and nothing I would want to be associated with would ever dilute in any way the critical importance of the role of the office of Constable. I am deeply indebted to Jan Berry and indeed the Federation who have been involved in the review throughout. In the press launch of the review I used an analogy where I thought “What sort of headline might this attract?” and I am going to use it again, Chairman. When I was a student I worked in building sites as a plumber’s mate. I was not a plumber, I did not threaten the professional status of the plumber, but I relieved the plumber of all the routinised tasks so that the plumber could then divert his professional skill—and I say his because there were not any women on those particular building sites that I worked on—and expertise to areas where it really mattered. That is what I am talking about in terms of support being provided by what some people called non-sworn colleagues to do those routine tasks so as to relieve Constables to be able to divert all their energy, their expertise and to give the benefit of their experience where it really matters. I am certainly not threatening the office of Constable at all; quite the opposite. I am trying to free up Constables so that they can give the public the benefit of their professionalism where it really counts and where they can really make a difference.

Q27 Martin Salter: It is the idea of having transferable powers of arrest, search and seizure. It was a Policy Exchange paper that put that forward. Have you a view on that?

Sir Ronnie Flanagan: I would want to approach that with great care. In terms of actually exercising a power of arrest, restraining a citizen’s liberty --- We referred, and it was misreported, to the fact that the plumber could then divert his professional skill and I say his because there were not any women on those particular building sites that I worked on—and expertise to areas where it really mattered. That is what I am talking about in terms of support being provided by what some people called non-sworn colleagues to do those routine tasks so as to relieve Constables to be able to divert all their energy, their expertise and to give the benefit of their experience where it really matters. I am certainly not threatening the office of Constable at all; quite the opposite. I am trying to free up Constables so that they can give the public the benefit of their professionalism where it really counts and where they can really make a difference.

Q28 Martin Salter: Would you not agree there was some contradiction in the Police Federation’s criticism about increased civilianisation in that, on the one hand, police officers complain about excessive bureaucracy and wanting to do the frontline policing for which they are trained and, on the other hand, your proposals and other moves
towards increased civilianisation are aimed at freeing up the police officers to be able to do precisely that.

Sir Ronnie Flanagan: I think the criticism is brought about in a well-meaning way. I think what it does is point up the need for care that we do not deskill police officers. If we can provide them with support, with colleagues who are not police officers but who can, for example, record statements of evidence so that we do not thereby deskill police officers in those areas, I think the balance can be achieved and is being achieved. In terms of what we call workforce modernisation, there is a lot of really good work going on in a number of forces. I am thinking of the Metropolitan Police Service and Surrey where a lot of this is going on without in any way bringing about the spectre of the fears as expressed by some members of the Police Federation.

Q29 Martin Salter: Moving on to police pay, finally, the submission we received from the Home Office, although this Committee unanimously backed the Federation in its pay claim, does make the point that very, very few police officers are voluntarily leaving the Service, there is not a big issue of recruitment at the moment, but there is a question on the appropriateness of tenure-related increments. At the moment, obviously, police officers can put their salaries up for a period of time, and I think this was ten years, purely by dint of staying in the job. There have been arguments floated that perhaps those additional payments should be related to officers who take the trouble to acquire additional skills and adopt the specific professionalism required by their individual services. Do you think there is some merit in going down that route and rewarding officers who train to become specialists in various fields?

Sir Ronnie Flanagan: There already is a mechanism for special priority payments, so that is in being as it is, and of course there is the whole question of performance-related pay. I am giving very much a personal view. It is not the role of the inspectorate to be involved in pay negotiations or to express views in relation to pay. I think, provided there is the machinery and the transparency through that machinery for fairness and a fair reward package provided for policing, that is what is important in the whole area of pay, but really it is not for the inspectorate to be involved in pay negotiations.

Chairman: Thank you, Mr Salter. David Winnick.

Q30 Mr Winnick: If you talked to the average person, they would say: if only the police could get on with the job and not spend so much time on paperwork, it would help in so many ways. What would your response be to that view held by so many people and probably a good number of Members of Parliament for that matter?

Sir Ronnie Flanagan: As I indicated in earlier responses, I spent some time with officers in the front-line in West-Mids and was actually surprised at the degree of administrative burden that falls upon them. I see it as my responsibility to ease them from that burden, but I do stress, in areas like domestic violence, for example, it is crucially important not only to deal with in an individual incident of violence but to ensure that all the partner agencies are fully informed so that people are not at future risk. There are areas where it is crucially important that we keep proper audit trails, keep proper documentation and that we engage in the necessary bureaucracy. I think there is tremendous scope for relieving officers of the unnecessary bureaucracy that has come about, and I have indicated that in a quantifiable way. In my view we could at least make available the equivalent of 3,000 additional police officers through relieving them of that unnecessary bureaucracy.

Q31 Mr Winnick: I happen to agree with you—and I will come to that in a moment—that a good deal of the paperwork is essential, despite the general view which I have just expressed. If you had to put a percentage on it, and it may be rather difficult---. Let me put it this way. How long would the average police officer spend on paperwork? Is it possible to put any sort of figure on it?

Sir Ronnie Flanagan: It depends, on a given shift, whether an arrest is made and an officer has to accompany the person arrested to a custody suite and then engage in all the documentation that that entails. There are ways of handing that over others, who need not be police officers, who can engage in that necessary documentation, et cetera. Certainly in the shifts that I went out with, and that was late duty and night duty, the officers were absolutely determined to be out, so they took all the documentation with them so that they did not have to return to the station; so there are ways of dealing with this. One is to question whether the processes are necessary, or whether they are necessary in all instances, and that goes to the question of discretion. If you have a suite of documentation that is used in a given incidence—"stop and account", I think, is a good example (and we can perhaps discuss that in detail)—then I think there should be some discretion afforded to officers. If an encounter is good and positive and not in any way controversial or not in any way likely to bring about complaint, I think we can make better use of technology in terms of recording such encounters.

Q32 Mr Winnick: You have made a number of recommendations to reduce bureaucracy in your report.

Sir Ronnie Flanagan: Indeed, but to put a percentage on it is difficult. You see all sorts of figures banded about in the press but it various very much from shift to shift.

Q33 Mr Winnick: Can I bandy about some figures: 20%, 25%, 30% spent on paperwork?

Sir Ronnie Flanagan: It could be as much as that in some instances.

Q34 Mr Winnick: Not higher, Sir Ronnie? Not higher than, say, 30%?
Sir Ronnie Flanagan: I do not think so.

Q35 Mr Winnick: Is it possible it could reach 25% to 30% of the time spent by a police officer on paperwork?
Sir Ronnie Flanagan: Up to that sort of proportion could be feasible.

Q36 Mr Winnick: Bearing in mind (and I will come to it in a moment) what you said about the necessity of paperwork in certain cases—of that there does not seem to be any doubt—how optimistic are you that unnecessary paperwork can be reduced as a result of what you said earlier: technology and civilians being involved in the Police Force?
Sir Ronnie Flanagan: I am very optimistic. Jan Berry was mentioned earlier. Jan and I and the President of the Superintendents Association, with Shami Chakrabarti, took part in a panel at the Superintendents Annual Conference last autumn, and Jan raised the question that we had had many attempts at reducing bureaucracy in the past. One of my predecessors, Sir David O'Dowd, led a bureaucracy taskforce.

Q37 Chairman: We will be coming on to that later.
Sir Ronnie Flanagan: I will shorten my answer, Chairman, just to say I am very optimistic that we can make a real difference. I think the time is right, I think the appetite is there in government, in the Home Office, certainly in the Police Service, to address this very seriously.

Q38 Mr Winnick: But will not a conscientious police officer, knowing that the defence counsel will do his or her utmost, as part of the responsibility of a defence counsel, to undermine the prosecution case, take the utmost care to have the necessary paperwork—what you said earlier on—and, therefore, reducing paperwork is far from a simple matter, is it not?
Sir Ronnie Flanagan: It is certainly not a simple matter. I certainly would expect officers to take the utmost care and to engage in what we are describing as necessary bureaucracy, but there is a wealth of scope in terms of cutting out unnecessary bureaucracy; and you will see in the review report, that very closely goes on with, for example, the Crown Prosecution Service and there are examples in London where many hours of officers' time have been saved in terms of case preparation without any risk to the success of the case subsequently as it goes through the court processes.

Q39 David Davies: I do my bit as a Special Constable and I have done quite a lot of stop searches. I think the recommendations that you made were absolutely superb, and I hope the Home Secretary can implement them as soon as possible, but one thing I am not clear of is how her suggestion, not yours, to extend police powers of stop and search in designated areas is different from the existing section 60?
Sir Ronnie Flanagan: I think the power does already exist. I am not sure. In my experience there is no demand arising from either ACPO or the Federation of Superintendents Association for additional powers. I think what is referred to is the whole question of designated areas and the exercise of those powers.

Q40 David Davies: What you are suggesting in your report was very new: digital recording using head cameras as evidence instead of written statements. This is all new stuff and very welcome it would be, but this announcement about designated areas: we have already got that power under section 60. It is the football match stop and search which already exists and can be put in place by an inspector; so was this announcement an announcement of something new?
Sir Ronnie Flanagan: I am not quite sure. I certainly did not detect any appetite in my work for a need to extend police officers' powers in the area of stop and search. Some have said that it is not a useful tool. I certainly disagree with that; I think it is a very useful tool that police must have in their armoury, so to speak, the ability to stop and search, but it must be done with great care and it must be done in ways that it is possible to subsequently interrogate the database to make sure that we are being proportionate and we are not adversely affecting relationships with minority communities, for example.

Q41 David Davies: One of the problems which I have come across, which is not addressed by the Home Secretary as yet, is as more and more crimes are being dealt with, as you know, by process at the moment, the so-called minor crimes, the ticket offences, some shop-lifting, et cetera, et cetera, when somebody is being dealt with by process you get their name and address, you have established that they have broken the law and they are cautioned, caution plus two, but they are not searched because they are not arrested. On many personal occasions I have had people in front of me with serious recent criminal convictions for drug dealing and violence—knives, guns, et cetera—warning signals coming over, and yet I am unable to search them. Do you not think this is something that should be addressed? Where someone has clearly broken the law and has been stopped for committing an offence, if they have a recent conviction for a violent offence or possession of an offensive weapon, then a quick frisk should be permitted even if they are not being arrested?
Sir Ronnie Flanagan: I think if you have a reasonable suspicion that a person has something unlawfully in their presence, that is where I think the standard should fall.

Q42 David Davies: What I am told, though, Sir Ronnie, and what I have been trained to do is, if I have a reasonable suspicion, yes, obviously that can be done under section 1 of PACE, but if I do not have the suspicion or I cannot stack up the suspicion that they have got something on them at that particular moment, I personally feel that if somebody
in front of me has broken the law and they have got a recent conviction for either drugs or offensive weapons, that ought to be enough to enable a police constable to carry out a quick search.

Sir Ronnie Flanagan: No. I think, as in all these things, a balance has to be achieved. Even if people have committed crimes, I do not think it necessarily asserts that a police officer should, therefore, have the ability to search them every time they encounter them in a public place. I think the balance is right, that the police officer must have a reasonable suspicion that they have some articles unlawfully in their possession.

David Davies: That is an excellent reply. With the utmost respect to your years of service, I think we might have to slightly beg to differ on that last point.

Q43 Ms Buck: On the same point, Sir Ronnie, I think none of us, seriously, are questioning the importance of stop and search and stop encounters are tools in the police armoury, but it is also true that there are issues about accountability. You say, quite rightly, that the process has become bureaucratic, none of us are defending bureaucracy, rather than focusing on what I believe is important in one-to-one interactions between the police and members of the public: courtesy, respect and accountability. But is it not the case, as the Stephen Lawrence inquiry revealed, that that could not always be guaranteed, that there were serious issues, both about disproportionality and about a problem in confidence and the relationships on precisely those issues around courtesy and respect? That was what, in a sense, drove some of those additional checks and balances to be put into the stop and account process, and I just wonder, whilst agreeing entirely with what you say as an objective, why we have to have proxies to ensure that happens and accountability mechanisms are those proxies. How can you be sure that, by reducing that form of accountability, we do not end up in danger of replicating some of that breakdown in relationships, not just with ethnic minority communities, but with young people generally?

Sir Ronnie Flanagan: To make sure that we would not lose the thrust of what Sir William McPherson was recommending. I had long conversations with Sir William about what his intention was, and he described the need to have recording that protected both the police officer and the member of the public being stopped. We already had the procedures for stop and search, so his recommendation extended the procedures for stop and search to what we now call “stop and account”. In other words, if we stop someone in a public place and ask them to account for their presence, where they have been, where they are going, virtually if you ask them anything, that requires the completion of the same documentation that existed for stop and search. In my experience watching these processes, it took some seven minutes per person to complete but, more importantly for me, or as importantly for me, the person at the receiving end could not understand what was going on, became suspicious that their details were being recorded for some intelligence purposes and, however much the police officer took great pains to explain that this was for their protection and they were being given a copy of that, it actually adversely affected the quality of the one-to-one encounter. That is why it was important for me in conducting this review to have an advisory group which included, for example, Doreen Lawrence. Doreen would have great reservations that there are things that we must not lose. We must make sure that ethnicity is still recorded so that we can go back and check whether the Police Service is operating in a proportional way. What I am suggesting is not abandoning this but making sure that, through the use of airwaves, for example, this can be digitally recorded in ways that there is a database which can be later interrogated, that the member of the public knows the identity of the police officer with whom they have been engaged in the encounter and that the police officer is protected as well. What we are doing in for a (and again I mentioned the forces earlier) in West-Mids, Staffordshire, Leicestershire and Surrey, we are piloting this now. We need, as I understand it at this stage from legal advice, to change the PACE Code of Practice because, as a result of Sir William’s recommendations, we changed the codes of practice to make this a requirement, so we need to do this, and it may be something that the Committee will pay close attention to. I am convinced that this will work in ways that maintain the protections that you point out are so important.

Q44 Ms Buck: It is reassuring to have that on record.

Sir Ronnie Flanagan: I think within three months we should be able to establish that and, thereby, very quickly roll it out nationwide thereafter.

Q45 Ms Buck: Moving on to a broader issue about targets—national targets, national objectives, stop and search being a kind of example of that—and how you see them as being sometimes inconsistent with local priorities and about building trust and confidence (and you have used those words again this morning and you use them in your report), how do you think we can ensure that that trust and confidence that we all agree is integral to modern policing does not just stay as apple pie and motherhood, that it is not just a concept but it is something that we can focus on achieving? What are the mechanisms by which you deliver that concept in practice?

Sir Ronnie Flanagan: If you look at what West Midlands police do very regularly in testing the trust and confidence of the population whom they serve, I think it is a very good example of making sure the Police Service knows exactly what the public think of how they are delivering the service. I think it is imminently possible to conduct such surveys and determine what level of confidence and trust the public have, and for me I think that is important rather than the quantitative measures. Someone mentioned policy exchange earlier in conjunction with the Superintendents Association.
They did a bit of research whereby a high proportion of BCU commanders felt that externally imposed numerical targets actually detracted from their ability to deliver what their local people wanted.

Q46 Ms Buck: Could you give us a couple of specific examples of that?

Sir Ronnie Flanagan: In the interim report we made a recommendation which was immediately accepted. The whole question of emphasis on offences brought to justice tended to bring about, I think, a practice within policing where even a minor fracas in the playground, for example, ended up being investigated with one youngster alleging that another youngster had assaulted him or her, and then there was a counter-allegation. That was all fully reported and brought about the risk of criminalising two youngsters for a very unimportant fracas between them, but suddenly the police had two offenders brought to justice, and I think the unintended outcome of such targets has to be addressed, and there was an immediate acceptance of that. Therefore, in the drawing up of the new PSA targets there will be much greater emphasis on the qualitative targets, the level of trust and confidence that the public have. I think that is important.

Q47 Ms Buck: Is there ever a danger that the localisation of accountability diffuses accountability; that you have so many neighbourhood, ward, local levels at which that accountability is delivered that you lose that essential ability to hold the Police Service to account across the board?

Sir Ronnie Flanagan: I think there is a danger of adding another level of bureaucracy, and I think that is a danger we must avoid. For example, we looked at the Northern Ireland situation and Patten's recommendation of a whole network of district policing partnerships which nestle up to the ultimate policing ward, and while that works very effectively and has a very local involvement, when we went to Northern Ireland they are currently looking at crime and disorder reduction partnerships and how they may benefit from what we have in place over here, so it is certainly not the case that one size fits all. I think in the whole area of accountability there are two areas that require attention. For me one is at the level above an individual force, so that, for example, if we are talking, as we earlier did, about collaboration, what mechanisms are there actually to hold people to account? Certainly we in the inspectorate will be inspecting as to how effectively collaboration is working, but what mechanism is there to make police authorities and police forces collaborate? At the moment there is none. The Home Secretary has powers to mandate that collaboration, but I think there should be a mechanism of accountability that looks regionally and then, at the other end of the scale, I think much more has to be done to give people a feel that they can have a say in setting the policing priorities for their area, for their neighbourhoods and then have the ability through neighbourhood policing panels for—

Chairman: We are coming on to that now. I am sorry to cut you short, but it is just that we have another evidence session on identity cards coming up. I would ask you if you would keep your answers to our next few questions as brief as possible. Ann Cryer has a question exactly on neighbourhood policing.

Q48 Mrs Cryer: When you were in the process of doing your report, how were local authorities and other partners involved in the review, how have their views been taken into account with what you have done and what barriers remain to effective partnership working and neighbourhood management?

Sir Ronnie Flanagan: There was great involvement, so it was not just a question, in government terms, of looking at the Home Office. It was a question of looking at what is now Hazel Blears' department, for example, in terms of looking at the LGA as well and taking their views, and they very kindly provided me with their view as to neighbourhood management going beyond neighbourhood policing. I certainly have always been very strongly of the view that policing is much too important and too imperative on all our lives to be left to the police alone. In the interim report we suggested even a trial for pooling budgets, because some of these other departments and agencies have funding that, I think, could be pooled. Certain colleagues at a high level of policing through ACPO would have reservations about that, even the question of moneys that are provided specifically for policing. Is there any legal barrier to those moneys being pooled with the moneys of others? I certainly, in the advice that I have been given, do not think there is any legal barrier to that. There was a very high degree of involvement of other public sector agencies, bodies and departments, and I think that is crucial.

Q49 Mrs Cryer: So you brought all the local partners into it when you were compiling your review?

Sir Ronnie Flanagan: Indeed.

Q50 Mrs Cryer: You got their views?

Sir Ronnie Flanagan: Indeed; absolutely.

Q51 Chairman: The Prime Minister and the Home Secretary have high hopes for neighbourhood policing.

Sir Ronnie Flanagan: I think it is crucial, Chairman. To use the jargon, it should be a golden thread that runs through every aspect of policing. It is not something to be separated, that in some way is totally detached from our counter-terrorist thrust, for example. It should be a golden thread that runs from the local right through to the national and, indeed, the international. I think it is crucial and a lot of good work has been done. I pay tribute to
my colleague, Matt Baggott, who has led in that for so long and who was very crucial to me in the conduct of this review as well. 

Chairman: He comes from Leicestershire, so must be very good! Bob Russell has the final question.

Q52 Bob Russell: Sir Ronnie, there are now 16,000 police community support officers, and the Home Secretary states that, by April, there will be a team in every neighbourhood in England and Wales, more than 3,600 in total. What, in your opinion, is the key role and purpose of PCSOs and where should the limits of their responsibilities lie?

Sir Ronnie Flanagan: I have conducted many focus groups in London and elsewhere in very rural areas and where it works best, in my experience, is where they are integrated into neighbourhood teams so that you have constables or PCSOs working very much together, providing a visible presence, known to the people in the area that they police—they know the people in the areas that they are policing. They are not substituting police officers; I think it is very important that they work in partnership with police officers.

Q53 Bob Russell: Can I follow up that last point? You will be aware that this Committee, a year or two back, conducted an inquiry and we were concerned at being told that substantial numbers of PCSOs were being deployed inside police stations rather than on front-line duties. Bearing that in mind, what progress has been made by the Home Office, in terms of your interim recommendations, to consider opportunities for broadening the role of PCSOs?

Sir Ronnie Flanagan: At this stage, not a lot of progress, but certainly there is an assessment underway in terms of evaluating the whole project, and I think it is important that that evaluation takes place. For me, my personal experience being out and conducting focus groups is that they have made and are making a very positive contribution.

Q54 Bob Russell: I endorse that. Our Committee has said in its last report that we were concerned that they were intended to provide a more visible public policing presence. Are you satisfied that that will continue to happen and they will not be drawn back into police stations to cover the bureaucracy that you referred to earlier you wished to take away from full-time qualified police officers?

Sir Ronnie Flanagan: No, I am confident that that can be achieved.

Bob Russell: Thank you.

Q55 Chairman: Sir Ronnie, thank you very much for giving evidence today. Can I also repeat the praise that has been heaped upon your shoulders by all parties in producing this very thorough report? We will certainly be using it as our core script as we proceed with our very detailed inquiry. 

Sir Ronnie Flanagan: Chairman, members, thank you very much indeed.
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Q56 Chairman: Can I open this session by referring all present to the Register of Members' Interests. Mr Livingstone, thank you very much for coming to give evidence to the Select Committee in our inquiry into policing in the 21st century. Obviously London’s role in policing is absolutely crucial. In your view, does the Police Service in London have the appropriate structures and capacity for dealing with the challenges of the 21st century, in particular counter-terrorism and in preparation for the Olympics in 2012?

Mr Livingstone: We have just reached the end of an eight-year programme of expansion going from 25,000 uniformed staff to 35,000 and a big 4,000 of those have been PCSOs who were not in anyone’s thinking ten years ago. Sir John Stephens made changes and Sir Ian Blair made even more substantial changes and, under the threat of terrorism that arose after 9/11, those were absolutely essential. I think, now that we are seeing the falling crime figures on the back of rolling out Neighbourhood Policing, you can begin to see— there will still be some changes but this is broadly the structure that is important—the huge specialist operations tackling terrorism but a return to neighbourhood policing that is giving us the raw intelligence on who gets in and out of trouble. For decades kids could get into vandalism, petty crime and not be identified by the police. Now, half a dozen kids hanging around on a street corner, the neighbourhood officer walks by and knows them by name and they know they are known. If I can give one specific example: we introduced 21 teams of 18 PCSOs in the outer London boroughs around transport modes, particularly targeting the buses, and crime by under-16s has fallen 19% in the 12 months following. So, all those academics, Home Office and Treasury people who told us for decades that putting police on the streets was a waste of money, I think, have been demonstrated to be wildly wrong. Clearly, we are putting in place now the structure for the Olympics and, bearing in mind the venues remain afterwards, it is a permanent legacy for policing because they will always be doing high-profile events and they will always be a target for terrorism.

Q57 Chairman: The evidence given to us so far by Sir Ronnie Flanagan, who has just finished his major inquiry into policing, is to look at the better use of police resources rather than more police officers. In fact, Sir Ronnie told the Committee that the days of the large increase in police officers was over, but you have promised additional officers. Have you had a chance to look at the proposals that Sir Ronnie has put forward?

Mr Livingstone: I think it is absolutely right. I asked Sir John Stephens to give thought to how many police are needed to police London, and after about a year of looking at this he came back and said, “I need 35,000 uniformed officers.” We have now achieved that. We are still looking at new initiatives. We are looking at the moment at expanding some of the neighbourhood police teams in a project with the Ministry of Justice and what we call “neighbourhood pathways” in those wards in London that bear the brunt of returning criminals from the prison system. We think that perhaps increasing police in those areas will help prevent some of them falling back into crime. We will continue to be tweaking at this, but I think the 35,000 is broadly right. We have plans for some expansion next year, but clearly, having taken about 40% of the increase in total policing numbers nationally over the last ten years, I do not expect to be able to do it again.

Q58 Mr Clappison: Mr Mayor, violent crime is a big problem for many Londoners. Twenty-eight per cent of Londoners say they are very worried about violent crime, compared with a national average of 17%. I was supplied yesterday with some statistics from the House of Commons library which showed that since you became Mayor total violent crime has gone up every year, except for last year when there was a change in recorded statistics and the figures were not comparable. Do you accept that crime is now higher than before you became Mayor and that London is a more violent city?

Mr Livingstone: I absolutely reject that. We had, with some oscillations up and down, basically a 50-year increase in crime that started in the 1950s. It peaked nationally, I think, in 1999; it peaked in London in 2002–03. Since that time we have had a 21% reduction in overall crime. The murder rate is down 28%, gun and knife enabled crime are both down by over 20%, rape is down by over 25%, and that is against a background where we add to the figures. In one year recently there was an increase in what is labelled “gun crime”, but it was mainly the
use of CS gas. There was an increase in sexual crime when we reclassified it so that flashers were included in the sexual crime figures; we will see an increase in violent crime where we amended the figures to include spitting; so the figures, if anything, are being expanded all the time. There would be something seriously wrong if we put 10,000 extra officers on the street and you do not get a cut in crime.

Q59 Mr Clappison: These are figures that have come from the House of Commons library. They put total violent crime together and they show that it has gone up every year since you became Mayor and that it is now higher than before you became Mayor. Do you accept that violent crime is higher now than when you became Mayor or are they wrong?

Mr Livingstone: They are, clearly, completely different to my figures. I have to say, I have always trusted first now Lord Stephens and Sir Ian Blair to bring to me figures that they were confident in. They are fed into the Home Office figures, and, I repeat, crime continued to rise until 2002–03; since then it has fallen by some 21% overall and violent crime has fallen by more than the average. We can swap our figures. It might be perhaps the Committee needs a group of statisticians to boil down the figures. It might also be from 2 May people will have less interest in inflating the figures.

Q60 Ms Buck: We all know that there is a concern at the moment about youth crime and some of the issues around gangs. Extra policing and enforcement powers are clearly part of the answer to dealing with that, but, in addition, there is a critical need to deal with some of the issues around prevention. What role has the Mayor got in dealing with issues of youth crime and prevention?

Mr Livingstone: It is important to remember the Mayor sets the police budget, and that is it. The application of that budget is a matter for the Commissioner, i.e. the day to day administration is matter for the Commissioner. I am not in the position of, say, the Mayor of New York, who has basically operational control of the Commissioner and the budget, and I suspect no-one would actually want that for any mayor, but the relationship is one in which, I think, all the agreements I have achieved with the two commissioners to put resources back on transport. Have you been able to do anything since you became Mayor in dealing with some of those concerns about young people's behaviour on buses and transport?

Mr Livingstone: We had a spike of anti-social behaviour in the immediate aftermath of making free travel on the buses for under-16s, and our response to that was to create the safer transport groups in the 21 outer boroughs. We are now rolling them out in the 11 inner boroughs this year. As I said, in the year following that, crime by under-16s on the buses was cut by 19% and the conviction rate went up about 20%. From June, where initially we decided the photo-pass would only apply to children over 14, I think we will make that from the age of 11 (so at that point where children move from primary to secondary school they have to have a pass with the photo ID or they will not be able to get on the bus), and that is going to be easier for conductors to enforce. It is much easier to tell the difference between a ten year old and a 14 year old than it is a 14 and a 16.

Q62 David Davies: Mr Livingstone, the figures that you are using, are they based on the British Crime Survey, which the Chief Constable of the BTP has recently said are not that accurate, or are they based on recorded crime?

Mr Livingstone: They are the Recorded Crime Statistics. It is quite interesting: when you track the Recorded Crime Statistics and the British Crime Survey, over the period since 2000 our crime statistics show an 18% reduction and the British Crime Statistics—it is an opinion poll really, a good poll, and we spend a lot of money on opinion polls, so I am not going to rubbish them—shows a 15% reduction. That is within the margin of error. I think the problem with British Crime Statistics is I know people are interviewed in their home, but if the overwhelming background of the media is endless crime, it encourages a fear. The big difference between, say, London and New York is that, as crime figures came down in New York, New York's media broadcast this world good news story. I have yet to see on the front page of the Evening Standard: “Murder, rape down 28%”. In almost any other city in the world you would expect to see that. When you analyse fear of crime by newspaper readership, people who read the tabloids have a greater fear of crime than those who read the broadsheets.

Q63 Mr Clappison: So it is all the papers' fault!

Mr Livingstone: In the London BBC and ITV regional news programmes they have a slogan, “If it bleeds, it leads”, and it is quite bizarre that as crime and serious crimes are coming down they are not instantly reporting it. It sells papers. People love horror stories; here they get one free on the tube.
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Mr Streeter: I was interested in your answer to Karen Buck, Mr Livingstone, when you said that people in this country would not want the Mayor of London to have operational control of the police, because in your submission to us you suggest that one of the reforms you support is that the Metropolitan Police Authority’s executive functions should be taken over by the Mayor of London. It seemed to me that was more or less saying the same thing. Do you think that people in this country would be comfortable with you as Mayor having day-to-day control of London police?

Mr Livingstone: That is the Metropolitan Police Authority, which is the small body that is comprised of half of Assembly members and then co-optees; it is not the Metropolitan Police Service. They cannot tell the Commissioner how to operate either. I think there is confusion. The problem with the Metropolitan Police Authority is, like the old BBC Board of Governors, it is the body they are accountable to but it is also involved in advising, guiding and managing. So I would rather that the Mayor appointed a small core of non politicians with expertise in this area, representing the community, representing people who have real expertise in crime, and the MPA then became accountable to the London Assembly, so you strengthen their role as well. At the moment they are not.

Mr Livingstone: I would share your views on the success or otherwise of the Thatcherite years. However, you seem to be suggesting that really there is nothing that the police can do and you as Mayor can do about tackling the crimes that are associated with the sort of young people that you are talking about.

Mr Livingstone: There is a real difference between saying the police cannot stop somebody killing someone else, unless it is very ugly circumstances, to saying the police cannot do anything about it. We have had incredibly effective targeting. We used to have a much higher rate of murder amongst the black communities. We established Operation Trident and rebuilt confidence between the black communities and the police. The conviction rate for black-on-black murders under Operation Trident: at the beginning, before Trident, it was only a third of convictions; it is now running at two-thirds of convictions because the black community have gained the confidence that the police are on their side and they are giving information up. When we have specific, targeted operations, as we did over Christmas and New Year, against clubs where we know a lot of the customers carry knives and close them, a dramatic reduction in knife crime around that time. You can extend CCTV. Every time you are on a bus we have six or seven cameras trained on you, we are gradually getting better and better at arresting people, even people who carry out quite
got police back on the streets of London if there was not a directly elected mayor, and you needed somebody who actually set the police budget to be in a position to negotiate and say, “I am prepared to give you eight years of expanded spending. I want police back on the streets”", and that was the deal I struck with Sir John and it is a deal that has been honoured by Ian Blair, and I think that a clear point of accountability, the person who sets the council tax, subject to the Assembly, able to say as you sit there with the Commissioning Office, “I will give you X million more. How are they going to be deployed?”; and the two commissioners have always honoured the deals we have done. If police numbers in London go down, Londoners have the Mayor to blame, because the Mayor has not provided the funding.

Q69 Gwyn Prosser: Mr Livingstone, I want to ask you about the relationship between minority groups in London and the Met Police. In your view (and perhaps if you have got any evidence you could share it with us), how has that changed within the time that you have been Mayor and, in particular, what effect have the counter-terrorism measures and activities had on that relationship?

Mr Livingstone: Twenty-five years ago we had riots in London and we eventually had the hacking to death of a police officer at Broadwater Farm—relations were appalling. Before I became Mayor at the time of David Copeland’s free bonds, I went to community events where the police were working and I was struck by how already things had begun to change. Sir John Stephens drove that forward, Ian Blair has continued that and I think there is an incredible level of trust between London’s ethnic minorities. If you look at the Muslim community, which is the one most under pressure at the moment, a police officer that mishandles a stop and search clearly worsens the situation, but I think the vast majority of our police are very sensitive to the fact that the Muslim community needs to be kept on side. It is our eyes and ears; we get much of the intelligence that leads us to prevent atrocities from the Muslim community. If you actually look at the raid in Forest Gate, in Newham, which could have stretched relations to breaking point, I was struck by the number of Muslim leaders saying, “We know these things have to be done. If there is a suspicion, there has to be a raid.” We learnt how to handle it a bit better out of that. What is stretching relations between the Muslim community and wider society is not the police, it is the war in Iraq, and anybody whoever sits before you and says that the major force fuelling terrorism is not the war in Iraq, they are really misleading you.

Q70 Gwyn Prosser: The specific effects of counter-terrorism activities?

Mr Livingstone: This is a tension. My primary response in all these debates is if something would genuinely make it safer for Londoners, we have to do it, and that is the balance against civil liberties, but it is a constant struggle. I followed the twists and turns of how many days. I am not persuaded to go beyond the present limit at all, and being honest and slightly humorous, if you say to a police officer, “You would like 42 years”, they would say, “That is fine”—the police are inevitably going to take whatever enables them to do their job more easily. Members of Parliament have got to balance that against any long-term damage to established civil liberties, which might in the end---. There is no point fighting Al Qaeda if at the end of the day we have lost most of the liberties which we are told they so hate.

Q71 Gwyn Prosser: You mentioned stop and search. What do you think the effect of Sir Ronnie Flanagan’s stop and search proposals have had on the relationship?

Mr Livingstone: I am attracted to them, because anything that reduces the time of the stop and search is to be welcomed. You have got to retain the essence of what the Macpherson Lawrence Inquiry did in terms of accountability. If we can have a small handheld computer and something is tapped in, or if each officer has got a named identity card that they can give with a phone contact point, that is fine. I think one of the great mistakes of the last ten years is this drift into the idea you can manage everything with monitoring and checking and reforms to the centre. I think an awful lot more is achieved if you devolve and let people have more responsibility locally.

Q72 Gwyn Prosser: On a number of occasions you have said that you want to see a police force in London that looks more like London. How are you progressing in that and what effect will that have?

Mr Livingstone: We have made very good progress. It is very difficult when you inherit an established force; you can only change the intakes coming in. It is much more instructive to look at the police community support officers, which look much more like London. What is really good about that is that a lot of people are doing a year or two PCSOs and then feel they have the confidence to go to Hendon and train to be a full police officer. Bearing in mind what I remember of tensions between the police and ethnic minorities in London 25 years ago, it is never going to be perfect and it never can be because their job is to police, it is to control, it is to check, but it is infinitely better than it was. I never go to bed worrying if there is going to be a riot in London; whereas that was a constant threat 25 years ago.

Q73 Chairman: Are you disappointed that more progress has not been made in appointing senior figures from the black and Asian community within the Police Force to senior positions in the Metropolitan Police, because we have not had very many in the last four years?

Mr Livingstone: This is not just in the police, it is in the fire brigade, it is amongst my own senior staff. Progress is being made. There are black and Asian and female appointments being made, but it is always going to lag a good decade behind that initial wave of recruitment and we have just got to
push much harder. I think you actually may need special mentoring and help, because there is a huge focus of attention on the first few faces that appear at the front of any organisation, they almost have to be perfect, and the slightest mistake, the slightest error, all the hostile evidence of watching to exploit it, and we have a couple of examples (which I do not need to go into before your committee) where, had they not been high ranking ethnic minority officers, their small indiscretions might not have achieved the attention they would have liked.

Q74 Mr Winnick: You said the police would take any number of days beyond the 28 they can have; so you are not surprised that Sir Ian Blair is one of the very few people in leading authority who support the Government on extending the 28 days?

Mr Livingstone: No, I do not agree with him on that. That is the difference between—. You know where I am coming from politically. Before I had responsibility in some small measure for London’s safety I would have been totally in the camp of no extra powers for the police.

Q75 Mr Winnick: On the basis that all of the candidates are for necessary protection against terrorism, we would listen, obviously, to the other two who are appearing after you, Mr Livingstone, but if the three of you are very much opposed to extending it beyond 28 days, should not the Government take that very much into account in deciding on the policy?

Mr Livingstone: Yes. We may reach a point where this problem of decoding the encrypted data on computers means you have to come back and look at 28 days, but I would think it would be unusual to have a situation, unusual but not impossible, where you had not already identified other things you could charge them for whilst you continued to work on the computer. My broad view would be only to extend the encroachment of civil liberties once it had been irrevocably demonstrated that it was running the risk of costing us lives.

Q76 Mr Winnick: That is more or less the evidence given to us by the Director of Public Prosecutions. Have you notified the Government in one way or another of your views on this subject?

Mr Livingstone: I think I have made that clear. Mind you, they do not seem to be paying much attention to me or my rival candidates on the question of the third runway either.

Q77 Bob Russell: You indicated earlier that of the 35,000 uniform officers, 4,000 of them are PCSOs. Following on Mr Prosser’s question about the ethnic diversity of police officers, are the PCSOs more representative of the London community?

Mr Livingstone: Much more and, in particular, in terms of women as well. I do see that almost as an entry into the full police service later on, so we are very encouraged by that, because that is the group of officers that Londoners most see. Seventy five per cent of their time is spent out on the beat.

Q78 Chairman: Finally, Mr Mayor, if there was one thing the Government could do to help you with your policing priorities in London, apart from giving you more money to do it, what would that be?

Mr Livingstone: Part of the problem is this, and Sir Ronnie Flanagan’s report touches on this question of the damping. I would say give us the freedom financially to manage our own budgets. Ninety-seven per cent of all tax in this country is collected by central government and then doled out. The life of ministers is a stream of people like me coming from their towns and counties, saying, “Can we have more money for this, more money for that?” At some point the Government has to let go. When I told that figure of 97% to the Mayor in Moscow he said, “That is worse than Russia under Stalin”, and that is absolutely true. There was once a promise to return the business rate. That would help.

Q79 Chairman: Mr Livingstone, thank you for coming to give evidence.

Mr Livingstone: Thank you. It is a pleasure to be here.

Witness: Mr Boris Johnson MP, Conservative Candidate for Mayor of London 2008, gave evidence.

Q80 Chairman: Mr Johnson, thank you very much for coming today. As you know, the Select Committee has begun an inquiry into policing in the 21st century and we thought it would be helpful, in view of London’s essential role in policing, for you to come and give evidence today. Are you satisfied that the London Police Service has the structures and capacity for dealing with the challenges that will confront London over the next few years?

Mr Johnson: Let me begin by saying that, of course, I think the police do a fantastic job and I certainly agree with much of what the Mayor has said about the decline in some crimes in this city over the last few years, though I do not think he necessarily reflects the reality as it is perceived by many people in this city, and I certainly do not think that in the case of violent crime his picture reflected what the Home Secretary herself seemed to indicate when she said she was worried about walking down the streets of Peckham—

Q81 Chairman: I thought it was Hackney.

Mr Johnson: Hackney, forgive me. I mean to cast no aspersions on either borough—and her colleague, Emily Thornberry, who said there was not a child in her constituency who had not been mugged for a mobile phone, or whatever it was. I do think there are two interrelated problems that we need to take more seriously, and they are gang violence and the general climate of disorder on public transport. I think there are things we could do with the structures
of the Police Service at the moment that would make a difference to those two particular problems, and I have urged that we reallocate some of the Mayor’s publicity budget for next year, or some of the increment in the Mayor’s publicity budget for next year, so that we get more uniformed personnel, PCSOs, on the buses giving people a sense of reassurance and security, which they do not have at the moment. One of the crimes that is going up, in spite of some of the statistics we have just heard, is bus crime, violent crime on buses is up 3.4%, and if you talk to Londoners this is something they care about and something they want addressed.

Q82 Chairman: Do you personally feel safe at night in London?
Mr Johnson: It depends where you are, but by and large, yes, I would feel safe to walk down the streets of any neighbourhood in London, but I have to say that many people do not feel safe and I think the job of the Mayor is to deal with people’s real apprehension and their real sense that the city is too violent and there are too many people who pose a real threat to them. In particular, I think what the Mayor said about a climate of disorder and instability as a result of deep social changes in the 1980s, or whatever his analysis was, is true in the sense I think we have the problem, I do not necessarily agree with his analysis, but I think it is up to the Mayor to do something about it, and that is why I want to see far more done to sort out this order on buses and that is why I want to see far more done to sort out gang culture.

Q83 Chairman: Mr Johnson, we have taken evidence already from Sir Ronnie Flanagan about the whole debate on additional police officers as opposed to the better use of police officers. Where do you stand on this particular issue? Do you think London needs more officers or do you think it is a question of their better use?
Mr Johnson: I think it is a question of getting more officers out on the street. I agree profoundly with the analysis that the public wants officers out on the street. We benefit as a city and as a society from having the reassurance of police out there and we can do much better. They have a much higher ratio in New York of police officers out on the beat than we do in London, and we all know the arguments about getting rid of some of the bureaucracy, we all know how we might do it, and that is why I do want to take the opportunity of taking the Chair of the MPA, working with Sir Ian, to get more of his officers out on the street where we want them and I think there is a case to be made for using more civilian power in the back room to deal with processing of forms. I am a great fan of the PCSOs. I think we should drop all the kind of—
Chairman: We will be coming to them later. A quick supplementary from Mr Clappison.

Q84 Mr Clappison: The point you made about fear of crime in London: I have a 14 year old constituent, the daughter of one of my constituents, who no longer feels safe to travel on buses in London. My constituency is very near to London, and her father came to see me from Potters Bar to complain about his daughter being mugged on a bus in the afternoon in North London. There seems to be a widespread perception amongst those of us who have constituencies near to London that there is more of a problem with violent crime affecting young people. Will you give priority to crime against young people? There seems to be an amount of feeling that it is of a lesser order. I do not think that is wrong.
Mr Johnson: Yes, and I just do not think we can be complacent about it. We cannot be complacent about people’s real experiences on buses. I think there are things you can do. I applaud the Mayor. There is one act of theft that I will defend before this committee, and that is the Mayor’s determination to steal my policies. I think his decision now, late in the day, to say that he wants to try live CCTV on buses, if I understood him, is a good idea, and I think we should do that: because very often, if you talk to the police, the problem they have with cracking down on young kids who create violence on buses and intimidate other kids on buses is that the bus companies do not have any obligation under statute to hand over the CCTV, and I think we should change that. I think it would make a huge difference. I am told by the police responsible for this in many London boroughs, in the case of a reported crime, the relevant CCTV is only handed over in 5% of cases and in the best London boroughs it is only handed over in 30% of cases. We could do much better. I think we should have a by-law to insist that the CCTV is handed over by the bus companies in an effort to crack down on what I think is a real problem and must not be under estimated.

Q85 Ms Buck: You talk in your introduction in a lot of the coverage of crime about violent crime, yet your specific proposal concerns bus crime. What is the evidence that you have that suggests that this is Londoners’ top priority for your one specific and costly proposal? Can you give us an indication of what has been happening in terms of staffing on the London transport system over the last few years?
Mr Johnson: Of course what happened was that there was a decision taken to remove conductors from buses, which, of course, is impossible to revoke because it will be financially extremely expensive, though I do think there is scope. Again, I applaud the Mayor for coming late in the day to the idea of putting more PCSOs, beefing up the transport teams, on buses to give people back a sense of security. You cannot restore conductors, but you can have more PCSOs on buses and I certainly think we should do that. To get to the first part of your question, I do think there is a relation between what goes on on the top deck of a bus and what goes on on the street generally. There is a relation between crime on buses and violent crime on buses and crime on the street, because if a young tearaway thinks he or, indeed, she can dominate people on the top deck of a bus and get away with mayhem, that person is going to get off the bus and think that he or she can dominate the street as well, and so I do think it has a very corrosive effect. I also think, by the way, that
we should be much less tolerant of habitual theft on buses in the form of fare evasion. I am sorry, Mr Clappison, just let me finish this point. We are currently tolerating losses of £46 million per year in lost fares, and if we cracked down harder on that, we could, of course, spend a lot of that revenue more sensibly on staffing buses with the kind of people the public want to see.

Q86 Chairman: I was not trying to interrupt you to stop you, except that we would like briefer answers because a lot of the members wish to ask you questions. 
**Mr Johnson:** Forgive me.

Q87 Ms Buck: Just to pursue that point, what actually has happened to the transport police staffing and PCSOs on buses in recent years and what would be your proposal in terms of the trend?

**Mr Johnson:** What I want to do is to reallocate, as I say, The Mayor's Transport for London publicity budget which is going up from 64 million to 84 million next year. I think some of that money could be spent on getting another 440 transport PCSOs on some of the rowdier bus routes where there are not enough transport PCSOs. I would also like an additional 50 transport police, because one of the big problems we have got is suburban railway stations where people feel very threatened after eight o'clock at night. We only have about 330 transport police around London. I think we could do a lot better there and give people an extra sense of security, and I would also like to give the Revenue Protection Inspectors greater powers to interrogate people about their names and addresses if they are caught evading fares.

Q88 Ms Buck: Is it the case that the 440 that you are proposing is only about a quarter of the total increase that there has been since 2000? Why should it be that that number is as transformatory as you claim when the number that has actually changed over the last eight years has been so much bigger?

**Mr Johnson:** I understand what you are saying. I do not think anybody would claim that any single measure is going to be transformatory, to use your word, but I do think that something needs to be done. I do think we cannot be complacent about this. We cannot just throw our hands up in the air and say this is all the fault of Margaret Thatcher. We do need to do specific things to tackle the problem of crime on buses and people's sense of---. You asked me earlier on, I think, what gave me the impression that Londoners cared about this?

Q89 Ms Buck: Much of the evidence.

**Mr Johnson:** Believe me, I travel all around London boroughs talking to people, and it is the number one issue for many people across London, and not just late at night: people are feeling intimidated particularly at 3.30 in the afternoon when school is out and there are too many kids on the buses acting up. What I want to do is much more systematically take away their right to free travel, and take it away permanently, but then give them the right to earn it back if they want.

Q90 Ms Buck: You also make the general point about looking at (your words) the 3.2 billion policing budget for efficiency savings. What figure has been achieved, do you know, in the Met in terms of efficiency savings and what is your own personal target?

**Mr Johnson:** I am not in favour of losing any money from the Metropolitan Police budget. It is going to go up to 3.5 billion and I heartily applaud that. What I want to do, by working with Sir Ian and using my role as Chairman of the MPA, is to make sure we allocate those funds that London needs more effectively, as I was saying earlier on, to get a proportion of London's officers out on the beat where we want them.

Q91 Ms Buck: Do you have a target figure?

**Mr Johnson:** Of course I do not have a target figure, because I have not yet been able to go through the budget in detail, but I can assure you that that will be a priority.

Q92 Tom Brake: I think you accused the Mayor of stealing your policies on getting PCSOs on buses. When did you first call for extra PCSOs on buses?

**Mr Johnson:** Several months ago.

Q93 Tom Brake: Thank you.

**Mr Johnson:** He seems lately to have espoused this. I think it was at the transport hustings two weeks ago that he developed—

Chairman: Mr Brake, your question!

Q94 Tom Brake: There are many PCSOs travelling on buses already and there have been for a number of months. You have also called for extra BTP officers. They are not within your remit or responsibility as Mayor. How would you go about securing those?

**Mr Johnson:** It is curious you should say that, because as far as I can tell, having talked to the BTP at length about this, they would be very grateful for some Transport for London money to be allocated to them, as it already is, by the way, to supply another 50 transport police.

Q95 Tom Brake: What is your financial pledge then in terms of how much you are willing to put into that?

**Mr Johnson:** If you have studied my manifesto in detail, as I am sure you have, Mr Brake, you will discover that, again, simply by reallocating some of the increment in Transport for London's non recruitment publicity budget for next year, we can achieve our manifesto proposes to re-allocate the increment in the MPS non recruitment publicity budget for next year, not TfL.
Q96 Tom Brake: So the publicity budget is paying for that as well.
Mr Johnson: I do think that when Londoners are faced with the choice of more police officers or more press officers in London, I know what they would go for.

Q97 Mrs Dean: Mr Johnson, neighbourhood crime mapping is already undertaken by the police. What difference would your proposal to publish this information make?
Mr Johnson: Of course the difference, Mrs Dean, is that what I am proposing is that the public should be able to see the information, and I know that this is controversial because I know that people worry that it could blight neighbourhoods, for instance, and I know that there are anxieties about whether police information might be prejudiced in some way. I do not think that either of those are sensible objections and I think the public deserves to be treated as though it was grown up and as though it deserved information about what is really going on in their city. The police have crime maps. There is no reason at all why crime mapping should not be made available to all us so we know what is happening in London and we can use that information as a tool to make our points to the police about what is really happening in our neighbourhoods and we can, thereby, urge them to deal with the problems in our neighbourhoods. Additionally, of course, what I would like is to have proper monthly meetings between borough commanders and council leaders as widely advertised as possible so that everybody can go along with the information that is publicly available about what is happening on their street and make their point.

Q98 Mrs Dean: Would this not make it more difficult for the police to operate and retain discretion but also to target crime where they need to target it, without the public trying to get them to tackle it as they would wish, rather than the police feeling that it would be better tackled in a different way?
Mr Johnson: Mrs Dean, I do not think it is wholly illogical or wrong to allow the public some say in asking the police to tackle crime as they would wish, and I think that might be beneficial for policing in London.

Q99 Mr Winnick: On the make-up of the police force, Mr Johnson, some in your party over the years have dismissed having more ethnic minority police officers, be it in London and elsewhere, to use the phrase so often used, as political correctness—
Mr Johnson: I do not agree with that.

Q100 Mr Winnick: ---even if you leave off the “gone mad”. Where do you stand on this particular point?
Mr Johnson: I firmly believe that London should be policed by a police force that reflects our community, and I think what is happening with the PCSOs is very hopeful. If you look at the recruitment to the PCSOs, we now have about 50% from black and minority ethnic groups and I hope that this will feed through into recruitment in the Metropolitan Police generally. We are making progress, it is not as fast as it could be, and I agree—

Q101 Mr Winnick: How can we make it faster? If it is your wish that it should be quicker and that the Police Force should, in fact, represent London as a whole, what would be your policy to quicken the number of ethnic minority individuals within the Police Force in London?
Mr Johnson: One thing you have got to do is build up a much greater sense of cohesion between the community and the police, and you have got to make people feel that they have a much stronger link with the police and that they are not just howling past in their squad cars with their sirens blaring, that they are part of our lives and part of our world, and that is why I have great hopes for the monthly meetings with the borough commanders and the community. Hammersmith and Fulham had a crime summit the other day which was very well attended by all members of the community, and if you are there and you are mingling with the police and you gain an understanding of what policing is all about, then I hope that it will lead to much more recruitment from communities that currently feel excluded or do not identify with the police.

Q102 Chairman: But it is pretty bad at the moment, is it not? There is only one assistant commissioner who is of ethnic origin. Over the last four years there have been no more. Would you not perhaps use positive action to try and get some more people appointed as commanders and beyond? Monthly meetings are very helpful, obviously, but some further action perhaps is necessary.
Mr Johnson: Of course, you need positive role models and you need to give people every possible encouragement and support. You have got to be very careful not to lapse into a quota system that generates resentment and invalidates the whole selection process.

Q103 Tom Brake: On the monthly meetings, just to clarify, what extra are they going to add beyond what is already discussed in the police consultative meetings and, indeed, the ward panel meetings that are organised at a ward level?
Mr Johnson: I agree with you, there is already an abundance of means by which the neighbourhood is supposed to be interacting with the police, but, as far as I can see, you get the same old suspects turning up with the same old—

Q104 Tom Brake: That happens at public meetings.
Mr Johnson: Perhaps, but I think we should try it and I think we should make sure these things are well advertised and that people have a genuine sense that this is a forum in which they can make their point.

Q105 Mrs Cryer: Mr Johnson, you have already suggested that you would like 440 more PCSOs on the streets of London, and you have suggested that
it would be useful to have them on buses and also that it would relieve other police officers from administrative duties at the station. It looks to me as if you are going to be spreading them a bit thinly. Mr Brake has suggested that this is already happening on the buses. You have also suggested that there should be some method of removing Oyster Cards from young people who have committed offences. Is that back of an envelope stuff or have you really thought about that? If so, how are you going to administer it?

Mr Johnson: There are already procedures for removing the right of free travel, not the Oyster Card itself but the right of free travel, from those who break the behaviour code. In principle, that happened 6,000 times last year. In reality, hardly anyone had their right to free travel revoked permanently. My proposal is that it should be permanently revoked unless and until the young person in question wants to earn it back through a scheme I am going to call “Pay back London”, that would allow you, if you want to get back your right of free travel, to do some community service and prove that you value it and you are willing to give the community something back to get it back.

Q106 Mrs Cryer: What I wanted to know was who is going to make the decision to remove the Oyster Card?

Mr Johnson: There are already steps in place that removed rights of free travel from, as I said, 6,000 kids last year. The trouble is it is not being permanently revoked. People are reapplying and getting the ability to travel almost immediately. What I believe we need is a more substantial sanction.

Q107 Mrs Cryer: As regards PCSOs, you want to remove some of them back into the police stations to relieve officers from doing administrative work. It is said that often the PCSOs are very good at actually collecting information regarding potential terrorist outrages, and so if you remove them from the streets you will be losing that.

Mr Johnson: I understand the point you make completely, and I do not intend to remove PCSOs from the streets. I think actually as a country we should stop the general bashing of PCSOs and I think some of the “plastic policeman” rhetoric is misplaced. I think many of them are doing a fantastic job. They are very variable in quality and they are very variable in aspirations, but a lot of them want to go on to become warranted police officers, and they should be supported and encouraged, I just think there should be freedom to do a bit of both with the PCSO force: some of them might be better off in the back room and some of them would be better off out on the streets.

Q108 Martin Salter: Mr Johnson, do you support the Conservative Party proposals for elected police commissioners and, if so, could you explain why you have not argued for it in the Thames Valley, where we are both MPs, since your election in 2001?

Mr Johnson: I certainly think there is a case for more democratic accountability for police commissioners, and I myself believe that the Mayor of London should have a larger measure of democratic authority over the Metropolitan Commissioner. However, I accept that there is currently a difficulty, in the sense that the Commissioner is also responsible for counter-terrorism, which is a national responsibility, and, therefore, Home Office prerogatives are invoked, so there is a democratic difficulty there. I do think generally it would increase public confidence in the police and increase people’s feeling of connection with what is going on if there were elected police chiefs. Yes, I do.

Q109 Martin Salter: But it is not without its problems?

Mr Johnson: It is not without its problems, and I accept the points that Liberty makes about the baleful effects of politicising the police. I would not want to see the politicising of the Police Force.

Q110 Martin Salter: One last question on recruitment, which is something that we both have had an issue with. You may be aware that on 4 February Thames Valley MPs joined a cross-party delegation of south-east MPs to protest to the Home Secretary about the aggressive recruitment policy of the Metropolitan Police Force in poaching over 1,000 police officers from surrounding forces over the last five years. You were not at that delegation. Two years ago you called for more police in your own constituency. It is a simple question, Mr Johnson. Do you support the steps to curb the loss of officers to the Metropolitan Police, or have your priorities changed since you became candidate for the Mayor of London?

Mr Johnson: I want to congratulate you, Mr Salter, on a brilliant attempt to put me in an impossible position.

Q111 Martin Salter: Let us see you wriggle then!

Mr Johnson: Let me reassure you, therefore, by saying that I am in favour of increasing recruitment all round, and I am very happy to see that actually one of the recent successes we are having is that we are succeeding in recruiting very well, both in London and in the Thames Valley. I am happy to say that the dilemma that you beautifully offer the conclusion of my interrogation does not arise for the time being.

Q112 Martin Salter: Are you saying that the Chief Constable of the Thames Valley was wrong to be raising this matter with the Metropolitan Police Commissioner and that all the MPs from the south-east, including several here, who attended that delegation were wrong to be raising this issue, that there is not really a problem?

Mr Johnson: As far as I am aware, the problem has been considerably ameliorated and I am happy to say that I support and encourage the recruitment of more police officers in both areas, and if you look at the figures, we are actually being very successful in recruiting in both areas.
Mr Winnick: You surprise us.
Chairman: We do have one last final question from Mr Russell.
Q113 Bob Russell: Mr Johnson, I wonder if I could seek some clarification. In reply to Mr Brake I think you said it was 50 extra officers for British Transport Police would be funded out of the Mayor’s publicity budget.
Mr Johnson: Transport for London’s budget. The 50 BTP officers will be funded from the MPS publicity budget.
Q114 Bob Russell: Transport for London; okay. The other one was that you were going to put additional resources, as I understand it, for PCSOs to go on the buses. Bearing in mind that the whole reason for PCSOs is that they have a physical footprint in a local community, will these police officers or PCSOs on the buses be a separate breed or will they be part of the overall, and, if so, how does that then reflect on the fact that they have a community base?
Mr Johnson: I do not see any reason to denominate them as a separate breed. It seems to me that they could perform a multiplicity of functions, but there is absolutely no reason at all why we should not have more PCSOs on the buses giving people the sense of reassurance they want.
Chairman: Mr Johnson, thank you very much indeed. We know you are very busy. Thank you for coming today to give evidence.

Witness: Mr Brian Paddick, Liberal Democrat Candidate for Mayor of London 2008, gave evidence.

Q115 Chairman: Thank you very much for coming. I will not start with my long introduction as to why we are here, because I saw you sitting at an earlier session and we do also have the Chairman of the Metropolitan Police Authority and the Deputy Commissioner to follow you this morning. How do you see the challenges of the next few years for London? Do you think that London has the capacity, or the capability, of dealing with counter-terrorism, the forthcoming Olympics and the overall level of crime?
Mr Paddick: I think if there is a change in approach from the police in London then the capacity might be sufficient if there is additional administrative support. At the moment, as has been discussed this morning, we have PCSOs who spend 75% of their time out on the streets; we have fully fledged police officers who are spending 30–40% of their time in the police station. If we were able to provide sufficient administrative support in the police station, we could actually release a lot of those police officers’ time to increase their visible presence on the street. PCSOs do have their uses and, unlike Mr Johnson, in fact there are different sorts of PCSOs already existing. There are security PCSOs, there are transport PCSOs as well as community PCSOs, so they have their uses, but they are not as useful as fully fledged police officers. Indeed, when we are talking about counter-terrorism, whether we are talking about gun and knife crime, the use that PCSOs have is very limited. Administrative support to release police officer time out on to the street is one way of doing it; the other is to get back to the essence of British policing, which is policing by consent.

Q116 Chairman: You know that Sir Ronnie Flanagan has produced his report, and you have obviously come across him in your previous life as a borough commander. Do you think there is too much emphasis on additional police officers as opposed to the better use of police officers, which is what Sir Ronnie was talking about?
Mr Paddick: I think we can make police officers far more effective in the job they do: we can raise their moral and motivation, if we get civilian support to do the mundane paper work for them. For example, if we allow police officers to radio in or telephone in their crime reports whilst they are at the scene of a crime to a professional keyboard operator in the police station, rather than making the police officer go back to the police station and use two fingers to make up the crime report.

Q117 Chairman: And when you were Borough Commander, were you able to properly use the resources you had, or did you feel there were restrictions coming from the Home Office and others to prevent you from doing that?
Mr Paddick: The problem with the Home Office was nationally imposed targets, some of which were having perverse outcomes. For example, in terms of offences brought to justice, I am sure the Committee will realise that it is one point on the score board for a complex case of murder which might take 18 months to investigate and six months to try in court, provided there is a conviction that counts as one offence brought to justice, and a cannabis warning that takes 20 minutes to deal with on the street which counts as exactly the same under current Home Office targets. Clearly that is a nonsense, and clearly it is distorting what the police are concentrating on. If we are to rebuild that contract between the police and the public, the police must be free to be able to concentrate on what is most important to local people.

Q118 Mr Winnick: Recognising, Mr Paddick, that the overwhelming majority of Muslims are no less opposed to terrorism than ourselves, you however said that when you look at the Stop and Search figures under the Terrorism Act they are massively directed towards Muslims. Is that surprising any more than when the IRA was conducting its policy of terror in Britain? Presumably the police were looking for what they considered to be people?
Mr Paddick: But this is the problem we have had in the past with the Caribbean community and robbery; it is the same problem now with terrorism, whether in the past with Irish terrorism, now with so-called Islamic terrorism, although I find that term a little contradictory in terms of what the Muslim faith portrays. The fact is the tiniest minority of Asian people are involved in terrorism, and therefore for the police to target Asian-looking people for Stop and Search is a nonsense. We know from the atrocities that have been carried out in London already that the bombs that have been used so far have been carried in large rucksacks, so if there is a particular alert, if there is particular intelligence that an attack might be imminent, would it not be more sensible to be stopping and searching people carrying large rucksacks, rather than people who have a particular ethnic appearance?

Q119 Mr Winnick: Did you give that advice when you were a senior commander in the Metropolitan Police?
Mr Paddick: I even submitted a 12-page report on how Stop and Search could be made far more accurate and far less discriminatory. It never got past my boss and was never considered by the Commissioner and his top team because any report considered by them has to go through your boss.

Q120 David Davies: It is probably appropriate, then, to make my declaration as a special constable who has done a lot of Section 44 searches. I presume what you are referring to are Section 44(2)s rather than Section 60 or Section 1 case searches. Is that a fair comment?
Mr Paddick: Section 44 --

Q121 David Davies: That you say has targeted Muslims?
Mr Paddick: Section 44, yes.

Q122 David Davies: I am puzzled by it, genuinely, because the instructions that are given out to all police officers are that you must never, ever target people based on their ethnicity. It might be reasonable to look at rucksacks but that must never ever be done, and a Section 44 is meant to be a random search, not a targeted one. What you are saying, and I do not dispute it but I just want to be clear, is that Section 44s are being used to target one particular community, and you are saying the figures backed up that analysis?
Mr Paddick: The latest figures for London are that you are twice as likely to be stopped and searched if you are Asian and four times more likely to be stopped and searched if you are Black. I cannot see any other conclusion to be drawn from that other than some police officers are racially stereotyping.

Q123 David Davies: In order to make a Stop and Search a less blunt instrument, you are obviously aware that if somebody is stopped for a minor offence, a revenue offence, for example, and are being dealt with by process, that in itself does not constitute grounds for a search even if they have warning signals. Would you not think there might be a case for changing the law so that somebody who has warning signals, recent convictions carrying knives or drugs, could be given a quick pat-down type search if they are stopped and they admit an offence that is being dealt with by a process that is not arrestable?

Mr Paddick: There are two alternatives at the moment. Stop and Account, the issue raised by the Lawrence Inquiry report, and Stop and Search. I think Stop and Search should only be conducted if there is reasonable cause to suspect that the person has something on them at that time. Surely, if somebody is recognised as having a long record of street robbery, they are in an area of high street robbery loitering by a bus stop, then it is appropriate for the police officer to go up and ask them in detail to account for why they are there, what they are doing and so forth, but unless there has been a recent report of a robbery where that person fits a description, or there is some sign of something bulky being carried by them, there is some evidence they might have something on them, then it should not go through to a search.

Q124 Gwyn Prosser: Mr Paddick, you have been very critical about the health and safety legislation and the way it is applicable to the police. Was that your view when you were a serving police officer and did you make representations about it, and do you want to see that legislation abandoned altogether in respect of the police force, or do you want to see a more general interpretation of the law?
Mr Paddick: What we need is a common sense approach to the issue, and we had this ridiculous situation whilst I was in the police where we were commending officers for their bravery in circumstances in which the Health and Safety Executive would carry out a prosecution if they knew about the particular case.

Q125 Gwyn Prosser: How many prosecutions were there?
Mr Paddick: The law only changed reasonably recently and there was a high profile prosecution, one in particular was of the two previous Commissioners in the Metropolitan Police. I think maybe the Health and Safety Executive have learned from that experience, bearing in mind that the people were acquitted. Yes, the police have to take reasonable precautions in order to protect their staff but they must allow individual operational officers to use their common sense, to judge whether their actions could possibly save a life, for example, and in those circumstances if they wish to take more of a risk, put themselves at risk in order to save a life, then they should be allowed to do that, and that should not result in prosecution of senior officers.

Q126 Mr Streeter: Mr Paddick, I understand you have put forward crime reduction targets of 5% per annum for the first four years and if you do not hit them you will not stand again as Mayor, so that is
20% over the next four years. Some commentators have suggested this is not really very credible. Do you honestly think those targets are realistic? Mr Paddick: They are far more realistic than the current Mayor, Ken Livingstone, who at this time in the election process last time round said he would deliver 50% reduction in crime over the next four years and, as we know, even if we take the rather dubious police recorded crime statistics into account, it is only 17% and not 50%. I think a 5% per year reduction in British crime survey crime—and what we are talking about here is people’s experience of crime, not an opinion poll; it is a scientific survey of 2500 Londoners carried out every year, and is seen by most academics to be the most reliable measure of crime over time—is realistic.

Q127 Ms Buck: Following that up, you earlier talked about perverse and unintended consequences of targets. If you are setting a 20% overall target, is there not a real risk then that you and the staff for whom you are responsible will aim to achieve that numerical target without necessarily focusing on priorities for Londoners, and how would you avoid that?

Mr Paddick: Because the British Crime Survey is actually a survey of Londoners where they ask people: “Have you been a victim of crime over the last 12 months?”, it provides an incentive for the police to concentrate on those offences that are most affecting Londoners.

Q128 Ms Buck: Numerically?

Mr Paddick: So it is the only target that it is realistic to set. The fact is, if the public have more confidence in the police, which we hope to achieve, you could see recorded crime going up because you will not have the situation we have at the moment where a significant number of Londoners do not report crime to the police because they do not think the police will take it seriously, or they do not think it is worth it, or a lot of people in deprived areas, for example, do not have insurance so there is no point in getting a crime number in order to support their insurance claim. So British Crime Survey reduction is the only measure, and in fact it was one adopted by governments some years ago. When the recorded crime figures were going up they decided to base police crime reduction targets on British Crime Survey crime, but of course now we are in a situation where police recorded crime is going down. Government has abandoned the British Crime Survey in favour of recorded crime.

Q129 Ms Buck: I still wonder if that has not missed the point because it is still a global numerical target that does not allow you the flexibility then to focus on what might be the priority concerns rather than just chasing numbers. But let me ask you one other question. You propose to chair the Metropolitan Police Authority. What would be the advantage of that for Londoners?

Mr Paddick: Unlike the Mayor who claimed that 50% of the Police Authority were Assembly members, a third are Assembly members, a third magistrates and a third independent elected members. The advantage is I know the inside track. With the best will in the world, with fewer members of the Metropolitan Police Authority than you have boroughs in London, they do not know and they cannot examine in detail the way the police are functioning. I know exactly how the police functions: I know exactly the methods to present the best gloss on things, and I will not be misled in the way that the Metropolitan Police Authority has from time to time been misled.

Q130 Mrs Dean: Do you agree with Mr Johnson that neighbourhood crime mapping should be published?

Mr Paddick: At the moment whatever borough you live in in London it is possible for you, either interactively or by going to the monthly police community consultative group meeting, to find out exactly what the crime levels are in your particular borough. I think if you go down to, if it is published globally, what the crime figures are, say, on a ward basis, there is the danger of stigmatising particular areas of London, both in terms of creating ghettos where only the poorest people would choose to live if it is shown to be a crime hotspot, and, as we know, the poor are disproportionately victims of crime, and in terms of house prices and so forth. There are lots of downsides to it. In fact, neighbourhood watch groups who currently exist publish to their members what crimes have been taking place locally in order that people can take necessary precautions and keep their eyes open. I do not think publishing that data so that the Evening Standard can pick it up and publish a map with different shades of red on it is going to be advantageous to anybody.

Q131 David Davies: The British Crime Survey does not include crimes involving children or property, does it, and it has been recently criticised for this by the Chief Constable of British Transport Police. How can you say that it is more valid than an opinion poll?

Mr Paddick: What Ian Johnson said was that it was not a comprehensive measure of crime but it is a good surrogate for crime levels generally, and the most accurate measure of crime over time. It does include property crime but not crime against people under the age of 16.

Q132 David Davies: Shoplifting?

Mr Paddick: Shoplifting is a type of property crime that is not included. It is about the crimes that affect residents rather than businesses.

Chairman: Mr Paddick, thank you for giving evidence to us today; it has been very helpful.
Witnesses: Mr Len Duvall, Chairman, Metropolitan Police Authority; Mr Paul Stephenson, Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service, gave evidence.

Q133 Chairman: Mr Duvall, Mr Stephenson, we are extremely grateful to you for coming to give evidence to us today. As you know, we are conducting an inquiry into policing in the 21st century, and I am very keen to start by asking you about community engagement and the expectation of the police. What exercises do you currently undertake in order to engage with local communities?

Mr Duvall: There are a number of exercises. The Metropolitan Police Service do a number themselves at borough level in territorial policing, that is where we work with London boroughs; jointly with Council they conduct consultation exercises in producing local policing plans; they have Safer Neighbourhood Team panels that develop key individuals in neighbourhoods who they contact and talk to and use as sounding boards, and there is a panel of individuals that they bring together to talk about what the local policing plan on the neighbourhood that is developed over a period of time. They talk to local councillors—they are not part of the panels but they do liaise with local councillors about issues that are occurring within their neighbourhoods. We have a borough-wide mechanism that the Metropolitan Police Authority funds called the Legacy of the Scarman Era of Consultative Groups which we still retain and we are in the process of modernising in terms of the 21st century recognising not just holding the police to account but also the executive role of councils. We run London-wide consultation exercises; we are in the process of doing one across the 32 London boroughs about our asset property portfolio, and in the Metropolitan Police Authority itself we do a number of scrutinies, more recently the one on counter-terrorism involving every aspect of the community and how they feel about counter-terrorism, and more recently one about youth engagement, a very substantial exercise probably involving over a thousand odd people coming through the doors.

Q134 Chairman: That sounds pretty extensive. Do you feel you are currently meeting the expectations of the people of London?

Mr Duvall: I think as a Police Authority and at the Metropolitan Police Service in terms of all the survey work and the surveys carried out by others we retain the general confidence of the people in London about policing aspects. There are issues in communities where sometimes we have to regain their confidence, and certain incidences cause that to happen. We work hard at doing that. We know generally in terms of protecting Londoners that, much as we are the No 1 agency in tackling crime in its many forms, from graffiti and everything in between to counter-terrorism which we do both London-wide, nationally, and internationally, we do everything in between, that is what Londoners expect us to do, and basically people on the whole think that we are doing a pretty good job. We are not complacent about that and we enjoy very high confidence levels in doing that, but there are other ways we can check and test that. We are concerned; that is why I think the emphasis in the 21st century is about citizen focus; we have a mission I am constantly exhorting, and the senior management team are in agreement, to explain how we police, without giving the game away, to those who want to cause misery and mayhem to their communities; we have a mission to explain what we do and how we do it, if you come into contact with us, to make sure the public is on side.

Mr Stephenson: Just to set the context here I will start off by agreeing with my Chair, which is obviously a good thing to do, that we can do a lot better and that is our intention, but if you look at what we are doing at this moment in time and at the very extensive British Crime Survey work that is taking place, and our own public attitude survey work, virtually across the board there is an increase in confidence and satisfaction, and that means we are doing something significantly different. So it is important to set that in context. But even where we have got to it does not mean to say it is where we ought to be in the future. Historically the Metropolitan Police Service has been seen as being very good at delivering on very big jobs, and we have a good record on that, but the Commissioner is on record as saying when we break it down into individual contact we are not always guaranteed to be quite as good, and that is the big mission for the Met, to make sure those daily contacts match the same quality as we deliver on the big jobs. The survey work would indicate there is a significant improvement but we have some way to go.

Q135 Mr Streeter: London is obviously a great capital city; we have the 2012 Olympics coming up; you are on the front line for the fight against terrorism. Have we the right structures in place, and is there sufficient capacity to overcome these particular challenges?

Mr Duvall: The structures are beginning to take shape. Certainly inside the Metropolitan Police Service those structures are there. Government is reorganising their bits so they are interfaced with us. It is not just the Olympics that year; there are a number of other significant events that will be considerable challenges. From the policing point of view and in terms of this period leading up to the events the planning and testing for different scenarios is very important, but for us we still need to deliver policing in the capital, in your neighbourhoods, and in the other policing areas in terms of it being affected by Olympic events. So we have to chew gum and walk at the same time, as well as protecting people during this significant eventing issue. Albeit we are going to have to shift the resources around, from the policing point of view we need to do that from a common sense approach. We have learnt many lessons since 9/11 about responses to tragedies around managing police officer assets; we have certainly learnt different lessons in public order, the last one where we were severely tested was Heathrow Airport where we needed to have the capacity to move police officers from their local
locations to meet potential challenges, and we think we did that with common sense without ordinary people suffering from a lack of police response.

Mr Stephenson: I think we have the right structure for this moment in time but the idea that structure should last for ever is fallacious, and I am sure you would agree. We have made recent changes to structure in recent times; I think the Chair has referred to it. We have made significant changes to our counter-terrorism command. We used to have an SO12 and SO13 which was the Intelligence and the Executive action separately. We are now quite clear that that was a structure fit for the past but not for today and we have moved to SO15, a much more dynamic, combined structure. So we have amended that to fit with the new terrorist challenge. We are currently, again with the Police Authority, looking at the structure of the Met in terms of central support. I think we can make some significant savings there. We have to rationalise the way we do business; we have to bring together our financial planning and organisational planning into a seamless piece that means we can save some resources and produce a better product. So we have to constantly look at our structures. The one thing we are clear on, and if the Commissioner was here today I think he would want to make this point, is that the structure that the Met has indicates it is already a regional police service, and the overlaying of delivery of day-to-day policing in the boroughs and the greater empowerment of those borough commanders is hugely important and we are wholly committed to it, but, in the absence of an overlaying of a wider structure to bring in those extra specialist departments and requirements to deal with the more serious end of crime, keeping that together as a cohesive whole is very important to the policing of London.

Q136 Mr Clappison: On funding, which you have just touched upon, I have to say the whole subject of police funding is not one I find readily comprehensively and I am not sure many others do either. But the Mayor of London has said that the application of a police funding formula as recommended by Sir Ronnie Flanagan would have a negative effect on the policing in London. What is your reaction to that?

Mr Duvall: There are a couple of issues around funding. My background is in local government --

Q137 Mr Clappison: You might understand it better than me, then!

Mr Duvall: It is a bit like SSAs, no one understood that but it did become more transparent as it was developed and if you wanted to understand how you got to the final pounds, shillings and pence, then you could, providing you had a whole year to do it and got there and you could challenge or not challenge. The issue for us about formula funding, of course, is that we will always want to allocate resources accurately, because I think with those non-specific grants it is a matter of having some certainty of when you are going to take a decision rather than delay it, carry it over to the new year, give us it in the autumn if it is reasonable, let us then plan to the budget, and that is more important to us at this moment in time.

Q138 Mr Clappison: You know this well from what you are saying. Do you think within the constraints of the present system it would be possible for Government to give you more certainty?

Mr Duvall: Sometimes it is difficult for Government. They have their own timetable which does not always fit into a London timetable, either a mayoral or pre-set timetable that we have to respond to through statutory issues. I think with a bit of good will we could. Nobody gets out of bed to make life difficult for each other. Sometimes their timetable is obviously more important than ours. We can get there and get some planning around that. It is the same with Olympic grants. Paul and his colleagues need to do the job, they give you their best shots, but we need some certainty about the money and issues around that so we can get on and plan, and we are getting there with that money. We have recently had it; it would have been nice if it was a bit earlier, but the interface we have with government needs to be sharpened and more focused if we are going to do a good job. We always do the best job we can in the time available, but it is that certainty to be able to get on and plan and take the decisions they need to take in terms of delivering that response you require.

Q139 Mrs Dean: The Metropolitan Police Authority was judged to be performing only adequately by the Audit Commission in terms of the use of resources. Do you think this was a fair assessment?

Mr Duvall: Adequately? I think you have to look at it over a period of time. I have been in the job for four years and I value the Audit Commission and their comments and what they measure against. Someone likened it to an exam, are the right questions being asked and are we giving the right responses? The Metropolitan Police Service has 175 questions being asked and are we giving the right responses? The Metropolitan Police Service has 175 years of history; normally it has been always working to the Home Office. There is anecdotal information of how it received its estimates at that time. One thing that has been beneficial with the new governance arrangements in London is that it is much more transparent. I told you in the year 2000 what my predecessor Toby Harris had to deal with, as well as senior colleagues in the Met. I am used to a local government background in terms of the arrangements but we never had any accountants, I think we probably only had one in the entire Met at
that time, and we needed to make our arrangements fit and proper for the 20th century, never mind the 21st century. Over the eight years, year on year, you have seen some good things also said by the Audit Commission who has said there has been some good performance. There are still areas I am not happy with and that the Commissioner and Paul is not happy with, but I am expecting that to improve and I think we can do another step change in those issues. I am confident now about aligning the planning process with the resource process, and confident that we have some of the structures there that we would recognise in a local government setting, and the Audit Commission are confident about some of those structures and procedures. There are problems but we have identified some of those. The famous Amex exposure was one that we found rather than was found for us, and we took the corrective action and still take corrective action around those issues. So I am confident that we are getting better at it but I am not complacent, and certainly we are working hard for it and I hope in the coming year to give a different slant on some of those issues.

Q140 Mrs Cryer: How does the Met respond to Sir Ronnie Flanagan’s proposal for workforce modernisation, and can I specifically ask, because it has been drawn to my attention recently by members of the West Yorkshire force, about better working options to attract women and ethnic minorities?

Mr Stephenson: Starting with the specific, whilst again there is much more to be done, if we look at our current recruiting, particularly for BEM population, in year we are currently recruiting. I think I am right in saying something like 21%, and I think 30% are females, which is a significant improvement on previous years—probably unimaginable improvement if you turn the clock back maybe three or four years. We are doubling our rate in numbers of BEM background within the Met. The problem we have is we are a huge organisation and turning round the supertanker and getting ratios to hit the high mark is a long road, so I think the best measure is the in-year rate and the in-year rate is a significant improvement. So we are doing a huge amount around that. I would also say that our own HR department within the Met has been the recipient of numerous awards in terms of innovation and imagination to try and improve on this critical area. In terms of the wider question of Sir Ronnie Flanagan’s reforms, we have responded positively and are already doing many things that Sir Ronnie anticipated we should be doing in terms of looking more flexibly and imaginatively at how we use our resources. We must do more in the future because we are facing constrained financial times, and the growth we have enjoyed in recent years has come to an end and we are going to have to make much better use of our resource, so we have to be ever more imaginative in the future, but we are approaching that positively we see, and this is where we share in West Yorkshire’s ambition, is ever more flexibility allowed to us in the way in which we can employ a workforce that matches London’s needs.

Q141 Mrs Cryer: So you think that the flexible working, et cetera, that you have in place now is sufficient to keep your officers with you rather than finishing after a few years?

Mr Stephenson: We have a very good retention rate, compared with anybody within the industry and policing outside, and something we are proud of. Of course, we always want to make it better. If I say it is not a problem, comparatively it is not a problem at this moment in time. If you ask me am I satisfied there is nothing more we can do? No, of course there is more we can do, but we are pushing the boundaries of the envelope now, and I think we have to keep researching and being more innovative.

Mr Duvall: I think it is quite clear that people are changing their attitude towards the police service as a career of choice, particularly women and BEM communities. There is a problem with recruitment, slow down is a problem in some ways, but there are some wider issues here. There is flexibility and we are a sensitive employer, and I think we are a premier employer, and I am happy to provide further details in terms of what we do and do not do, but there are wider issues here and principles about policing. Warranted police officers are important, we would all agree, but the shape of policing in the future, and we need to give some confidence to our community and we need to explain this, is that also PCSOs are an important part of policing now, and if I go to the other side most senior officers and borough commanders will say their support staff are. They are all crime fighters; they just do different jobs. The issue for the 21st century is that we all say we want to put policing on the street and I want to put visibility on our streets, but the front line in policing may not be on our streets, it may well be behind a desk, and I think we have to have a bit more of a mature approach about what we try to do. But the issue is using that resource, and we are a labour intensive resource which is why policing costs so much at this moment in time. You have addressed some of these issues in past meetings, and how people are paid and viewed and valued about their work is very important, and they are allied and cannot be separated. In general, we are looking at some of the efficiencies of how you deploy those resources, but equally, and we have both been on public platforms and said this, in the 21st century we seek to remain an unarmed police force. I know it is very difficult in central London to think that is the case, but only 10% of our police officers are generally armed and even with trends as they are and despite all the interest from the press, that is an important principle we should seek to retain, professionally and from a police officer point of view.

Q142 Chairman: Why did it take Sir Ronnie to tell us there was too much red tape? Surely this was something that officers at a local level could have been involved in at an earlier stage.

Mr Stephenson: I think Sir Ronnie’s addition to the debate has been hugely valuable but I think even he would turn round and say it did not need him to tell us that was the case. A number of people in policing already recognised that, and a number already
recognised Sir Ronnie’s point concerning risk aversion. I myself as Chief Constable in Lancashire six years ago made a series of speeches to my own people saying: “If you are well-recruited, well-intentioned and well-trained and you think something should be done, I want you to get on with it”. So I do not think Sir Ronnie necessarily would say that he came up with it first, but he made a huge addition to that debate by highlighting it and giving it added impetus.

Q143 Martin Salter: As a Thames Valley MP a lot of my colleagues have concerns about recruitment, and we heard from Boris Johnson earlier that he felt there was no problem with recruitment to the Met and you have just said there is a problem with the slowing down of recruitment. Can you expand on that?

Mr Duvall: The trouble is there is an issue that even with slow down of recruitment you can be caught out if you have a rush of people leaving, and one of our issues in the coming years and leading up to the Olympics is retaining people with experiences and people who have choices. At the moment it is not a problem but I need to be mindful that some of the work we have been able to undertake in the Metropolitan Police Service is because we have been recruiting up to a number. John Stevens initially said it was 35,000; we have a mix now in the police service with just over 31,000, which is the highest it has ever been in its entire history, with the PCSOs at just under 4,000 I think. The question then for us is we are seeing some results from the ground. Much as we may have doubts there are trends happening around reductions in crime or increased reporting where young people have more confidence, and we want to go out and encourage that and not beat people up if they are coming forward to report issues. There is something happening in our community and we need to drive it further down. What is making the difference? It has to be about some of the investment in Safer Neighbourhood Teams where we have done survey work and seen that driven down; it has to be about some of the work that communities are doing themselves and local councils are helping us do that and other agencies; there is something going on here. We have not quite got to the bottom of it but it is going in the right direction. We can all talk about the flaws in the different recording aspects but there is a general direction in the right way, so we need to build on that. On recruitment issues, everyone knows the debate is can you get more out of police officers used in a certain way and get—not more for less, I am not suggesting Boris is saying that, but is there a different way of using them. That is his argument. My argument is London is slightly special; we need to make sure we keep the numbers up; we need to see how we are using those, but certainly I am very mindful of what it means to boroughs in the outer area. I have had conversations with the Chief Constable Thames Valley; I have spoken to Police Authority members, and it makes no sense for us to dilute outer London regions, but the issue is there always will be choice in the employment market. We are not offering any major incentives except for the Inner London allowance and the travel pass, and we have to work with those police authorities and police services to try and minimise the impact on any recruitment exercises we undertake.

Mr Stephenson: There is one particular point I wanted to make in response to Mrs Cryer’s previous question around the issue of how we have responded to Ronnie Flanagan’s workforce modernisation. We are very positive about that but I think all forces would say, but particularly in London, that we need to be bearing in mind the resilience of police officers, because when something happens we need to put fully trained police officers on the street. So there has to be a balance between modernisation and the retention of visible, skilled police officers who can do the business when the business needs to be done.

Q144 Martin Salter: Getting back to recruitment, you will be aware of the lobby from the forces surrounding London and of the figures that Sara Thornton, Chief Constable of the Thames Valley has put forward. Over the last five years not only have we lost one thousand officers to the Met but it has cost something like £11 million to recruit and replace specialist officers. Obviously it is not in the interests of the Met to displace crime just outside its border because it still becomes a regional problem, no one is arguing that the Met should not have the additional cost of the living allowance, but do you accept that there is clearly a much too stark cliff edge in remuneration between those officers who are serving just outside the Metropolitan Police area boundaries and those officers serving in it?

Mr Duvall: I would not want to make a Balkanisation case for extending the London policing boundaries, but I do accept there is a cost to training a specialist that is there. It is not for me to verify those figures that have been produced, and I do accept that in terms of our recruitment we cannot have a Do Not Care policy. Criminals do not need boundaries, and we need to work hard with each other to understand each other’s needs and see if there are some issues that do not work against what we are all trying to do, but I think it is ultimately for Government to look at those funding issues, if there are funding issues.

Mr Stephenson: There is little doubt, one has to be fair, that the range of opportunities, particularly at the high and specialist level, are very attractive to police officers, but there is also little doubt that there is a two-way flow and some people do go back, and there is an opportunity for forces to gain from experience in the fairly unique environment in the Met. Our advertising will continue in a controlled manner, through a combination of marketing events, hosted on MPS premises, and in police publications.

But I do not think we should ignore the fact that there is a two-way flow and there is no particular campaign to target a particular constabulary such as Thames Valley, but I do accept the attractiveness of the Metropolitan Police Service at the high and specialist level.
Mr Clappison: Chairman, may I say that Mr Salter speaks for me on this. We are in agreement.

Chairman: Excellent!

Q145 David Davies: I spoke within the last ten days to a constable in the British Transport Police who applied to the Met, was told the Met were not recruiting for a number of years, applied to the British Transport Police and was told informally by the Inspector in the Met that once he had done his training he would be very welcome, nudge, nudge, wink, wink, to reapply to the Met and he could be sure that a place would be found for him. So there seems to be anecdotal evidence that the Metropolitan Police are not happy to take on the cost of training constables, but are very happy to recruit them in from other forces.

Mr Stephenson: If you look at the figures in our record we are very heavy initial recruiters and we do bring in a certain level of experience, but it is not something that you would anticipate is anything other than proportionate to the need. I think we have heavily recruited around the counter terrorism requirement; one would expect us to do that. We have the lead for counter terrorism along with a number of forces in this country; therefore you would expect us to make sure we attracted and gave opportunities to people across the country to give of their best in a specialised area of work, but that is a special case. We are heavy recruiters at the initial recruitment phase. We are also heavy recruiters into policing from our own PCSO base, because that has been a huge success, particularly when we look at black and ethnic minority recruitment.

Mr Duvall: On the question of whether we are moving away from our residential training to do more flexible training on the job in surrounding areas, can I just say that we will not ever have a policy of doing it on the cheap, or letting someone else take the responsibility. That is not in our policy making, and certainly it would never meet our recruitment needs.

Q146 Chairman: Are you disappointed that in the last four years you have not appointed a black or Asian senior officer to the Met? We heard the Mayor earlier on saying it takes time, but in terms of 21st century policing, surely we should be appointing more senior police officers who are from the ethnic minority communities?

Mr Duvall: My background and inclination is to appoint people if they are of sufficient calibre. There are men and women in BEM community who I am obviously very willing to appoint and promote. On ACPO ranks we have had a number of Commander appointments, which is where the majority are coming through. Certainly I have appointed senior women in the last four years to senior positions in the Met; I do not think it is too far away for us to see an Assistant Commissioner position going to a woman, there are people coming through the processes: I do not think it is too far away to see other senior black and ethnic minority groupings coming into those ACPO ranks. We have in the Met the most senior Assistant Commissioner in the country with considerable expertise and we utilise that where we can. We do engage with the staff representative groups and the Police Association, and we are working that through.

Q147 Chairman: But is there a shortage of candidates? Because you have recruited more, have you not? Are they not applying? What is the reason, Mr Stephenson?

Mr Stephenson: We start from a much improved base, as we have indicated, and there is a fair point here, that once you start heavily recruiting at the base that will take some time to come through, but also it is a fair challenge. Are we getting the success coming through at the speed we want? It is starting to happen but we are encouraged by the Metropolitan Police Authority to be much more active in our talent management and in our interventions to ensure we get that representation coming through, and to ensure we have at some stage in the future a picture that we are proud of right the way through all of the ranks. It is significantly improving but it will take some time.

Q148 Mr Clappison: Do you have the feeling that that is something which is going to happen and, given what you said about appointing people on the basis of calibre, when it does happen we can all celebrate and say these people have reached the top on the basis of their calibre and there will be no question of anything else?

Mr Duvall: A lot of mischief-making has been done in the past. All people will receive their promotions on that basis and are very proud of their own achievements. It is a significant achievement to achieve high office in the Metropolitan Police Service. I am very much taken when I come across people newly promoted from the BEM community because it is not just for them; it has a wider significance in their community, and they are very proud of that.

Mr Stephenson: Reducing standards would do no one any favours.

Chairman: Thank you. David Winnick has questions on counter-terrorism.

Q149 Mr Winnick: The Metropolitan Police Authority, which, of course, you chair had two reports which were very critical indeed about Stop and Search. One of the reports, Counter-terrorism: The London Debate, said that Stop and Search is doing untold damage to certain communities. I am not sure if Counter-terrorism: The London Debate is actually Metropolitan Police Authority, but the Metropolitan Police Authority report on Stop and Search was very critical as well, and said it increased the level of distrust in the police and created deeper racial and ethnic tensions against the police. What is being done to try and avoid the sort of situations described in those two reports?

Mr Duvall: Both those reports are very balanced and are raising issues that have been pointed out to us in the various scrutinies we have held. Right from the very beginning, before I had my position, the issues at the forefront have been around Stop and Search,
Stop and Account post-Lawrence, and the development of that, based on an original scrutiny back in the first term in 2000. What is the Authority’s position, and what steps can we take? By and large, we should be proud of our young people. If you read the press you think most of them are committing crimes; they are not. Most are likely to be victims. Young people, black and white, say: “We do not mind more Stop and Search but can you explain to us why you are doing it, why we are being asked to account and being searched, and also can you please do it with respect?” And that is the issue. Stop and Search is a very valuable tool in policing, I am quite clear about that, and I had that view before I took this position as a local government leader. If it can save lives in terms of knife crime it must be important, and young people who were there before are many of the people questioning the issues. The issue of counter-terrorism stops has been much more interesting because the Metropolitan Police Service are not the only ones who carry out that power in London; there are other agencies like the British Transport Police, the Ministry of Defence, also doing it. Like all tools—and I think I represent the views of my Authority—sometimes we have used the blanket anti-terrorism stop as a way of keeping public order that has not quite brought the body into disrepute but has caused it to be significantly questioned. Equally, however, Stop and Search/Stop and Account is around places which we know terrorists are looking at and targeting through their surveillance and preparation issues and has almost certainly saved lives. The question then is what we need to do, and what we have been doing is, firstly, telling people their rights, which I think is appropriate in the circumstances; secondly, that if they feel they have been unjustly stopped explaining how they can raise these issues, or if they have a complaint where they can raise that; and we have highlighted, certainly through the counter-terrorism debate that we have promoted, the importance of why the police need to do this activity to ensure that if they feel aggrieved that they are being persecuted for the fifth, fourth, or tenth time, there are mechanisms where we can track that and see what the circumstances were at the time or will be in the future. By and large I think the training that the Metropolitan Police Service has undertaken is good but we need to improve on it. Most Stop and Search or Stop and Accounts at borough level are intelligence-led and not at someone’s discretion, but I do think it is important to stand up and say that police officers do need to have discretion sometimes and make a judgment call. But by and large in the boroughs it is intelligence-led and mostly, on counter-terrorism issues, it is around areas of activity that we know terrorists are looking at.

Q151 Mr Winnick: Finally, insofar as those two reports which I quoted were so critical of Stop and Search, how confident are both of you that progress is being made which would avoid the very sharp criticism which your own Authority made?

Mr Stephenson: Everything in my professional background, and I entirely agree with Len on this, tells me that with Stop and Search the issue is more often how you do it, not what you do. That is really the key issue and it has been throughout my entire professional career. Generally around Section 44, counter-terrorism stops, there is a real need to keep the way we use it and the need for it under close review. My professional view at the moment is quite simply that it is a balanced, very useful, protective tool around certain parts of our environment to stop aggressive planning, and indications are that that particular tool adds to our armoury and potentially can save us from attack. That is a professional view at this moment in time but it does need to be kept under careful review. At the end of your question I think you were referring to the possibility of profiling, stopping people on the basis of terrorism coming from a certain section of the community and anybody who looks like they come from that section must be stopped. It is not a very smart tactic to do that because the enemy will simply turn round and decide to use people who do not look like that, and it would be a huge mistake to go down the profiling route. We have to be intelligence-led where we can be, but we should look at our infrastructure to put in protective regimes, and that is what we try to do. On balance professionally it is still worth doing it, but I think we have to be careful.

Q150 Mr Winnick: Let’s be blunt about this, Mr Duvall. Just as, when terrorism was being organised by the IRA and the IRA people who could possibly be involved were of Irish origin, the overwhelming majority of Irish people were against terrorism, terrorism now comes from that section of the Muslim community—not even a
reflection of all our communities. If you look at the number of people brought to justice we have had white, African, Asian—across the spectrum, and that is why it is difficult to profile.

**Mr Stephenson:** There is a really important issue here that we, Government, all agencies, have to pick up on, which is this. You asked the question: How confident can we be that we are getting the message through? We are doing huge amounts more. The Metropolitan Police Authority-led London debate actually came up with recommendations around youth boards and female boards to get the communication system better. What we have to do to be more effective is communicate much more with key stakeholders and with accountability to the people. What is the process we use, what are the inevitabilities, come and try it, come and engage in some of our exercises and see for yourself how the decisions are made. We have to build up confidence in advance of incidents, because the idea of just sharing intelligence around incidents is much more difficult. We have to build up confidence in the systems, processes and people, and that is the challenge for us all.

**Q152 Mr Streeter:** Sir Ronnie had quite a lot to say about governance issues. What would you do to improve the accountability of local authorities?

**Mr Duvall:** I think there are some issues around the visibility of police authorities generally, although the Metropolitan Police Authority could do with being out of the limelight after recent months. I think there is a case for invisibility for them! My own view is about clarity of structure. Here in London we are special—and I do not say that with arrogance, or say that we are any different because the challenges in the rest of the country are just as challenging—but there are two shareholders who influence policing in London, who are the Government and the Mayor through their precepts and budgeting. Any Mayor that takes office will have a great influencing role. The Metropolitan Police Authority sets the trend and the strategic direction, and the new power that the Mayor will have when he takes office will be that he will be able to appoint his own chair of the Police Authority. I am currently elected by the Police Authority, if you did away with the Police Authority you would have to replace it. If the issue is about transparency and about engagement in a mission, we explain that in public. I think we have provided added value in London and I do believe police authorities provide added value to policing outside, but it does need to be done appropriately. We have got a balance; we are not in each other’s pockets; we can work together, and there are very few areas where we disagree—there have been some but by and large it works well in London. We need to be closer to local government, and I do not wish to take any decisions about fragmentation of the police service but I do believe that with local democratic leadership and working close together to deal with disorder, partnerships we should be able to offer a different type of service to them, and we want them to utilise the existing powers they have in terms of working closer with us. So that is what we are working on where you will see some changes in London, and we will be working much more closely with some agencies on localism, and we will unveil those ideas post May, and they have broad consensus across the political parties in London.

**Q153 Ms Buck:** Mr Livingstone earlier made reference to Ronnie Flanagan’s comments about the police being risk averse. What do you feel about that particular comment, and what are the Met doing in response to those comments?

**Mr Duvall:** You can imagine with some of the incidents and some of the tragedies we have had to deal with that issue is uppermost in the minds of police and professionals. We have had discussions in the Police Authority about risk averse issues, and we have had also the famous Morris Report talking about how we deal with HR issues and how black and ethnic minorities felt about discipline processes, and about what was happening. It was not so much that people were being racist; they just did not want to deal with it, so they were not taking the risk and managing properly the smaller issues that may have been dealt with lower down. Those were the findings that we all agreed in the end in terms of responses. We have to set in train some processes and actions here so that in an operational environment, when they come to make judgments, they have take those without looking over their shoulders. That does not mean they should not be held accountable for their issues or we should be above the law, but there are certain circumstances where we can send the wrong signals in terms of operational policing issues and in terms of how we want people to manage or deal with the media, and increasingly with some of those issues it is not that police officers are frightened about circumstances but there is the potential for issues to run and run if the wrong thing is said in the media, or at different operational levels, and this means we do not get the best out of policing, and that is the issue that Ronnie is trying to get across. It is cultural, it is about leadership and about training. We do not want people running around thinking they are not accountable to the people they serve because they are servants of the people, but equally we need to give back some confidence. Some of the foundations laid after the Lawrence Inquiry for John Stevens were important and we made a number of changes in the way the policing took place then; I think we have seen that in terms of the other issues we have; but it is something we need to keep uppermost in our minds.

**Mr Stephenson:** If I may say so, I entirely agree with Sir Ronnie. I also agree with his analysis that sometimes it has come about because of external influence, but occasionally because of the way we have responded to external influence and over-egged the pudding sometimes. It seems to me it is about professional police leadership and we have to internally redress that; but what Sir Ronnie has usefully done is brought the debate right out into the open because that debate also has to be had with the stakeholder groups who hold us to account and investigate us, to understand there is a wider context here.
Q154 Bob Russell: Mr Stephenson, it will be four years next month since the first Safer Neighbourhood Teams based in wards were set up in London, and I understand that by April 2006 all 630 were up and running with one police sergeant, two police constables and three Police Community Support Officers. Now, this has been rolled out across London, what impact has there been for the benefit of Londoners and those of us visiting London, and what more needs to be done to embed neighbourhood policing?

Mr Stephenson: There is little doubt it significantly contributes to what I was referring to earlier, the real increase in confidence and satisfaction, although there is more to be done. Safer Neighbourhood Teams have been key to bringing about that improvement, and I think it is right to say that in our most similar force grouping, which is the way we measure this, confidence in local policing is right at the very top, and that is something we are very proud of but which could get better. It has also had an impact on the crime figures. There is huge debate about the crime figures but whichever figures you look at, British Crime Survey or our police recorded figures, and you should not take one in isolation from the other, there are significant reductions, so it has had an impact there as well.

Q155 Bob Russell: And, for a Government that likes school league tables, have we got league tables for Safer Neighbourhood Teams? The “Safer Neighbourhood Team of the Year” award?

Mr Stephenson: I am not keen on league tables --

Q156 Bob Russell: Nor am I, but I was just wondering.

Mr Stephenson: -- but what I am keen on is recognising the fact that there are some places in London where the Safer Neighbourhood Teams are beyond good; beyond anything we ever imagined they were going to be. They are so outstanding. There are some places where they are not quite as good and we have to be clearer and cleverer at ensuring we bring everywhere up to higher standards. We are also rolling out Safer Neighbourhood Teams, and will roll out additional Safer Neighbourhood Teams where the wards are substantially bigger; there is an experiment going out about 24/7 in Hammersmith & Fulham Safer Neighbourhood Teams, and that has been evaluated, and clearly I will be very keen on something like that but that entirely depends on resourcing. What we now have to do is ensure we turn this very significant capacity into real capability. We were talking earlier about counter-terrorism; we have a potent opportunity in Safer Neighbourhoods now to embed counter-terrorism right to the level where counter-terrorism should be, and that is people working with communities who understand what counter-terrorism policing should be about and understand the need to support their neighbourhoods, and that is where we should be developing Safer Neighbourhoods in the future.

Mr Duvall: The important issue here is policing in that response alone, responding to a 999 call, is not good enough for police, it is long-term problem solving that Safer Neighbourhood Teams can do, and one of the tests of their success is that if there is a critical incident in a neighbourhood and you need other professionals the first port of call will be a briefing from the Safe Neighbourhood Team on what is going on in the area, what is the wider significance. Anyone who knows policing knows it is very hard to get other professional specialists to refer back to at an experimental, early development stage, but it is bedding in, it is working, and the fact that they are prepared to give credence to it is an important point.

Q157 Chairman: And giving the mobile numbers of the local police officers is very important.

Mr Duvall: It is new. We know people want to help. They do not want to spend hours on the phone if they want to visit in London? The best performing area?

Mr Stephenson: Nor am I, but I was just wondering.

Mr Stephenson: -- but what I am keen on is recognising the fact that there are some places in London where the Safer Neighbourhood Teams are beyond good; beyond anything we ever imagined they were going to be. They are so outstanding. There are some places where they are not quite as good and we have to be clearer and cleverer at ensuring we bring everywhere up to higher standards. We are also rolling out Safer Neighbourhood Teams, and will roll out additional Safer Neighbourhood Teams where the wards are substantially bigger; there is an experiment going out about 24/7 in Hammersmith & Fulham Safer Neighbourhood Teams, and that has been evaluated, and clearly I will be very keen on something like that but that entirely depends on resourcing. What we now have to do is ensure we turn this very significant capacity into real capability. We were talking earlier about counter-terrorism; we have a potent opportunity in Safer Neighbourhoods now to embed counter-terrorism right to the level where counter-terrorism should be, and that is people working with communities who understand what counter-terrorism policing should be about and understand the need to support their neighbourhoods, and that is where we should be developing Safer Neighbourhoods in the future.

Mr Duvall: The important issue here is policing in that response alone, responding to a 999 call, is not good enough for police, it is long-term problem solving that Safer Neighbourhood Teams can do, and one of the tests of their success is that if there is a critical incident in a neighbourhood and you need other professionals the first port of call will be a briefing from the Safe Neighbourhood Team on what is going on in the area, what is the wider significance. Anyone who knows policing knows it is very hard to get other professional specialists to refer back to at an experimental, early development stage, but it is bedding in, it is working, and the fact that they are prepared to give credence to it is an important point.

Q158 Tom Brake: Mr Stephenson, could I tempt you to look into the future again? Obviously you want Safer Neighbourhood Teams to bed in but I think there is now evidence from a number of borough commanders that Safer Neighbourhood Teams have been so effective at reducing crime on their patch that there is not much crime for them to deal with, and those borough commanders might like to redeploy those resources in a different way. How do you reconcile the need to see people on the ground, which is something that local residents want, with what the borough commanders are saying about how those resources could be more effectively deployed to tackle crime on their patch?

Mr Stephenson: There should always be a healthy tension between borough commanders and the centre, and that way we can push each other into improvement, but I think we have to learn from the lessons of history. I have had 33 years of policing, and I have been party, in various other forces, to a number of attempts to roll out neighbourhood, community policing, and had been part of something that has not left me feeling very proud because we have promised something one day and then taken it away the next. We have given too much flexibility too quickly. The success of the Safer Neighbourhood programme is due to the fact that for once it has an academic base so we can evidence improvements, and, secondly, there has been a disciplined approach to keep the Safer Neighbourhood Team to doing what it said on the tin in the first place.

Q159 Chairman: And where is the best place for us to visit in London? The best performing area?
Mr Stephenson: I can let you have a note but I will keep it secret because the rest will be very annoyed if I say it out loud!

Q160 Chairman: Mr Duvall, one last point?
Mr Duvall: I think it would be wrong for us to go back on Safer Neighbourhood Teams. It is the new foundation stone of policing. When people got into cars we lost something in terms of the contact and, quite frankly, patrolling and giving anticrime prevention information, or even going to local schools, is not a bad thing and I suspect there is not any neighbourhood that cannot do that work if they are not in a hot spot area, as they say. However, I do think we need to look at some issues and there is a live discussion around Safer Neighbourhood Teams where they have an allied major town centre, what do we do there, do we have the right numbers. We are looking at making sure we localise our Transport Safer Neighbourhood Teams which are central at the moment, and we want to localise those to transport hubs and start working locally on bus routes. Also, we live and die by wards but the police do not and nor do the criminals, and we know there are extra resources that we put in some areas which, quite frankly, may not be required in that locality, so over and above the core, because of the size of the neighbourhood, there is a debate to be had whether people stay on Safer Neighbourhood Teams or help to supplement other Safer Neighbourhood Teams but still be available to help in times of need. So we would not obstruct them or allow them to be moved off willy nilly, but keep them focused rather than in response. That is a healthy discussion which we are not rushing into because of the issues we have discussed. History is littered with Safer Neighbourhood Teams and nobody ever believed they would happen. There are suggestions made by people that some of the changes being made in the service now will go away, that we are running custody suites with medical support and moving away from doctors to senior nurses to give a better service to the criminal justice system, but there are reforms going on that are here to stay and that will be with us for some time in the future.

Q161 Chairman: Thank you very much. We have kept you longer than we anticipated because what you have had to say has been very useful, but if we have missed anything please send us a note.
Mr Duvall: I was going to suggest that.
Chairman: And your suggestions of where we can visit. That would be very helpful.
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Q162 Chairman: Can I welcome everyone present to the latest session of the policing inquiry that the Committee established, Policing in the 21st Century, and can I refer everyone present to the Register of Members’ Interests where members of this Committee have declared their interests. Can I also say to our witnesses that a number of the members of the Committee are also members of the Public Bill Committee considering the counter-terrorism legislation, so from time to time, and I am sure the veteran witnesses amongst you will understand this, members will be going in and coming out, and it is no disrespect to you. Can I welcome Sir Norman back again to give evidence to us. Sir Norman, the Government told us last year that the definition of frontline policing was in need of revision. What, in your view, is a good definition of frontline policing?

Chief Constable Sir Norman Bettison: Chairman, members, the definition of “frontline” that we currently work to is, in a sense, not the right one, because it is difficult for members of the public to understand why we would count a police officer in uniform as frontline but not a rape investigator or a forensic accountant that is investigating a fraud case. In West Yorkshire we have gone for something different which satisfies those who scrutinise policing at a local level. With the police authority we have worked through a definition of “public facing” as a means of coming up with a definition that (a) the public will understand, that these are the people that, regardless of what matters they want to bring to the attention of the police, they will come across as representatives of the police service. What that does is it gives us a certain figure that my police authority would want to always keep monitoring to ensure that nothing happens to that defined group of individuals that causes it to fall below a target number. So we find that much more helpful than the proportion of time that an officer spends in the front line. If he or she is making an arrest that is clearly the frontline, but if he or she is then doing the resultant paperwork and the resultant interviews that go alongside that arrest, then not all of that is counted as frontline in the current definition. So I think the current definition is less than helpful in terms of being sensible and understandable to the public and, I offer, just one example of a different way of cutting the cloth.

Q163 Chairman: In your ACPO submission you stress that the fact that the police are now reacting to events rather than dealing with underlying problems. It is obviously for politicians and for Parliament and ministers to try and solve the problems of crime, but do you think the police have a more important role to play in trying to deal with those underlying problems?

Chief Constable Sir Norman Bettison: Yes, we do, and the police service has responded to this in recent years. The neighbourhood policing model is a means of tackling the causes of crime, the root causes rather than the symptoms. The police service has been locked for the last decade or more into an efficiency model of policing, so what we have been concerned about, it seems to me, having served throughout all that period, is getting quicker and more efficient at handling incidents rather than satisfying the member of the public who turns to us for help, and rather than getting upstream and stopping that problem occurring next Thursday night or next Tuesday morning. Neighbourhood policing is a reaction to the efficiency model, giving us good crime detection figures and good crime reduction figures but not giving us the level of satisfaction amongst the members of the public that we are striving for. Neighbourhood policing, and I will deal with this in shorthand because you will have looked at this as part of the work of the Committee, is about taking people away from the Fire Brigade response to incidents, where officers would traditionally go, put a sticking plaster on the problem and drive away, and it is about putting officers, inspector or sergeant-led, as a team, a team that is capable of dealing with the problems that are faced the public in a particular area and leaving them in place, leaving them dedicated and committed to a particular geographical footprint. What most police forces do is they combine that policing team and lay it on to a democratic accountability footprint, principally council wards, so typically an inspector or a sergeant would have a team of officers and PCSOs and have a dedicated presence and build up a visibility and accessibility and familiarity in that area, and understand what the nature of the problems is. So youths drinking outside a row of shops on a Thursday or Friday night would in the old style of policing lead to them being moved on, or if offences...
were disclosed lead to them being arrested and dealt with, and then doing the same thing next Thursday or Friday. Neighbourhood policing --

Q164 Chairman: We will be coming on to neighbourhood policing in detail a little bit later.  
Chief Constable Sir Norman Bettison: -- but neighbourhood policing is the response, the pretty universal response, in the police service now. We need to be in a sense let off the hook of central targets in order to let neighbourhood policing fly. Central targets still hold us to very narrow definitions of police activity, namely crime and incidents.

Q165 Chairman: Later this morning we will be hearing from a custody sergeant and also the relatives of victim of crime, and one of the issues that is bound to be raised is the issue of bail. What additional pressure is placed on the police service because of the bail conditions that are put on individuals? Is bail too readily available which will mean that more of police time is spent on dealing with people who are on bail?  
Chief Constable Sir Norman Bettison: The Carter review, which the Committee may have been interested in, is the Government’s review to deal with the problem of prison overcrowding. We worry that the Carter review might lead to the further reluctance of the courts to remand individuals in custody, remand serious offenders in custody. Bail is used more than it has been for some time and, therefore, what we confront as operational police officers is the frustration of people being given bail only to commit further offences. Some who are on bail and are expecting a term of imprisonment as their punishment will go on what we call spree offending, which is getting it all out of the way before they are locked away. That is both frustrating for us as professionals and soul-destroying for the public, who are victims of this type of crime. Again, there are some creative ways of dealing with this problem. In West Yorkshire we are asking much more often for the courts to make tagging orders. The electronic tagging of people on bail has two benefits. One is that the individual feels constrained by nature of being electronically monitored; the second is that offenders who are not quite so constrained leave their geographical map as a database, and we as a police service can go back and check where they were at a particular time. So electronic tagging, I think is a 21st Century phenomenon whose time has come, and it is a buttress against spree offending on bail.

Q166 Chairman: Are you saying to this Committee that you think that bail is too readily available, and when it is made available it means that there is more pressure on police officers, more pressure on police time?  
Chief Constable Sir Norman Bettison: I am saying that there is a pressure on courts to be much more circumspect regarding those people who are remanded in custody. The types of people who would have been remanded in custody, in my professional experience, five or ten years ago now represent much more of a struggle; the threshold has been set higher. I think that is entirely to do with the size of the prison population, and it seems to me unfortunate that that is what is driving that policy and philosophical shift. People on bail and people who are persistent and prolific offenders are always the people that cause the police the most work. By definition, if they are locked away they cannot be committing offences. If they are out on bail I think what I am saying to this Committee is that is unfortunate but there are ways of controlling their behaviour whilst on bail other than locking them up for a remand period.

Q167 Mr Clappison: You have just enlarged on the question which I was going to ask you to say a little bit more about which is how this influence was operating in the court system as a result of people being given bail who might not formerly have been given bail. You have described the syndrome where somebody who is on bail already for offences, to put it in a West Yorkshire way, think they might as well be hanged for a sheep as a lamb. There is a risk, is there not, if the number of people getting bail—as you put it the threshold—is raised, that we will be seeing more of those people out and being hanged eventually for a sheep as much as for a lamb, and this type of spree offending will increase. Does that follow?  
Chief Constable Sir Norman Bettison: Yes, it does, and we are recognising that phenomenon.

Q168 Mr Clappison: It is very serious, is it not?  
Chief Constable Sir Norman Bettison: It is, but I do want to reiterate the silver lining that is in that cloud, that there are technical ways in the 21st century of controlling behaviour.

Q169 Mr Winnick: Later on this morning, Sir Norman, we will be having evidence given by Paul Carne, whose sister, as we know, was murdered as well as his mother, and he was released on bail while awaiting a previous murder charge. Do you find it surprising that someone who can be charged with murder can be given bail, often, presumably, opposed by the police?  
Chief Constable Sir Norman Bettison: I would find it amazing if someone was given bail for such a serious offence if it was opposed by the police and the prosecution, and the Crown Prosecution Service. I have known throughout my 36-year police career people who have committed murder who are not, bizarrely, ironically considered to be a threat to the wider public and have been given bail, but they have been the exception rather than the rule. One would hope that the cases that one reads about in the newspapers are the very exceptional cases. Those cases, it seems to me, are ones where one would need to be the judge in the case or at least to have been the fly on the wall in the court room to understand what the rationale was for giving bail. That is a long-winded way of saying that some of these cases are very surprising, yes.

Mr Winnick: The public tend to be baffled by the circumstances in that one case. It was such a terrible tragedy.
Chairman: Indeed.

Q170 Tom Brake: On the question of spree offending and tagging, is it possible for you to quantify how many people you think should be tagged who are not currently being tagged, or alternatively perhaps to provide us with some information about the type of person you are talking about who is currently escaping being tagged but you think should be tagged?

Chief Constable Sir Norman Bettison: A tagging order is an order that can be given by the court, either on conviction or on remand. I do not think there is any limit on the numbers or types of offending that can be controlled by tagging. It seems to me what the criminal justice system is trying to do at every turn is change the behaviour of offending individuals. If there is a mindset in an offender who has a proclivity towards further offending that they are being monitored, watched, carefully controlled, then that is a control on behaviour. We are a relatively short way down this particular road in terms of exploring the possibilities and the scope in which we can use the electronic tagging, but I do not see any limits on it and I do see it as a beneficial way of dealing with people who cannot be locked up for whatever reason.

Q171 Tom Brake: So your view, clearly, then is that anyone on bail should be tagged? That it should become the norm?

Chief Constable Sir Norman Bettison: Yes. Anyone on bail is amenable to tagging. There might be circumstances that would dictate. For instance, where the court is satisfied that this was a single offence unlikely to be repeated then that would not be an appropriate tagging case.

Q172 Tom Brake: Perhaps we could move on to the subject of funding. In the ACPO submission a lot of the recommendations that you have made are based on additional funding or increased funding from Government, yet it is very clear that the Government are not going to be providing that increased funding. Do you think that your recommendations can, in fact, be funded from the efficiency savings that Sir Ronnie Flannagan is talking about?

Chief Constable Sir Norman Bettison: I feel there is going to be a gap regardless of what is done, and I think that gap is in the area of serious and organised crime. That gap was highlighted in the HMIC report in 2006–07 called Mind the Gap, and still exists. I know that this Committee spoke to Sir Ronnie about that gap and the gap is being addressed by means of collaboration and some additional funding from central Government. But whilst it is being addressed, it is not being closed. The funding as defined by the current CSR is likely to mean that policing is unlikely to grow and to address gaps that currently exist. If I can say a little bit more about that, the public are often told, and usually there is a political reason for telling them, that the police have benefited from a 39% uplifting of funding over the last ten or fifteen years. The story that is often not told alongside that is the extension to the service that has been required, so when I look around my particular force I see a counter-terrorism unit that was not there—and was not there two years ago, a child protection unit that was not there; I see a confidentiality unit that was not there; I see a homicide and major inquiry team of considerable numbers that is necessary now because of the expertise that is required in major investigation, I see teams of officers brought together to tackle guns and gangs, et cetera, so that 39% increase in funding has, I would propose, been matched by a 39% plus increase in demand. There are again some linings in the cloud which are that the Proceeds of Crime Act allows the police service to recover funds through POCA forfeiture, or through seizure. At the moment, however, the amount of money that comes back to the police from such seizures amounts to sixteen and two thirds per cent of that which is seized, and I think that it would be possible for a government to change that formula and do two things as a result: first, boost the capability of the police service to get ahead of organised criminals, because it could be ring-fenced only for use in serious and organised crime investigation, but, secondly, it would be a sprat to catch a mackerel or a pump-priming process because the more you put into serious and organised crime investigation the more you will receive back in terms of proceeds of crime. So rather than barking at the moon at the CSR constraints, what I am hoping to point out to the Committee are a couple of ways in which they could be closed. You asked me specifically about Ronnie’s ideas around efficiency and cutting bureaucracy, I think that is going to make a difference but it is not going to allow the additionality that would be required to tackle organised criminality. It has been estimated by ACPO that, in order to interdict in the organised criminality we know of, we would require an uplift of about £300 million, and efficiencies are not going to give us that. There are some areas that I would very much speak in favour of, and one of them would be that we spend an awful lot of money on IT within the police service, and one of the efficiencies both Ronnie and the NPIA have focused upon is national procurement in a more efficient way than is currently done.

Q173 Mr Streeter: The NPIA has been in existence for two years, and you have been the head of it --

Chief Constable Neyroud: One.

Q174 Mr Streeter: Since 2006 --

Chief Constable Neyroud: One.

Q175 Mr Streeter: Well — never mind!

Chief Constable Neyroud: It makes a difference, actually.

Q176 Mr Streeter: When did you start?

Chief Constable Neyroud: We started on 1 April last year, 2007.
Q177 Mr Streeter: What have you achieved during that time? I am sure the achievements are considerable; could you list them for us, please?

Chief Constable Neyroud: In terms of achievements thus far, first, to create the organisation and bring a whole range of national operational functions, particularly the database functions, together and to start running them much more as a coherent whole. Secondly, as we started we had somewhere between five and six hundred projects and programmes that we inherited, and at that point I stopped counting, and we have worked very hard with the service—and Norman is one of the leads in that—to take that collection of “stuff”, and it really was “stuff”, and produce eleven clearly articulated programmes that are going to drive on some of the ambitions that you started to touch on, like protective services and closing the gap and areas like that. In terms of specific deliveries we have completed the Airwave programme in terms of finally delivering the final section to the Metropolitan Police, and we are about three quarters of the way through delivering the Underground, so 75 out of 125 stations thus far. We have completed the roll-out of the national fingerprint system, IDENT; we have completed the roll-out of Case and Custody—that is worth repeating, we have finally completed the roll-out of that one and we are just now doing the join-up; the service have delivered a substantial part of the neighbourhood policing promise of delivering the process in every single neighbourhood; we have delivered a new Leadership Strategy for the police service; we have almost completed a new People Strategy for the police service, and we are a long way down the track of things like the strategy for taking mobile data. I could go on but those are some of the first year achievements. Essentially it is about getting a new organisation that works for the service rather than what went before, which did not quite meet that test.

Q178 Mr Streeter: When you introduce your new ideas do you find resistance in any of the forces? How can you make them implement new ideas and new policies?

Chief Constable Neyroud: It is kind of the other way round. The key starts from the police service identifying the operational challenge that we need to follow, so you start from the business of policing saying: “We have a challenge, this is an issue we need to solve”. Specifically, we have just commissioned a programme called Forensic 21 which is a major programme to take forward the development of forensic services. That came from the service, basically saying we have three big budgets. We have the people budget, which is 80-something per cent of our total budget, we have the IT budget and we have the forensic budget, No 3, and we need to look at whether we are maximising the benefits of that. So we work with the service to design the programme and get it commissioned; it gets commissioned because the police service—that is ACPO, APA, and the Home Office—all agree this programme is required and are prepared to fund it at the expense of other priorities.

Q179 Gwyn Prosser: Sir Norman, we have been told that your association is positively, though not unanimously, in favour of force mergers, which I suppose reflects the view that there is professed resistance from some forces and, indeed, even hostility to any form of merger. Over the two years since the Home Office plan to merge was effectively abandoned, would you say forces are coming more in line with agreement to merge, or the contrary?

Chief Constable Sir Norman Bettison: The professional view—not unanimous, there are two or three very vociferous opponents to this view—is that mergers are inevitable. The police force patchwork quilt these days is 43 police forces in England and Wales ranging from 42,000 officers in the largest to less than a thousand in the smallest, and yet all forces are required to cope with what 21st century life throws at us. All forces are required to be technologically equipped and ready to support a police service in the 21st century, and that is becoming more and more untenable. Whilst understanding the political realities of the previous policy proposals and disappearance of those from the table, it remains the professional view that a smaller number of strategically sized forces would be the best way of arranging ourselves against 21st century ills. The fear in the public’s mind is that that would be a retreat from localism, that they would be losing their local police. Ironically it is the professional view of ACPO that it would be the best way of securing a committed, dedicated policing service locally that does not get disturbed from that role, because at the moment what happens in some small and medium sized forces is that they will be providing a service as a neighbourhood officer on Monday but on Tuesday will have to be dragged off to do something else, or form a team to respond to hue and cry around a major incident. What we would be able to do with a smaller number of strategically sized forces is the strategic stuff in the hubs leaving the local policing delivered by a local inspector and a local superintendent, and what that would mean is that there could be an integrated relationship with the community leaving the sort of stuff that is a rarity within that community to be handled by people at a more strategic level.

Q180 Gwyn Prosser: My own constabulary in Kent have started doing quite a lot of innovative collaboration since the pressure, if you like, from the plan to merge. Do you see a pattern emerging where adjacent forces move together in a loose formation but still maintain, perhaps, their county identity? When you describe it as being inevitable that there will be more mergers, do you mean that in the strict form of the first recommendations?

Chief Constable Sir Norman Bettison: No. The reason I say “inevitable” is I predict that it is events that will bring this back to the agenda. It will be the failing of a force to do what is required in the 21st Century that will cause people to ask whether it is suitably equipped, whether it has got capacity capability to meet the demands. So that is why I say “inevitable”. Actually, in the absence of that inevitability, or whilst waiting for it, forces are
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getting on with the business of collaboration. It is patchy and there are some obstacles, some barriers, to collaboration, and those barriers are the tight fiscal environment which means that a lot of forces are drawing in their belts which means they are not raising their gaze. There is an irony there because if they were starting from scratch it might be possible to configure the services so that they were more efficiently provided in a collaborative way, but starting from where they are it means finding new money to make the transition, and that is not possible in the fiscal environment. Secondly, there is that sort of sense in both chief constables and police authorities of sovereignty and the fear—which I have come across as I did some work around collaboration—of being a net donor. So what you have come across as I did some work around authorities of sovereignty and the fear—which I that sort of sense in both chief constables and police possible in the fiscal environment. Secondly, there is from where they are it means finding new money to make the transition, and that is not
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Q181 Chairman: Can you give the Committee an example of one collaboration that has worked?

Chief Constable Sir Norman Bettison: There are some good examples in Wales. Wales are collaborating around serious and organised crime, Operation Tarion, as it is called, where the four Welsh forces, with some pump-priming funding from Welsh Assembly, which was one of the triggers and incentives, have created a very active and successful joint force unit. My own area, Yorkshire and the Humber, is committed to collaboration, and we have just delivered a strategic roads policing regional commitment. This is not about traffic policing but about policing the roads because criminals use the roads, and we do that at a regional level by collating our intelligence and putting our patrol vehicles out in the areas where they are likely to gain most success, and that is done regionally with regional funding.

Q182 Mrs Dean: Mr Neyroud, do police forces have sufficient financial resources to invest in essential new technologies, and what should be prioritised?

Chief Constable Neyroud: This links very well with some of the questions Sir Norman has been answering. First, the service as a whole spends around about a billion pounds on technology, in particular ICT, so firstly we would have to justify that we are capable of spending that wisely and, if you are going to run it in 43 forces, to make best use of the cash you have to start thinking about operating some functions as one rather than 43, and this is one of them. We are embarked on an intensive review of the current state of play on ICT for two good reasons, one of which is the money and looking ahead to how we can best use it, but, secondly, we have had ten years of very significant investment. I mentioned earlier that we finished off the Airwave programme, so we are at a point where we have built an awful lot and we have to think about the next generation over the next ten years, so this is a good moment to do that. We are also coming together with a new Science and Technology Strategy as well. In terms of how we would apply that and make it count, the essence of it is prioritising it against what really counts to the public, which is neighbourhood policing. The biggest individual investment we are making in the course of this next six months is in mobile data, trying to force the pace on that so that we move from individual forces like Sir Norman’s in West Yorkshire putting some of the kit out on the street—in fact, I think all of his officers now have mobile data on the street—to making sure we have that coverage that can enhance neighbourhood policing, and then looking at how we deliver technology to deal with serious and organised crime, and then looking down the risks in those terms. The third challenge is how we speed that process up, because I think the constant tale is that it has taken so long. We are looking at ways in which we can speed things up by re-using what we have, by taking things off the shelf, and also by stopping the re-invention of the wheel. For example, if one person has a working system seeking, as they have done in Scotland, to take that system across the rest of the country more quickly. It is in those sort of territories that we believe we can make some quite rapid progress.

Q183 Chairman: The technology is not bought centrally, is it, but by individual forces, so you have the possibility of forces not being able to communicate with each other.

Chief Constable Neyroud: It is not quite that straightforward; it depends. For example, taking another aspect of technology, all 43 have just agreed that forensic procurement will be done once and the agency is doing that for the service. As far as databases are concerned, we do that one. In the mobile data programme we are creating a framework contract for all forces to buy into, so the forces who have not yet got a platform can buy into a platform they can use, so increasingly we are looking at buying once and make available the framework to the rest of the forces.

Q184 Chairman: So does the NPIA do this?

Chief Constable Neyroud: Correct. That is now the NPIA’s responsibility.

Q185 Chairman: You would go off to one of the mobile companies and negotiate the best deal?

Chief Constable Neyroud: Yes. We put out an invitation to tender and we create the framework. That is exactly what we have done with the forensic procurement, which is out to tender at the moment.

Q186 Chairman: And the forces would be obliged to buy in, would they, or is it still a choice?

Chief Constable Neyroud: In a sense they have already committed themselves to doing it before we start, on the basis that they have bought into the idea of a national tender for forensic procurement. They could subsequently opt to come out of it, although I
have to say the general consensus is that where we have decided to do it together we must bind and commit ourselves to doing that, not least because if we start to come out of it we lose the credibility with the suppliers to the market place to make the sort of progress we want to make.

Q187 Ms Buck: What is the ACPO position in terms of the scope and limitations of the civilianisation of the service?

Chief Constable Sir Norman Bettison: We are pro civilianisation, which seems an anachronistic term these days because we talked about it for years, for decades almost, and now the term is “workforce modernisation” but it still has the same overtones. I think workforce modernisation people would say, rather than thinking in terms of cop or civilian, what is the right person with the right skills at the right time for this particular post, and that could change. Many teams that do work that would traditionally be thought of by the public as police work involve both police officers and police staff. For example, the last time I had a roll call West Yorkshire police had 5,863 sworn officers and a total of 10,107 staff altogether, so almost 50/50. The police service, speaking on behalf of ACPO, would always want these days to take the view of whether this role requires warranted police powers and, if not, then what are the other options in terms of employment. We would also ask, and this is a 21st century question we ask ourselves, whether the technical skills required to do this job are, (a), available in the average typical warranted police officer, and (b), if they are learned skills, will he or she be around long enough to maximise the benefit of utilising those skills? For instance, we used to have fraud squad officers who were seasoned detectives but most of my fraud squad now is made up of accountants who bring their accountancy skills to bear and stay in that job for as long as they are with West Yorkshire police. They do not go off for promotion to the rape unit or the air support division; they stay as fraud investigators. So the bottom line to a very straightforward question is the scope is almost limitless, yet the public facing role of policing demands that many of our people in those roles are what you and I would both recognise as police men and police woman.

Q188 Ms Buck: What about the custody sergeant issue, and the sections of the Serious Organised Crime Act that have not yet been enacted?

Chief Constable Sir Norman Bettison: My personal—but professional—view is it is a mistake. The custody sergeant has a distinct role; the distinct role is champion of PACE on behalf of the accused and the detained; but he or she also has another role and that is to ensure that the investigation that is triggered by an arrest gets off to the right sort of start, so the custody sergeant is in an incredibly dynamic and complex working situation. The amount of money that it would cost to recruit somebody that could take on that level of complexity would be probably more expensive than a custody sergeant. From a professional point of view what I would say is: “Please leave the custody sergeant alone”. He or she does a fantastic job not only in terms of looking after the interests of the accused and the detained but also in terms of making sure that the investigation gets done properly.

Q189 Ms Buck: And do you feel that that message is heard? Is the fact that that section has not been enacted a reflection of those legitimate concerns being heard in Government, do you think?

Chief Constable Sir Norman Bettison: What has happened, and this is again a personal view reading the runes, is that a question similar to the one you asked first, what is the scope and the extent, has been asked of others, and they have kept being pushed and asked: “What about the custody sergeant?” Of course, there is nothing explicit about the role of being a custody sergeant that necessarily needs warranted powers if PACE were changed, but putting forward something as possible does not make it desirable. So the custody sergeant role, I think, has been offered by some as, “What is the extreme thing you could think of in terms of civilianisation? Well, the custody sergeant could be civilianised if PACE were changed”. Just because it is possible does not make it desirable, and I think what has happened is that the delay in enacting the legislation to make it happen has been caught up in that question of whether it is really desirable, and professionally we say not.

Q190 Mr Clappison: The Committee has taken lots of evidence in the past about police bureaucracy and has also heard from Sir Ronnie Flannagan. Mr Neyroud, how is the National Police Improvement Agency responding to Sir Ronnie’s recommendation to build standard processes for use across forces as a way of preventing duplication, which we have heard a lot about, and bureaucracy?

Chief Constable Neyroud: Firstly, overall in terms of Sir Ronnie’s recommendations, we have taken on the job of programme-managing the entire programme of the recommendations on behalf of the service, so we will help to make the whole happen rather than just the individual recommendations for us, which are the bulk of the recommendations. Picking up standard processes, this is not a very straightforward question because we do have a range of standard processes now. One in particular, the criminal justice process, is reasonably standard because it had to be in order to enable the case and custody system to come into place and for us to get the join-up with the Crown Prosecution Service and the other criminal justice agencies and the courts, so one of the things we are doing is making that process stick this year by getting the join-up to happen, and some of the benefits that the police service has been promised for a very long time. In terms of the others we are trying to identify the top ten processes, working with the service, that would make a real difference to the frontline operational officer if we were to streamline them or make them work more effectively, particularly the areas of Stop and Account and the use of powers on the street but also in forensics. There are some complex processes that
would benefit from being refined, and in the process of information handling there is an enormous amount of time that officers take in getting information into various systems, and we will be looking very carefully at those, and have an opportunity to do that as part of the IMPACT programme. Sir Ronnie’s report makes the point very carefully that just because you have a standard process, and Stop and Account would be, it does not mean you are going to reduce bureaucracy. You have to start by asking what the outcome is going to look like, what is the citizen going to gain, and what is the officer going to gain if we start streamlining the process.

Q191 Mr Clappison: On the point of information handling Sir Ronnie told us that up to 70% of information is entered into police systems more than once. Can we expect to see a reduction in that figure as a result of your work?

Chief Constable Neyroud: I would be very disappointed if you did not. The top line in the review of ICT is looking for opportunities to reduce double-keying and dual-keying, first to make sure that what goes into the system is what we need in the system in the first place, and then to make sure officers are not having to re-enter data, not least because every time they do that there is a risk that the data will be wrong on the second and third occasion.

Q192 Mr Clappison: Sir Ronnie also identified specifically the problem of risk aversion, which is a problem in society in general, and I think most members of the public recognise the police are brave and professional but they cannot be insulated from that general tendency in society. Could you say what the police are doing to combat risk aversion, and could you make specific reference to the de Menezes case.

Chief Constable Neyroud: By far the biggest part of this is about leadership. If you have a leadership that is empowered and confident and understands how to take risk decisions and is supported through its governance to make those decisions in an effective way, then you will get the beginnings of a change. One of the biggest pieces of work that we have been doing in the first year is working with the service to produce the revised Leadership Strategy, and a big part of that is continuing both to improve the professional operational qualifications of colleagues—because it helps if you are a confident professional operational commander who is clearly supported in making well-informed judgments about the risk—and to put a substantial emphasis on the personal and professional ethics of officers.

Ethics dealt with in the right way, not in a bureaucratic way, in terms of understanding why you are taking judgments, is important, but also improving and developing the fundamental business skills also means you are in a position to take well-judged decisions about risk in the business. So I think leadership is going to be the biggest component of the change.

Q193 Mr Clappison: On this general theme, could I put in a very brief plea to you to take a look at the training of police in the law of self-defence from the point of view of the household, of the shopkeeper and of the law abiding member of the public, because I think the law is robust on this but it only needs one or two cases where it is misinterpreted for a poor climate to be created through reporting of those cases. Could that be something which is taken into account so that the police take full account of the way in which the law of self-defence does give people a wide margin to defend themselves when they are being attacked?

Chief Constable Neyroud: The key there is to drive in the guidance that ACPO and the Director of Public Prosecutions reiterated last year, which is pretty robust, in fact very robust and as robust as the law is, and we would certainly wish collectively to reinforce that guidance.

Mr Clappison: That is heartening.

Q194 Mr Streeter: On the issue of local accountability and governance, your submission to us suggests the retention of police authorities. Is it right for the 21st century to have this tripartite arrangement between the Home Office, local authorities and the police force itself? Is there not a better, more modern way?

Chief Constable Sir Norman Bettison: I think there is an addition or supplement needed, but not a revision. I do think that it has stood the test of time, which is rarely sufficient of a recommendation, but the fact that the current arrangement precludes the police service falling into a politically driven, politically expedient police force has to be a key tenet of British policing that the public would want to protect. ACPO do support the role of the police authority as the police force level strategic oversight body. They have several tasks but the three main key tasks that they have are to agree an annual policing plan with the Chief Constable which allows, therefore, the strategic focus that the public of that particular county expect the police to have to be built into the plan: they raise and delegate finance at a strategic level, much of which now comes from central Government by way of grant but they raise the finance to enable the plan to be implemented; and, thirdly, they hire, fire and hold to account the Chief Constable in that particular area. The “three-legged stool” arrangement, Sir Ronnie’s favourite metaphor, which allows the different tensions that offer a stable platform to play against each other, has worked well and ensures that the police are both independent but accountable to local people. I think additionality is required, and a lot of observers, a lot of commentators, want to move from where we are now to something else and reject the old, but I say that we perhaps need something else that is built on to the present platform, and that is a much more local accountability or answerability at a very local level at the business end of neighbourhood policing, so the neighbourhood inspector ought, and I encourage it in West Yorkshire, to be accountable to those people at the very local level—the local councillors in the wards that he or she provides a
policing service to, and the local people who live in the local houses on the local streets. That is the accountability and answerability that we have to find for the next phase of the 21st Century, but that is not to reject the accountability structure that currently exists.

Q195 Mrs Cryer: Sir Norman, on the business of accountability to local people, councillors, neighbourhoods and communities, in my own constituency, for instance, for the eleven years I have been member of Parliament I have had a different Chief Superintendent every twelve months, sometimes less. How can that square with neighbourhood policing where there is a need for knowing your area and the problems of that area? Also, I am finding and my constituents are finding that when we try to contact the police we are put through to a call centre and we talk to somebody who does not know the area at all. That does not square with where we should be going on neighbourhood policing. Could you comment?

Chief Constable Sir Norman Bettison: To become really parochial, the fact that we have put a person in charge now of Airedale and Bradford North who is a Keithley resident ought to give you some confidence that he at least knows what the problems are in the area. On March 3 in West Yorkshire—and the reason I tell a local tale is that I think this plays out in many forces across the country in that it is about recent moves and ambition rather than embedding and delivery—I put 300 more police officers (making 1,650 in total) into neighbourhood policing teams, and increased the number of neighbourhood policing teams in West Yorkshire from 36 to 47, and these 47 inspector-led teams have a more local focus, because 47 teams can be more local than 36, and a greater number of officers which enable them to tackle more crime. Those inspectors—and the inspectors at Keithley I know well—are local people who have been in post, most of them, for quite a while, and it is those inspector-led teams that have to be held to account and brought to the attention of the knowledge of local people. Each of them in their performance and development review has a requirement that they raise their personal profile and become known by and accessible to the people in their parish. The police authority surveys members of the public on the question of whether they know the neighbourhood team and whether they feel the place is getting safer or more dangerous. We have also pushed a newspaper through the letter box of every member of the public, every household, in West Yorkshire, not only giving them details about the neighbourhoods that are responsible for policing them but giving the personal contact numbers of each of those teams. So if it were a neighbourhood matter, a continuing matter, an update that was being sought by a member of the public, they now have a direct dial number to ring to speak to the organ grinder. I talked earlier on about the efficiency model for policing, and what was done some years ago is that a single point of contact for emergency calls was set up within the force, but now that we are at that point it is very difficult in the current funding regime, if not impossible, to roll it back out to eight divisional areas. So we have a central point of reference for emergency calls but we are now very much publicising and rolling out, and the inspectors have it as part of their action plan to get that number and get their profile out into the local community. So it sounds like jam tomorrow, but that is the ambition.

Q196 Mrs Cryer: Moving away from parochial matters, do either of you feel that there is a gap between local priorities identified through neighbourhood policing and centrally imposed targets?

Chief Constable Sir Norman Bettison: There has been a gap. APACS is a new form of performance regime that has been rolled out by the Home Office. The concern we have in ACPO is APACS seems to be the way to go but we have not yet seen it have any traction on other local services, promised by APACS. APACS stands for “Assessment of Policing And Community Safety” which ought to bind local authorities and others, and we have not seen that take place.

Chief Constable Neyroud: I substantially agree with that. The key is finding in the national scheme a much bigger focus which is embedded in the new performance framework with public confidence and trust being the starting point. If you are succeeding in that then you should have substantial scope to make shifts and change a lot of detail that lies behind it. That means that neighbourhood policing teams become the pinnacle of performance regime rather than being, as it were, at the bottom of it, and if we can accomplish that shift, and I think there is a huge amount of honesty and purpose to accomplish that between the Home Office, ACPO and APA, we will see neighbourhood policing embedded over time.

Q197 Mrs Cryer: The Home Secretary has said that public service agreements will provide greater flexibility for forces to focus on local priorities. Do you agree with that?

Chief Constable Sir Norman Bettison: Yes. The focus for the last six years has been on volume crime, and volume crime means that you have a very narrow view of what matters because volume crime only accounts for about a third of all incidents. What the public sector agreement targets now push us towards is seriousness at one end of the spectrum, whereas volume crime never thought about seriousness, and it pushes us towards, as Peter says, the confidence and satisfaction of local people. The reason those are separate is satisfaction is measured of those who have used the policing service, and confidence is measured of those who are actually passive receivers of the policing service.

Chief Constable Neyroud: Coming back to your point about contact centres and contact management centres, public experience of policing is through telephone and personal contact, et cetera, and we have to be able to measure that whole experience. We know we made substantial progress with neighbourhood policing; there is a 5 or 6% rise...
in the level of public confidence\(^1\), but we also know that we fail back on the personal service when we fail to deliver on promises, for example, to turn up, to take a statement, and so on. Basic personal services. So what we have to do in the course of the next period of time is to meet both challenges. Neighbourhood policing is about more than just a name for a neighbourhood and a neighbourhood policing team. It is about the total service that we deliver to you in your local neighbourhood.

**Q198 Chairman:** I have two very quick questions and I would like quick answers. The Prime Minister said on 25 February that we would have the mobile telephone numbers of local neighbourhood officers. What percentage of the population is now covered by this wonderful scheme that was proposed whereby we could just ring people up on our mobile phones?

**Chief Constable Sir Norman Bettison:** ACPO’s response to that statement was that we can deliver an individual telephone number; we cannot necessarily, across the Service, deliver an individual mobile telephone number. In my area, for example, there is an individual telephone number of every neighbourhood policing team, and that is published. The details of those have been pushed through letterboxes.

**Q199 Chairman:** There are no mobile numbers but just a number people can ring?

**Chief Constable Sir Norman Bettison:** Some officers creatively and of their own initiative are handing out business cards with their mobile numbers on them. We have started from a footprint of local numbers for the 47 neighbourhood teams.

**Q200 Chairman:** Certainly, with the reporting of crimes, for example the theft of a handbag or breaking into somebody’s car, the police do not come out any more, obviously, because of resources and pressure of time. You report it; you get a crime reference number.

**Chief Constable Sir Norman Bettison:** Actually that is not true. Some forces apply a sort of triage system but my force asks the question—

**Q201 Chairman:** If a handbag is stolen in West Yorkshire, somebody would come out?

**Chief Constable Sir Norman Bettison:** Yes. The question is: “Do you want a police officer to come to you now or come to your home at your convenience tomorrow?” We now run what we call an appointments system. Just the same as you would make an appointment with your doctor to get advice about ingrowing toenails, you can make an appointment in an office and we will attend.

**Q202 Chairman:** Is the crime reference number on a central database?

---

\(^1\) In areas where we have been doing some very carefully controlled sampling because of neighbourhood policing it increased 15 percentage points.
**Chief Constable Sir Norman Bettison:** Quite the reverse; it is actually making it permissible, not exclusionary. The words “may or may not include local people” are actually an invitation, a permission, that local people can be involved in the holding of police—

Q207 Bob Russell: On page 8, Sir Norman, ACPO states that there remains a need to win widespread public support for an understanding of their role. I welcome ACPO’s commitment on page 11 to neighbourhood policing, which states: “There are core principles of neighbourhood policing that we would wish to see established and any Government policies should take account of these features.” Can you tell the committee where PCSOs fit into the ACPO policing vision and where should the limits of their responsibilities and powers lie?

**Chief Constable Sir Norman Bettison:** PCSOs do a different job to police officers. The reason I say that is that we often do not say that up-front, and therefore the public get hold of the wrong end of the stick—plastic bobbies and all the rest of it. Police officers are traditionally a visible, accessible, familiar presence on the streets of the United Kingdom. What has happened in the recent years is that as they have been drawn in to deal with the greater amount of paperwork and the greater demands of the criminal justice system, et cetera, we put them out; they are out there for 10 minutes, they make an arrest and then they are in the station for the rest of their shift. PCSOs do something unique. They wear the uniform of the local constabulary and walk the beat of a dedicated area day-in and day-out, thus restoring that visibility and familiarity. PCSOs should not be given any more powers than are commensurate with that role. Giving them additional powers that take them off the street would be throwing the baby out with the bathwater. PCSOs with their current levels of powers are providing a service, which is a sufficient service.

Q208 Ms Buck: ACPO blames poorly thought out police reforms, distortions of pay and conditions and parochial thinking for difficulties in recruiting into the senior levels of police officers. Indeed, something is driving a relatively low number of applicants at chief constable level and for other senior posts. What do you hold responsible for that and what is your organisation going to take as its priorities where it responds to them?

**Chief Constable Peter Neyroud:** A number of factors come together. Incidentally, this is not a unique problem. If you look across the pond to America and at Canada and Australia, there is a substantial problem in getting people to the top of the service in all of those countries. Colleagues in America would say it is because folk look up and see the amount of pressure that chiefs are under. I could reflect that in terms of the last hour or so! There is a substantially greater pressure for public scrutiny, and that is right. The second thing is that we had the merger debate and, frankly, that moved the goalposts in a way that a lot of people just stopped applying at that point. We had the lowest number of people coming forward for senior ranks for many a year and, in the end, it ended up with 15. We are in catch-up mode to fill that. We have substantially filled the vacancies for this last year with the largest courses we have had at senior level for some time. We are hoping to replicate that and more, and particularly in respect of more women and ethnic minority candidates coming forward this year. In terms of the agency’s responsibly, we are now responsible not just for implementing the leadership strategy but for the National Senior Careers Advisory Service. Critically, we have to get in much earlier than we have been doing in the past when we talk to people about their prospects and their capability to reach the most senior ranks, when they are inspector and chief inspector level, and start them thinking about and making sure that they have the skills to do that at a much earlier stage. Those skills will not be wasted at that earlier stage; they will ensure, as Mrs Cryer was saying, that they are capable of doing a very good job as a BC and Commander. We need them to be planning their own careers in a much more effective way. There is one final point. We do need to look at some of the incentives. If you are taking on a job of scrutiny at Chief Officer level, there is a gap in terms of the reward and the packages that support officers to move them around the country. We have set ourselves up to have a family-friendly organisation. We have many senior cops, men and women who are married to partners with good jobs in other sectors. If you ask them then to move around the country, you have to put something very substantial on the table to encourage that to happen.

**Chairman:** If you have any further thoughts on that, perhaps you could write to us. May I thank both you, Sir Norman, and Mr Neyroud, for coming. I am sure we will see both of you again in the future.
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Q209 Chairman: Good morning, Sergeant Rooney. This is the first time you have given evidence to a select committee. Sir Norman Bettison described your role as dynamic and complex and he urged Parliament to leave you alone. Has your role changed in the time that you have been a custody sergeant?

Sergeant Rooney: Yes, it has and I would strongly agree with what Sir Norman Bettison has said.

Q210 Chairman: Would you regard yourself as being in the front line of policing as far as policing in the 21st century is concerned?

Sergeant Rooney: Yes, purely based on the number and types of people we now have to deal with when they come into custody.

Q211 Ms Buck: Over the years I have had some really quite dramatic examples of some people with severe mental health problems having to be relocated from my central London constituency to the Isle of Wight on one occasion and Birmingham on another occasion. What steps are being taken currently and how successful are they to ensure that this kind of extremely upsetting experience is not repeated?

Sergeant Rooney: You mean relocating some of these people?

Q212 Ms Buck: These are people for whom there were no custody suites available in central London. That is just an example. I think there is pressure on custody for vulnerable adults, which is an experience many of us know about.

Sergeant Rooney: There certainly is. If a person is vulnerable, we would look to have a mental health assessment of them in the police station. We would then be guided by the recommendations of the Mental Health Panel. That would be a psychiatrist doctor, nurse and social worker. It is down to the doctors. We are then guided by them. If they say that this person is not suitable to be in custody, we will then facilitate their movement from custody to somewhere that they need to be for the appropriate care and treatment.

Q213 Ms Buck: But you do accept that this kind of thing has happened?

Sergeant Rooney: It definitely has.

Q214 Ms Buck: Do you think it is still happening or do you think there has been progress?

Sergeant Rooney: It is definitely still happening. Last week I was involved in two mental health assessments in custody, so it is definitely still happening.

Q215 Ms Buck: Can I ask you about the criticism that the IPCC made about alleged queue busting and what your view is of that practice and what measures can be taken to respond to that? Is this something that you are aware of in your own force?

Sergeant Rooney: What do you mean by queue busting?

Q216 Ms Buck: It is basically the fixed penalty notice practice and using that as a means of avoiding detaining people.

Sergeant Rooney: Where I work it is certainly not a means to avoid detaining people.

Q217 Ms Buck: Is it used to ease pressure?

Sergeant Rooney: No, it is seen as another way of dealing with somebody on the street. If my officers have to make an arrest and bring someone into custody, then that is what they do. If the disposal option subsequently turns out to be the issuing of a fixed-penalty notice ticket, if the person is suitable for it, then that happens. That does not necessarily mean jumping the queue in any way, shape or form because they have still come into custody.

Q218 Ms Buck: Do you feel therefore that the criticism that the Complaints Commission has made is not justified? Are they, in a sense, claiming that there is a practice going on that you do not necessarily recognise?

Sergeant Rooney: Yes. I do not know of instances when my officers have decided rather than taking a person into custody to give a ticket. We have very strong guidelines about when somebody is and is not suitable to be issued with a ticket.

Q219 Mr Streeter: How long have you been a custody sergeant, may I ask?

Sergeant Rooney: I have been a custody sergeant for the last 18 months. I have been in the Police Service for 17 years.

Q220 Mr Streeter: Can you tell us how you use technology in your job? Do you write things out longhand or tap into a computer? How do you use technology?

Sergeant Rooney: All of the above: if the computers are working, we use the computers; when they crash, we go to paper. On a day-to-day basis when the computer system is working it does save an awful lot of time over using paper records. There is no doubt about that at all. Recently we have gone to a new custody system. I would say that it is much better than the old computer-based custody system we had. It needs to be more joined-up but there are plans afoot to bring that on line. We cannot implement everything all in one go.

Q221 Mr Streeter: In the 18 months that you have been doing this job, have there been any changes in the technology which you have found helpful and where do you think it need to go? Describe how it could work if the best technology was being used in your police station.

Sergeant Rooney: From somebody coming in through the door under arrest, I would say that it takes 30 to 45 minutes for me to process them standing in front of me to a point when I can turn it over to the gaolers and say, “Now take their fingerprints, photograph and DNA”. We need to be able to move the information that I have created into their file, for want of a better way to describe it, into
the crime system. We need to be able to move it through the criminal justice system so that once I have put that information in, nobody else has to input the same information. At the moment, that does not happen.

Q222 Mr Streeter: Have your officers already asked this person much of that information anyway before they get to you?
Sergeant Rooney: Yes.

Q223 Mr Streeter: Could they put that information in to their hand-held devices and just slot that into your system?
Sergeant Rooney: That could be one way of doing it. We do not have hand-held data terminals.

Q224 Mr Streeter: How often does your computer system crash in an average working week?
Sergeant Rooney: Last Sunday it crashed.

Q225 Mr Streeter: That was not a good day?
Sergeant Rooney: It was not. It just crashed at 2 o’clock in the morning. I learnt that from a colleague who was there at the time. It is still a new system which has glitches. We just work around the problems. It is not easy and it makes our life very difficult. As I say, what we have now is an awful lot better than what we did have.

Q226 Chairman: I want to ask you quick questions about alcohol, migration and paperwork. Could you respond briefly to each? Has the number of offences increased as a result of changes in the licensing laws?
Sergeant Rooney: I could not tell you if the number of offences has increased. The workload has increased. We now deal with many more people who are drunk during the day, who are coming into custody during the afternoon drunk. That has a knock-on effect. In relation to licensing hours, instead of having minor public order problems at tradition pub leaving time, those problems are now spread from 11 o’clock in the evening all the way through to 4 o’clock in the morning, so that there is no one single mad rush timeframe outside licensed premises. We now have people leaving various establishments and going to other establishments which are open later. We need to police those people throughout their journey and their night. I have been on duty at 6 o’clock on a Sunday morning and that was their Saturday night and we were dealing with fights in the street.

Q227 Chairman: Roughly what percentage of the people who go through your suite could have an offence that is alcohol related? Is it half or less than half?
Sergeant Rooney: It is at least half. We have noticed how bad the problem is. We have drug referral services and we now have drink referral services, which we are trying to push. We are a pilot for that. Unfortunately, the take-up by detainees is not very high because these people do not want help with drinking because they do not think they have a drink problem.

Q228 Chairman: What about issues of migration? Has that had any impact on the number of people who come into the police station?
Sergeant Rooney: The types of people we have coming into custody have changed. Acton and Ealing historically have a very high Polish and eastern European community. That community is now an awful lot bigger. The increased use of interpreters reflects that. It has got to the stage where we are on first name terms with the Polish interpreters. The research that I did before coming to this committee today shows that in Ealing alone the interpreters’ bill for the last financial year was £1 million. That will give you an idea of the expense involved in employing interpreters.

Q229 Chairman: That has created an impact on policing priorities?
Sergeant Rooney: I would not say necessarily policing priorities but policing time.

Q230 Mrs Dean: On the question of whether civilians should be allowed to carry out the role of custody sergeant, could you say a little bit more about where your experience and training as a sworn officer enables you to do a better job than a civilian would do and why it should remain as the role of a sworn officer?
Sergeant Rooney: You can train somebody to input the information into a computer system. You ask the person their name, date of birth, address and what they have been arrested for and you input what the officer has told you. However, whilst the person is there in front of me, I am making an assessment of them. That is my risk assessment of how I think they are going to behave during their time in custody. I can benefit from the short time I have been dealing with custody and my 16 plus years of dealing with people on the street. Somebody who is very quiet and withdrawn and does supply the answers needed could be put into a cell and dealt with but vital clues could have been missed because the person who is inputting that information does not have the skills and knowledge to think: hang on a minute, there is something not quite right about this person and we need to explore a few more areas. That is at one end of the scale. At the other end of the scale is somebody who is drunk, antagonistic and wants to fight and still continue to fight. How does a non-sworn officer deal with that person? That is not an easy thing to do because you have to try and reason with the person but you still have to try to get their details out of them. There does come a point when, unfortunately, you end up having to use force to put them in a cell. Just because you have put them in a cell does not mean that your duty of care is finished. When you have done that, your duty of care to that person is considerably higher than to somebody who has been compliant. Again, there is a time issue. If the person doing that is a civilian and he misses out on the cues, is he going to be allowed to use force and how is he going to be held to account? I just do not think you would find a civilian who could be paid enough money to take that amount of responsibility.
Q231 Gwyn Prosser: Mr Rooney, you have just mentioned the case when someone comes into custody drunk, unruly and perhaps violent. You probably know that a detention officer in my constabulary of Kent has made a call for more protections for the detention suites. He has mentioned the use of what he calls “bouncer spray”. What is your view of that call? Does that tell us something about the use of civilians in the detention suite?
Sergeant Rooney: I think it does.

Q232 Gwyn Prosser: Do you think in general the custody suite and those working in it have sufficient powers, especially civilians, and sufficient protections?
Sergeant Rooney: First of all, if one of my officers used CS spray in my custody suite when I was in there, I would be furious because that is not the right place to use that piece of protective kit. It is not the right place to use batons either. If you have to put somebody into a cell, unfortunately the only way you can do it is by putting your hands on to that person. We are trained in how to do that. Also, we use those skills more often than an unsworn person would because of what we have to do out on the street. If the person is really violent, I would look to use special public order trained officers to relocate the person rather than just a normal PC. Those people have had extra training. That goes back to the duty of care on them as well as my staff. Our dedicated detention officers in London can carry handcuffs. I have not seen a DDO use handcuffs in the time that I have been in the Metropolitan Police. I have seen lots of other custody staff use them, but they are police officers and invariably that is under the instruction of a custody sergeant saying, “Right, the risk assessment now requires us to place the person in handcuffs and leg restraints because of something”. That is justified. I do not think at all that DDOs should have more personal protective equipment other than handcuffs.

Q233 Chairman: Sergeant Rooney, what percentage of your time is spent on paperwork?
Sergeant Rooney: In custody or generally?

Q234 Chairman: Generally? You go in on a Monday morning. By the time you leave, what percentage of your time has been spent doing paperwork?
Sergeant Rooney: Too much!

Q235 Chairman: Is it 50%?
Sergeant Rooney: I leave the police station to go and deal with incidents that my officers ask me to attend. If I am not out dealing with incidents like that, I am in the police station doing paperwork. It varies from day to day. Sometimes I manage to get my paperwork done and sometimes I do not because I have to be out.

Q236 Chairman: Is it about 50% of your day or less?
Sergeant Rooney: I would say about 70%.

Q237 Chairman: What about the demands on the police force by the government and by Parliament to meet targets? How much is this a problem? How much pressure is put on you to meet the targets?
Sergeant Rooney: I think the senior management of the teams are under a lot of pressure to meet those targets. That filters down to the teams. Some of that is used as an effective management tool to make sure that the teams, and therefore by default the officers, are working, but then there can also be micro-management involved: please do this, ensure you have done this, make sure this box is ticked. That is especially around crime recording. That takes up an awful lot of time.

Q238 Chairman: Say you were Home Secretary for the day, what are the one or two things you would do in order to help with the proper use of police time? You have immunity here because you are talking to Parliament. Do not worry about Sir Norman sitting behind you. What are the one or two things you would do to free up some more time to catch the criminals?
Sergeant Rooney: Short term, we have to sort out our relationship with the Crown Prosecution Service. If someone is arrested and is brought into custody, they are interviewed and may be decided that we are now going to go to see the CPS lawyer who is in the station during the day to get authority to charge. That is because the Attorney General Guidelines say that for there to be a charge we have to go to the CPS. We cannot do that because I only have one CPS lawyer in Action and we have 40 charging slots a month instead of 16; we should have two lawyers. As a custody sergeant, I then have to bail that person for nine weeks. We need to sort that out because that is not serving anybody. It is not serving the judicial system. The police officers have to complete all that paperwork. It is certainly not serving the victims of crime. If it is out of hours, is there a CCTV officer? Yes, there is but I am in North Wales and I cannot view the CCTV over the telephone, so you will have to bail the person for your local CPS representative to deal with. We need to sort that out because, quite frankly, it is ridiculous that we cannot get the CPS either to work longer hours or to be more amenable as to how we can deal with problems like that as they arise. I am forced by law to bail the person. I have no choice. That is the first thing I would like to try to sort out. I think that would be enough for the Home Secretary for one day, to be perfectly honest with you.

Chairman: You did not even mention police pay, which I think is amazing. Mr Rooney, thank you very much for coming to give evidence to us today. As we progress through our inquiry, we are not going just to take evidence from the chief constables but we are in Reading later on this week where we will be meeting some front-line officers like yourself. Thank you very much.
Witnesses: Mr Paul Carne, Mrs Rachel Carne and Mrs Helen Newlove, gave evidence.

Q239 Chairman: Mr Carne, may I on behalf of the Committee first of all express my condolences to you and your family—your wife is here—on the death of your sister and mother. It must be very painful for you. We are very grateful to you for coming to give evidence today to this committee to provide us with an insight into the views of the victims of crime. May I also welcome Rachel Carne and Helen Newlove. Mr Carne, my first question to you is: what were your views on the decision to award bail to a man awaiting trial for murder?

Mr Carne: We were particularly concerned. We knew there was a risk of Mr Weddell receiving bail and eventually he did receive bail, much to our concern. Our main concern was that there was a risk to us as a family. Knowing Gary Weddell personally, we knew what he was like and felt that there was a risk of him perhaps harming the family in some way.

Q240 Chairman: The decision was opposed by the police. I understand.

Mr Carne: Yes.

Q241 Chairman: Did you feel there were sufficient ways in which you could make representations as the family of one of the victims?

Mr Carne: We worked fairly closely with Debbie Pritchard, who is here today, who worked with the family and explained matters. She had very good communication with us and kept us informed at all stages really. We put that question to Debbie but there was very little scope for any other action that could be taken.

Q242 Mr Winnick: As the Chairman has said, we all have the deepest sympathy for what happened. It was a tragedy. In the paper that you circulated to us, Mr Carne, you more or less say that wealth and privilege played a part in the fact that the person concerned received bail. What makes you come to that conclusion?

Mr Carne: Given the way in which my mother died, I believe so, yes.

Q243 Mr Winnick: Mr Carne, you more or less say that wealth and privilege played a part undoubtedly in the fact that Gary Weddell was in fact given bail. Why did you come to that view?

Mr Carne: I am not an expert in these areas. I have only recently looked at the Bail Act or part of it. There seems to be very limited scope for manoeuvrability in refusing bail. The judge identified from Gary Weddell’s theft of the coaxial cable that there was possibly a risk to himself. I believe that for somebody to be able to form a proper assessment of a person, and particularly an intelligent person as Gary Weddell was, requires a lot more than just a few hours. In particular, the psychiatrist actually was conducting an interview with Gary Weddell immediately prior to the hearing and the granting of bail and in fact did not actually submit a full written report as the judge had initially requested.

Q244 Mr Winnick: I ask you that because of the figures which have been released by the Ministry of Justice. It does appear that 60 out of 455 murder suspects awaiting trial for murder were released on bail, so it was not quite a unique situation regarding the person concerned. Nevertheless, you remain of the view that in this particular case the fact that the brother was a barrister played a part?

Mr Carne: It was certainly a contributing element. I think if Gary had been somebody in a more normal position, and his brother also, that the support for bail would not have been as strong.

Q245 Mr Winnick: You are also very dismissive about the psychiatric evidence that was given, which played a part undoubtedly in the fact that Gary Weddell was in fact given bail. Why did you come to that view?

Mr Carne: I am not an expert in these areas. I have only recently looked at the Bail Act or part of it. There seems to be very limited scope for manoeuvrability in refusing bail. The judge identified from Gary Weddell’s theft of the coaxial cable that there was possibly a risk to himself. I believe that for somebody to be able to form a proper assessment of a person, and particularly an intelligent person as Gary Weddell was, requires a lot more than just a few hours. In particular, the psychiatrist actually was conducting an interview with Gary Weddell immediately prior to the hearing and the granting of bail and in fact did not actually submit a full written report as the judge had initially requested.

Q246 Mr Winnick: While he was out on bail, did the police keep any track of him at all or do you not know?

Mr Carne: They attempted to, yes, but that is a matter of resourcing. In an ideal world, yes, you would tag, you would do all the other technological type things that can be done today, but that is not always possible.

Q247 Mr Winnick: Was he tagged?

Mr Carne: No, he was not. The bail conditions were fairly limited. He had to sleep and reside at his brother’s house and he had to sign on on two occasions during the week.

Q248 Mr Winnick: While he was out on bail, he was able to join a clay pigeon shooting club and in this way was given access to firearms. You obviously consider that totally inappropriate?

Mr Carne: Given the way in which my mother died, if that could have been prevented, then perhaps her death would have been averted. Certainly there should be improvements made about the public having access to firearms for sporting activities. Even so, there should be some safeguards in place, particularly of unknown people to the club who may come along just as members with a member to use firearms.

Q249 Mr Winnick: We all agree with that. I find it amazing, and I would imagine all my colleagues would feel the same, that Gary Weddell could join this particular clay pigeon shooting club, with all the dangers involved. You have been very critical about the brother who is a barrister and who played no part, except along the lines that you have indicated, and you believe that was a factor and you have been very dismissive about the psychiatrist’s report. Can I finally put this question to you? Do you believe that
the judge did not take into consideration all the factors and that much of the responsibility was with the judge who decided that bail should be given.

Mr Carne: Could you repeat the question? I did not quite grasp it.

Q250 Mr Winnick: Yes. How do you feel about the judge in the case who decided that bail should be given?

Mr Carne: I feel that there ought to be a process to go through and perhaps a logical and sequential process when evaluating information that is presented during a hearing. I felt that the judge at the outset had a predisposition to grant bail. He denied a request to visit the prosecution details relating to the case. I do not think he took significant note of the prosecution evidence when it was advanced, particularly in regard to the fake suicide notes. The case did centre around suicide notes, about the use of the family printer to generate the notes.

Chairman: We cannot go into too much detail about the case. Your comments have been noted on what you felt about the judge’s decision. We have two quick questions, from Mr Clappison and from Mr Salter.

Q251 Mr Clappison: May I express my sympathies. You were clearly unhappy with the decision to grant him bail. Did you make that known to the Crown Prosecution Service?

Mr Carne: Through our police liaison officer, yes.

Q252 Mr Clappison: A few years ago, Parliament created a right of appeal in respect of decisions to grant bail. Were you told anything about that and whether there was a right to appeal?

Mr Carne: We were not informed about that.

Q253 Mr Clappison: That is something we will have to look at as a committee. If you had been aware that there was such a right in your case, would you have wished to pursue it if you were against the decision that you knew was being taken?

Mr Carne: If it would have led to a fruitful end, yes. At that time, and even now, we are not particularly aware of all the evidence and the law and perhaps Debbie Pritchard could answer that.

Q254 Mr Clappison: You felt at the time that this was the wrong decision and you were worried about it and, if you had had a right, you would have wanted to exercise it?

Mr Carne: Yes.

Q255 Mr Clappison: Or you would have wanted the Crown Prosecution Service to exercise it and you would have asked them to do so?

Mr Carne: Yes. There are difficulties because Mr Weddell was of previous good character.

Q256 Mr Clappison: I understand that but you felt that the decision to grant bail was wrong in all the circumstance of the case and the seriousness of the offence?

Mr Carne: Yes.

Q257 Martin Salter: Mr Carne, I want to turn to the issue of Mr Weddell gaining access to a clay pigeon shooting club. Were you aware that he held a firearms licence at the time?

Mr Carne: I did not know anything of Gary’s activities. I do not believe he had one. He never had firearms training from what I have heard from the police.

Q258 Martin Salter: It would have been quite extraordinary, would it not, for him to be participating in a clay pigeon shooting club without actually having a firearms licence in the first place? Did he have a history of an interest in shooting prior to this?

Mr Carne: Not that I am aware of. It is not a requirement to have a firearms licence to use the gun at a shooting club when accompanied. I have even used a shooting gun myself in company events. There is no requirement for that.

Q259 Martin Salter: Would you like to see the law tightened to include bail restrictions placed on people who are awaiting charges on crimes of violence that they have no contact with either firearms or activities that involve firearms?

Mr Carne: Yes, the bail conditions should be onerous to govern all possible eventualities to exclude the person from causing any further harm to any person by whatever means.

Q260 Chairman: To be clear, Mr Carne, you claim to this Committee that if bail had not been granted, your mother would still be alive to day? That is your opinion?

Mr Carne: Yes.

Q261 Chairman: Thank you very much. Our next witness is Helen Newlove. Mrs Newlove, could I, on behalf of the entire Committee, express our deepest condolences following the death of your husband and thank you very much for coming to give evidence here today. We are conducting an inquiring into policing and therefore what you have to say is highly relevant to our deliberations. May I also say to the Committee that two of those convicted for the murder of Gary Newlove are currently seeking leave to appeal against their convictions. The exact circumstances of Mr Newlove’s death are therefore sub judice and should not be referred to in evidence. May I ask you what the reasons were for your setting up Mothers in Arms?

Mrs Newlove: I think enough is enough. We have been through so much altogether as families. Obviously the other murders were different from Gary’s but in the end the criminal justice system and the policing are still the same. I think that if we all get together and we stand together, that is more impactive and we may get something done.
Q262 Chairman: Before your husband was murdered, he had already raised, and you had raised, the issue of local crime and the levels of local crime and antisocial behaviour in your area. What was the response of the police to those concerns?

Mrs Newlove: They did not come out because if it is just criminal damage they do not come out. It is not necessary for them to respond to it. Gary saw somebody from a serious beating. The brother of other two neighbours sent me a letter to thank Gary for what he did. The police came after the event, so there was no policing. We have been told on the phone that we are fifteenth down the line and that they are too busy in Warrington town centre.

Q263 Chairman: How important is the issue of visibility in circumstances of that kind?

Mrs Newlove: It is very important because I believe that children of today know that the police do not come out for minor crimes, and I think the police should, especially for criminal damage because criminal damage was the start and then it ended with the murder of Gary. I think that the police ought to come out so that these people know that they can get into trouble for criminal damage as well.

Q264 Chairman: Since this appalling incident, has there been greater visibility of the police in the local area?

Mr Carne: We have actually moved away but I do go back to the house and there is visibility, but it is a case of the horse having already bolted, and to me it is still not enough. You need local police stations and not just somebody on a bike who goes round. There are people present but, as I have said before, the children see the police and they run off and they come back, and that is what they a have been doing. It has become steadily worse over three or four years.

Q265 Mr Clappison: In an interview with the Sun newspaper you said that policing needs to go back to basics. What do you mean by that? Can you expand?

Mrs Newlove: What I mean is that we should have police stations in our villages like we used to instead of closing them all down. When I moved into Padgate, there was a police station there and that was taken away. We only have a central police station in Warrington town centre that does not cover the outskirts of Warrington.

Q266 Mr Clappison: Since April of this year there is supposed to be a neighbourhood policing team operating in every neighbourhood in the UK. You have mentioned that you have moved away but is this something of which you are generally aware?

Mrs Newlove: Yes, I have contact with my local inspector. They come out to me and we have meetings and they are the neighbourhood team and they are asking what I want. The police that are here now were not there when I used to go to the community meetings.

Q267 Mr Clappison: Without going into the facts of the case, as we have been told not to, you have heard about the position of offenders on bail. Do you think there is more that the police could do to manage offenders on bail generally?

Mrs Newlove: You mean once they are out on bail?

Q268 Mr Clappison: Yes, when they have been charged with offences and then granted bail?

Mrs Newlove: Yes, and I do think the issue then does relate to having police stations. You cannot have one central station and nobody can check. They do not have the resources because, as they say, they are bogged down with paperwork. We have to have somebody in the community who knows what is going on.

Q269 Mr Clappison: I am sure every member of the Committee has a great deal of sympathy with you and wants to express condolences. You have mentioned your organisation, which was formed since then. What is the general message that is coming out of that organisation for people who have been in the same position as yourself?

Mrs Newlove: We want more DNA database evidence. We want the punishment to fit the crimes. As victims in court, we want more help and respect. If you go into that court, you go through all the motions and you are fighting for a seat. You should not have to do that. The press have a box, and obviously all the legal people have a box, but nobody has any respect for the families. You do not know who you are sitting next to. I had excellent family liaison officers who helped us get seats. We were there for nine weeks and we managed to get a room but if that room had to be taken for another trial, we would have had to walk round the building, gone through the same rooms, shared the same canteen. I think that is utterly disgraceful because you think the court is your safety net but you are there to prove your case.

Mr Clappison: From my point of view, may I thank you very much for coming to speak to us.

Q270 Mrs Cryer: Helen, I have been widowed twice and so I know that you are very brave to be here. James Clappison has already touched a little bit on this. As from last month, we have a new system whereby we have neighbourhood policing teams operating in every neighbourhood in the UK, which is supposed to ensure a more visible police presence. You said to the Sun that the police should be more visible. Has it made any difference in your area? Are you seeing more policemen and policewomen around?

Mrs Newlove: Yes, I am. There were a lot more police officers obviously when it happened, and I did say, “Do not be naïve. Once you leave, they will come back”, because they were protecting us. They did come back, but we do have more policing and I am working closely with the neighbourhood teams in that area obviously because I have a property there. It is something I was passionate about before this happened. I said to Gary, “They will wait until
society it used to be that the minority were of the yob culture and the majority were decent people. Unfortunately, there is role reversal now. The minority are decent people and the majority follow yob culture today. Yes, you do question it because they know that you can push their buttons and they can turn it round.

Q273 Bob Russell: Mrs Newlove, is it the case that for the young people in the area where you used to live there were no club facilities, no youth facilities, there is nothing for them to do?

Mrs Newlove: There is a youth facility. Yes, there might be a shortage of people covering to open up but, I am sorry, I still do not agree that there is nothing to do. My children are just the same as these children. They do not go out and do this to people. They do not go out and drink. It has nothing to do with that. It is about the fact of going out, glamorising getting drunk and then doing these acts and then getting your mobile phone and taking pictures. This is not a case of “we have nothing to do”. This has gone above the boundaries totally.

Q274 Bob Russell: Thank you for that because that is a view that I hold as well. There is plenty for young people to do if they look for it. As a separate question, you have mentioned the closure of police stations. The counter argument that has been put to us—generally over the years and it is not a new thing—is that it is better to have police officers circulating around a neighbourhood rather than sitting behind a desk at the police station.

Mrs Newlove: Yes, I totally agree, but you still need your local police station for the elderly who are not good on phones or computers. People say you should email. You may not want voice mail. If that community hope is still there, I am not saying you should not bring the police out into the streets; you need them because the communities will get together. They will know the nooks and crannies; they will know the faces. Obviously if you have police stations, why do you not name and shame the people who are causing criminal damage and violence on the streets, or name the parents because we have to protect the children. If my children were in trouble, I would want the police to tell me and I would deal with it. I would not run away and blame the system because they are my responsibility, as Gary did when he went out to protect us that night.

Bob Russell: I thank you for all that you are doing.

Q275 Chairman: You mention alcohol-related crime. Do you think the availability of alcohol has now increased to such an extent that it is out of control?

Mrs Newlove: I think the availability is glamorised. I think it is so cheap to get and I think we need to have more powers for the police. Why are we not penalising the licence holders and the big stores and not by huge fines because that is nothing to them, as I have said before. Shut them down. If we do not pay our council tax, we are thrown in prison or we are stopped. Why are these places not shut down straight away? Make them stand up and be accounted for. They will just carry on and do it. You will never stop anybody going in and getting alcohol for a friend, but it is about the culture we have. Cheap alcohol is available abroad and this does not happen. You can go out at 2 o’clock in the morning with your family still around. I think now it is very glamorised. That is just a hinge that they like have for it—well, it is the alcohol. It is not a defence for murder but it is part of the mitigating circumstances. You have two levels there that do not go together. It does not matter; alcohol is a problem but it does not give them an excuse to go out. We all drink alcohol but we do not all go out and do that and now the yob culture think it is quite good because now they use their mobile phones to take a picture. Would you take a picture doing that and get fun out of it?

Mr Winnick: You are quite right. Your views are the same as ours.

Chairman: I think you will find that the Committee agrees very strongly with what you have said. Mrs Newlove, Mr Carne and Mrs Carne, thank you very much indeed for coming and giving evidence to us today.
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Q276 Chairman: Could I welcome you all to this session of the Home Affairs Select Committee in Reading. As those of you have been following the progress of the Select Committee’s inquiry into policing in the 21st century, will know, the Committee decided very early on that we would not just sit in Westminster to take evidence but that we would take formal evidence in different parts of the country, therefore we have been to a number of places and we plan to go to others. We have been to Newark in Nottinghamshire, where we launched the inquiry; we have come here to ready at the invitation of one of the members of our Committee Martin Salter; from here we will be going to Monmouth, where we will be looking at, amongst other things, new technology; we will then go to Stockport; and from there we will go to Manchester to look at guns and crime in Moss Side. We had a very good session this week from the victims of crime. We heard evidence from Helen Newlove, who is the widow of Gary Newlove, and, also, from Paul Carne, whose mother and sister were killed by somebody who was on bail. There are many, many issues we are covering as far as the inquiry is concerned. We are very pleased to be here. The focus of the inquiry is going to be on recruitment and retention, as well as the diversity of the police force. We are also hoping to look this morning at neighbourhood policing. Although the setting is with the public and our witnesses, this is a formal evidence session. As the police would say—and we have one or two of them here today—everything is being “taken down in evidence” by our shorthand writer and it will form part of our evidence that we will put before Parliament in our comprehensive report which we will be publishing later in the year. There is no audience participation; I am afraid, until after the formal session is over. At that point, I will be inviting members of the audience to contribute to the discussion and the debate. May I welcome our first witnesses, Sara Thornton, Chief Constable, Terri Teasdale and Maurice Collins, to this evidence session. I would like to start off by asking you, Chief Constable: you are aware that 338 officers have transferred from your police force to the Met police, why do you think this has happened and what can you do to prevent what appears to be a drain of officers away from Thames Valley?

Chief Constable Thornton: I am not certain that we think it is 338. It is 242 over the last five years—but it is certainly substantial numbers. We believe that the different levels of pay in the Metropolitan Police Service contribute to that significantly and the free travel, from areas such as Thames Valley, up to 70 miles away from the centre of London also contributes to that. But they are not the only factors. One of the difficulties we have, because of the turnover in staff, is we are a very young police force. There was a survey done in January 2007 which showed that of all the forces in England and Wales we had the highest percentage of officers with less than five years’ service: 41%. That inexperience in our workforce of course translates through to inexperience in policing. That is sometimes an issue, therefore. One of the other concerns we have is that we are still, in police officers per 100,000 population, at 199 per 100,000 population, the eighth lowest in the country, and that can sometimes lead to officers feeling rather alone when they are on patrol in Thames Valley, and the prospect of them going to the Metropolitan area, where they feel there is a lot more officers giving them support. Speaking candidly, sometimes there are management issues, and we have been taking steps to deal with those, but, in summary, I would say the main issue is the difference in pay and conditions between us and the Met and the free travel. You asked a second question about what we have been doing to try to deal with that. Some of the things we have done because we are able to, with support from the Police Authority. We have a good housing scheme and we also make use of the DCLG housing schemes. This assists about 550 officers who are in the south of the force, so that is quite considerable. We are trying to do all we can. We try to work in London, a bit more money.

Q277 Chairman: Ms Teasdale, are you doing enough?

Ms Teasdale: We are trying to do all we can. We try to stay on top of it all the time. When we first realised there was a problem—which is going back a few years now, 2002–03—we set up a retention working group, which included the staff association, ourselves, senior officers, and so on, to look at what all the options were and what we could do. We introduced a retention guide, which is about management issues: how to make people feel valued and how to help them in career development, in making Thames Valley an employer of choice. We issued the retention guide and we have updated that
this year as well. We promote flexible working as well. We know that 9.4% of our workforce is working part-time and there are all sorts of different types of flexible working that we do. This year we have issued a flexible working guide. One of our real successes is our housing initiatives. We had some money from the Home Office to set up our own housing schemes and, then, when the Government launched their schemes, we piggybacked onto those and encouraged our staff to join them. If we take police officers and police staff, and we take our own scheme and the Government schemes, we have helped over 700 people in total onto those housing schemes, and, at this point in time, 15% of our police officers are being helped on housing schemes.

Q278 Martin Salter: I remember a few years ago running a campaign at the Police Authority around the decision to get rid of police houses. You had a number of those houses which have been flogged off. On the other hand, you are telling us that you are taking advantage of Government schemes, from the taxpayer, to provide effectively subsidised housing—which I support—for police officers. How do you square that circle?

Ms Teasdale: Generally, our staff, our police officers, like the rest of the community, do like to get on to the home ownership ladder if they can. We started off with a large stock of police houses, going back a few years, and over the years we have reduced them as and when we have needed to. We still have about 120 houses. Before we sell any houses, we take stock and see what the need is in terms of the Local Policing Area, in terms of any use at the centre for helping people on a temporary basis, recruits coming in or indeed welfare cases and so on. The proceeds from the sale of those houses go into our housing fund, so the funds are being regenerated to help some of these home ownership issues.

Q279 Martin Salter: Is it true, Maurice, that a lot of coppers did not want to live in them because of where they were located?

Mr Collins: That was true 10 or 15 years ago, because everyone had the desire to get on the property ladder, but the reality is that a significant percentage of our police officers now cannot afford the property ladder, and they would welcome the choice or the option of a police house. I do suspect that if we had the stock of police houses we used to have then we would not have a retention problem. But those days are long past.

Q280 Gwyn Prosser: In my constabulary in Kent we also suffer from a loss of officers to the Met, for obvious reasons, but my own officers at senior level say there is also a drift back, because there is a better working relationship and an identity about working within their own constabulary of Kent. The Metropolitan police tell us that there are gainers outside, because an officer might go into the Met, get some specialised experience, and take that experience back to the local constabulary. Could you give us your view on that? Do you have any figures on what we call the drift back, of returning officers back to your constabulary?

Chief Constable Thornton: I do. There is a two-way flow, but it is a very unequal two-way flow. I have the figures from Thames Valley to the Met over the last two financial years: 121. From the Met to Thames Valley is 8.6, of whom three were ours in the first place. So there is a tremendous imbalance.

Q281 Ms Buck: Could I ask about recruitment and quality of recruitment. Obviously I would expect, Chief Constable, you to defend the quality of officers you recruit, and it would be right for you to say so, but, in terms of the pool you are recruiting from, are you satisfied with that trend? Do you feel that candidates of sufficient quality are coming forward? Also, do they represent the community that you serve, in the way that we have definitely seen in terms of recruiting and training in the Met?

Chief Constable Thornton: We have ten applicants for every one place in Thames Valley, so I think it is fair to say there is a great group of people coming through in terms of numbers. In terms of the diversity of that group, I think it could be better. 3.8% of our officers are from BME backgrounds. We would like to increase that, not just because of Home Office targets but because we think it is the right thing to do. In terms of the number of women, now 28% of our total officers are women. That number is increasing all the time, certainly in terms of our intakes. It is now up to the 40% or 45% mark for the new intake.

Q282 Ms Buck: In terms of the diversity issue, what is the trend? What are the key things you might be able to do, whether locally or nationally, to improve that participation?

Chief Constable Thornton: As I say, it is there that I think we need to work harder. There are some colleagues of mine here today who work specifically on the recruitment of BME people. We do need to get better. We have set ourselves a very challenging target for next year of 10% of our recruits. We have never hit that sort of level, but I personally think it is very important. The way in which we recruit in Thames Valley is that we will recruit for a month or so, get all the applicants in, stop to process those applications for several months—and we do not take any more applicants in that time—and then we will open it again. It is just a way of managing the process. I was very concerned that if people from non-traditional backgrounds applied, particularly BME, and were told, “We’re not recruiting at the moment,” that might put them off completely. We use our positive action team to keep in touch with those people, to keep them interested, to keep them warm. I said, “Why can’t we just keep on recruiting BME through the year?” The advice from our employment lawyer, very recently, a couple of months ago, was: You would not be able to do that; you would be contravening the law. That is the sort of thing that would help us. I can understand that if
you do not come from a traditional background, to join the police service is quite an unusual thing, and just that one knock back might make it difficult.

Q283 Chairman: Your colleague in Cambridge, Chief Constable Julie Spence, has made a number of statements about migration issues and the effect on policing. Has it had an impact here? You have a large Eastern European community here. I understand the Home Secretary was here yesterday and went to a police station with a Polish Community Support Officer. What kind of impact has that had?

Chief Constable Thornton: The issue in terms of Thames Valley, I think, is the growth in population right across the board. To a certain extent, it does not really matter where people come from, the population of Thames Valley is getting. The plan is for 230,000 new houses over the next 10 to 15 year period, so we are a growing area. Some of the growth is from people from outside this country. I think the challenge for us, if you take somewhere like Slough, where 10% of the population of Slough are 2004 Accession nationals, my issue is: How do we provide a service that meets the needs of that community? We are very committed to neighbourhood policing, very committed to citizen focus, very committed to giving people the service they want. If a lot of people are from a different background, what does that mean in terms of the way we deliver our services? As you say, we do have a Polish PCSO. She is here this morning, so I am sure she would love to meet you. We have six Polish PCSOs now in Thames Valley—not enough, but it is the sort of thing that is important. Those language skills, in terms of local policing and building relationships, are so key.

Q284 Chairman: The recent ACPO report says the arrival of Eastern Europeans in particular has not resulted necessarily in an increase in crime; that populations of communities that are already settled do not push up crime. Would you agree with that?

Chief Constable Thornton: We discussed that paper with the Home Secretary last week at Chief Constables Council. My observation is it is that point about service. If the nature of your population has changed quite significantly, then you need to think about how you are doing your neighbourhood policing, your citizen focus. That, for me, is the key strategic challenge.

Q285 Martin Salter: Are you aware, Chief Constable, that we have in the audience a Nepalese ex-Ghurkha PCSO? Do you feel that the introduction of PCSOs—which was controversial at the time,—gives us an opportunity to increase more quickly the diversity of our workforce and to be more in tune with what is going on in the streets in multicultural and multi-ethnic areas like Reading and Slough?

Chief Constable Thornton: Yes it does. That is exactly what is happening. I said that 3.8% of our officers are from BME backgrounds; 6% of our PCSOs are. It is definitely a tremendous opportunity and we are beginning to harvest that.

Q286 Mrs Dean: Work-based assessments for promotion have been trialled over the last four years in seven forces, including Thames Valley. According to Police Review, no candidates in Thames Valley have failed the assessments. Do you have any concerns about any fall in standards?

Chief Constable Thornton: No, I do not. I am going to refer this to my colleague for some more detail, but I am absolutely convinced that we are very careful about whom we select for promotion, and then we assist them to reach the required standard. We have been inspected twice and I think we are regarded as the most robust users of the system. Terri is the expert on this.

Ms Teasdale: We do have a broad process for getting on to the WBA scheme. That is where we really weed out people who we consider are not quite there yet. I have the figures here: at the sergeants’ board in January this year, 23 out of 35 passed, which is a 65% pass rate; at another sergeants’ board in October, 17 out of 23 passed, which is a 74% pass rate. You are absolutely right to say that, once we get them onto the WBA, we coach them and provide them with all the support they need and then they get confirmed in post when they have reached the required standard, but we do weed them out at that early stage and that explains why there is such a success rate. As the Chief Constable said, we have been audited on all this and inspected on all this, and come out of it with a very clear commitment that we have got it about right.

Q287 Mrs Dean: Perhaps I could turn to retention rates. Could you give us the overall Thames Valley retention rates?. Do they give you cause for concern?

Ms Teasdale: The overall turnover rate for police officers is consistently, over about the last six years, between about 7% and 8%. In any one year, about 2% to 3% is due to retirement; 2% to resignations, and the rest are transfers out. In relation to the transfers out, it is not the number; it is when you add them onto other people leaving—the normal turnover, if you like—and add capacity within the organisation to deal with the number of recruits that have to come in to replace them and the loss of experience. That is our concern to do with retention. In terms of the future, we are concerned, just like all forces, that we have a situation coming up in 2009–10 and 2010–11 where the Edmund Davis bubble kicks in. Although retirements this year, for example, were 75, I think in 2009–10 they go up to 139, and in 2010–11 they go up to 172, so we will need extra replacements and recruits coming in. We are getting very close to that capacity in terms of taking recruits in. It is not the problems of the training school. It is coping with them on the BCUs, the tutors constables, and so on, and taking those people away from front-line policing to support the probationers.

Q288 Mrs Dean: Mr Collins can you give us an impression of the morale among Federation members. Do you think retention will become a bigger issue in the future?
Mr Collins: Morale is a very broad question, and it demands a broad answer. I do not want to give the impression that Thames Valley officers are going around with their heads hanging low. That is not true. The professionalism and dedication of officers is the best, in all honesty, but there are a number of issues that the Chief Constable has already touched on. The first issue, which makes it very difficult in Thames Valley very difficult, is the affordability issue. Housing is very expensive in Thames Valley and it is a particular challenge for our young officers. 60% of our officers are in receipt of the South East Allowance and it is not enough to meet their housing need. The second thing that makes Thames Valley stand out is the relatively low number of police officers. We are the sixth largest force in the country and the largest non-metropolitan force. There simply are not enough police officers to go around. Yes, neighbourhood policing is a success, but it is stretching the police resources. That impacts on morale. These are generic problems across the country in terms of policing which impact on morale. Bureaucracy is a major issue. Thames Valley suffers from that as much as anywhere else.

Q289 Chairman: Bureaucracy at which level? Mr Collins: Particularly in the criminal justice system. When an arresting officer arrests an offender, there is so much process to go through before you can get that offender to court or even get the decision made to charge. Years ago, when I was making arrests, it was an instant decision, but these days it is a long process to get there. That is a system which the criminal justice system has built: it stretches our resources; it turns police officers off rather than turning them on. It is a national problem, not just in Thames Valley. Because we live in a performance culture now, police officers have to chase targets, and they feel under pressure to achieve so many arrests.

Q290 Chairman: Are there too many targets? Mr Collins: Yes, there are. Police officers feel they have lost the discretion to say, “That’s a minor incident. I can deal with that by just giving you some words of advice.” They do not have the confidence to do that any more because they have to tick the box and meet the target. That is a national problem, not unique to Thames Valley. That is not good for morale. In Thames Valley, as the Chief Constable has already said, we are a young police service because of retention. As a result of it being a young police service, we do have young supervisors and young sergeants. I have to say the work-based assessment process has been fantastic in Thames Valley. If we did not have it, I would be very concerned that those young sergeants were not getting the structure and support they need. They are getting it now. Those young sergeants need support, but they are tied to the police station by the bureaucracy, and that further frustrates the officers on the street. Finally—and this is a national issue—officers are angry and confused that the Prime Minister and the Home Secretary seem to have singled them out in terms of the pay award.

Q291 Martin Salter: Not as angry as we are. Mr Collins: Absolutely. It would go a long way if some confidence was put back into that process. We enjoy policing, but those are the realities.

Q292 Martin Salter: I would expect to hear no less from a trade union rep. Mr Collins: Federation rep. I am sorry it is very different.

Q293 Martin Salter: Therein lies your problem! Perhaps that is a matter to be explored in another inquiry. I would like to broaden out the issue of problems with recruitment and retention so that we are not just looking at the Thames Valley. You will be aware, and, indeed, have provided valuable information, of those MPs who have been campaigning on the problems of recruitment and retention for the forces surrounding London. Indeed, in February, based on information you collated, we took a delegation to see the Home Secretary, with Bob Russell, our Lib Dem colleague who cannot be here, and James Clappison. I would like to try to get into the record three specific areas, and then I want to ask you about solutions. First of all, can you give me an indication of the numbers of officers that have transferred into the Met from the forces surrounding London over the last five years; second, their specialisms; and, third, the cost of training these officers to the council tax payers.

Chief Constable Thornton: We looked at the forces that surround the Metropolitan and we also included Bedfordshire and Northamptonshire. Over the five-year period it was 1,038 officers transferring from those forces to the Metropolitan police and at least 261 were specialists. When I say specialists, I mean firearms officers, detectives, or road policing officers. So about 25% were specialists. Of course we are concerned that we lose experienced officers. Even if we can replace them with new ones, we are losing experience, but it is also the cost. We have calculated that the cost of training a constable is £55,000 for a normal constable, going up to firearms officers to £77,000. If you think about it, if 20 officers transfer, even at £55,000 it is £1 million. Our concern is that, in all these areas surrounding London, local people are paying for the training of their local police and the benefit is being felt in London.

Q294 Martin Salter: The total cost of that is significant for council tax payers. Of course, on top of that, we are not just talking about a young police force; we are talking about a police force that is not as experienced as it could be if it had not lost these experienced officers. Is it fair to say that the experienced officers tend to catch more crooks? Chief Constable Thornton: They probably not just catch more, but they probably deal with the most difficult cases: the highest risk situations, and that is why we need experienced people. People who can deal with the most difficult fatal road traffic collisions, who can deal with murder investigations, who can deal with difficult cases where people are threatening the public, be it with a Samurai sword or
with some sort of firearm. People do not get those sorts of skills within two or three years; they need to be with us five, seven, ten years.

Q295 Martin Salter: This was raised by the Home Secretary yesterday. We have discussed solutions, including increasing the South East Allowance. That, I understood, was introduced a few years ago and has remained frozen, whilst the Metropolitan Police London Weighting Allowance has continued to rise and, therefore, the pay gap has got wider. I understand the Home Secretary has put this into the police negotiating process. I have two questions. Is this the right approach? And a question for Mr Collins: Why the hell is the Fed objecting to it and therefore reducing the ability of your own members in Thames Valley to earn more money in slowing up the process.

Chief Constable Thornton: The South East Allowance was introduced five years ago at £2,000 and has remained at that level. We have been pushing for the flexibility to increase it. We have met with both the Home Secretary and the Police Minister, pushing for our Police Authority, all the authorities around London, to have the flexibility to increase the Allowance. We would ideally like to increase it to £3,000 and our Police Authority is very supportive. If we get that flexibility from PNB, the Authority is committed to pay that. There are two other things. I do not think the South East Allowance is just the answer. One of the things we have been pushing for and which we are progressing is for all of us who sit around London to say, “How many people can we afford to lose? What is a reasonable level?” We are working from one end, calculating what that is. We know the Met’s plans for this current financial year: 550 transfers they seek to recruit. We are beginning to compile the numbers. We have a meeting with the Met on 3 June. The plan is to see what we think we can afford to lose and what they want, and to see what we can do to bridge the gap. A lot of my chief constable colleagues are particularly concerned about losing specialists. Particularly if you are a small firearms unit, if you are losing five firearms officers you might be losing half of your unit’s capability. It is slightly different in Thames Valley, being large. For us, that is really important, to get the Met to sit around the table with us—and politicians have encouraged us to do this—to try to agree some sort of protocol. The other thing we have been arguing strongly with politicians is that there is a considerable cost to authorities for training and—

Q296 Chairman: What is your training budget this year?
Ms Teasdale: About £6 million.

Q297 Chairman: £6 million out of . . . ?
Chief Constable Thornton: Out of £345 million this year. No, it has gone up to £354 million.

Q298 Chairman: You have a budget here of £345 million?

Chief Constable Thornton: No, because we are now in a new year. For the new year, 2008–09, £354 million is the revenue budget. The point I make is about the £55,000 training costs per trainee constable. We are a net loser and so are all the other forces around London. Our authority is incurring significant training costs. We would like to see that reflected in the grant funding formula.

Q299 Martin Salter: Mr Collins, can you explain why the Federation nationally appears to be at odds on this issue.

Mr Collins: Since 2005, the record is clear that every year the Federation have been lobbying about budgeting for the South East Allowance. The record clearly demonstrates that. Nationally the Federation represents 43 forces. Thames Valley is one of those forces. It is fair to say that the problems in the South East do not reflect the problems in the country. Thames Valley has a particular problem because of affordability issues in Thames Valley added to by the transport infrastructure. You can jump on a fast train to London from Banbury, Milton Keynes, High Wycombe, Slough—you name it. From anywhere in the Thames Valley you can easily get into London, so our problem is particularly bad. For that reason, for the health and wealth of Thames Valley and its community, the Thames Valley Federation think it is the right thing to do to support the Chief Constable, to break away from the national agreement, because we are concerned about the future. The reality is we are becoming a training ground for the Metropolitan Police. That is the reality. The other reality which concerns me is that the core shifts, which are the bread and butter of policing, used to be driven by officers with four to seven years’ service. That is not the case any more. Those core shift officers have now, typically, two-and-a-half to three years’ service, and some of them are in probation. Often their sergeant in Thames Valley has only three to four years’ service in total. That is not good for Thames Valley; it is not good for our community. We need to do something about it. That is why the Federation is supporting the Chief Constable.

Q300 Ms Buck: It is an interesting dilemma. As I have been a London MP, I have spent 17 years now being a councillor, grappling with public services generally and having the problem of having only relatively new recruits, losing teachers and nurses and doctors and police officers and, therefore, having to take positive action to redress that balance. It is a difficult tension to solve the problem for everybody.

Mr Collins: I have some case studies I would like to share with you. There are a couple of officers here today. The first one is Dan. He has four years’ service and he comes from Aylesbury. He is a family man with two children. Despite what you read in the papers, his take-home pay is approximately £1,600. With two children and a mortgage commitment in excess of £1,000 (which is very typical), it is easy to
understand why he might be tempted to go four miles down the road and catch a fast train to London. Another one is Chris. He is here today.

Q301 Chairman: What would Dan’s age be?
Mr Collins: He is 34. He used to work in the RAF, for ten years. Chris is 28 and works in Reading in the Probationer Development Unit. We cannot afford to lose him because he is tutoring all these new recruits who are coming in. The Metropolitan want him badly because he is an A1 assessor. From Reading he gets free transport into London. He is taking home £1,450 per calendar month. He cannot even afford to purchase an affordable starter home; he is currently leasing a starter home. He cannot get on the property ladder. He knows that if he goes to London he is instantly £5,000 better off, plus free travel—which probably equates to about £8,000. He is continually checking the timetables at the moment and the temptation is massive. If he goes, the impact will be massive.
Chairman: Thank you. That is helpful.

Q302 Ms Buck: The crux of this issue is housing. We are constantly chasing the cost of housing: pumping subsidy into salaries, which in turn affects housing costs. It is the housing problem—
Mr Collins: It is not just house purchase it is house rental as well.

Q303 Ms Buck: I appreciate that it is both. Could we return to the issue of women in the force. I think, having interpreted the figures, that the resignation rates amongst women are significantly higher than amongst men. Chief Constable, did you yourself experience any form of discrimination in your history of service? What do you think are the barriers? To what extent are they discrimination and to what extent are they issued to do with conflicting responsibilities?
Chief Constable Thornton: When I joined the Metropolitan Police 22 years ago, things were very different. It is worth saying on the record that the Police Service has changed enormously in those 22 years. The reality is that as a constable then I was equipped differently. That was the reality in policing and I do not think the Met was any different from anywhere else. I guess there were differences in terms of the way we were treated—which was unacceptable but in those days was never challenged. Things have changed enormously in my years of service and the organisation I lead is very different.

Q304 Chairman: How many women chief constables are there now?
Chief Constable Thornton: We are just about to go to five, with a new appointment in Nottinghamshire: five out of 43. Twenty-two years ago, there were no women chief constables. We find that when women go for promotion, they often are disproportionately successful. They are more successful than the men are. Sometimes it is the more subtle things which can make a difference still. It is around the importance of networks for progressing your career. If you are not in a network, that is more difficult—so we have set up a women’s network in Thames Valley. It is about the absence of role models. Therefore, encouraging people to do mentoring and various schemes is very important.

Q305 Chairman: Who was your role model? Not Jane Tennison!
Chief Constable Thornton: No. I did not have a woman police officer as a role model. There were successful women who I admired. Particularly, I remember that when I was working as an Inspector in Fulham, the Deputy Chief Exec at the time was Heather Rabbatts. I thought she was an amazing woman. It was people like her who encouraged me at that time to think I could progress. The last point I would make about barriers is to do with these more subtle points. It is a really important one for us to deal with as leaders: we need to challenge the idea of leadership as a white, male leader. I do think we need to challenge that. It is a very subtle thing. We just need to challenge that. Every time we do these exams, the sergeant and inspector exams, there are some people in the top 1% or 2%. I get a list of names, and I always invite them up for a cup of tea and a chat. It strikes me that I often have as many, if not more, women in that top group than men.

When I ask them all the question, “What are you going to do now?” there is a tendency amongst some of our women to say, “Well I’m not going to get promoted straight away. I just need to do a bit of this or a bit of that, then I’ll be ready” and a tendency for men to say they are going for it. It is these subtle issues. I think the structural issues have been largely dealt with. It is about encouraging through mentoring, through networks, through role models, to make a real difference.

Q306 Mrs Cryer: For those women who are saying, “I will do a bit of this and a bit of that before going for promotion” could it be about caring responsibilities?
Chief Constable Thornton: It could be about that. I think it is largely about confidence. We have done a lot of work to encourage flexible working within Thames Valley and now 4% of our police officers are working flexibly. We do really try. You mentioned about resignations being high amongst women. When I joined, when I had my first child, there was no part-time working, job sharing, flexible working, elongated hours. None of those things were an option. They are now an option. The issue for us is to encourage our managers to be flexible and our staff to be flexible, so that people can continue in whatever way they want.

Q307 Mrs Cryer: You seem to be satisfied that in Thames Valley you have sufficient flexible working schemes to attract and retain women—and I should say, men—with caring responsibilities?
Chief Constable Thornton: It is absolutely right that it is both. We have worked very closely with the Federation. We had a conference about flexible working last week. We have the policies in place; the
challenge is to encourage our staff to be innovative about which jobs can be flexible, which jobs can be part-time.

Q308 Chairman: Finally, I have one issue to raise that was in the media: that escorts are not to be provided by Thames Valley Police for the bodies of soldiers flown into this country. I gather that policy has now been reversed by yourself. Do you admit that that was an oversight?

Chief Constable Thornton: When I saw the photographs online in the Mail on Sunday, when they were published, I was horrified to see the hearse caught in traffic on the Oxford ring-road. My view is that all of us need to pay respect for those who give their lives for the country and that includes the Police Service. The practical reason, when I started asking questions, was that the Service people used to come back to Brize Norton in Oxfordshire, and at that point we did used to provide escorts with our motorcycles. About a year ago, the bodies started to return to Lyneham in Wiltshire and, at the same time, we lost all our fleet of motorcycles. They had to be taken off the road because of issues about their safety, after the death of two police officers in the north of the country. Those two events conspired together, which meant that, for over a year, we have not been providing the escort. We are getting new bikes in June and so that will recommence. I apologised at the time for any distress caused by those photographs. As soon as we had done that first thing on Monday morning, we did then hear from the military that two servicemen were being returned on Friday and we took a decision that, even in the absence of motorcycles, we would use marked police vehicles as an appropriate act of respect.

Chairman: Thank you very much and thank you for that decision. Chief Constable, Mr Collins and Mrs Teasdale, thank you very much for giving evidence to us today.

Witnesses: Commander Ali Dizaei, President, National Black Police Association, and Dr Ranjit Manghnani, Development Adviser, National Policing Improvement Agency, gave evidence.

Q309 Chairman: Commander Dizaei, Dr Manghnani, thank you very much for coming to give evidence this morning. Commander Dizaei, when we originally wrote to you, of course, you were the Borough Commander of Hammersmith. Can we, as a committee, congratulate you on your promotion, now Commander of the Metropolitan Police and President of the National Black Policing Association. How can police forces attract more BME recruits?

Commander Dezaei: First, the Police Service needs to remove what I call the chill factor, which prevents people from ethnic minorities joining the Police Service. There is a variety of reasons. Lack of progression is one, lack of role models is another, negative media images of our members within the National Black Police Association being disciplined and often discriminated against is another. In summary, research has shown quite clearly that ethnic minority potential recruits, particularly from the Asian community, scan the employment market very carefully. I represent 12% of the graduates in society, which doubles as the proportion in society. They scan the employment market and, in doing so, when they look at the Police Service and they see a mixture of black role models and the others that are alluded to, they find it very difficult.

Q310 Chairman: Would you elaborate on your position on affirmative action.

Commander Dezaei: It is very simple. It will take, in my estimation, another 120 years for the Police Service to look like the community. I do not intend to wait that long. We have deployed every conceivable initiative in the last ten years to try to make the Police Service look like the community. I am afraid, despite some good work, we are not quite there.

Q311 Chairman: We have heard in the evidence given to this Committee by people like Len Duvall, the Chairman of the Police Authority in London, and, indeed, the Mayor of London, and others, that they do not believe in giving people positions just because they happen to be black or Asian. How can we ensure that affirmative action does not mean there is going to be resentment?

Commander Dezaei: For a lot of black people, I think that comment is in itself quite offensive.

Q312 Chairman: It is not my comment.

Commander Dezaei: I know. I want to say for the record that it is ironic that, when I lecture on affirmative action and I raise it, the question often that is raised is: “Does that mean reducing standards?” I say, in response, “What standard exactly do you mean?” There is silence. The point I make is this: affirmative action and making the Police Service look like the community is not a beauty pageant. It is not about having black people because it looks nice; it is about operational imperative. I can tell you, having been Borough Commander in Hounslow, that I had the biggest Sikh population outside Punjab. It is no good you sending me French or German speaking officers, because it does not help me to give a service to the community. In a nutshell, the way I would describe affirmative action and the way the National Black Police Association would describe it is this: selection amongst equally qualified candidates. That means that if a candidate and I both attain the high standards the Police Service expect you to achieve, but because, for example, I speak three languages and the other candidate speaks none, for operational imperative I gets fast-tracked either through promotion or through selection. Very similar to Northern Ireland.
Q313 Chairman: Thank you, Dr Manghnani, what do you think the NPIA is doing about this? Are you satisfied with their progress?

Dr Manghnani: Progress is being done but I think it is very limited at the moment. Following on from what the Commander has said about some of the issues, I would say that currently in the High Potential Development Scheme (HPDS), from which senior police officers at senior level are chosen, there are only 18 BME out of 388 nationally, which is only 4.6%. In the last assessments, which took place a year before, 5% were BME and none of them got through. To me, that suggests that if people are not coming through the system, how can they ever become senior police officers? If you look at the senior command posts, of which the majority come from this kind of cohort, we have no one in that process. In terms of the NPIA, there are some fast selection methods being taken—and I can come to some of the issues—but there are some serious issues in terms of cultural barriers and other barriers which the Commander has just made.

Q314 Martin Salter: Commander Dezaei, welcome back to Reading. You were, of course, an area beat officer in Colney Park in my constituency.

Commander Dezaei: Indeed.

Q315 Martin Salter: You have been outspoken at times in your career in pursuit of greater diversity of workforce. In 1999 you accused the police service—and I am not sure if it was the Police Service as a whole or a particular police service—of the “ethnic cleansing” of black and Asian candidates for promotion. What changes have you seen since 1999?

Commander Dezaei: I would be delighted to say that I have seen massive changes but I am afraid that the facts and figures do not bear that out. In that very year, 1999, when I made that speech, it was actually at the Home Secretary’s Conference in Southampton at which, you may recall, the national target was set for ethnic recruitment and retention. I am quite disappointed that, despite the fact that in the Police Service we try to achieve all the targets that we are given, we have already conceded the fact that we are not achieving those targets at all. We certainly are not going to achieve them in the Met and we are not going to achieve them in many, many forces. In that particular year, there were very few people going through the accelerated promotion scheme. At that time, there were only a few. Ten years on, it is still a few. A lot of goodwill, a lot of action, a lot of money has been spent, but the progression, I am afraid, is very, very slow.

Q316 Chairman: There you are as the Commander of the Metropolitan Police, does that not show your system is working?

Commander Dezaei: It is quite important that we do not have a lonely swallow flying out. We need to have saturation level. If you look at, for example, the diversity of London, by the year 2012 just over 50% are going to be from ethnic minority communities. It is no good just having myself, Shabir Hussain and Tariq Ghaffur as chief officers in London. We need much more greater numbers. Once again, not because it is nice; it makes operational sense to have diversity within the Police Service.

Chairman: I have heard of many descriptions of you, but never “a lonely swallow”.

Q317 Gwyn Prosser: Commander, the Home Office statistics show that BME officers are resigning or being dismissed at a far higher rate than their colleagues. Do you have any further thoughts about that?

Commander Dezaei: Those figures are absolutely correct. There are a number of reasons. There is clearly a disproportionate number of investigations taking place against certain minorities, which require them either to resign or be dismissed. In our Association, as a result of some work we have done, we have found that it is normally because the face of racism, I am afraid, has changed. When I joined, very often people we were called names—and I had that experience. Today, what I call the post-modern racist no longer calls you names, because he will be caught and prosecuted, but will pick up the phone to Crimestoppers and say, “PC Khan is a burglar” or “a drug dealer”. That comes into a system, into the hands of our professional standards department, who do not represent the Police Service in terms of ethnicity, and then they misuse that intelligence to embark on investigations against the minority officers which are often disproportionate and which result in them either being dismissed or required to resign or simply giving up. Misuse of rogue intelligence coming into the Police Service and not being properly filtered by our professional standards department is, I think, one of the main reasons for that disproportionality.

Q318 Gwyn Prosser: On the question of lone swallows, in Kent we are very proud to have a black chief constable, Mike Fuller, an eminent officer. Do you think people like him and people like you who have risen up through the glass ceiling have a special responsibility and could provide a special role in encouraging more black and Asian people into the force? Commander Dezaei: Absolutely. But we cannot do it on our own. As an administration we would need the support of politicians. The National Black Police Association, for example, has desperately tried to set up a national mentoring scheme which would help black and ethnic minority officers, but, I am afraid, the Home Office has not given us an answer with regard to our funding. The answer to your question is yes, but I think we need the support of the Home Office in order to create systems and processes to encourage more ethnic minorities to join.

Q319 Gwyn Prosser: Dr Manghnani, what feedback have you received from officers who have problems with promotion because of the reasons stated?

Dr Manghnani: The feeling is that they do enough and still that is not good enough. The procedures and the processes go against them. I will give you an example: input at the senior police officer level. You get the opportunity to do a temporary and acting...
role. Invariably, you see the sitting person has to be a white male, and what happens is they go through the process and when the job options do arrive the person can select the same person. In this case, the minority members, who have been struggling to get promotion to ACPO level, senior level, are denied that opportunity because they have no chance whatsoever. If somebody has been in the job for six months, how can they get the chance to do that? These are the things which they feel. At senior level they feel it is the procedures which are against them.

Q320 Mrs Cryer: What do Thames Valley do by way of getting into senior schools and talking to boys and girls of, say, 15/16 and over, explaining to them about your job and trying to attract them into working with the police. Do you do anything like this?

Commander Dezaei: I am sure they do in Thames Valley, but I can tell you that in the Met we certainly do that. I think it is fair to say there is no shortage of applicants wanting to join the Police Service. Currently there are several thousand people waiting to join the Metropolitan Police. The important thing for me is to ensure that the large proportion of those are from ethnic minorities, particularly from the Muslim at the moment. That, I am afraid, is not the case, for the reasons I have alluded to. It is an issue which requires a real effort and not a defeatist attitude, in the sense of: “Oh, yes, of course we are not going to meet the Home Secretary’s targets next year.” I am sorry, but I feel that is just not good enough, because if I were to say the same thing with regard to my robbery or my burglary target, I would not be a commander for very long. The same level of quest to achieve targets should also apply to the issue of race and diversity. Provided that happens, we are going to see the change. The schools are important. Going out to universities is important. Having national mentoring schemes or organisations such as the Black National Police Association is important but we clearly need support in order to do that.

Q321 Mrs Cryer: You are getting plenty of recruits but not getting any Muslim recruits.

Commander Dezaei: That in itself is quite noticeable. We do get Muslim applicants but our vetting procedures are such that many of them are eliminated, often for not proper reasons. The fact that I go to Iran four times a year to see my family does not necessarily make me a terrorist. It is quite important that people who sit in comfortable offices and make decisions around the vetting of Muslim officers understand the context of race and diversity and do not apply rigid processes which unwittingly take out a lot of good applicants. From the basis of national security, I think we need more Muslim officers in the Police Service and the security services.

Q322 Mrs Cryer: We do have a police parliamentary scheme whereby we can join our own police force and go out with them and spend a number of hours in a year doing whatever they are doing, following what they are doing, learning about their work, and experiencing it at the sharp end. I wonder if getting Muslim boys and girls to do this sort of thing with various police forces may demonstrate to them that they could fit very well into it and perhaps do a worthwhile job.

Commander Dezaei: Absolutely, those are exactly the kinds of initiatives that we need to be driving at.

Q323 Ms Buck: That issue is about recruitment, encouraging young recruits to come forward to join the services. We would all wholly endorse that. You are implying that the majority of Muslim applicants to the service do not get recruited because they are security vetted out.

Commander Dezaei: There are no official figures, but from my role as the President of the National Black Police Association I very frequently get people from the Muslim community coming to me and saying, “Look, I do not know there is anything wrong with me. I want to be a member of the Police Service. I have been vetted out and nobody tells me why.”

Q324 Ms Buck: This is an incredibly serious issue and one that we need to get to the bottom of. Are we in a situation where you are claiming that there are no figures that allow us to make a judgment on the number of Muslim applicants, where they get to in the process, how many do not proceed because the service chooses not to take them on for training?

Commander Dezaei: I have not seen any figures.

Q325 Ms Buck: I am sorry to press you on this, but I think it is incredibly important. You are saying there is some anecdotal evidence that people are being screened out and do not know why. You are saying there is some anecdotal evidence that some recruits are not allowed to pursue their application because there is some prejudice in the system? Anecdotal evidence is one thing. What can we do to bottom out the genuine extent to which there is a problem?

Commander Dezaei: I have gone on public record, in my role as the President of the National Black Police Association, as saying that Her Majesty’s Inspectorate should do a proper and full review of the recruitment, selection, and progression of ethnic minorities within the Police Service. The inspectors very regularly do these inspections. I think one is well overdue. It is now ten years nearly since the Home Secretary set those targets. We need to review why forces have not received those. The kind of questions to which you are alluding will certainly be part of that inspection process. I would fully endorse that if that were to take place.

Q326 Chairman: Commander, it would be very helpful if the Committee could have a letter from you from the Association giving us specific examples, which we would be very keen to pursue with the police. Finally, we have heard from the Chief Constable about the success of networks. How long has the NBPA been in existence for?
Commander Dezaei: The National Black Police Association was set up in 1999, by the then Home Secretary Jack Straw. We have, I think, made fundamental contributions to policing.

Q327 Chairman: How many members do you have?
Commander Dezaei: I think we have in the region of 10,000.

Q328 Chairman: How are you funded?
Commander Dezaei: We are funded by the Home Office but unfortunately our funding has been stopped because of allegations by our previous Cabinet. That is an issue which is being looked at. I was given a clear steer, as President of the NBPA, that, provided we audit our accounts and are willing to work with a proper mandate, our funding would be resurrected. That has not taken place.

Q329 Chairman: When were you given that assurance?
Commander Dezaei: We were given that assurance in the first week of February 2008.

Q330 Chairman: So you have no funds at the moment.
Commander Dezaei: We have no funds. We have no accommodation. Our files are now in storage. We are unable to make any contributions to police reform, which, in my view, makes police reform not legitimate or authentic, because you are missing policing through a set of lenses of BME officers. I think for policing to be authentic and legitimate, you must hear it from people who are practitioners in the field who come from an ethnic minority background.

Q331 Chairman: If it would be helpful, I will write to the Home Secretary to ask about the issue of funding.
Commander Dezaei: I would be very grateful.
Chairman: Commander and Dr Manghnani, thank you very much for giving evidence this morning.

Witnesses: Superintendent Steve Kirk, Commander, Reading Police, and Mr David Betts, Chairman, Purley Neighbourhood Action Group, gave evidence.

Q332 Chairman: What has been your analysis of the impact of neighbourhood policing on Reading?
Superintendent Kirk: In terms of consultation with the public, it is a number of techniques: street briefings, surveys, access to websites, public meetings, and a whole host of information which we have used both in terms of detecting priorities but also the use of that information with other agencies to get some quick wins about issues that people feel very strongly about. That has been really important.

In terms of access, we have increased the number of officers and PCSOs on the beat, so that now in Reading there are 76 people within neighbourhoods who are red circled within those neighbourhoods. They do not go anywhere else. We have been very strict on our abstraction policy and we have had a zero abstraction rate for the last 12 months.

Mr Betts: It is very difficult for me to comment on Reading because my particular area is West Berkshire. It is a mature group which has been running for four years. Certainly in terms of my career, yes, we have had an impact; yes, we are seeing a lot more results from the introduction, particularly, of PCSOs, and from the direct consultation that is going on in communities.

Q333 Mrs Cryer: What more do you feel could be done to improve neighbourhood policing in your areas?
Superintendent Kirk: In Reading, we finished our implementation in March this year, so very early with regard to some neighbourhood action groups.

The oldest neighbourhood action group has been going for 12 months. This year we are working on a communication strategy both internally and externally to get the most benefit from neighbourhood policing. We need to make sure that we have effective engagement beyond the neighbourhood action groups, so that we do not just deal with the people within those groups and we use the people within the groups to have further engagement beyond that as well. We need to make sure that we have effective links with some of our existing structures, such as the Safer Reading Forum, and other CDRP structures and groups. Internally, I am working very hard on making sure that neighbourhood policing is mainstream, so that we actually work closely with our response colleagues, so that there is not a division and there is not a silo mentality. We use the increased local knowledge that we have gained to share that with everyone.

Q334 Mrs Cryer: Perhaps I could follow on with a question from what we were asking before. Do you have any quite large Muslim areas in your patch? If you do, do you think it would be better if you had more Muslim officers to improve neighbourhood policing?
Superintendent Kirk: The answer to the first question is yes, we do. It was the first neighbourhood action group that took place in the Newtown area. We have two large collections of Muslim populations and Newtown is one of our main ones. We have a very effective neighbourhood action group there, a really high level of consultations and engagement. Yes, it would help to have more Muslim officers, people with language skills.

Q335 Mrs Cryer: Do you have any?
Superintendent Kirk: We do not—not enough, no. We have examples of people from other minority ethnic communities, as we have said before.
Q336 Mrs Dean: Superintendent, can you tell us about neighbourhood management initiatives in Reading and which agency leads on these?

Superintendent Kirk: There are a number. The local authority, in parallel to us implementing neighbourhood policing, have been producing locality teams. We have seen that as a real opportunity to form some links there. We formed a strategic group, which included myself and the local Chief Executive, amongst other people, to make sure we exploited opportunities there. That includes, on the crime and disorder side, joint tasking coordination and joint briefing opportunities, making sure that we exploit opportunities collocated around the community and, also, opportunities in dealing with children and young people, and environmental issues as well. When it comes to the neighbourhood management style, there have been some good examples prior to the advent of neighbourhood policing, particularly in the town centre, where we have looked to have a management approach rather than purely an enforcement approach. Certainly I encourage that in the other neighbourhoods as well.

Q337 Gwyn Prosser: Superintendent, how effective has this joint working that you have just described to us been? Have you seen value from it?

Superintendent Kirk: In terms of neighbourhood policing, as I say, it is very early days, but there is one particular success we have seen in the last 12 months. We have 13 neighbourhood action groups. Each one of those has three priorities that were determined from our consultation. By far the most current issue is anti-social behaviour. Seventeen of our priorities are in relation to anti-social behaviour. We have constructed both formal groups and informal approaches to that. We have a multi-agency, MAPA-type approach to anti-social behaviour, where we discuss individuals and discuss a plan of action. There are some innovative tactics being used by some of the NAGs in relation to anti-social behaviour, and in terms of enforcement we have had a real concentration on criminal damage, particularly graffiti, where we have seen a decrease in the last year of 12% on average and a detection rate of 25%, which for the offence of criminal damage is extremely high. It is traditionally a low detection rate area.

Q338 Gwyn Prosser: You have said that it is early days, and we appreciate that, but at this stage are all the agencies fully engaged or sufficiently engaged?

Superintendent Kirk: We are very fortunate here. The Chief Executive who has just left was on the National Board of Neighbourhood Policing and was very well versed in the principles and was extremely enthusiastic. That has been mirrored by the staff within the neighbourhood authority and, indeed, other agencies as well. We have worked closely with the PCT on this and there is a high degree of collaboration in Reading.

Q339 Gwyn Prosser: Finally, do you see any barriers to installing this joint working in the partnership systems?

Superintendent Kirk: There are no great barriers. In the partnership, in general, there is sometimes a bit of a misunderstanding: we are sometimes seen as an equal partner on the policing side; in terms of numbers and resources we obviously are not. We are also working with agencies such as the local authority and the PCT who are used to commissioning services and have budgets in order to do that. The police tend to employ lots of people, and we can employ staff to do activities. Quite often there is a tension, in that some agencies are providing big budgets and it is seen that the police ought to be providing the same. We get over it but there is sometimes a minor tension there.

Q340 Martin Salter: You mentioned the figures and you mentioned the relationship with Reading Borough Council, which is, I would suggest, an example of quite a close working relationship over the years. Can you flesh out for us, so that we can get it on the record, the reductions in crime in Reading? I noticed in a local paper that they were talking of a 3.4% reduction in the last set of crime figures and something like an 18% reduction over the last three years, but how much of that, given that a lot of these categories are violent crime, criminal damage, anti-social behaviour, theft from vehicles, how much of the success in reducing crime do you put down to neighbourhood policing and, in particular, the presence of PCSOs on our streets?

Superintendent Kirk: Certainly in the type of crime I mentioned before, the citizen type crime of criminal damage, very, very relevant. On the serious inquisitive crime front, what has been very significant in the last year is the increase in intelligence which has led to us being able to increase our level of enforcement. It will not necessarily be a neighbourhood officer who makes the arrest, but the information they gather will lead to an arrest. That has been quite significant. In terms of the partnership, we have had a real emphasis on trying to break the cycle of offending, so, collectively, looking at how we get people into treatment and then employment, how we support people coming out of prison and try to prevent young people committing crime in the first place, so they are the priorities we have been concentrating on.

Q341 Martin Salter: Can you remind the Committee of the crime reduction figures in Reading?

Superintendent Kirk: Yes. Last year we saw a 3.5% reduction on the British Crime Survey type crimes. We were working to a baseline of 2003–04 and it was a 14.5% reduction. There might be a slight qualification there, in that the figure you saw was in that period where we had a local area agreement target to increase the level of reporting for domestic violence. If you take that increase out, you end up with an 18.5% reduction.
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Q342 Mrs Dean: The Association of Chief Police Officers have suggested to us that the best way to ensure greater accountability of the police at a local level is through the local strategic partnership. Do you agree with that? In your view, will the Community Area Assessment help to improve accountability?

Superintendent Kirk: The position we are in at the moment is that increasingly, all the agencies are aware that if we are successful in the outcomes for the local area agreement we will be individually successful and it is true to say at the moment we feel most accountable within our individual agencies. That said, because of the importance of achieving the outcomes within the LAA, we hold ourselves to account internally. With the new local area agreement, we are still in the process of understanding governance and performance management, but I think it is a pretty healthy situation in Reading in holding each other to account.

Q343 Martin Salter: Superintendent Kirk, can you give us some specific examples of how local people have set policing priorities?

Superintendent Kirk: We have the Safer Reading Forum which has been going on for some time, which gives an opportunity for local people to talk to the police and the local authority about crime and disorder issues. There is a really health structure there. There is a resource attached to it as well. I co-chair that process and we get some very useful information from that. Like I said before, there is a lot of activity within the neighbourhood action groups. When we purely rely on consultation to drive police and local authority activity, we tend to be quite defensive, so a good example in your locality would be Kensington Park, where we tend to get people asking us to put big fences up and trying to deter people from going there—or the wrong people from going there. At the latest NAG meeting it was suggested that we should perhaps reverse that and have a picnic in the park, and get the residents to reclaim the space rather than defending it. That is the sort of thing that I am trying to encourage. When you talk to people—and the Oxford Road is a good example—they say, “Right, there are lots of problems here,” and actually there are very few compared to the number of people who live there and the majority take control rather than the minority. That is the encouragement in terms of neighbourhood policing. It is communities understanding that there is strength in numbers rather than feeling a fear of crime behind a closed door.

Q344 Martin Salter: Would it be fair to say that the recent sharper focus on problems that have been caused by traveller encampments—and I am trying to bring Mr Betts in, because this is Berkshire issue as well—and the fact that the police are taking a more robust approach to anti-social behaviour and to criminality in the traveller encampments, is as a result of the police being more in tune with the local community? There has been a change of emphasis recently and it has been very welcomed.

Superintendent Kirk: There has. We are trying to adopt a problem-solving approach to that as well, so that we have a long-term solution. We were facing the same situation on a daily basis and dealing with the symptoms rather than the root cause. I know you were involved in that process. It is not an easy problem to solve.

Q345 Martin Salter: Enforcing the law is a start, of course.

Superintendent Kirk: It is a start and we have done a lot of work on that score.

Q346 Martin Salter: Mr Betts, you have talked about process. Can you give the Committee some indication of how specific actions have happened as a result of representations that you and your colleagues have made?

Mr Betts: Absolutely. There are many but I shall pick just one. We consulted a number of bodies. One of the ways we consult is by planting the mobile police station at a local event; in this case, the farmers’ market in Purley. A clear example that came out last summer was the illegal use of motorcycles on local commons where people walk their dogs and play with their children. That went into a problem-solving phase within the NAG and from there we put together a partnership to tackle this problem. That is what NAGs can do: they can give parishes and communities the opportunity to work in partnership. We had a partnership where three different parishes are paying for some new signs; West Berkshire Council is providing those signs; the landowner is installing those signs; the Forestry Commission, which leases the land, is putting in additional fencing; and West Berkshire’s Countryside Agency is putting in additional anti-motorcycle gates and horse stiles and so on. That whole thing is coming together, funded out of NAG, out of consultation. There are half a dozen examples of similar things that have happened.

Q347 Chairman: When the Home Secretary launched the neighbourhood policing initiative, she said it was impossible to be able to ring up police officers on their mobile phones. Is this deliverable in Reading?

Superintendent Kirk: As I have said before, this year we are working on our communication strategy. It is really important that we (a) felt contactable and (b) provide feedback on regular basis.

Q348 Chairman: Yes, I understand that, but what is the answer to my question?

Superintendent Kirk: I think it is deliverable.

Q349 Chairman: When will you be able to deliver to the people of Reading, so that they can telephone a police officer on their mobile phone and get a response?
Superintendent Kirk: I am not sure whether it will be in exactly that format. There are mechanisms that we can use to make sure that people are contactable.

Q350 Chairman: What is the format, if it is not mobile phones?
Superintendent Kirk: We have to bear in mind that officers are not on duty 24 hours a day, seven days a week. It is about making sure that when people do contact us they contact us in the right manner to deal with the problem they face.

Q351 Chairman: What is the manner?
Superintendent Kirk: I have found that, because of the added visibility—and it really is a day-to-day visibility, particularly with PCSOs—people find it very easy to contact us on a face-to-face basis rather than having to phone us to speak to their local officer. If they do want to phone us, we have a message service that is efficient, and we do make sure that we call people back when we can. To suggest that they can pick up the phone and speak to a named officer any time of the day is probably not right.

Q352 Chairman: It is too ambitious a plan.
Superintendent Kirk: I think we can—

Q353 Chairman: You can be very straightforward. You can criticise the Home Secretary. We do not mind.
Superintendent Kirk: It is about meeting the needs of the person making the call. I am very confident we can do that.

Chairman: Thank you very much Superintendent Kirk, Mr Betts. Thank you for giving evidence to the Committee this morning.
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Q354 Chairman: Sir Simon and Chief Constable, thank you very much for coming to give evidence to the Select Committee today. Sir Simon, I congratulate you on your appointment as chairman of the LGA. I know that that occurred some time ago, but this is the first time you have appeared before the Committee. This Committee is conducting an inquiry into policing in the 21st century. We felt strongly that the evidence you gave not just as leader of Westminster City Council but also as chairman of the LGA would provide us with an insight into current policing priorities. This is our fifth session. As part of your role as chairman of the LGA do you believe there is a shortfall in revenue from the government in respect of policing as a result of migration issues in Westminster or beyond that?

Sir Simon Milton: I would say it is but for a very specific reason. Councils including my own can generally manage the impacts of migration pretty well provided they are able to plan. The difference in the past few years is that nobody expected, certainly not the government and local government, the scale and suddenness of the increase in the number of people arriving.

Q355 Chairman: Obviously, because Westminster is at the core of the capital city it has always had migration issues?

Sir Simon Milton: Yes, it has.

Q356 Chairman: You have been a local councillor for many years. Is the current situation worse than it was, say, five or 10 years ago?

Sir Simon Milton: Those are both key issues on which the LGA is doing a great deal. We were at the forefront of arguing over the course of the past two years that the systems for counting population are simply not fit for purpose. That has now been accepted by a number of Select Committees of both the Lords and Commons to which we have given evidence. The government has also accepted that...
there are major shortfalls in how migration is counted both at the borders but also where people move on to settle and the churn of population which is very significant. Until we get a better handle on that we will not solve the problem of resources. Government can provide resources only on the basis of accurate data. If the data is not there the costs being borne locally cannot be compensated through additional revenue.

Q359 Ms Buck: What is the LGA doing to assist that? That debate has been going on for some time. You will know that we ran into a wall with the 2001 census. I do not see any signs that from within the LGA and other agencies we have anything like a coherent set of indicators.

Sir Simon Milton: We are working on something and hope to publish the results later this year. That will set out some ideas about how one can use administrative data more effectively to supplement the ONS data to give a much richer picture of the true position in local areas. Councils have various data bases from council tax registers to child protection registers. There are NHS and GP registrations and National Insurance numbers. If all of that information were collated it would provide a much richer picture. That is the work we are doing and we can write to the Committee with further details of that if that would be helpful.

Q360 Ms Buck: Chief Constable Spence, what is your assessment of the impact of population change and mobility on your resources for policing?

Ms Spence: It is immense. I believe that the Committee visited Peterborough six or seven months ago.

Q361 Chairman: We have not, but I am sure we will at some stage.

Ms Spence: It was probably somebody from the cohesion team who visited. In many respects the position six to nine months ago is not the position today. I have been doing a lot of research to understand it. There has been a good deal of press coverage about the Polish community going home. I wanted to know exactly what the reality was. It is as you say; there is tremendous churn; we are in an era of super-mobility. Some males are leaving but families are arriving. The number one nationality now going through “New Link”, which is the receiver of new arrivals in Peterborough in particular, is Czech-Slovak, not Polish. We have lots of new nationalities in the communities that we did not have six to nine months ago: Albanians, Russians who purport to be Poles—there are some immigration issues in that regard—and now new Arab communities from Morocco and Egypt. We also see seasonal or weekly commuting where people have different work patterns. I understand that worker registration is down nationally by 17% but it has decreased by only a small amount in Peterborough. We have no idea exactly how many there are in the black economy.

Q362 Chairman: What is the answer to Ms Buck’s question about resourcing issues?

Ms Spence: There is tremendous pressure. While officers are dealing with either crimes or victims they cannot be doing other things. The real resourcing issue is the fact that one has to translate issues, whether they involve on-the-ground problems or those in custody where investigations take two or three times as long. A Police and Criminal Evidence Act review that an inspector could deal with in 10 minutes could take 90 minutes in the case of someone for whom English is not his or her first language. There are basic day-to-day problem-solving issues. There are also incidents we now investigate that we would not have investigated in the past, labour and sex trafficking being examples. There is pressure all round. That is why we have recruited PCSOs to provide language skills. We got to a point where we could not do our job properly if we did not have language skills.

Q363 Ms Buck: I think that is a very fair assessment based on experience elsewhere. Research has been published recently. In terms of the incidence of criminality by new communities, is it your experience that that trend is consistent with the general population or are there different patterns of criminal activity?

Ms Spence: There has been no crime wave per se. The pattern is similar to that for the rest of the community except for certain pockets. For example, we have identified that particularly where alcohol is concerned there is much more alcohol-fuelled criminality. Forty per cent of our detainees for drink driving, for example, are migrants particularly from Eastern Europe. We know there is under-reporting. Forty per cent of our detainees for drink driving, for example, are migrants particularly from Eastern Europe. We know there is under-reporting. Forty per cent of our detainees for drink driving, for example, are migrants particularly from Eastern Europe. We know there is under-reporting. Forty per cent of our detainees for drink driving, for example, are migrants particularly from Eastern Europe. We know there is under-reporting. Forty per cent of our detainees for drink driving, for example, are migrants particularly from Eastern Europe. We know there is under-reporting. Forty per cent of our detainees for drink driving, for example, are migrants particularly from Eastern Europe. We know there is under-reporting. Forty per cent of our detainees for drink driving, for example, are migrants particularly from Eastern Europe. We know there is under-reporting. Forty per cent of our detainees for drink driving, for example, are migrants particularly from Eastern Europe. We know there is under-reporting.

Q364 Chairman: Do you agree with the chief constable that there has been no crime wave per se because of the patterns of migration?

Sir Simon Milton: Yes, we would. Nationally, there has been no crime wave but there are instances of local spikes in certain types of criminal activity, much of it low level, for example driving offences and so on.
Q365 Gwyn Prosser: Chief Constable, we have been told that the Home Secretary, having received your report on the impacts of immigration has agreed to consider new ways of additional transient funding and you are preparing more information in that respect. What are your views about how that can be achieved, measured and be fairer?

Ms Spence: To go back to funding per se, we have had only a 0.3% increase in the way the formula operated this year. The Home Secretary announced there would be a transitional fund. That was already in existence but it was unclear whether or not the police could apply for it. Therefore, that is something that emerges from some of the new immigration policies and funds, for example how people pay for visas or whatever to enter the country. It is that fund which will be redistributed but no doubt we will be at the door of that fund with colleagues from other agencies as well. It is not a new fund just for policing as became clear after the announcement was made. We wait to see what the reality on the ground will look like. That will not be available until 2009 at the earliest.

Q366 Gwyn Prosser: Is there a continuing dialogue between, for instance, ACPO and the Home Secretary on the issue of funding the special impacts of immigration?

Ms Spence: The next migrant impact forum will look particularly at the impact on policing, but again that forum does not necessarily have any money attached to it. We have not seen any money coming directly into policing for the impact of immigration. It is run through the formulas. As Sir Simon said, when the formulas are run on population where the data is outdated and does not reflect the reality of what happens on the streets today it means that areas with net outward migration get the same amount of money as areas of net inward migration. Therefore, some are able to deal better with the situations they face but those with additional pressures suffer because they have the same amount of money they had prior to that migration.

Q367 Gwyn Prosser: You have no set view on how the shortfall should be addressed or the formula changed?

Ms Spence: Because the formula is based on many factors some changes would be advantageous. There must be some methodology within government to respond to rapid change. As my colleague said, before 2004 when I went to Cambridgeshire there was normal migration into and out of the county. It is a dynamic county with a high-tech industry, so it is used to a churn of population, but there has been a rapid influx. There is nothing within government to be able to respond to the rapid changes that have happened. That was where the problems arose. The funding formulas are not rapid and flexible enough to deal with change.

Sir Simon Milton: In direct response to Mr Prosser, the LGA put forward the suggestion that there should be a contingency fund for which councils experiencing rapid changes in population could bid and it would take some time for the formula to catch up with them. We put forward a proposal that that should be a fund of £250 million which equates to 1% of the total revenue support grant to councils nationally. Unfortunately, the government did not think that was a good idea.

Q368 Chairman: Are you still pursuing that idea?

Sir Simon Milton: We are, but what government has said is that rather than establish such a fund it wants to have a much better understanding about specific costs and impacts. Quite recently there has been a meeting with Hazel Blears and a number of hot spot councils on migration. That was very productive in getting the government to understand some of the actual pressures. I hope that that dialogue continues.

Q369 Tom Brake: Chief Constable, you have identified areas where there has been a growth in crime. For instance, you have highlighted alcohol-fuelled motoring offences. Would you be able to give us now, or possibly in writing, some statistics over the past two to three years—the period of peak migration—just to confirm precisely the numbers?

Ms Spence: We have trawled some figures and data. The problem that faces the Police Service currently is that it does not record nationalities. The work we have done to understand the picture is to trawl through it case by case, but we have some data which shows particularly drink driving and the figures for other crimes.

Q370 Tom Brake: It would be useful if you could provide that to the Committee. Sir Simon mentioned that migrants were more likely to be victims than perpetrators of crime. Is that your experience, and do you have any statistics from your force to support that?

Ms Spence: One way to get a good identification of the issue is by looking at translation budgets. Half of that goes to dealing with the custody and justice processes and half to other community cohesion issues. Of the half that goes to custody issues, one half goes on offenders and the other half deals with victims. Therefore, from our perspective there is as much victimisation as there is offending. Members may well have heard this morning that in the GLA they are identifying interesting dynamics in worker exploitation. There is some under-reporting but some quite serious undertones in relation to work trafficking and sexual exploitation which are very worrying.

Q371 Tom Brake: Are those the specific crimes of which you detect migrants are more likely to be victims, or can you highlight other types of crime?

Ms Spence: If we look at some of the intelligence, currently we are working with colleagues in Lincolnshire, Norfolk, the Gangmasters Licensing Authority and UKHTC particularly in relation to work trafficking. Underlying some of that picture are instances of kidnapping, rape, the taking of passports, assaults and also insidious deductions from pay for housing administration etc that are probably excessive for the contributions that the gangmasters make to individuals. The exploitation
tends to be by Eastern Europeans on Eastern Europeans. There is a mix and it is something that is not as well understood as it needs to be. Currently, we are working very hard with colleagues to understand exactly what it looks like.

**Sir Simon Milton:** Several councils have given evidence to us about an increased incidence of migrants being the victims of hate crime.

**Ms Spence:** If one looks particularly at the offences which I did not cover, antisocial behaviour is an issue but it arises in relation to social factors. One has houses of multiple occupancy and people spil over and relax outside. With their use of alcohol they make a noise and upset people and this causes racial abuse. This is a cyclical process which needs to be nipped in the bud to get people to live and work in harmony. A good number of the neighbourhood teams spend a lot of time trying to get people to live in harmony.

**Q372 David Davies:** Chief Constable Spence and Sir Simon, I appreciate the way that you have put across your evidence, but I say with all due respect that in some ways it appears you may be trying to have your cake and eat it. On the one hand you say you need more money because of the increase in crime; on the other you say that immigration is not causing any increase in crime. For example, how can you say to us that immigrants are more likely to become the victims than the perpetrators of crime when, as you have also made clear in your evidence today, you do not collate the nationality of crime perpetrators? How can you make that statement? The reality is that we do not know the number of people who are committing crimes and where they are from?

**Ms Spence:** I cannot give you accurate data year on year, but we have done a lot of our own trawling. I cannot give you the national data, for example, but in Cambridgeshire we have looked at it because it is important to understand it and I can give you data and figures if you want them. Once people say that the police have an issue in relation to immigration they automatically think of crime. Policing is more than crime; it is also about community cohesion. What we have is a work wave, not crime wave, which covers all aspects of dealing with immigration into the county. I have an increase in arrests but I also have an increase in victims.

**Q373 David Davies:** To be fair, many of those people are probably victims of crime carried out by others who have migrated into the area?

**Ms Spence:** That is true.

**Q374 David Davies:** It is not really possible for the Association of Chief Police Officers to say there is no evidence to support theories of a large crime wave generated through immigration when at the same time you and many other police officers say that a lot of people you deal with are foreign and recent arrivals in this country. Liam Byrne himself has said in evidence to the Committee that he does not collect national crime figures based on the nationality of the individual. Therefore, you cannot say one way or the other; the evidence is not there to make the statement that immigration is not causing crime.

**Ms Spence:** I think the evidence is there.

**Q375 David Davies:** There is no evidence that it is but there is no evidence that it is not either.

**Ms Spence:** The issue about whether or not there is a crime wave is that crime is proportionate to the amount of people in the country. Just because you come into the country as an immigrant does not make you more or less likely to commit crime. The fact that we have a number of new people in the country means that, like the resident population, a proportion of them will commit crime. Some of it is because they have criminal tendencies; some of it is because they do not understand the law and how we operate within the UK, so there is an education process to go through. The evidence of this is there and I can give it to you in spades.

**Q376 David Davies:** I would like to see it. You have said there have been spikes in certain crimes with some nationalities being disproportionately more likely to commit them. I am married to an Eastern European and I agree with this. I note that Sir Simon was candid enough to mention Eastern Europe as being a particular feature in driving. I have also been told by one ethnic minority police officer that knife crime is a problem. I am more or less happy to say which of the countries it is; it is white and Eastern European. One of the other countries happens to be in Africa and I am less likely to name it because all of us feel uncomfortable about singling out countries, but do not all of us have a duty to say there are certain countries—it is nothing to do with ethnicity—in certain continents where there seems to be a greater problem than in neighbouring countries?

**Ms Spence:** We have identified some communities that have a greater propensity to carry knives because that is what they do at home.

**Q377 David Davies:** Are you happy to name any?

**Ms Spence:** Initially, it was the Iraqi Kurds who carried knives; we had the Poles and Lithuanians who carried knives. A lot of the work we have done with them has been to tell them not to do so and we have noticed that knife crime has gone down. We have named those countries in the past, but my officers should not be blind to the fact that anybody in the community, as we know in relation to London and the UK, will carry a knife. It is not about picking out people specifically and saying they will be more or less likely to do this. However, if it is normal for a person to carry a knife in the country from which he comes we need to educate him pretty quickly so he does not carry one here.

**Q378 Chairman:** Sir Simon, would you like to comment on that?

**Sir Simon Milton:** To go back to the issue of cost raised by Mr Davies, it is very difficult to establish a figure in relation to individual nationalities or crime, but we know that because of long-term net inward
migration and the population churn there is somewhere between one and one and a half million people living in Britain for whom there has been no public expenditure provision through the normal formulae because they were not expected. However one cuts it, there are increased costs to local public services. We cannot give you precise figures and say so much is for crime and so much is for the impact on education, but in any area that has experienced this migration there are pressures on public services which currently we have no way to address other than by stretching resources more thinly.

Q379 David Davies: I do not disagree with what you say. Is it the case that many police officers in London will say that, sadly, a number of the people with whom they deal are recent arrivals to this country, not necessarily black or Asian but quite often Eastern European, and certainly are not indigenously British?

Sir Simon Milton: Certainly, the police to whom I speak in Westminster will say that as you get different waves of migration from different parts of the world very often accompanying that you have a type of crime that might be characteristic of that group, but we are a country with lots of people coming and going. You just have to manage these things.

Q380 Mr Winnick: Chief Constable, do you take the view that if you demote recent arrivals and make them responsible for most crimes without any evidence at all the danger is that hate crimes against them will increase?

Ms Spence: I do not disagree with that at all. What we have tried to do is lay out exactly what is happening and encourage victims particularly from Eastern European countries to come forward and have confidence in us, using our PCSOs to enable us to have greater involvement with victims so that we can show that in this country we deal with people fairly. I know that there are members of the media here. When you read the context of what we say it is about a very balanced management of the issue, but some of the headlines are not so balanced. That can make life very difficult and adds fuel to some of the fire about the harassment and racial abuse that go on, so we all must take a measured approach. For the vibrant county I represent without inward migration it will not remain vibrant and contribute to the GDP as it does currently.

Sir Simon Milton: A lot of councils spend money with their partners on so-called bridging or integration activities specifically to counter some of the myths that can arise. Very often one gets quite disconnected things being conflated by people who blame migration for the fact that there might be restructuring of service provision going on anyway in a particular place. If I dare to mention Crewe and Nantwich as an example, it has reported significant Polish migration originally of single males and then the families that followed. There was a big wave of applications for children of primary school age. It just so happened that Cheshire was doing a restructuring which included some school closures and in the public’s mind this was blamed on the migrant community. It had nothing to do with it whatsoever. You are absolutely right we have to be very careful not to allow the fact there is migration to be used as evidence for things going on elsewhere in the public services.

Q381 Mr Winnick: Sir Simon, do you agree that all political parties must be extremely careful not to do or say things which can only inflame the situation?

Sir Simon Milton: Absolutely, but there is probably a more proactive duty that all politicians can and should perform, which is to look at how they can anticipate and then defuse some of these issues rather than simply not say anything inflammatory.

Q382 Chairman: Westminster had signs in Polish to assist people driving through that area but I understand they have come down.

Sir Simon Milton: It was subject to quite a lot of criticism. It was to stop Polish coach drivers driving through streets subject to coach bans but it was not very effective.

Q383 Mrs Dean: What more can be done to protect immigrants from being the victims of crime? To what extent is diversification of the police workforce important?

Ms Spence: Diversification of the workforce is absolutely needed. We identified very early on that we could not do our job if we did not have language skills. That was why we were one of the first forces in this area to use genuine occupational qualifications to make sure we could properly recruit those who had the language skills that we needed for the 93 different cultures and 100 different languages with which we had to deal. That has made a significant difference. It is also about empowering our own staff to go out and learn languages and looking at our own staff to realise how many languages we have. We had 450 staff speaking languages within the constabulary. First, the identification of that made a significant difference. Also, recruiting our own interpreter who spoke five languages made a difference, not just because she could interpret but also because she knew about some of the cultures we would have to police and was able to give us very clear advice. Having 13 languages spoken in our community cohesion team in Peterborough made the job and life a lot easier. For example, one of our Polish-speaking PCSOs is currently on leave with his wife who is having a baby. We are just noticing the difficulty being caused by his absence. We need diversity to allow us properly to manage and police what is going on.

Sir Simon Milton: A number of things are being done to try to minimise the chances of people becoming victims. There is work to reduce tensions within communities, understanding and addressing the needs of migrants, bridging and integration activities which I have mentioned and explaining the benefits of migration to existing communities. For example, we have also noted some very good work going on in places like Bristol, Devon and Flintshire. In addition, some councils provide information and
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welcome packs to migrants which not only explain laws but also how to keep them safe. Burnley, Fenland, East Cambridgeshire and West Lancashire are examples of councils which have done good work on that.

Ms Spence: We now do that in 20 different languages. That was sponsored by the Office of Criminal Justice Reform. Again, that was good partnership working to enable the delivery of good information.

Q384 Patrick Mercer: Immigration can increase tensions. What are your views on that? What are the implications for policing? How does that relate to the community cohesion agenda?

Sir Simon Milton: Of course it can, which is why councils try very hard to do the things I have just mentioned: to explain the benefits of migration to communities and help people to integrate much more quickly and effectively. All you can do is look out for signs where trouble is brewing. Where one has places which experience unexpected levels of migration which historically have not had to be coped with before one tends to get more difficulties than in places like the big cities which have long experience of coping with inward migration. Issues have arisen because of competition for scarce resources and public services. Therefore, the duty is on councils to try to minimise those tensions and work with communities to build greater understanding. I think that is the only way we can do that.

Ms Spence: I would endorse that. We are part and parcel of the community cohesion programmes within the county. The neighbourhood teams play a specific role because from my perspective I want them out on the ground understanding and seeing where tension is and nipping it in the bud but also to talk regularly to both sides, bringing them together so they know and understand each other better.

Q385 Patrick Mercer: In your constabulary do you have in your mind’s eye—or is it even possible to plot on a map—where the hotspots might be?

Ms Spence: I know where the current hotspots are and therefore there is intense work going on.

Q386 Patrick Mercer: Do they change or are they fairly constant?

Ms Spence: They change and intensify at certain points, but there are two hotspots currently. Within those there are individual hotspots. One can concentrate where one puts resources, but one must be aware and never take one’s eye off the ball; otherwise, it will pop up somewhere else. In some of the other areas a lot of this work is done with employers. There are some very good employers who have been able to talk to their workforce about what they can and cannot do and to make sure that when they are out in the community we do not get those tensions and everybody lives in harmony.

Q387 Chairman: But neither of you thinks that Britain is on the brink of ethnic violence. Chief Constable, you are quoted as having said that to the Police Federation only two weeks ago.

Ms Spence: I did not say that. If you read the bit underneath that was not what I said.

Q388 Chairman: That was the headline.

Ms Spence: Yes.

Q389 Chairman: Is not the danger that in respect of some of the things you have been saying about migration newspapers and others may feel that that is the end product of it?

Ms Spence: At the Police Federation conference in essence I was talking to professional officers about the need to be alert, as I said to Mr Mercer, to activities taking place on the ground and the Police Services needed to be on the front foot to nip things in the bud; otherwise, there might be tension. I was talking honestly and openly. There have been comments between communities and if one does not nip that behaviour in the bud one will have bigger problems. This is about positive, proactive policing.

Q390 Chairman: Sir Simon, if it is going to happen your borough is probably where it will happen?

Sir Simon Milton: I disagree. It is less likely to happen in boroughs like mine which are used to melting points than in areas which have not had much experience of coping with inward flows of migration. The truth is that this country has experienced an unprecedented wave of inward migration over the past few years and there has not been ethnic violence; it has been managed pretty well with examples here and there of problems and as a country that is something about which we should be quite proud. I do not imagine that the same would have happened in, say, France.

Q391 Mr Winnick: Sir Simon, I agree with your last comment. You are the leader of Westminster Council, are you not?

Sir Simon Milton: For another two weeks, yes; I am about to stand down.

Q392 Mr Winnick: Westminster Council has been the subject of a great deal of controversy which I am certainly not going to mention today. Can we proceed on the basis that Westminster Council is better run than it was when it was the subject of intense and bitter controversy that lasted for a long period of time?

Sir Simon Milton: Certainly, the view of the Audit Commission and government is that Westminster is one of the best run councils in the country.

Mr Winnick: Do you have any regrets about what happened in the past? You were involved, were you not?

Chairman: I do not think that is relevant to the inquiry. Sir Simon, thank you very much for giving evidence to this inquiry today. I did not realise that you would be stepping down. I am sure that it will not be a quiet retirement bearing in mind all the
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Q393 Chairman: We are delighted to welcome to the next phase of our inquiry Mr James Lowman, Chief Executive of the Association of Convenience Stores; Mr Rob Hayward, Chief Executive of the British Beer and Pub Association; Mr Alan Brown, Director of Group Loss, Prevention and Security at Tesco; and Mr Rob Chester, Head of Licensing at Asda. We are conducting a detailed inquiry into policing in the 21st century. As all of you gentlemen will know, the impact of alcohol on crime is quite dramatic. The figures we have been given reveal that the annual cost of alcohol-related crime in different areas of policy is £7.3 billion. Because we have four witnesses and many questions coming from colleagues, brief questions will be put and if we have replies that are brief as possible we can get a contribution from all of the witnesses to all relevant questions that concern you. Perhaps I may ask all of the witnesses: what is your assessment of the impact of the Licensing Act in terms of alcohol consumption? Has it resulted in an increase in alcohol consumption in the United Kingdom?

Mr Chester: I do not believe there has been a direct link between the two things. The Licensing Act 2003 was a robust piece of legislation which was very challenging for us in local areas. I think it has some strengths and weaknesses, but I do not say there is a direct link.

Q394 Chairman: You do not believe that it has had any effect?

Mr Chester: I do not believe there is a direct link between the two.

Q395 Chairman: Do you say that more alcohol has been consumed?

Mr Chester: I would say that alcohol consumption is on the rise at the moment, but I would not say that that is a direct result of the legislation.

Mr Lowman: The Licensing Act has proved to be very costly for our members, but it is very flexible and robust in the way it operates. It challenges our members in terms of standards and gives local authorities and stakeholders including the police immediate and effective powers in respect of licensed premises. I do not think there has been a link between the Licensing Act and changes in alcohol consumption.

Q396 Chairman: But has it resulted in more action being taken by local authorities against some of your clients?

Mr Lowman: Yes. Under the previous Licensing Act 1964 one either lost one’s licence or did not lose it; it was, if you like, the nuclear option. The Licensing Act 2003 has much more flexibility for conditions to apply to premises on specific issues, whether they be related to opening hours, training or something else.

Q397 Chairman: Do you agree with Mr Chester that the consumption of alcohol is on the increase?

Mr Lowman: My understanding is that in the past couple of years that has not been the case; the amount of alcohol consumed has declined. In answering the original question, I do not see an increase or decrease being linked to the Licensing Act 2003.

Q398 Chairman: Mr Hayward, are we drinking more beer?

Mr Hayward: We are certainly not drinking more beer. Beer consumption in pubs has gone down by 9% since the introduction of the Licensing Act. To echo what Mr Lowman has just said—the figures are available from the Treasury—alcohol consumption went down in 2005 and 2006 and increased slightly in 2007. There is not a link per se with the Licensing Act. According to Home Office and DCMS figures, licensing hours of pubs and bars have extended by only 21 minutes following the introduction of the Licensing Act. There is not a correlation. Beer sales continue to fall quite dramatically in 2008.

Mr Brown: Our view of the Licensing Act is that it has provided a far more flexible approach to the sale of alcohol which perhaps reflects how communities and people’s work patterns are changing. It has provided an opportunity to have a responsible approach to that. As to what it means in terms of our engagement in policing, I think it has been a very welcome development in bringing the licensing trade, police, trading standards and local authorities far closer together and provides a good basis for us to be able to take forward a much better working relationship than there was in the past when perhaps one either had a licence or did not have a licence. It has set some very clear standards that we are very happy to meet and we are disappointed when we fail to do so.

Q399 Chairman: Do you recognise the figure of £7.3 billion that I put to you? Is no one prepared to challenge that?

Mr Brown: I do not believe that I am in a position to challenge that at the moment.

Q400 Mr Winnick: As a result of the change in the licensing laws the general feeling, evidence based or otherwise, is that the drinking of alcohol has increased substantially. Is that your view, gentlemen? Mr Hayward: Referring back to the figures I quoted just now, the answer is no. The Licensing Act has provided a backdrop against which there is social
concern about alcohol consumption. There have been some marked changes as a result of the Licensing Act, not least of which, certainly if you talk to the police authorities as I know you have, is that in many cases there has been a movement away from consumption in high streets and city centres into the outer areas, because if you can drink for an extra half-hour or so in a pub or bar why pay for a cab to go into a town, the entry fee and all the rest of it? There are a number of cities where the whole lifestyle has changed which throws up different problems in terms of the policing of bigger areas.

Q401 Mr Winnick: You are saying that it has made no difference. The amount of drinking has that occurred since the Act came into operation shows no increase and we should not be at all worried?

Mr Hayward: I did not say that at all. I said that it was the backdrop against which there was a whole series of issues related to alcohol. I was identifying one of the most identifiable patterns where local authorities, police and the industry all agree there has been a change. That is something which changes the circumstances. In relation to overall alcohol consumption as we sit here one Member of this Committee will see the brewery in his constituency close in 2010 and another Member has seen substantial redundancies in the brewing industry. I think the best indication in relation to alcohol consumption is the experience of Members of this Committee.

Q402 Chairman: Mr Lowman, do you want to comment on Mr Winnick’s question?

Mr Lowman: I refer back to my previous answer. My colleague has referred to the statistics for the overall levels of alcohol consumption which are probably inconclusive. One year it has gone down and another year it has gone up. My main point is that I do not believe those changes are linked directly to the Licensing Act 2003.

Q403 Mr Winnick: So, if the Licensing Act changed—I do not suggest it would be—you would be quite neutral; you would not have any particular views one way or the other?

Mr Lowman: It depends on how it changed and what was required.

Q404 Mr Winnick: Let us say it made the position more restrictive.

Mr Lowman: We would have concerns about any piece of legislation that imposed new bureaucratic burdens on members and restricted their ability to trade.

Q405 Mr Winnick: I thought you would. Do you say the same, Mr Hayward?

Mr Hayward: Yes. When the Act was introduced it was the view of government and the police that what one did not want was everybody racing to consume until 11 o’clock with vast quantities being thrown at people who would come out to a city centre all fighting at the minicab ranks and in the local kebab shops. If you disperse that more effectively over a period of time there is hope that you may achieve some changes in terms of social behaviour. Some of those changes have not as yet come through and I would like them to do so.

Q406 Mr Winnick: Have we not seen examples up and down the country of people clearly intoxicated at all hours of the day, including well beyond 11 o’clock? It is very difficult to take what appears to be, if I may say so—if you take offence, so be it—a complacent attitude that the Act has made no difference at all. We see it with our own eyes.

Mr Hayward: I echo what ACPO has said in relation to alcohol. What I said was that there was an overall social issue which must be tackled in whatever field we are engaged, whether it is politics, industry, the police or local government.

Q407 Mr Winnick: A social issue that is made worse by making it easier to get drink?

Mr Hayward: I would refer back to the analysis made by the Home Office and DCMS. It is your own government’s analysis, not ours.

Q408 Tom Brake: I put a question to all of you. Clearly, there will be rogue supermarkets, pubs and corner shops. Do you believe that the action being taken is tough enough? Is it not in your interests for much firmer action to be taken to close down the rogues because they are tarring your industries with the same brush?

Mr Chester: I think I made the point that the Licensing Act 2003 contains some very draconian measures. Clearly, government measures the performance of industry all the time in terms of test-purchasing, that is, sending people into stores to try to buy alcohol and that sort of thing. We do a good job and we have been improving. That leaves no room for complacency because we can always get better, but none of our colleagues or any of our store managers sells alcohol irresponsibly or to underage people through the day. That is just not what we are about. Managers and colleagues live in that community as well.

Mr Lowman: No one wants to get rid of rogue retailers in the market more than our members; they do not want to compete against people who flout the law. I believe the numbers who flout the law are very small. The Licensing Act 2003 provides very strong powers to tackle those and the way it is enforced day to day is that there is targeted test-purchasing activity. I think that where the Act works best is when it operates in partnership with local authorities, the police, schools and parents to try to tackle all parts of the problem. It presses all the buttons rather than just one. That is how you identify rogue retailers, and we fully support the loss of their licences. The Act includes ample powers for licences to be revoked.

Mr Brown: I should like to align myself with the comments from Asda, which is an unusual situation for my company. We would like to see rogue traders made subject to the penalties under the Act. As an organisation we are very clear about the standards set by the Licensing Act and we are determined to trade within them, and we do an awful lot to ensure that
that is the case. Unfortunately, there are very rare occasions when people do not meet those standards, but there are many other times when colleagues refuse sales to people who try to buy alcohol underage. I think that the challenge is to ensure that that motivation is still there but to find a way to bring ourselves closer to the Police Service, trading standards and the local authorities to make sure we are all aware of what we are trying to achieve and how we are doing it. There are a number of very good practices in place in different parts of the country to reinforce that approach.

Q409 Mr Winnick: There was a report on what is described as “pre-loading” which made the point that individuals consumed large amounts of alcohol at home prior to going out. The report was critical of the fact that the measures to tackle drunkenness and related violence tended to focus on bars and public places but not off-trade premises. Some of you probably take the view that that is appropriate criticism.

Mr Chester: There are headlines in today’s newspapers about challenges to consumers’ pockets. I certainly believe that drinking patterns have changed. Fifteen or 20 years ago you went to the pub from seven o’clock in the evening, but I think that drinking patterns have changed since then.

Q410 Chairman: How much do 12 cans of Stella Artois cost at Asda?

Mr Chester: I cannot give you a precise figure today; I can do so afterwards, but I would guess the cost would be about £10.

Mr Winnick: Is it right that as a result of competition if Asda is selling it at a certain price and Tesco wants to remain in business and sell that sort of stuff it will simply vary or lower the price?

Q411 Chairman: Before we compare prices, can Mr Lowman answer the question about pre-loading put by Mr Winnick?

Mr Lowman: I think the evidence submitted by the BBPA suggested that a small proportion of people drank before they went out in the evening. I think that has always happened to a degree. Issues around price and so on are part of that. The vast majority of customers to whom we sell alcohol drink it in front of the television. My colleague Rob Hayward is in a very exciting industry; we are in quite a boring one in that respect. Young families, ie people aged 18 to 30, pre-load before they go out in the evening. Not only is there some evidence that it is a rapidly growing proportion of the population but the amount they consume is also increasing.

Q412 Chairman: And the beer that you sell is not cheaper than £10 for 12?

Mr Lowman: We are a trade association and so it will vary enormously across the industry.

Mr Hayward: There are certain excitements to which Mr Lowman refers that I could well do without, but in terms of the actual pricing clearly there is a huge differential between our association and other markets.

Q413 Chairman: What about pre-loading?

Mr Hayward: Pre-loading is something that has impacted enormously on the pub industry. I gave evidence to the Select Committee on tourism and was asked a lot of questions about pre-loading at the time. It is now reckoned that about 80% to 90% of all youngsters, ie people aged 18 to 30, pre-load before they go out in the evening. Not only is there some evidence that it is a rapidly growing proportion of the population but the amount they consume is also increasing.

Q414 Chairman: Do you know from where they get that alcohol?

Mr Hayward: Clearly, it will be off trade.

Mr Brown: It is difficult to make a comment about people’s habits in their own homes. Our business is about trade and retail. In answer to the question about competition, yes, it is an incredibly competitive market and businesses do respond to market pressures and moves by others in that same trading area, but in terms of our research into those to whom we sell alcohol the majority of it is sold to young families and slightly older families.

Q415 Chairman: Young families?

Mr Brown: I am referring to families with children under the age of 10. It is difficult to see how those form the group about which perhaps Mr Winnick is concerned in terms of pre-loading. We find that when people buy because of a particular promotion they stock up as opposed to drink more, so they take the opportunity to make use of that value offer. As a consequence we notice that the sale of alcohol to those individuals drops off for a period.

Q416 Mr Winnick: Do you feel any sort of responsibility when it comes to pricing? One store sells at a particular price. A rival store, be it Tesco, Asda or whatever, wants to maintain business and therefore lowers the price. Inevitably, by the very nature of the retail trade alcoholic drink becomes cheaper and all the difficulties that we are discussing become more acute. Do you feel any sense of responsibility when it comes to pricing as to what could follow from that?

Mr Brown: We are very happy to engage with the government. Government needs to take the lead because of the Competition Commission and the laws that surround competition. We are very happy to engage in a discussion about pricing, but it must be led by government.

Q417 Mr Winnick: Presumably, you have not done so thus far?

Mr Brown: We have not done so thus far. Sir Terence Leahy has mentioned it to the Prime Minister. We are very happy to engage in that process, but it must be government led because of the restrictions relating to competition.

Mr Chester: I have to echo those comments simply because as my colleague from Tesco says that is a competition matter.
Q418 Chairman: So, if the government says that the price should be increased are you happy to do that? 
Mr Chester: Obviously, the vast majority of customers who purchase and drink alcohol do so in a perfectly responsible manner and I think that has to be borne in mind. Overall price increases may not tackle the issue that you are discussing.

Q419 Martin Salter: It is probably worth declaring my interest. I am the Member of Parliament whose constituency will lose 500 jobs as a result of declining beer sales particularly in the on trade market as a result of the closure of Courage brewery. I suppose that initially my question should be addressed to Mr Hayward. The figures before the Committee based on NHS statistics on alcohol published this year show that in 2007 alcohol was 69% more affordable in the United Kingdom than it was in 1980. I also hear stories—I have not seen it myself—where in some supermarkets as a result of using loss leader promotions one can buy cans of strong lager cheaper than bottled water. Clearly, that is bonkers and it has social and police ramifications. I know that the other witnesses will disagree with this, but is there not a case for changing the burden of taxation on alcohol so that more of it falls on off trade where a lot of the problems arise rather than on trade where the evidence shows that people drink in a managed environment?

Mr Hayward: Thank you for that supportive comment in relation to pubs. Clearly, it is a decision for government in terms of all the information it has as to where the tax burdens fall. I am not sure one can discriminate legitimately between product sold on one side or the other. We would love it to be because of the crisis we face in relation to pubs closing at the current rate of four a day. I think every constituency MP will recognise that large numbers of pubs are being lost. In relation to pricing I touch on just one matter. In answer to Mr Winnick’s question we operate a promotions policy. We have had such a policy for a number of years. We encourage our members to operate very effectively, so we have moved away very considerably from all you can drink all night for £5 or £10 and letting women in free, which encourages excess consumption, and speed competition so you get beer at a certain price before England score a goal or whatever it happens to be.

Q420 Chairman: Happy hours?
Mr Hayward: We have taken very strong action in the on trade against those sorts of things, and ministers have welcomed it. The difficulty is that in doing so we are relatively close to consumption law. All things are becoming cheaper because our standard of living is rising, but the margin between ourselves and the off trade rises every time a duty increase is imposed because we have all the other costs associated with it.

Q421 Chairman: Mr Chester, referring to Mr Salter’s question, is it cheaper to buy 12 bottles of lager than 12 bottles of water?
Mr Chester: I can tell you that Asda’s Smart Price water is cheaper than Asda’s Smart Price lager, if that answers your question.

Q422 Chairman: But not Evian?
Mr Chester: Asda’s water is absolutely cheaper than Asda’s lager.

Q423 Chairman: Obviously, Mr Salter has gone to the wrong store. Mr Brown, is Mr Salter correct? Is it cheaper to buy beer than water at Tesco?
Mr Brown: No, it is not. But the point I would like to make is that where there have been concerns about the consumption of very strong alcohol—I can quote Westminster and other inner London boroughs—we have withdrawn the product from our stores as a way of working with the police and local concerns. We see that as a key example of working together to resolve local difficulties and problem that relate directly to policing and public safety.

Q424 Martin Salter: Focusing on policing, the evidence we have received is that based on figures over the past 12 months those who pre-load by buying alcohol cheaper from the off trade are two and a half times more likely to be involved in a fight and that is a direct contributory factor in violence on our streets. Mr Hayward, when I bowl you a full toss it would be good if you hit it for six. You just said you would love it if there was a change in the burden of taxation. Perhaps I may invite you gently to go through with us the way that an increase in beer duty in particular impacts on the price of a pint. Obviously, one is talking about VAT and the need for a licensee to increase his or her margins. You might also like to explain to us from your trade’s point of view the difference between those who consume alcohol in a controlled and managed environment and, as is so often the case in my constituency, kids who load up on alcohol and drink in public parks and other unmanaged environments.

Mr Hayward: In relation to “controlled environment”, I assume it is a well managed venue. I would share the comments already made that we must get rid of bad venues whatever they may happen to be, whether they are on or off trade. I would welcome it. As far as concern costs, clearly in supermarkets one operates in terms of a multiplier if one provides a service. In a supermarket one provides a product with relatively limited service, ie it is there in a corner shop, whereas in the case of a hotel, restaurant, pub or night club one is not only providing the alcohol but the venue, entertainment, lighting, chilling and all the other factors and one must operate to a margin. At the moment everybody faces increases, whether it is the food industry, our own industry, utilities, rates and the like. The margin between the on and off trade has never been greater. We are in discussion with the Treasury in an effort to find ways to ameliorate the impact on the pubs and bars so we do not lose what is a great British institution which attracts many tourists. One of the things they identify as a reason for coming to this country is to experience British pubs. If there were a way of differentiating between alcohol from the on and off trade we would welcome it. If you would like to make those representations to the Treasury on behalf of all your colleagues I would be only too pleased.
Mr Brown: Any issue to do with taxation is a matter for government. We will work within those guidelines and directions from government.

Mr Chester: The overwhelming majority of people who consume alcohol do so responsibly. If you make their weekly shop more expensive that is not something that intrinsically Asda would support.

Mr Lowman: We have rising costs; we have to pay wages, utility bills and so on, so there is cost pressure on us as well. We are in a different market. The job of Mr Hayward’s members is to create an environment in which people want to spend time to eat and so forth; our job is to sell products. The price of water has already been mentioned. If one compares prices in off trade and on trade premises it costs substantially more in a pub because it is a different market, and so it should be.

Chairman: Before I bring in Mr Davies, I remind those attending this session that this Committee has received statistics which show that 46% of crime in the UK is alcohol-related.

Q425 David Davies: Are you not being a bit polite to a number of Members of the Committee? Is it not the case that it is nothing to do with price? If we increased the price of alcohol in pubs and supermarkets people would simply start to brew their own as they did years ago, buy take-out wine or illegal supplies from abroad, smoke dope or do any one of a number of other things? The reality is that whether it is £10 or £30 for Stella there are some who will drink too much of it and cause a problem and money is not the issue here? The reality is that whether it is £10 or £30 people are placed on a licence of course we comply with directions from government.

Mr Lowman: I think that is absolutely right. Price is a very blunt instrument and we have to be very careful before we believe that changing price will affect the various forms of alcohol harm that have been discussed. A number of other issues have been discussed. Bootlegging has been discussed. Look at other markets round the world where alcohol is a lot cheaper but they do not have the same problems but have different problems. You also have to look at individual responsibility. The individual who is committing violence is the person responsible for doing that late at night. To me it all points to a much broader cultural problem which is best tackled through genuine partnership working.

Mr Hayward: I would echo what my colleagues have said in relation to price. It is a fair question. Significantly, earlier you took evidence from Sir Simon Milton. Within his council alcohol is probably the most expensive in Britain and yet he has a problem which we all have to work together to resolve. It is not price driven specifically; there are other factors to which one must give consideration. As Mr Davies says, there is a large number of people in this country who consume alcohol sensibly. We have yet to find a way to tackle the problem cases without it impacting on the rest of society. It is a balance.

Mr Brown: I agree that this is a cultural issue that has grown up in the past few years. The whole question of individual responsibility is affected by a new culture. As a subject area it is plagued by anecdote as opposed to evidence to identify the actual causes of the problem. It is very easy for people to suggest that a simplistic approach will resolve the difficulties. We are confronted with a far more complex paradigm.

Q426 Tom Brake: I follow up Mr Brown’s reference to “a simplistic approach”. Would Mr Chester support perhaps the withdrawal of XXXX, Tennants Super or whatever it is from areas where there is a known problem of heavy drinking or antisocial behaviour? Do his stores do that? Would Mr Lowman expect his members to take similar action?

Mr Chester: One of the real benefits of the Licensing Act 2003 has been the better links among local stores, police officers and trading standards officers so that the conditions for the sale of alcohol that apply to stores are more locally relevant and appropriate, so I would support that. Perhaps you would repeat the second part of the question.

Q427 Tom Brake: The second part is really for Mr Lowman. Your stores will take the same action as Mr Brown’s. If there is a known problem of heavy drinkers in an area you will withdraw the stronger stuff from the store?

Mr Chester: Yes, but I have to flag up the issue of competition with the Westminster approach. If you are a brewer of strong lager you will not be too happy if all of the retailers get together voluntarily to take those products off the shelf. One must be very careful about how one does it and so it takes one back to the question of legislation and conditions.

Q428 Tom Brake: Mr Brown’s stores seem to have managed to do that without the competition implications.

Mr Chester: I can only assume that they can get round it because they have a local conditions on their licence, but I stress that there is an issue of competition in getting together voluntarily so as not to sell certain products.

Mr Lowman: The Licensing Act 2003 allows that flexibility which is an important point. If conditions are placed on a licence of course we comply with them. We have to be very clear about cause and effect. Is it those particular products that cause problems in an area? That needs to be very clearly understood and the factual basis established. In addition definition is important. There are some strong lagers and ciders which can be characterised in that way. There are also some specialist Belgian lagers which are very strong. How does one catch some products and not others? Definition is difficult.

Q429 Tom Brake: Heavy drinkers tend to drink XXXX and not the specialist Belgian beers.
Mr Lowman: Yes, but how does one deal with that in legislation locally? Does one have a percentage level? It is very difficult to think how one could do that in a way that did not catch all those products.

Mr Hayward: In relation to promotions policy in which one or two Members were interested, I shall submit that to your clerk afterwards.

Q430 Chairman: Thank you. Mr Brown, do you have anything to add in response to what Mr Brake asked?
Mr Brown: The key issue for us is to work with the various authorities to address local problems. Our stores are located in local communities.

Q431 Ms Buck: I am a little confused by the position you take on price. A moment ago you all rallied together effectively warn the government off raising prices and yet a little earlier Mr Hayward in particular argued very strongly that the price differential between on and off-sales had changed the pattern of drinking and people were drinking at home. Price cannot be a factor in one case and not the other.
Mr Hayward: I did not say there was no influence. Clearly, if you push a product down to a certain price that will influence consumption. What we all say, I think, is that the impact on the market is contestable. The government has a study going on at the moment. The Treasury made an analysis as to whether one think, is that the impact on the market is contestable.

Q432 Ms Buck: We can go into the nuances, but does price matter or not?
Mr Hayward: By definition it matters. If you sold it at zero or 1p it is more available; if you push it up there is by definition an influence.

Q433 Mrs Dean: Obviously, representing as I do the capital of brewing the price and sales of beer are very important to those who work in the industry in my constituency. We are not talking simply about beer. One can buy strong lager for 20p a unit in supermarkets. One is not talking here about baked beans. How do you respond to the claim that selling alcohol as a loss leader is irresponsible, and do you or your members pursue that policy?
Mr Chester: I agree that alcohol is a different product which is why we deal with it far more responsibly. We put more due diligence into making sure that we never sell alcohol to kids than into any other area. It is different product but we probably do far more to make sure we control how we sell alcohol than in relation to any other item.

Q434 Chairman: Mr Hayward?
Mr Hayward: I share Mr Lowman's view. I think the chances of our selling it below cost are virtually zero.

Q435 Mrs Dean: Is it irresponsible to do that because one is not talking about baked beans?

Q436 Chairman: Perhaps we can have a response from each witness. Mr Lowman?
Mr Lowman: I cannot speak for every single member or store, but it is highly unlikely they will sell alcohol as a loss leader primarily because the basic economics of the business would make it very difficult to sustain that activity.

Q437 Chairman: Mr Hayward?
Mr Hayward: In a fiercely competitive market we compete with the pricing strategies of other retailers. I think I have already mentioned that.

Q438 Chairman: Mr Brown?
Mr Brown: We have no policy, but in response to competition we will sell below the market price.

Q440 Patrick Mercer: I find it very hard to square the proposition that selling alcohol as a loss leader is responsible.

Q441 Patrick Mercer: I find the word “responsibility” a contradiction in terms when one is selling a dangerous drug which from my own past professional experience, and now my parliamentary duties, causes much death and injury particularly to the underage. I do not find that the words “loss leader” and “responsible” sit comfortably together.

Q442 Chairman: Mr Mercer is not talking about responsibility in selling alcohol as a loss leader.

Q443 Patrick Mercer: May I suggest that you substitute the word “irresponsible” or “immoral” for “responsible”? 
Mr Chester: I can only disagree.

Q444 Chairman: Mr Brown, do you have any comment to make not about your customers’ responsible drinking but your company’s behaviour in selling alcohol as a loss leader bearing in mind the fact that 46% of offences are alcohol-related?

Mr Brown: I think there is a question of definition of “loss leader”. We sell alcohol which enables us to respond to the actions of other retailers. In doing so we intend to make sure that our customers have a wider choice of quality and value.

Q445 Mrs Dean: Mr Hayward, what effect does the selling of alcohol as a loss leader have not only on the on trade but on brewers?

Mr Hayward: At the moment the profitability of brewers is lower than it has ever been before which is why you have the number of closures and redundancies that you face in your own constituency—Mr Salter has already referred to this—and in a number of other constituencies as well. Brewers are finding it incredibly difficult to maintain their operations and some are going out of business as a result of current circumstances. We put the information to the Treasury, as did you, Mrs Dean, that profitability is at an all-time low and the industry will not be able to continue. That will be a serious threat to many communities around the country.

Mr Chester: I would just make the point about brewers: they are the people who brew the beer that goes into the cans.

Q446 Mrs Dean: How much pressure does the retail industry put on the brewers to keep their prices low when they sell to you?

Mr Chester: I do not deal directly with the brewers. I can only imagine that with big corporations like Asda and the brewers there will be robust negotiations over price.

Mr Lowman: Our members will negotiate as keenly as they can. The reality is that three-quarters of the market is represented by the country’s major grocers. We represent part of the remaining quarter, so basic economics suggest that we do not have the same power in that negotiation as some larger retailers.

Mr Hayward: Our industry has made absolutely clear that it does not like loss leading and it has made representations to all sorts of authorities to that effect. The capacity of our industry and others to pass through duty increases and the like is very low and the net result is lack of investment in the industry.

Mr Brown: In relation to your question about how we negotiate with the brewers, obviously those negotiations are based upon trying to achieve value which will eventually be passed on to the customers, but it is also very clear that we try to work with suppliers to make sure that they have a sustainable position and we have a position where we are able to sell their product in a value way to our customers. We certainly do not want to disenfranchise or damage the level of choice in supply that is available to us, and we purchase accordingly.

Q447 Mrs Dean: I put a question to all of the witnesses. How much responsibility does and should the industry take for alcohol-related crime and antisocial behaviour?

Mr Chester: We should sell alcohol responsibly given all the measures that I and others on the panel have outlined. I agree absolutely that we have a part to play.

Mr Lowman: We have a part to play. We have to be very clear about cause and effect and the action we are taking in terms of the way we retail alcohol and the effect it has in terms of alcohol-related disorder and so forth. The prevention of alcohol-related disorders is one of the four principles of the Licensing Act. That Act therefore allows action to be taken against businesses that are not doing what they can to meet that objective.

Mr Hayward: We take it very seriously. We have just introduced a document concerned with managing safety in bars, clubs and pubs which has been discussed with and based upon our negotiations with ACPO in terms of how venues should be managed so that people can drink responsibly.

Mr Brown: We are very clear that we shall trade only in a responsible fashion within the law. We provide extensive training for our staff and we look to work with the authorities where there are difficult areas in a way to promote public safety and remove any difficulties within those areas.

Q448 Ms Buck: The chief constable of Nottingham said: “What [the drinks industry] has done is sacrifice responsibility for bigger profits . . . It has already proved itself unworthy of self-regulation.” Why would one of Britain’s senior policemen say that?

Mr Chester: Clearly, I cannot comment on what he said.

Q449 Chairman: Why can you not comment on what he said?

Mr Chester: I cannot question what he said. If that is his view that is his view. We certainly want to play our part in selling alcohol responsibly. For example, one of the measures we have taken recently is not to sell between 12 and six in all of our town centre stores. We accept this as a very different issue and that we have a part to play.

Q450 Chairman: Mr Lowman, do you agree with him?

Mr Lowman: I am not in Nottingham.

Q451 Chairman: You do not have to be in Nottingham.

Mr Lowman: He is commenting on what he has seen on the streets of Nottingham and comes to the conclusion that that is down to the acts of the alcohol industry. I believe that the cause and effect between all different parts of the industry, whether it be producers, pubs or shops—it is not one homogenous mass—is not the strong, bold line he suggests; it is much more a dotted line. In that area and all others up and down the country local authorities and the police
are able to use powers to tackle premises and parts of the industry that are not doing all they can to meet the four licensing principles.

Q452 Ms Buck: It is not working and that is why he makes the remark?

Mr Lowman: Obviously, he feels that it is not working in that particular area, but the powers are there to be used.

Q453 Ms Buck: So, it is the fault of the police?

Mr Lowman: I did not say that at all. There are a number of complex issues to do with the causes of alcohol-related disorder. There are cultural issues to do with parenting and policing and sometimes it is very tempting to think that there is one lever we can pull or one place we can look at to solve the problem; it will not. The solution is more complex than that.

Q454 Ms Buck: I am just asking you: what exactly is your responsibility in this? One of Britain’s most senior policemen has said you have lost the right to self-regulate.

Mr Lowman: We are not self-regulated; we are regulated by the Licensing Act 2003, so our responsibility is to comply with that Act and go further in terms of pushing responsibility particularly in relation to the issue of underage sales.

Mr Hayward: We are not self-regulated. With the police force in Nottingham we are developing a Business Improvement District because we recognise that area has faced particular problems. We are working with the police and local authorities and hope that the BID will be fully operational before long.

Mr Brown: I agree with my colleagues that we are not self-regulated industry. There is a significant level of regulation that is available to the police, trading standards and local authorities. We are very clear that we wish to work with police and those agencies, so I have to divorce myself from the chief constable’s comments because there is probably a degree of detail behind them that is perhaps not necessarily reflected in that statement.

Q455 Chairman: You are a former police officer yourself, are you not?

Mr Brown: I am.

Q456 Chairman: Do you agree with Mr Lowman that the powers are there but they are not being used?

Mr Brown: I believe that the powers are there. There are certain restrictions within the Police Service in terms of resource availability and the challenges it faces which make it even more important that as part of a regulated industry we are prepared to work with former colleagues. We have a big say in terms of wanting it to be a safe environment where people feel comfortable to come and shop with us. It is important that we work with the police, the trading standards and local authority to achieve that environment. For me that is the key.

Mr Chester: I reiterate that certainly in Nottingham for every one of our shops we have to agree with the police the conditions to be imposed on them, that is, the opening hours and so on. It is far more than self-regulation. For all of those stores the police have every opportunity to come forward with proposals about what more we can do about underage selling or how we retail alcohol.

Q457 Patrick Mercer: Gentlemen, in what way do you and your members work with the police to tackle underage drinking and alcohol-related crime and disorder?

Mr Chester: We take pride in the fact that every one of our store managers and colleagues in stores has good links with the local police. They meet regularly and understand the conditions that apply to the store. That has been a very positive move from the 2003 Act and it is something that must continue.

Mr Lowman: What we are trying to do is spread best practice in the best way and engage in partnership working. “Partnership working” is very easy to say but it is very difficult to do because it involves so many people and takes time and effort. I think the best example is the St Neots project that off traders have piloted which involves all the local agencies getting together and has had an effect in reducing street drinking, using powers to confiscate alcohol, work with parents and so on. That is the benchmark and we are trying to push that best practice around the country. There are also some fantastic examples round the country. Some members even have small police stations in their stores. The absolute priority for us as an industry association is to push that best practice wider and wider.

Mr Hayward: To pick up what others have said, not repeat it, as an association we actively encourage and try to ensure that every Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership has a representative from the on trade participating in it. There are ongoing discussions in that regard. We fund Pubwatch, for example. That probably would not exist as a national organisation but for funding by the British Beer and Pub Association. We try to do those sorts of things all of which involve working with the police.

Mr Brown: Within Tesco we have a policy that demands that our store managers engage with police at a local level. That takes a number of different forms. We have local police stations in some of our stores. We believe that the government’s move towards neighbourhood policing is a significant opportunity for communities. We want to make sure that we are part of that. We seek active engagement. Probably one of the reasons I was employed by Tesco in the first place was to promote that policy throughout the company. We would like to think we seek that engagement and respond to the concerns. There are a number of examples of where we have responded to concerns in terms of limiting the licence and limiting product availability.

Q458 Patrick Mercer: We have already touched on Mr Green’s comments in Nottingham. I am also a Nottinghamshire Member of Parliament. It is interesting to see the efforts to bring under control the very widespread alcohol-related problems in the city of Nottingham. What is your opinion of the proposed
alcohol disorder zones, and to what extent do you think the industry should contribute towards the policing costs of them?

**Mr Chester:** I think it is very difficult for supermarkets to comment on them. Most of our stores are not a hotbed of underage drinking and disorder. We are nervous because obviously where stores are not a hotbed of underage drinking and supermarkets to comment on them. Most of our zones will be top down forced partnership working; in our areas will do this, this and this. In our experience that is not how partnership working is most effective. We have concerns about that. Again, to return to cause and effect we have to be clear with all these things, whether they are local initiatives or national policy, that the particular measure of an alcohol disorder zone will tackle the specific problems that that area faces. My concern is that given the way the legislation is drafted and the discussion on it sometimes it may miss the target.

**Mr Lowman:** There is a danger that alcohol disorder zones will be top down forced partnership working; in other words, the police or local authority will say that businesses in an area will do this, this and this. In our experience that is not how partnership working is most effective. We have concerns about that. Again, to return to cause and effect we have to be clear with all these things, whether they are local initiatives or national policy, that the particular measure of an alcohol disorder zone will tackle the specific problems that that area faces. My concern is that given the way the legislation is drafted and the discussion on it sometimes it may miss the target.

**Mr Hayward:** Sir Simon Milton who has just given evidence has made it absolutely clear on behalf of the LGA that the proposed regulations in relation to ADZs just will not work. The police and also our industry have also expressed their concerns about it. As far as we are concerned it is an interesting idea but in terms of trying to identify the premises it is an absolute nightmare. On three different occasions the regulations were severely criticised by the Statutory Instruments Committee of the House of Lords to the extent that one Member of the Upper House asked whether there could be a vote, which was quite extraordinary. I highlight the oddity in ADZs that it is unclear whether supermarkets will be picked up in any zone. Because of the definition of their trading they could well be exempt which to the on trade seems utterly illogical.

**Mr Brown:** I think that ADZs should be a tool of last resort. A whole continuum of response that needs to be tested and put in place before one ever gets to the suggestion that there should be such a compulsory approach. We would advocate much closer partnership working that starts to address some of the cultural concerns around this issue. ADZs are a tool of absolutely last resort and one can envisage significant difficulties in terms of their implementation.

Q459 **Chairman:** I should like to raise a number of issues that have arisen over the past few days. First, the Mayor of London has made the decision to ban drinking on the tube. Does anyone oppose what he has done?

**Mr Hayward:** We issued a statement welcoming it.

Q460 **Chairman:** You all welcome that? Second, in terms of the consumption of alcohol Channel 4 obtained information about the number of women who had been detained for alcohol-related offences. There were 5,891 women detained for such offences compared with 3,847 three years ago, so there has been an increase in the number of women drinking alcohol despite the overall consumption figures. It was suggested by another senior police officer, the chief constable of Northumbria, that discounted drinks, happy hours and alcohol advertising should be banned. Does anyone disagree with that?

**Mr Lowman:** I think that the banning of alcohol advertising is a very heavy-handed blunt instrument. I want to see the evidence that that move would tackle the particular forms of alcohol harm that we are talking about today and elsewhere.

Q461 **Chairman:** Do you all agree with that?

**Mr Chester:** I would agree with that.

**Mr Brown:** I think there is room for a responsible approach to the advertising of alcohol and perhaps the trade should contribute to, say, one in six adverts as promoting responsible drinking or giving that message that runs through all alcohol advertising. It is important that people are aware of what choice is available to them to enable them to make their own shopping decisions.

Q462 **Chairman:** Mr Hayward mentioned various issues that had been taken up by his association. What about the banning of discounted drinks and happy hours?

**Mr Hayward:** I indicated that I would make available to the Committee our policy in relation to responsible promotions including happy hours. That is the actual phrase we use. We do not ban them but believe that there are ways to restrict them so they produce responsible behaviour in general terms. This is something on which we have worked both with ministers and the police. In relation to alcohol advertising, I do not believe there should be a ban. One must have a dynamic market. There are new products—this is true of any industry—which are subject to all sorts of restrictions in terms of advertising and that should be the case.

Q463 **Mr Winnick:** If the advertising of alcohol should not be banned—there may well be a case for taking the same position you adopt—would there not be an argument that on bottles there should be a warning about excessive drinking? I have in mind what happens with cigarette advertising where for many years there have been warnings about the danger of smoking.

**Mr Chester:** Every single Asda beer, wine and spirit product has clearly marked on it the units and a message about responsible drinking.

Q464 **Chairman:** Does it have on it the warning “Don’t drink”?

**Mr Chester:** No, it does not say “Don’t drink” but that you should enjoy drink responsibly. It is made clear the number of units one will consume if one drinks that bottle.

Q465 **Chairman:** Does Tesco have that on its bottles?

**Mr Brown:** We do. We put on it the alcohol content and what it means in terms of units in fairly simple graphics. That is supported by what we call shelf-talkers and Tesco TV in the particular aisles to promote the need to drink responsibly.
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Q466 Mr Winnick: Could it be given a higher profile?  
Mr Brown: It is difficult to see how it could get a higher profile in those specific areas. It is very apparent to shoppers that there is a need to enjoy this product responsibly.

Mr Hayward: I led the negotiations on the question of labelling for the whole sector. There are five requirements which we agreed with the Department of Health. It has just undertaken a benchmark survey to establish the current position and there will be a review later this year as to what has changed, and the products to which my colleagues refer will be included in that. Those five requirements include a warning about consumption during pregnancy.

Q467 Mrs Cryer: I understand that in Canada every bottle of beer or any form of alcoholic beverage that is sold must have a health warning similar to that put on packets of cigarettes. Would all four witnesses oppose its introduction here?

Mr Chester: I would unless there is any evidence that drinking one bottle of beer will do you any harm at all. As long as there is clear information to the consumer about alcohol content and drinking responsibly I believe that is adequate.

Mr Lowman: I think the challenge is about communicating properly the message about responsible drinking. I agree with Mr Winnick that there is scope for us to do more to get that message across.

Mr Hayward: I echo the comments that have been made.

Mr Brown: I agree.

Q468 Chairman: Mr Chester, Asda’s president Mr Bond wrote to the Prime Minister on 25 February saying that Asda would be donating £1 million to youth projects aimed at reducing underage alcohol consumption. How much money has been donated so far?

Mr Chester: We are currently working with Business in the Community to devise how we will spend that money and there are ongoing meetings.

Mr Lowman: Absolutely. We have stopped selling in all our town centre stores between 12 and six; we have adopted challenge 25—up from challenge 21—in all stores. Forgive me if I do not mention the others, but they are all implemented.

Q469 Chairman: So, no money has been spent?

Mr Chester: We want to make absolutely sure that it is properly targeted in the right areas. The idea is to identify projects and discussions are ongoing.

Q470 Chairman: So, all five of the points about which you wrote to the Prime Minister are being actioned?

Mr Chester: Absolutely. We have stopped selling in all our town centre stores between 12 and six; we have adopted challenge 25—up from challenge 21—in all stores. Forgive me if I do not mention the others, but they are all implemented.

Q471 Chairman: I ask you finally about the youth action plan published yesterday by the government which states that parents might face a ban on giving alcohol to young children in households. Do you agree that more responsibility should be placed on parents to ensure that they prevent their children from drinking?

Mr Chester: Parents have a very tough job, but it is clear from research done both by government and Asda that parents are a very likely source of alcohol for children, unfortunately. Clearly, they need to be part of the solution.

Q472 Chairman: Mr Lowman?

Mr Lowman: Yes.

Q473 Chairman: Mr Hayward?

Mr Hayward: Yes. Parents must accept some responsibility. The police are being asked to cope with nightmare circumstances. For example, over the previous weekend parents were driving 13 and 14 year-olds to a beach party in Hampshire, dropping them off and handing them multi-packs.

Mr Brown: We would align ourselves with the need for people to drink responsibly. We have a responsibility to ensure they know what that means.

Chairman: We may write to you asking for further information as the inquiry progresses. I thank all of the witnesses for coming to give evidence today.

Witness: Mr Stephen Otter, Chief Constable, Devon and Cornwall Constabulary, gave evidence.

Q474 Chairman: Mr Otter, thank you very much for coming. You have the right of reply on a number of issues since you are the last witness this morning. If there are any matters on which you wish to comment other than those we ask you about please feel free to do so. I start by asking you what proportion of criminality dealt with by your police force is alcohol-related?

Mr Otter: If we look at Devon and Cornwall, since 2004–05 there has been a fairly significant increase in the proportion of violent crime where we can be absolutely sure there is an alcohol-related aspect. In some other areas that is quite difficult to identify. The proportion of violent crimes went up from about one third to half last year, so it is a significant increase. That must be viewed against a reduction in the trend of violent crime overall. When we start to look at the nature of that violent crime 42% is in the street but what concerns us is that 30% is in the home and it is related directly to domestic abuse. The impact of this increase in violent crime related to alcohol is not just about disorder and rowdiness, which is very serious; it is related also to problems in the home and the family. We have serious concerns about that.

Q475 Chairman: Earlier I gave the overall figure of 46% of crimes being alcohol-related. Would your force reflect a similar percentage?

Mr Otter: Overall it is similar. We would say that there is a health warning around that particular figure because “alcohol-related” could mean an offence relating to a licensee, for example. It is more difficult to gauge what harm is being done which is obviously what we are interested in.
Q476 Chairman: Can you give us any trends? Is it more prevalent among young people or women?  
Mr Otter: It is more prevalent among young people; one only has to look at hospital admissions to see that. It is also more prevalent among women. In our area we have levels of hospital admissions for women which are higher than the English average. That is partly to do with the fact that we get 10 million visitors to our area every year. Most of the statistics are based on resident population figures. We have a population of about 1½ million. We see an increasing trend of young people and women who are intoxicated. Intoxication leads one to being either a victim or offender. The worrying trends are really those to do with sexual crime. We see a definite increase in serious sexual crime, particularly rape, in which a lot of young people are involved where both parties are drunk or part of the incident is alcohol-related.

Q477 Tom Brake: Have you been able to analyse why there has been an increase in violent crime? We heard earlier that perhaps it is not to do with the price of drink. In your view is it to do with the fact that drink is getting cheaper and therefore people drink more—that was challenged earlier—and the more they drink the greater the risk of violence, or is there some other factor that explains why, for instance, there is a significant increase in domestic violence?  
Mr Otter: The factors are fairly complex. ACPO has done some thinking on this from the policing point of view. There is a change in the drinking culture and people drink more. We think that could be due to price and it is certainly down to the concept of happy hour—buy one, get one free—so that people double their intake in an evening basically because they cannot resist the offer. There is also a change in the nature of drinks. Our view is that that results in more young people drinking stronger drinks. For example, a lot of alcopops are now served in what look like water bottles with pop-up tops—the sort of thing you would take along to a gym. They are bright blue and purple in colour. In our view they are not drinks that are destined for the dinner table of a 45 year-old couple. There is something about the presentation of the liquor itself. We are talking about a substance that is licensed because it is dangerous. I should like to talk a little more about the licensing of it.

Q478 Tom Brake: You are clearly suggesting that the packaging is designed to appeal to young people and possibly underage drinkers as well?  
Mr Otter: Our view is that it is. We have not done any research on it but it seems commonsense that these types of drinks tend to be more attractive to younger people, in particular young women. Once upon a time, if you went to a pub you had the choice of only a pint and maybe a glass of fairly rough wine and a sweet drink of some kind. Now the sweet drink has vodka in it. One also has other additives like caffeine which are all about sustaining the drinking so one does not get tired. One of the most popular drinks for young women at the moment is vodka and Red Bull. I did my own market research because I knew I would be attending today. I asked a 19 year-old girl how many she would have and she said eight.

Q479 Chairman: Newspapers talk about drinks called Girl Lychee and Girl Coco produced by a Geneva-based company called Necker which they say are also targeted on young women.  
Mr Otter: I have never heard of it.

Q480 Chairman: You have not researched that one?  
Mr Otter: No.

Q481 Chairman: Referring to the licensing laws, do you believe they have become more liberal and more people are consuming alcohol and therefore there is greater disorder?  
Mr Otter: There are two things working together here. One is a change in the culture of drinking which I do not believe is a result of a change in the licensing laws. But I do not believe that the licensing laws have responded to the change in culture.

Q482 Chairman: What is the change in culture?  
Mr Otter: There is a more liberal approach to drink. In the drugs market there is peer group pressure among young people that you do not enjoy yourself unless you have a joint. That type of thing is now happening with drink. An evening of enjoyment is therefore related to drink. That grows very quickly into a cultural change, that is, if you go out to enjoy yourself you have a drink. There are other elements in terms of the supply side. We talked about price, presentation and the types of stand-up venues clearly designed for high volume drinking, not sitting around to chat. There is some evidence of that. As to legislation, our view is that it does not allow partnerships to control the nature of our town centres. We heard from the supermarkets that we cannot rely on self-regulation because the competitive power is so great. People are well-meaning but at the end of the day they are competitive and so things start to happen that perhaps they might not set out to do. Regulation is important. That takes us back to the reason why we license this in the first place. There is a view that one ought to be able to stop a strip of high-volume drinking establishments in a town centre. There ought to be a way to regulate the way people drink within premises. We cannot do that at the moment. I do not think this is about the new Act; it is a general issue. Perhaps the Licensing Acts have not really had to deal with something like this, certainly not since 1800.

Q483 Mr Winnick: The argument in favour of the new licensing laws is that instead of everyone drinking up by 11 and causing a possible disturbance the situation has changed. Is it not the case that the situation has changed for the worse and people become very intoxicated after 11 as long as the pubs are open with all the sorts of antisocial activity we see in which the police are much involved?
Mr Otter: I agree with that. That is the experience in our towns in particular where there are large numbers of premises open beyond 11 o’clock. It is not the case that one has a diversity of closing times. Competition means that each town takes on its own nature in terms of closing, so it finds a level. For example, in Bideford it will be one time and in Tavistock it will be another. From a competitive point of view they all settle around a certain time, perhaps two o’clock for one and three o’clock for another. One still gets large numbers coming out at the same time. It is not a product of legislation but the way this market works. That has implications for our resources. Once upon a time we corralled resources around a particular time.

Q484 Chairman: We shall come to policing costs a little later.

Mr Otter: There is an issue related to that. In relation to communities people used to be able to put up with a certain amount of noise between 11 and 12. In part it is the noise which really affects communities particularly where drinking establishments are in residential areas.

Q485 Mr Winnick: It can go on all night?

Mr Otter: Yes.

Q486 Gwyn Prosser: You started to mention some limitations of the new Act in terms of revoking licences. When the Bill was promoted one of the points the government kept making was that it would give responsible authorities, the police, powers to remove licences from irresponsible licensees. To what extent have you used those powers? If there are deficiencies what are they?

Mr Otter: I think that one of the real powers of the legislation is that the review process works very well. We have carried out 40 reviews.

Q487 Gwyn Prosser: These are reviews of licences?

Mr Otter: Under the Act we have to undertake a review process before we can set new conditions, get rid of the licensee and so on. That works very well. I think that two designated premises supervisors, as they are called, have now been moved on and new ones put in. They are not the same as licensees; it has changed slightly. With the local authority we can say that they should install CCTV before they reopen or we close down the premises, but to some extent that is after the horse has bolted. I would like us to get ahead of it and have premises we can be certain suit the local environment. One of my concerns is that if you look at the responsible authorities that have a say in relation to a new licence the health authority is not one of them. I also believe that planning does not play a strong enough role. I have done a little thinking on this and talked to colleagues about how often a planning department thinks whether this is what it wants in its town. It is more about getting ahead of the opening of new premises; otherwise, we are always chasing our tails with the reviews we carry out.

Mr Otter: As you know, every year we have three events, one in Newquay, one in Rock and one in Polzeath, which are attended by lots of young people. We read in a newspaper exactly the same thing: parents drop off very young people knowing they will be drinking large amounts and will be vulnerable to other crime, particular sexual activity. We have done a lot of work with local licensees. We have reduced the amount of violent crime in those areas significantly. For example, in Newquay we have used legislation over the past three summers to seize 8,000 items of liquor. One starts to wonder: is this the role that one wants local police officers to be doing? People are not committing an offence, but there is power to seize liquor. It is an important power which I welcome, but we have to think: how do we stop it happening in the first place? I know that it is not about policing but is to do with education and investing in this. There is a significant difference between the amount invested in drugs and alcohol education in our schools. I should like to see a lot more done to educate young people about the real harm. For them it has to be shocking and real.

Q488 Gwyn Prosser: You have told us about some of the deficiencies and the ways you would like to see it improved. What are you doing in your particular patch to tackle the increase in criminality?

Mr Otter: I think there is power to seize liquor. It is an important power, but do you believe there should be greater emphasis on prosecuting young people who either commit offences or are found to be drinking or buying alcohol under age, which is an offence? How do you respond to the criticism that all too often the police will seize the liquor and not do anything further?

Mr Otter: A child does not commit an offence if it is drinking or in possession of liquor. I know that there have been recent discussions about the creation of a criminal offence in that respect and the availability of powers related to parents. I have some concerns about criminalising young people. It is probably a phase they go through and they will come out of it with a criminal record. I do not believe that is the answer. The seizure legislation works but I also believe it is important to work with parents so they understand the danger to their children.

Q489 David Davies: There is a problem with underage drinking at seaside towns and it has been widely reported. Do you believe there should be greater emphasis on prosecuting young people who either commit offences or are found to be drinking or buying alcohol under age, which is an offence? How do you respond to the criticism that all too often the police will seize the liquor and not do anything further?

Mr Otter: We do all of that. For example, in North Wales those found to be drinking under age are taken home by the police and parents are given advice. What about fairly firm policing when children whose alcohol is removed start to back-chat?

Mr Otter: We do all of that. For example, we have a major problem in Torquay. We work with the local authority. Our officers on the street carry video cameras. We take video footage of 13 and 14-year-olds drinking and often being very abusive. We then take them home and show it to their parents. We have learnt that often if you do not take the video footage home parents do not take any notice. There is a sense that our authority is less welcome back in the home, whereas if we show it there is irrefutable evidence and that works quite well. There is a whole
programme where undercover young people are sent in to buy drinks. We work with local authorities to do test-purchasing. In Plymouth we find there is quite a high rate of underage sales. Obviously, we target those premises that we think are doing it and we prosecute. All of these things are right and we shall do our very best to use the legislation. I believe that the legislation is good for policing but that the volume and demands are increasing at such a rate that there must be a more fundamental change. I come back to the premise that we are dealing here with a drink that is meant to be licensed. It does not feel like that to us; it appears to be just as readily available as a glass of Coca-Cola.

Q491 Mrs Dean: Based on the alcohol that has been confiscated have you been able to make any analysis as to what is the worst problem? Is it alcohol that has originated from supermarkets, or perhaps has been purchased by parents, or is it alcohol from convenience stores that may or may not be purchased by young people?

Mr Otter: A lot of stores work with us. We mark products with information about the postcode of the seller and so on that can be seen under ultraviolet light. That has enabled us to identify stores that sell these drinks and go back to find out precisely what has happened. We have CCTV. In the majority of cases it comes from convenience stores in the sense they are off-licences in a street on an estate somewhere; in other cases they are supermarkets. A lot of the evidence we have gathered at the moment indicates a major trend away from young people buying it, because they know they will not get it any more, to adults who buy it for them. For example, if you go to Torquay and speak to convenience stores you find that they have a really difficult job. Believe it or not, people walking down the street—you and me—seem to be willing to walk into these stores and buy drink on behalf of young people, give it to them and then walk on.

Q492 Mrs Cryer: There are some parts of the world where alcoholic drinks can be bought only from liquor stores, hotels and restaurants. To retail drink one must provide drink through a licensed liquor store. I did not ask the previous retailers about it. There did not seem to be much point in it; it would come back to the premise that we are dealing here with a drink that is meant to be licensed. It does not feel like that to us; it appears to be just as readily available as a glass of Coca-Cola.

Q493 Ms Buck: You referred to parents purchasing alcohol for children. Do you have an idea, or has anyone else engaged in trying to find out, why this happens and what is going through the minds of adults? Are there some adults who are perfectly aware of the potential consequences and do not care, or is there a larger group of adults who simply do not think through the risks? Are they buying for 16-year-olds or 13-year-olds? We need to understand more about what that group is doing and why.

Mr Otter: The range is quite diverse. The evidence about the purchase of alcohol from convenience stores is that these are randomly picked individuals who walk past young people. They will keep asking until they get the right response and someone goes in to buy it. We also know from the Polzeath, Rock and Newquay examples that young people below 18 are sent on holiday with liquor given to them by their parents, or at the very least parents turn a blind eye to the fact that their liquor store has been raided. They will take bottles of vodka with them. That is allowed to happen. I do not know the reason. My own view is that drink is generally accepted as part of our world; it is not like drugs where parents may find cocaine and say, “What’s this?” There is a view that this is a phase through which young people pass, that it is a bit of fun and they will grow out of it and move on.

Q494 Tom Brake: What is your view about the financial contribution that the alcohol industry is making towards the policing costs associated with the consumption of its product?

Mr Otter: ACPO takes the strong view that essentially in this case the polluter pays. We do not accept the view of industry that it pays taxes just like any other business. If you are a baker and bake bread it does not result in harm to the community. We would like to see an element of payment for policing and a contribution in the area of health. That would perhaps help to manage the competitive edge to the supply of liquor which concerns us. We have concerns about some of the proposals, for example the alcohol disorder zones, but only in relation to the bureaucracy associated with them. How would you decide which premises paid what, etc, etc? In principle it is worth investing time to think about how to do it.

Q495 Tom Brake: If the alcohol disorder zones initiative went forward would you expect supermarkets to be part of it and to make a financial contribution?

Mr Otter: I would. Its strength would be that everyone within the area would contribute; otherwise, it would just be bureaucratically so complicated. Because of the financial incentive it would encourage people to look at common solutions.
Q496 Tom Brake: Do you have a view about the additional cost of a pint of beer or glass of wine that you think the industry should bear?

Mr Otter: Not at all.

Q497 Tom Brake: To take a particular town in your area, for how many additional community support officers and police officers do you think they should bear the cost so we can get an idea of the expenditure attached to better policing that they are in part creating?

Mr Otter: To a certain extent I liken it to the policing of football. Once upon a time policing costs were not borne by football clubs; now they are. I regard it as being very similar to that. The police, local authority and the football club all look at the nature of the game, the history, intelligence and everything else and then make a charge accordingly; in other words, that it requires a certain level of policing. It must be judged on the basis of need rather than as a penalty.

Q498 Chairman: Do you think that would be a solution?

Mr Otter: It could be a solution. One has to be careful not to create a bureaucratic nightmare that is unworkable.

Chairman: Chief Constable, thank you very much for coming to address our session.
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Q499 Chairman: Can I welcome everybody to the sixth session of the policing inquiry of the Home Affairs Select Committee, and can I refer everyone to the Register of Members’ Interests which has members’ interests declared therein. Can I welcome Charmaine Eggberry, Richard Bobbett and Paul Moonan to the select committee hearing. We are focusing today, ladies and gentlemen, on the issue of new technology and how that can assist the police in the conduct of their work. We have, as I am sure you have, seen the evidence of Sir Ronnie Flannagan. The purport of his evidence is that by using new technology the police can save an enormous amount of time, and each of you three organisations are involved in some way in trying to assist the police in doing that. We have had some pretty remarkable statistics, such as 20% of police time is spent on paper work, with only 15% being spent on visibility, and the police service as a whole spent a billion pounds on technology, mostly on ICT. If I could start with you, Ms Eggberry, how does Research in Motion work with police forces to develop and implement mobile technologies that meet their requirements?

Ms Eggberry: Firstly, let me thank you, Chairman, for welcoming us here. Research in Motion has been in the United Kingdom since 2001, which is actually when we started working with police forces as well. Today we have 14,000 devices that are rolled out across 28 police forces in the United Kingdom. We have another 23 forces that are looking at deployments or looking at trials of our devices. Those 14,000 devices represent roughly three-quarters of the mobile devices that are currently deployed by police forces in the United Kingdom and, in terms of your question, in terms of how we work with them, we work directly with them and with the carrier partner that they chose, which would be Vodaphone, Orange, T-Mobile, etcetera, so that would be the wireless network carrier. We work very closely with each of the police forces, because in our experience what we have seen is that each police force has particular technology requirements based on the environment that they are serving. To put that in perspective, for example, a traffic officer in London would have a very different technology requirement in terms of a police officer in a rural environment. So one of the reasons why we have seen an uptake of BlackBerry technology in these police forces to that degree is because we do work very closely with them to make sure that our solutions are tailored to their environments and, very importantly, to make sure that that solution is secure.

Q500 Chairman: Have you got one of those devices here?

Ms Eggberry: I do, yes. I have actually brought all three, plus, for the purposes of the committee, I have also brought the new device that we are bringing out that we announced last month.

Q501 Chairman: To help us—not that we are dinosaurs—can you hold each one up and explain which are currently being used by the police.

Ms Eggberry: Certainly. Thames announced last week that they rolled out 1,100 devices, and this is the device that they are actually using today. This device is used to access police national computers and all the databases, and I have a list of them here. They can do everything from issuing warrants, looking up pictures of suspects while they are actually out on the street and are able to input the information that they gather directly onto the device.

Q502 Chairman: How many police officers in the country have one of those at the moment?

Ms Eggberry: As I said, there are 14,000 currently deployed, which means that roughly around 100,000 police officers have access to this technology today. Fourteen thousand represents roughly three-quarters of the mobile devices that are currently being used by police forces, and one of the reasons they chose this particular kind of technology is because it took them less than two weeks to roll out. It takes them less than half a day to train their police forces and, very importantly, that then means that these officers are able to get back out on the street and really look at visible policing.

Q503 Chairman: What about your other devices?

Ms Eggberry: These are some of the more consumer orientated devices that we have, the more mobile phone form factor.
Q504 Chairman: How many have that?
Ms Eggberry: No, they do not predominantly use this, the police forces today, not that I am aware of, but I will happily come back to the committee and find out. As far as I understand it, the 28 police forces that we do have these. As I said, this is the new device that is coming out, which has a larger screen, a large form factor, and this runs on 3G networks. Again, the point about these devices is really more about form factor than it is about the technology that runs in the background.

Q505 Chairman: Before I bring in colleagues, the cost, obviously, is a major factor.
Ms Eggberry: Of course.

Q506 Chairman: How much does it cost the police?
Ms Eggberry: There are a couple of things to keep in mind. The first reason they choose them is cost, the second is security. I will start with security and then get into cost. BlackBerry is the only CESG approved device in the United Kingdom. CESG means that we are approved for the use of restricted data, which is obviously very important to the police forces. That same security accreditation, and also a common criteria in others, is the reason why BlackBerry has been adopted by everyone from the MoD to the Pentagon and the FBI has now rolled these out across all of their operatives as well. In terms of cost, Thames Valley, West Yorkshire and Bedfordshire, who I believe you are meeting with straight after this session, have given us their ROI figures, and there are a couple that they have noted. One is that the average cost in terms of actual policing is 80p to one pound per officer per day, and that is a fully inclusive fee which includes training, infrastructure, the device itself, et al. So that is 80p to one pound per officer per day, and, as I said, these figures come directly from the police forces.

Q507 Chairman: If you were to equip the whole of the Police Force, how much would it cost them?
Ms Eggberry: At the moment, £50 million for all the police officers.

Q508 Chairman: Per year or as a one-off?
Ms Eggberry: No, that is the infrastructure cost for the entire year, so that is £50 million in terms of rolling or providing this.

Q509 Chairman: For every police officer in the country?
Ms Eggberry: One hundred and forty-three thousand police officers, yes.

Q510 Chairman: It would cost £50 million?
Ms Eggberry: Fifty million is the number we have, yes.
Chairman: Can I bring in Tom Brake.

Q511 Tom Brake: I want to start with a couple of quick questions. First of all, have you carried out any satisfaction surveys amongst officers to see what they actually think of these devices? As parliamentarians we have all got these, and I think there are very differing views as to how successful they are. Secondly, could you tell us a bit more about the security safeguards that exist in terms of those devices not falling into the wrongs hands, perhaps being lost on the train, and so on?
Ms Eggberry: Certainly. In terms of your first question, which is around satisfaction, we are hearing phenomenal reports back from police forces, including, ease of use. For example, North Wales Police Force rolled these devices out and an hour after they rolled them out the first officer made his first arrest because he was able to look at a picture of the suspect. As I said, he arrested him within one hour of actually rolling them out. The satisfaction studies, and I would welcome that same question being put to the police forces you are going to talk to afterwards, who actually do have these devices, we certainly have had nothing but encouraging reports back from them. To your question about why members of Parliament are not using Blackberries today? When your first technology requirement was put out to tender, we were not part of that tender.

Q512 Tom Brake: I did not ask that question.
Ms Eggberry: No, but I am addressing the issue. I actually do get asked this question very often. We are working quite actively right now with the providers for the members of Parliament to make sure that we provide you with that. In terms of security, there are a number of different levels of security that the BlackBerry offer provides. The first one, a very primary level, is that the device itself does not store data and it also carries a password. So that is the first level. The second level is that you are able to wipe the device from working. So if the device, unfortunately, does get into the wrong hands or is lost, your actual department is able to wipe it completely. So you start off with the password level, you do not store anything on it, you are then able, as I said, to wipe it remotely, which completely locks out that part of the chain. In terms of security accreditation, as I said, we have CESG, Philips 40 common criteria. In fact, we are the only, as I said, mobile device accredited by CESG here in the UK. We have covered not only the chain from the policeman’s hand but all the way through in terms of all the infrastructure that is used.

Q513 Chairman: Are there other companies that offer this service?
Ms Eggberry: Not that are CESG approved, no.

Q514 David Davies: How long does it take to do a stop and search form on one of those?
Ms Eggberry: A stop and search form?

Q515 David Davies: Can you do a stop and search entry on one of those?
Ms Eggberry: My understanding is yes. I think you will have to probably ask the police forces who are coming in if they do have them, yes.
Q516 David Davies: If you do a stop and search entry on one of those, do you then have to put it into the computer back at the police station?

Ms Eggbery: No, but that is the point about why the police forces are actually embracing BlackBerry.

Q517 David Davies: The other question is, can you call up a photograph of anyone on the police national computer who has been arrested previously on it?

Ms Eggbery: Yes.

Q518 David Davies: So you can check identification?

Ms Eggbery: That is exactly why they are using them, yes, and you are able to do that in terms of speed, just to put that in perspective, within about two seconds.

Q519 Mrs Dean: Can you say how easy it is to measure the efficiency savings made by forces using BlackBerries, and what kind of efficiency savings have been made?

Ms Eggbery: The police forces themselves have done their own studies, and the University of Leeds Business School is also currently running one as well. There are a couple of figures to note. The police forces are telling us (and this come from Thames Valley, West Yorkshire and Bedfordshire) that their officers are able to spend an hour per day, per shift, out rather than necessarily being in the particular station filling in forms, et cetera. The point about the BlackBerry technology is you are now entering it onto the device and it is going straight into the system. So there is not a requirement to go back, refill in paper work and leave the community you are in; so it leads to much more visible policing as well.

As an example, West Yorkshire has said its non-cashable return investment amount was £8.8 million, and, again I would be happy to provide all of that to the committee as well in terms of how they worked that out. Those are the average numbers that the police forces are telling us.

Q520 Mrs Dean: The Scottish Police Federation have said that 70% of officers taking part in the trials of PDAs found that they made them less efficient. How would you respond to that?

Ms Eggbery: I find that interesting. I wonder what technology they are using. As I said, we have got 28 police forces today and 23 others that are looking at the trials of our technology. We have asked them, apart from security pieces, what are the things that you are looking for, and, of course, they are looking for ROI and they have seen very robust figures. The numbers I quoted you here are not mine, these are the police forces themselves, and they are using particularly BlackBerry technology. Again, there is this issue of how often are you stopping to enter paper based systems, how often do you have to go back to your patrol car to check information? The point about making them most efficient is that you have this device, it is small, unobtrusive, you are able to deal with the issue at hand right in front of you, you are able to look at those warrants, issue them if necessary, access the police networks, et cetera. For example, one of the police forces has told us that they have seen a five-times increase in the number of times that PCN networks are actually being accessed, which is undoubtedly making those officers much more efficient.

Chairman: Thank you, Mr. Mercer has some question for Mr. Bobbett.

Q521 Patrick Mercer: Mr. Bobbett, Airwave, unusually, has been adopted right the way across the police forces. How did you overcome initial resistance to this?

Mr Bobbett: Thank you very much for the question and thank you very much to the committee for giving us the opportunity of presenting here today. Airwave, as you quite rightly say, is the national system, not just for the police forces but actually for all the blue-light services, fire and ambulance. So, uniquely, the UK is in this wonderful position of having a joined up communication system for all of its emergency services; not just the three primary blue lights, but nearly 300 organisations that actually support the emergency services in those critical events. In terms of initial resistance, I think the obvious benefits of having a system that is national, provides you with national coverage, is secure, is available and resilient actually naturally overcome those initial fears that people have when you change technologies. If you go back to the old days of the analogue systems that the police forces had, they did not have the ability to communicate across their police force boundaries, they did not have the ability to communicate with other services, so they were very restricted in the things they could do with their previous systems; so Airwave is clearly a major step forward for them.

Q522 Patrick Mercer: I think that obscures quite a lot of friction that went on in terms of getting the idea through the various different constabularies, but I will not ask you to elaborate on that. Correct me if I am wrong, I suppose the first significant and important outing that Airwave had was the bombings of 7 July, with the different agencies partially converted and partially unconverted. Could you just elaborate on that, please?

Mr Bobbett: Two issues really. I would say that that week was the first significant outing we had, as we had 51 police forces using Airwave very successfully for the G8 Conference that was also taking place, of course, based in Gleneagles, but with all the other events that had led up to that week. So all 51 of the English, Scottish and Welsh Forces took part, all using the Airwave system, and it actually worked exceptionally well for managing the G8 Conference. Of course, as we know, in the latter part of that week we had the unfortunate incident in London. The Metropolitan Police were not a user of Airwave at that time, because they were in their roll-out programme and had not actually converted to the system. The predominant usage was British Transport Police, and I believe Ian Johnston will be presenting later, so perhaps you could ask him for his direct experience with his team. For the uses we had at the time, I think the system worked very, very
Q523 Patrick Mercer: Can I nail you down on this one. If we are attacked today, if the underground is attacked today, what airwave coverage will we have between surface and tunnel?

Mr Bobbett: The Airwave system is completely joined up between the surface and the tunnel, and as we sit here today and I refer to the underground stations, obviously the stations that are above ground on the London Underground system have coverage already, but those that are under ground, about 75% actually now have the system deployed into the stations and tunnels. I would be happy to provide the committee with more detail as to exactly where that is, and we expect by the end of this year that programme to be complete, when it actually will be, if not on contract, actually ahead of contract.

Q524 Patrick Mercer: So if we are attacked today, three-quarters of the tunnels will be able to speak to the surface and by the end of the year you are hoping for 100%?

Mr Bobbett: Yes, more than hoping.

Q525 Patrick Mercer: You are confident?

Mr Bobbett: Yes, we are confident.

Q526 Tom Brake: I have been told that Airwave did not work when the police march happened a number of months ago, when they were protesting about their pay, because of the volume of users in a very small location. Is that correct, and would you have expected it to have worked?

Mr Bobbett: I cannot comment on that particular event, as I do not have the details for that particular event with me. What I can comment on is the most recent significant event, which was the Olympic torch run, which obviously was a very complex policing situation right through London, and, of course, on the same day, or that weekend, we had two FA Cup semi-finals at Wembley, we had various other events taking place right across London, so it was one of the busier weekends in London, and the system worked very well for those officers carrying out those duties at that time. We continually review our work with the Metropolitan Police to make sure they have the capacity and the coverage that they need, and it will be fair to say that the experience of working together with them is that we are learning. They have recently come on to the system and we have been employing the coverage and capacity as we need, and certainly we have already seen, if you compare events to previous events, that we are carrying something three or four times the amount of communications that were previously carried. So, we are actually achieving. I think, an awful lot in London, and I am pretty confident that we can cope with the events, whether they be expected or unexpected events.

Q527 Tom Brake: It may be helpful for the committee if you were able to write to us to confirm whether, in fact, Airwave did function during the police march and also possibly clarify now, if you can, if there is a physical restriction as to how many users you can get within a square mile, for instance?

Mr Bobbett: We would expect a physical restriction. I think every technology has some limits, but we are talking about many thousands of officers. If I take G8 as a real-life example, I think we had 3,000 officers in and around the Gleneagles event itself, and the system worked very well. I think that gives you a prime example of something in real life rather than some theoretical examples. I will be happy to confirm to you details of the absolute event that you have raised.

Q528 Tom Brake: Just to return briefly to the issue of coverage, we have talked about coverage in tunnels. Is it like coverage for a mobile phone? In other words, are there parts of the country where over-ground officers cannot, in fact, reach a signal? Are you required to provide 100% coverage across the whole of the country, and is that available?

Mr Bobbett: I think, unlike the networks that the previous evidence referred to, the Airwave system has over 99% geographical coverage. So, whether you are in the Highlands of Scotland or the mountains of Wales, or Devon and Cornwall, you have coverage. The actual statistic is something like 99.4%, 99.5% absolute coverage on the ground; so I think we should not have a fear on that basis. The one development that we are currently actively working on with our customers as well is how much we want to extend that into buildings. Clearly, the London underground system is a significant set of structures, and we are not only working on the tunnels but also the stations and all the infrastructure that goes around it, and we are working with a number of our customers now as to extending it into critical buildings. We already have a number of major stadia that we are covering and, clearly, there is a key requirement to make sure the Olympic venues are covered as well, and that work has already started.

Q529 Tom Brake: You have to fit buildings for it to work within buildings. Is that what you are saying?

Mr Bobbett: Depending on the type of structure of the building, as with any network that you have, yes, sometimes you do have to put infrastructure inside those buildings, and where those buildings are identified it is easy to do. It is not complex. The technology is available at relatively low cost.

Q530 Chairman: Are you working with the tier one contractors on the Olympics at this time to put in your infrastructure?
Mr Bobbett: We are working with both the ODA and LOCOG currently, and the Metropolitan Police and the Home Office lead for the Olympics as well; so we are working with all parties to make sure that we get the right solution.

Q531 Mr Winnick: The Police Federation, Mr Bobbett, was ever critical, was it not, of the Airwave system in situation like the Olympics? The Vice Chair of the Federation last year said, “Airwave would struggle to cope with a well-attended egg and spoon race, let alone the 2012 Olympics”—pretty blunt criticism. You knew about the remarks at the time. What is your reaction?

Mr Bobbett: Yes, I did know about the remarks at the time; I was actually there on stage with him. As I said to him at the time, as I have been through the major events that we have already covered, whether it be the Olympic torch run in London a few weeks ago or whether it be the Gleneagles Conference with 51 police forces and many thousands of officers in attendance, the system works very well. I think the criticism was a little unfounded.

Q532 Mr Winnick: Not according to the information I have: 92% of the delegates said that the Airwave system is inadequate. Presumably those who use it have a pretty good knowledge of the system.

Mr Bobbett: Yes, and I think the issue that you are seeing there is a very interesting one for Airwave as an organisation. We actually provide the network and the infrastructure, and individually, I think, very relevant for your committee is that lots of other components, such as the devices, are purchased separately, such as specifying where you want building coverage. It is purchased separately. Actually, if you analyse the detail (and, as I said, I was at the event) and you ask for the individual issues that those officers from the Federation wanted to raise, the vast majority were actually about components that were purchased outside the Airwave contract. So you have the Airwave network and then an individual force might have bought a set of devices and then lots of their criticisms were about those devices, or they were building coverage specifications which were purchased separately. I think the lesson for us all is making sure it is joined up, to make sure we direct the spend not just through devices but through the whole end to end solution so that we deliver right out to the end user the real benefits.

Q533 Mr Winnick: Mr Bobbett, I am sure your organisation is doing what it can—I do not dispute that for one moment—but you can hardly say that what occurred at the annual conference of the Police Federation was a vote of confidence in the equipment, can you?

Mr Bobbett: As I have said already, when you look at the detail, a lot of the detail was about the specific devices.

Q534 Mr Winnick: That is one explanation, but overall when 92% of the delegates were critical, and the remarks made by Alan Gordon, I would have thought, unless we are in 1984, that must be taken as a vote of a lack of confidence in the system.

Mr Bobbett: As I have said, the actual criticism—

Q535 Chairman: I think the answer is probably, yes, is it not?

Mr Bobbett: No, I think what we have got here is a very interesting point, which is about joining up the solution. Clearly there is frustration amongst a significant community within the end users. We survey every one of our customers.

Chairman: Mr Bobbett, we understand; we get the point.

Mr Winnick: Yes or no is always a useful way to answer questions!

Q536 Margaret Moran: Following on from that, I do not want a repeat of that answer, because you have given it to us twice now, but a question to everybody. The issue here is about expanding the technology, to have technological solutions for not just the twenty-first century but the twenty-second. There appear to be issues around interoperability, or lack of it. Are there other issues like lack of band width, and so on, and how are those overcome? It is a general question. What is the solution that is going to make it a technology fit for purpose in the twenty-second century?

Ms Eggerry: I am not the chief technologist for my organisation, but I will happily have them come in and talk you through. We work with a number of relief organisations and emergency response organisations and the police forces that I have gone through, where devices were used. For example, for hurricane Katrina, they were used during 9/11 et al, and, as I said, I have gone through the Pentagon, NATO, et cetera. How are these devices fit for purpose for now as well is into the future to the point that we are not just using the mobile networks? We also have our own network, which we do run, and we are able, through the BlackBerry devices, to offer a variety of different communication mechanisms, one of which includes what we call peer-to-peer, which is that you are able to communicate not via a mobile network but you are able to communicate device to device and you are able to do that in a secure manner. So that is a start. You are also able to do things like instant messaging, text messaging, phone calls, email, access to databases, et cetera. The point about that is to try and not only embrace the communications mechanisms that we use today and to do so in a secure manner, but to make sure that we are addressing what the requirements are going into the future. From a company perspective, I have two and a half thousand engineers whose only job it is to develop wireless applications, and the largest group of customers that we have within that are government organisations who we are working with very, very closely to make sure that we address their requirements, as I said, now and into the future.

Chairman: Thank you. David Davies.
David Davies: Mr Moonan, tagging is a good idea in theory. The criticisms I hear, the three main ones, are these. First of all, offenders can just take them off and leave them behind, and it does look fairly easy to get on and off your wrist; the second criticism is that they do not work in certain areas, particularly in built up areas, areas where there are high tower blocks and things; and the third criticism is that when breaches are noticed, very often they are not followed up. I just wonder if you could perhaps tell us how many breaches have been recorded and how many were followed up? Let me put something else to you, and I hope you will take this with all due respect, but it has been suggested that, because of the way the Government impose targets, it is not particularly in Group 4's interests to record breaches, particularly minor breaches, when they occur. Sorry to be so direct. Would anyone else like to have a look at this?

Q537 Chairman: Yes, please.  
Mr Moonan: Taking those questions in turn, but first, to thank you for allowing me to attend and to mention that G4S provides a lot of services in conjunction with the police: electronic monitoring, which we provide for three of the five contract areas which we will talk about; we also provide five outsourcing contracts for custody suites and we also provide retired police officers back to the police forces, and we believe there is a lot of potential to improve the ability to support the police via electronic monitoring and also to reduce costs and improve services by outsourcing more. On the ability to take it off, firstly they do not go on the wrists, they go on the ankle, and the strap size is measured to a precise level so that you put the exact strap on the ankle so that it cannot be pulled off without us being able to detect it. If somebody willingly wants to break their court or prison curfew order, they can cut the tag off, but we would receive an alert in our control centre to that event. The second criticism is that tagging is not a service that is currently being provided. It is a service we provide in the States. We have got 2,000 people who are being tracked there, and there are some weaknesses with that technology, but on the whole it still provides a significant amount of information for the people who would want that information.

Q538 David Davies: Are you saying that they cannot be pulled off in any circumstances?  
Mr Moonan: They cannot be pulled off, no. They can be cut off, but we would know.

Q539 David Davies: How many breaches have there been in numbers?  
Mr Moonan: I have not got that number.

Q540 David Davies: I have heard it is very high.  
Mr Moonan: Ninety-five per cent of people successfully complete their curfew.

Q541 David Davies: We are talking about thousand of breaches.  
Mr Moonan: It depends how you classify it. A breach to us is somebody who arrives—

Q542 Chairman: This is a very important question from David Davies. How many breaches have there been? You must have some figures.  
Mr Moonan: I have not got those figures to hand. We have tagged—

Q543 Chairman: You do not have the figures as to how many people.  
Mr Moonan: I can get those figures, but I was not expecting to be asked. We have tagged hundreds of thousands of people over the years.

Q544 Chairman: Will you write to the committee with the figures?  
Mr Moonan: Yes.

Q545 David Davies: There is a suggestion that thousands have been breached and that those breaches are not properly followed up in all instances.  
Mr Moonan: I can tell you that we are under a very strict regime of management from the Home Office with strict KPIs, and we have to adhere to that.
Q546 David Davies: Do you follow every single breach?

Mr Moonan: We follow every single breach from the areas where we are responsible. Sometimes an element of following up that breach is passed on to other people within the Criminal Justice Agency, and that is not something that I could comment on, that entire process.

Q547 Mrs Cryer: Mr Moonan, can I ask you about your capacity to administer custody suites. Your organisation has apparently said that you would be able to provide better control of difficult detainees and potentially violent situations. However, Sergeant Rooney, a very experienced custody sergeant at Acton Police Station, told us that he felt that it is, in fact, harder for non-sworn officers to control difficult detainees. I wonder if you could give us a clue as to why you feel that you could do the job better than the sort of experienced and trained officers that are doing it at the moment? Are you already doing this sort of work?

Mr Moonan: Yes, we provide five contracts in England and Wales to provide custody suites; so I can talk with a lot of experience and facts on those matters. What has typically happened when we have provided the custody service is that service has been far cheaper, 30% or more cheaper, and the standard of service has been improved.

Q548 Mrs Cryer: Is it cheaper because you are paying your employees much less than the police authority will be paying their officers?

Mr Moonan: Yes. When we train a police officer, we train them in a wide variety of skills, and that requires a lot of investment and requires a significant salary package to have that person trained to that level. When G4S provides a custody suite service, we train people in the specific roles for that particular area of police work, and what the police have found is that we provide a better service because our training is consolidated into the key things that are required for that environment and our people are very used to working in that environment. Typically a policeman is asked to do many different jobs, and working in the custody environment could be an eight-week period for them and they maybe do not enjoy that work as much, but we train specifically just for that role and that is why we have been able to provide a better service, and our police partners tell us that we provide a better service in those areas where we have taken on that service.

That is why there could be lots of efficiencies from outsourcing. The workforce modernisation programme, which you will all be familiar with, talks about segmenting the police work into different areas. Therefore, you are able to pay people for the bit of the work that they do and get better value for money and release more police to frontline duties.

Q551 Mrs Cryer: Your people are in complete control of a custody suite. You do everything. You provide the food, make sure the toilet is all right and everything. Is that right?

Mr Moonan: We do all of that, but we are not in complete control. There are still police custody sergeants working alongside us. At the moment we are starting to pilot taking on some of the custody sergeant work. At the moment we provide the custody officer work, and there is still a police sergeant working alongside us.

Q552 Mrs Cryer: Thank you. How can technology, including facial imaging, be used more effectively in custody suites to improve efficiency and safety for detainees?

Mr Moonan: We work with, as I said, five different police forces, and they have all adapted the technology to different levels. What we have found is, where technology has been utilised by that force, we have been trained to utilise the technology, and it has made things more efficient. Some of our best custody suites, or where there has been more investment, process information better. For example, fingerprints. I was at one of our stations the other day in Staffordshire and we had had one error in 11,000 fingerprints in the previous period, and that error was due to someone who had a disability that made it hard for them to keep their finger still. So the sort of performance that we are able to give now in conjunction with technology and in conjunction with the training is very, very high.

Q553 David Davies: Do you accept there has always got to be a warranted officer there in the case of a dangerous prisoner, where incapacity spray may need to be used when cuffs are removed in a custody suite?

Mr Moonan: I do not believe that is necessary, because we also provide outsourced prisons where there are no police officers or no Prison Service people, where we have built, designed, maintained and managed the prison, including recruiting the Governor and all the people that work inside.

Q554 David Davies: You reckon you can do it without any incapacity spray on all occasions?

Mr Moonan: We do not use sprays in the prison environment, so I would not see why we would need to do that.

Q555 Martin Salter: I want to explore with the three of you the lack of common solutions. Ronnie Flannagan, in his review of policing, noted that
common solutions are rarely introduced service-
wide as the favourable conditions required rarely
arise at the same time in 43 places. This results in
systems which do not link across forces and a large
amount of duplication. Apparently up to 70% of
all information is entered into police systems more
than once; so a significant amount of double
handling. From your experience of working with
police forces, what is your view of providing a
common system to all 43 forces as opposed to
tailored systems appropriate to individual forces?

Mr Moonan: Electronic monitoring is an example
where we are providing the same technological
solution and service to all of the forces, and so we
know it can work, but our experience is also in
trying to win work from the police. It is more
difficult. We are dealing with 43 customers who
have got different specifications. It is harder for us
to give economies of scale and to give a solution
that will provide the optimum value for money for
the police because we have to work with each one
in turn and develop a solution just for their needs.

Q556 Martin Salter: Is this because of their
individual procurement process and would, in fact,
it be easier for you as major suppliers if there was
a common procurement policy?

Mr Moonan: We are finding that some police forces
are starting to join together in local areas and also
there are some framework agreements. When those
people join together or when there is a framework
agreement, there is more opportunity to provide a
more efficient service, I would suggest.

Q557 Martin Salter: Any views on that from Mr
Bobbett or Ms Eggberry?

Ms Eggberry: Definitely.

Mr Bobbett: Yes; absolutely. I think the obvious
benefit of Airwave providing a common
communications platform enables things like
mutual aid to happen on demand without there
having to be that: “How do I communicate if I
bring an officer in from a neighbouring force to
help me? How do I communicate across
boundaries?” So there are obvious benefits, and Sir
Ronnie Flannagan, I think, alluded to those in his
report. In our view, making sure that you have a
common platform does not deny localisation,
because there are local issues that are needed to be
dealt with, but I think starting with a standard and
a standard platform enables you then to build the
localisation that makes the most efficient use for
those individual officers but gives you the comfort
of common information and common sharing. I
think we have already done it with the Airwave
system and, hopefully, we can have many more
examples of that right across policing.

Ms Eggberry: Certainly. I would agree. I think
there is a great benefit to having a common
platform but allowing for those individual
requirements per force. As I mentioned earlier, a
traffic officer has a very different requirement in
terms of the information he needs to look at and
input than, say, a bobby on the beat in a rural
environment. I think the most important thing to
do with this is to make sure, as I said, the
information, as you point out, is secure and input
once and everyone has a common view of that, and
some of those ROI statistics that I mentioned
earlier, the bedrock of that is that you are able to
cut down the amount of paper work because you
are inputting it once. As an example, the Gateshead
Social Services uses that for domestic violence.
They used to have laptops to input that
information into and then that information needed
to be uploaded into the police computers when they
get back, et al—so a living example of trying to
make it easier but not. They now have
BlackBerries. They are unobtrusive, they can enter
the details as they are sitting in front of the victim
and, very importantly, that information goes
straight into the police computer; so there is not
this issue of having to fill in paper work, upload
data et al, it just goes straight in. So, everyone is
looking at the same data all at the same time,
thereby, again, aiding efficiency. I think there is a
great benefit to having a common platform, but we
do have to allow for individual clients perforce and
we do have to make sure we are cutting down on
that all important paper work trail throughout.

Q558 Martin Salter: This is quite revolutionary, of
course, for some of our 43 individual fiefdoms who
will stagger towards that point. Do not all feel
obliged to respond to this, but the National Police
Improvements Agency and the Home Office are
trying to roll out these common platforms. What
practical steps could either of those two agencies,
the Home Office or the NPIA, take to facilitate a
more co-ordinated and common process?

Ms Eggberry: I think it is more about access to
funding and how quickly you allow access to that
funding. Thames Valley announced they were
ordering 1,001 BlackBerries last week, and they
managed to do that within a two-week period all
the way through from the training et al, and the
reason that they cite is that they are able to get the
cash quickly et al. So I think that the NPIA and
others can certainly help us. I think that is the issue,
making sure that the individual forces have access
to those funds as quickly as they can.

Q559 Martin Salter: Thames Valley is my local
force, but it is also a largish force and that affects
the economies of scale.

Ms Eggberry: One of the things we have worked
with is with governments, and whether you are
buying one BlackBerry or 143,000 BlackBerries,
you are able to get that at the best possible price.
So this is not a question purely of scale per se only,
it is a question of how quickly can you roll it out,
how quickly can you deploy them and, obviously,
the cost element as well. We have worked very hard
with government.
Q560 Margaret Moran: There seems to be some confusion as to how we quantify the value for money arguments of the levels of investment that are needed. Could you perhaps each tell us how you would describe your model for quantifying, because everybody seems to be taking it on a different basis, and how could government assess whether each application is providing the value for technology that is needed?

Ms Eggberry: The numbers I have been citing come from Thames Valley, West Yorkshire and Bedfordshire. I believe you are meeting with Bedfordshire afterwards. These are their ROI models. They are built predominantly on cutting down on time spent in the office and how much time then an officer can go out and spend more time with visible policing, which I think is a key criteria. As I said, we mention there that they are telling us they can have policing back on; they can spend an hour a day post shift extra. So those are their models that they are using. The University of Leeds is also looking at developing a model, which I believe will be finalised by the end of the year, which will standardise ROI analysis across police forces, and that is something they are doing independently. We have done our own research, not only on policing, but in general in terms of BlackBerry usage. The average user, irrespective of environment, is able to get back an hour a day, cutting down on additional paper work and what we call “down time”. Down time is anything from having to go back to your squad car, having to go back to your office. Anything that takes you away from the job in hand is what we call down time. As I said, those are our normal statistics. They were independently audited by a company called Ipsos Reid, and I would be happy to provide this committee with the entire maths of how we worked that out.

Mr Bobbett: Can I just add to that, because I think the actual business benefits are much more far ranging than just the officer face-time. Clearly, we have seen very similar statistics when we have delivered mobile data devices as well as the Airwaves system. We see typically an hour a day by delivering those sorts of devices and giving applications at the kerbside, but you have also got to measure the effectiveness of the officer. It is about being able to identify and make arrests at that point. It is about their effectiveness, not just the time saved. It is about the officers in Hampshire that, when they now follow somebody on a train to London, do not have to deploy 23 officers, as a deputy chief constable told me was his prior practice because he could not monitor which station that person might get off at. He can now send two officers to follow that person on the train and rely on communications all the way through to central London. It is about those benefits as well. It is actually about quantifying a far-ranging set of benefits that actually talk about effectiveness as well as time saving and then the real opportunity here is to improve the perception of the general public that the police service is delivering what they want when they want it by actually creating that total effectiveness.

Q561 Margaret Moran: Given that we are looking into the future of policing, what would be the new applications that would give real value for policing that are currently not obtaining the best use from technology?

Mr Bobbett: I would start by actually quoting a joined up platform, a single platform that gives you the ability to move forward, because, as we have seen here today with the selection of devices, devices will move on, the technology will move very, very quickly. We sit here today and we can talk about a device or a technology. In three years’ time I am sure that research will have taken us to another device and another technology. It is actually about having that joined up system, that common platform, and the right supply chain that enables that flexibility, that does not just say, “You know what, I have delivered you. That is the tick in the box and that is what you are going to get.”

What I need is something that is going to keep up with time. I might not even know in five years’ time what that will look like, but I am prepared to create the flexibility that actually enables us to refresh and keep up-to-date.

Q562 Chairman: One final question from me to all of you. Is there a police force in the world—because you are all multinational companies—that either uses BlackBerry completely in its entire force or Airwave or Group 4 for the work that has been done that we can look at, where we can see the benefits of new technology? Perhaps I could start with you, Ms Eggberry.

Ms Eggberry: The FBI have rolled out 19,500 devices to all of their operatives as an example, and I think that would be a perfect example to look at as regards policing. I have other examples too and I will provide all of those to you, plus contact details, if you would like them.

Mr Bobbett: I am pleased to say that we can be much more local than that and provide you with access to solutions, say, with Lancashire Police Force. They were an early adopter of Airwave for the original technology, and they now have a fully deployed data solution as well, mobile data as well as the Airwave solution, and we would be happy to facilitate access to that for you.

Mr Moonan: A couple of things. Firstly, there is more data available with the existing tagging service that we could provide to the police that would add significant value, but also, I think, they should consider GPS tracking again. We have got examples in the US where we are working with the US Government departments and states to provide a tracking solution, and that might be something that is useful. The other thing is on outsourcing. A lot greater use could be made of outsourcing. We have saved a significant amount of money providing a better service, but we have only scratched the surface of the sorts of things we could move into and we would then invest in technology if we are given enough scope in the outsource service that is required.
Q563 Chairman: Thank you very much. On behalf of the committee can I thank all of you for coming to give evidence. We have asked for further information from some of you. It would be very helpful if you could make sure that that information is provided as soon as possible. If we could say two weeks, that would be very helpful.  
Ms Eggbery: Absolutely.


Q564 Chairman: Chief Constable Johnston and Inspector Hitch, thank you very much for coming today to give evidence to the select committee inquiry into policing. I would like to start with you, Chief Constable Johnston, your instant reaction to the very impressive sales pitches we have had from these three companies. Any instant reactions?  
Chief Constable Johnston: I think the position around Airwave and around mobile data is that there are still lessons to learn, there are still things to be done, but both of them are a fantastic facility for the Police Service. I am supporting their pitch around all the good things that are happening, but I am saying that there are things that we can do to make better use of both of those facilities and to address some of the concerns that the Federation raised so powerfully when they did.

Q565 Chairman: Presumably you believe that the new technologies will help the police as far as their work is concerned.  
Chief Constable Johnston: Absolutely. I think the Airwave radio system has been a revolution for us. We have got coverage that we never had before, we have got facilities, in terms of talk groups, that we have never really had before, so there is flexibility in the system, and in terms of the mobile data, the ability to search criminal records from the position on the street, to get information from voters’ registers, from an encounter on the street, is very powerful operationally for the officers out there and also actually saves us time back in the control room, because the officer doing the search direct is not ringing on the radio back to base for somebody to do the search there and then come back. So there are a lot of efficiencies there and a lot of really good news for us.

Q566 Chairman: What about the figures that we have been given that it will cut down on paper work?  
Chief Constable Johnston: I think paper work is always going to be a burden for the Police Service. As Ron Flanagan acknowledges, I think he spoke about good cholesterol and bad cholesterol, and there is good bureaucracy and bad bureaucracy. Bureaucracy is essentially around accountability, and I think we all want a police service that is accountable, so we are always going to have bureaucracy. What we want to cut out is things like duplication.

Q567 Chairman: Does it cut down?  
Chief Constable Johnston: The mobile data stuff certainly does. An officer, under the old system, would write down a stop search in his book, would go back to the police station, type it into the computer—a very slow process—and would have to do the same with the intelligence report. Mobile data does this for him automatically. He taps it out on his mobile data terminal, John Smith gets typed in once, so every time he deals with a name John Smith, it will come up automatically on the key pad, the date of birth will come up automatically, so there are savings there in terms of paper work and also savings in terms of transferring the records from his on the street record back to the records of the organisation. That is done automatically, and so there are definite savings there.

Q568 Chairman: Before I bring in Mr Prosser to continue along this line of questioning, can I ask you about the Mayor of London’s ban on alcohol on the transport system because the inquiry is quite a wide inquiry into policing. Do you welcome this ban?  
Chief Constable Johnston: I think drinking on any form of transport, drunk anywhere holding bottles of alcohol and rolling about on other passengers, is a pretty unseemly, unattractive part of life, and I think doing things about that is a really good idea. Clearly, it is the drunks who are the problem, rather than people carrying the alcohol, so we are still going to have a problem with the drunks, but I think London Underground and the Mayor giving a very clear signal about what is acceptable behaviour and what is unacceptable behaviour is a really good move. If the public picks up on the spirit of this in the way that they have done with the smelly food lessons that London Underground portrayed, generally getting people to behave better, I think is a really good thing and I am happy to play my part in that.

Q569 Chairman: Presumably you were consulted about it?  
Chief Constable Johnston: Yes, we were.

Q570 Chairman: Did you expect those little parties at the end of the official drinking period?  
Chief Constable Johnston: I think it is a shame. I think it makes the point very clearly that this is exactly why we do not want drinking on London Underground. That was pretty unacceptable behaviour and I think it makes the point very much about the value of the ban.

Q571 Mr Winnick: That party, as the Chairman put it, I know he did not quite mean it in that way, was as good an illustration that one could find of outright, drunken hooliganism.
**Chief Constable Johnston:** Absolutely.

**Q572 Mr Winnick:** There was absolutely no justification for that sort of conduct.

**Chief Constable Johnston:** No; absolutely not.

**Q573 Mr Winnick:** I want to put this question to you. It is argued by some that the ban on drinking is unenforceable; it is not going to be observed by a good number of people. Do you accept that sort of pessimistic line: that the large majority of people are not going to be law abiding?

**Chief Constable Johnston:** No, I do not. I think the large majority of people who use the tube are law-abiding. I think there are some that get on it that we would rather they did not and we would prefer them to behave in a different manner, but I make the point, again, this is about giving a signal about what is acceptable behaviour and what is unacceptable behaviour, and I think it is a very powerful signal.

**Q574 Mr Winnick:** Those who are not law-abiding (and I hope they will be very, very few indeed and that sort of drunken exhibitionism will not be repeated), are you confident that your force can deal with such people?

**Chief Constable Johnston:** Yes, we can. In the first instance what we are looking to do is to advise people rather than have to enforce the law, but there are the rules of carriage which enable us to eject people from the underground system should they not comply with the rules around drinking and carrying drink.

**Q575 Tom Brake:** Could I clarify whether you are saying that this should be self-policing or have you, in fact, put in a request for extra officers?

**Chief Constable Johnston:** We are in negotiations with the Mayor’s office about extra officers for the underground, and he has made an offer that we have yet to see.

**Q576 Chairman:** Who is he?

**Chief Constable Johnston:** The Mayor in his manifesto pledged to release funding for 50 additional British Transport Police officers to patrol the worst suburban stations, and we are in dialogue about that. As yet they are to materialise, we shall clearly be pursuing it with a considerable amount of enthusiasm.

**Q577 Chairman:** Have you put in a request for more officers?

**Chief Constable Johnston:** We have accepted his offer of a gift of more officers. If that does not materialise, we shall clearly be pursuing it with a firm request.

**Chairman:** Excellent. Back to new technology.

**Q578 Gwyn Prosser:** Chief Constable, we have been told about the funding system for British Transport Police. It is rather complex, but more than one source. Indeed, your connection into the new technologies, into the police database, for instance, there is some confusion perhaps. Can you tell us a bit more about the barriers to purchasing and implementing this huge array of new technologies which are out there?

**Chief Constable Johnston:** The British Transport Police is funded by the rail industry. We are occasionally included in wider policing initiatives, like, for example, mobile data, where we have benefited from some additional funding. In relation to the Police National Database, which is, in effect, going to be the major intelligence source for the Police Service going forward, the major data collection regime, we do not have access to full funding and support, which seems to me to be an extraordinary anomaly. I think that is a big issue for us. We suffer a bit from a serendipity arrangement in terms of funding, but we are never quite clear whether we are in or whether we are out. Quite clearly, I think, in terms of the national intelligence database for the United Kingdom, we should be very much a full part of that family. We have something to contribute and something to take from it and I think we should be fully included within it in funding terms. We are not being excluded, we are just being required to pay for it through the railway companies.

**Q579 Gwyn Prosser:** Has the Home Office given any rationale for that, what looks like an omission?

**Chief Constable Johnston:** The rationale they give is that the Police Service for the railways is funded under “the user pays” principle and, therefore, the railway companies should pay. I can see value in placing at the railway company’s door some specific benefits of policing, but it seems to me that the BTP’s contribution to the national intelligence database is for the benefit of UK, not just for the railway companies, and I think on those sorts of grounds there is a very clear rationale for the scope of the programme to be widened to include BTP and for it to be fully funded by government.

**Q580 Gwyn Prosser:** Especially in these days of the terrorist threat.

**Chief Constable Johnston:** Indeed, yes. I think it is anomalous.

**Q581 Bob Russell:** Inspector Hitch, can you quantify the benefits in Bedfordshire of using mobile technologies?

**Inspector Hitch:** Yes, we worked very closely with the NPIA towards the end of last year to do an informed business benefits analysis, and I think we are the only force that have taken it to the level we took it to. It is always difficult, business benefits, because we talk about driving out the benefits but it really depends on how much it costs to deliver them in the first place. I was interested in the figures from Charmaine who was talking earlier. Her figures were about the same as ours. We have £270 per officer per year for the BlackBerry system, but I know that some forces are spending five or more times that. Clearly, if I get the benefit of £270 per officer and they get the same benefits by spending five times the
money, then clearly the business case does not stack up for them as much as it does for us. The results of the analysis were quite interesting. To come back to your original point, I have got a number of graphs which I would love to be able to show you because they are absolutely fascinating.

Q582 Chairman: Would you send us the graphs. Just summarise it.

**Inspector Hitch:** I can do, yes. This was an NPIA report, so it is nothing to do with me, so I have not doctored the figures in any way, although I have brought in mobile data, so I have a bit of a vested interest if I want to progress my police career. The bottom line is we were facing a big problem in Bedfordshire with officers spending time on station, and the trend was upwards, and it had been for a number of years, and it peaked at 46% officer time spent on the station, which is enormous, is it not? I was horrified by those figures, I have to say. After we introduced these devices, that fell very quickly to 36%, and it has held at 36%. These are from the activity-based costing figures that we have to do for the Home Office, so the officers are surveyed. We used to do it as time and motion studies, but every force has to conduct these. So I cannot actually say, yes, for sure, it is the devices, but it seems a remarkable coincidence, and there was nothing else in the organisation that we were doing at that time that would make me think it could be anything else. That is the “in station” time. The other one is “visible patrol” time, which went up from 14%. Currently it is 19%. So it is not a huge increase, but actually if we looked to how many officers we would need extra to do that, it would be an awful lot of officers and an awful lot of money. The final one is the time the officers spend dealing with incidents. Again, the trend had been downwards, and 18% of officer time was spent dealing with incidents. That is now going up and it is rising steadily. It is currently at 26%. So there is quite a lot of data now that we are getting together. I go back to what Mr Bobbett was saying, because he put it quite well. It is really difficult to prove some of these things. Instinctively you know they are right, but to quantify them and to actually put figures on them is quite difficult. For example, the Airwave network is encrypted. Before we had the Airwaves network criminals could listen into our radio system at will, and there were cases where they actually despatched officers to the other side of town while they would go about their business. That does not happen now with Airwave, with an encrypted network. How do we quantify that? It is really difficult to do.

Q583 Bob Russell: Inspector Hitch, Bedfordshire Police is one of the small police forces.

**Inspector Hitch:** Yes.

Q584 Bob Russell: Are you the pace-setters in this and how do you explain the fact that another police force, unnamed, are costing five times greater than Bedfordshire?

Q585 Bob Russell: Thank you for the Bedfordshire success story. Perhaps the committee ought to look at the other force, unnamed, for comparison. Chief Constable, it is good to see that British Transport Police are on-line, although we are aware that technology can have the potential to hinder as well as to help officers, and I guess this is the reason why I have been given this question, as the most technology challenged member of the committee! Can you elaborate on the down sides of technology and how this can be mitigated, and if I can just put a special pleading in here that the digits on the human hand are not altering yet the keypads seem to be getting smaller all the time.

**Chief Constable Johnston:** I think this is essentially a “management has changed” issue which is not limited to the world of technology, but to make it specific around the mobile data for example, there were issues for us around battery life, and if the batteries went down you had to reboot the system, and we had to solve the battery problem for people. Officers did have some concerns about writing, with some technology in their hands, whilst they were dealing with a suspect, whereas they were much more comfortable with a notebook, and I think that is an issue about getting comfortable with your terminal which I think experience shows that you will do. I think there are problems for officers around the amount of kit we want them to carry around today—they are walking around a bit like a Christmas tree—and we have given them actually vests with pockets in them which balance the weight over their bodies to deal with those things. There is something about how do you encourage people to pick up on this technology, and we have introduced what we call “super users”, who are people who have a solid reputation and who demonstrate to their colleagues that these things work really well, and they trust their colleagues and they trust hearing from them and they pick up on these things. So I think there are some things around customising officers to the kit, about when they can do this stop-check, when they get this information out of the system immediately which leads to an arrest, it is those sort of successes which get officers to overcome their technophobia.

Q586 Margaret Moran: All of the learning we have from IT projects, be they very large centralised ones or otherwise, is that the greatest benefit comes from, if you like, systems reconfiguration—it is not just the
technology, it is the way you deploy your people. What has happened in that respect in either of the examples that you are giving?

Chief Constable Johnston: I think the systems reconfiguration bit, for me, is around the fact that you can actually directly access these systems and you transfer data automatically from one to another, so you are not doing it five times—you are doing it once. An officer going to an incident can be sent there on mobile data, so no writing down of details, and, when he gets there—

Q587 Margaret Moran: Can I just clarify? I am talking about the way in which you deploy your resources, be they manpower or other, as much as the technology itself.

Chief Constable Johnston: The big difference is we have an extra hour out on the streets (or 51 minutes is what our research showed), which is at our disposal. The systems reconfiguration bit, for me, around that is making sure that we capture that and making sure that officers do stay out and we do get the use of that 51 minutes in terms of extra visibility, rather than simply continuing with old habits and coming back to the station and taking rather more time to do things. So that is the sort of systems reconfiguration; it is about joining up data so there is not duplication, and it is about redeploying the savings that we get from the system.

Inspector Hitch: We have got one system, which is the crime recording system for Bedfordshire, that is available now on the BlackBerry. What officers were doing previously was having to find a desktop terminal, print off their inquiries for the day, effectively (so it would be: “Go to a burglary, take a statement”, and so on and so forth), and once they had done that they were coming back and updating the computer system. It was time spent forwards, backwards and all the rest of it. Now they have a BlackBerry they can do that; they can get the job backwards and all the rest of it. Now they have a computer system. It was time spent forwards, making sure that they capture that and they were coming back and updating the computer system. It was time spent forwards, backwards and all the rest of it. Now they have a computer system. It was time spent forwards, backwards and all the rest of it.

Chief Constable Johnston: I think the systems reconfiguration bit, for me, is around the fact that you can actually directly access these systems and you transfer data automatically from one to another, so you are not doing it five times—you are doing it once. An officer going to an incident can be sent there on mobile data, so no writing down of details, and, when he gets there—

Q588 David Davies: Chief Constable, do you share the concerns we heard earlier on about the Airwave system? Would you agree that 75% of stations are covered?

Chief Constable Johnston: Yes. Obviously, they will all get covered in due course and the only anxiety I have around it is the sense that the station programme is around engineering priorities rather than around operational priorities. So they get done, very sensibly, in a business sense, alongside other work that is being done around signalling and the like, but of course it does mean that some of the more important places are not getting covered as quickly as we might like.

Q589 David Davies: Can I just ask, are you getting any extra funding for the Olympics? Obviously, the British Transport Police are going to be playing a very prominent role in that.

Chief Constable Johnston: The Department for Transport, for the CSR period up to 2011, have agreed to fund our additional costs to a figure that we are negotiating currently.

Q590 David Davies: Lastly, if the Chairman will allow me, can I congratulate you on the big reductions in knife crime on the Tube, which do not seem to have been reflected elsewhere in the country?

Chief Constable Johnston: It is very interesting. On the technology front, there is a lot of debate about the effectiveness of these knife arches, but we can show a very close correlation between the growth in knife crime, the introduction of our knife arches and a decline in knife crime. Knife-enabled crime in London at its peak on our transport system was running at about 70 a month and currently it runs at about 20 a month. So that is a massive reduction. Obviously, other things have happened alongside that—we have had additional resources in other respects—but this, I think, has made a very significant difference. Again, back to the points made earlier on about alcohol, it sends out a very clear message about what we will accept and what we will not accept.

Q591 Ms Buck: You will be familiar, Chief Constable, with the phrase “Computer says ‘No’”. To what extent do you experience problems with technology either malfunctioning or (and I think we have had some representations and evidence to the Committee on this) technology simply not being fit for the purpose that it is applied to? I think one of the examples quoted to us was the amount of time officers can spend trying to run CCTV images which then are not compatible with other forms of technology. From an operational point of view, to what extent are there problems with technology breakdowns and technology incompatibility?

Inspector Hitch: From the point of view of the BlackBerries, I have to say they are amazingly reliable. We have 1200 devices, we have had 19 replaced under warranty and 29 have been broken or damaged through our own fault—either run over or, in one case, a police dog ate one. The actual devices and the system, the network, are very reliable.

Q592 Ms Buck: What happened to it?

Inspector Hitch: The dog? I think it is okay. The BlackBerries, I have to say they are amazingly reliable. We have 1200 devices, we have had 19 replaced under warranty and 29 have been broken or damaged through our own fault—either run over or, in one case, a police dog ate one. The actual devices and the system, the network, are very reliable.

Chief Constable Johnston: I think the systems reconfiguration bit, for me, is around the fact that you can actually directly access these systems and you transfer data automatically from one to another, so you are not doing it five times—you are doing it once. An officer going to an incident can be sent there on mobile data, so no writing down of details, and, when he gets there—

Q593 Ms Buck: What happened to it?

Inspector Hitch: The dog? I think it is okay. The BlackBerries, I have to say they are amazingly reliable. We have 1200 devices, we have had 19 replaced under warranty and 29 have been broken or damaged through our own fault—either run over or, in one case, a police dog ate one. The actual devices and the system, the network, are very reliable.
am a strong proponent that we should be using things designed for the private sector and just adapting them to our needs rather than having a grand plan and trying to build them from scratch with public money. Breakdowns we do not get a lot of; users are the issue. Users are the absolute key. Their fingers are not getting any smaller and the technology gets quicker. It is a mistake to give them too much at one time; it is better to grow it gradually, organically, and add things to them.

Q593 Ms Buck: So if we can just replace the people we would be all right?
Inspector Hitch: Would that not be nice—in some cases! It is an ongoing issue. I urge all forces to spend more time with their users. Charmaine was talking about half-a-day’s training. We did more than that, and I think to do it properly you do need to do more than that; you need refreshers and you need either super-users or people to come in and re-educate.

Q594 Ms Buck: Extending that same argument, there is always a tension, is there not, between the national roll-out—the “big bang” day and the introduction of common systems in all parts of the country—and those constraints, particularly the human constraints, in terms of skills, training and resources and the possibility of things going wrong, and the fact that, as we know and heard earlier, there are different kinds of operational demands on the transport system or in an inner urban environment to a quiet, rural environment. What is your view about the pros and cons, really, of going for the advantages of uniform systems versus the disadvantage of “big bang” days and all those risks?
Inspector Hitch: I think we have to remember that the best ideas do not come from the centre; the best ideas come from the people actually using the devices. We have made a number of changes to our system purely as a result of what the users have asked for and said. I have not sat, as a project manager, and come up with all the answers because I do not know all the answers to policing, and I think it is a mistake to centralise it and to have everybody doing exactly the same. There are different requirements in different parts of the country. For example, in parts of Scotland the Airwave coverage is the only coverage; there is hardly any mobile “phone” coverage in the Highlands. Airways is the only thing that can be used, whereas here mobile “phone” coverage is absolutely superb and there is no problem in using it.

Q595 Ms Buck: That is a common fault and I understand that, but it is a bit of a cop-out as well, though, is it not, because the next minute we are hearing from you, understandably—or perhaps we are pressing you—about all the difficulties that arise when officers cannot talk to each other.
Inspector Hitch: I think it is important. You can talk to your own systems, but actually I think there needs to be retained some of the element of if we want to make a change to the system we can do it fairly quickly. Making a local change to Airwave is impossible; it is a complete, centralised system. Airwave works really well. I am a frontline police officer now; I am an Inspector at Luton, and Airwave works in Luton very well. However, if I wanted to make an individual tweak or change to that system, as I would do with mobile data, because I might want access to information specific to Luton, if it is a national system I can have real problems doing that. I like the idea of a national system, as long as it is one that is cost-effective. I just do not like the idea of spending loads and loads of money.

Q596 Ms Buck: I do not think we will have the magic answer to that one.
Chief Constable Johnston: Echoing Jim’s point there, if you have an established set of processes, like we have with radios and how we use radios, and we are familiar with that, we understand it and we have a shared ambition around it, then I think the national roll-out is important. Also, radios’ interoperability is very, very important. So a single approach to radios is very, very important. When you are into the new sort of technology stuff, where we are really trying out new ideas about how do we use mobile data, I think giving some freedom at the front end, as Jim says, so that the people using the kit can have some influence over our destiny, is a really important part of the way we do business here.
Inspector Hitch: It is still very early days.
Chairman: Margaret Moran had a supplementary on this.

Q597 Margaret Moran: It was really the point about the “big bang” approach versus the individually tailored solutions. How adaptable do you think either of those two options are? It is the point I referred to earlier on. We can have BlackBerries today but the next generation technology will be with us next month. How do we make sure that we genuinely are ready for that technology?
Chief Constable Johnston: At the moment we have two real choices of the platform to do this, obviously: the Airwave platform or mobile “phone” technology as a platform. With Airwave we have the route there to a common approach and that is the route down which we go, but I think the Airwave front end bit is significantly inferior to the other facilities that we are currently using on mobile “phones”. When the new mobile “phone” technology comes along, I think the ability to switch into that is going to be important because it will give us greater band width and it will give us the ability to get photos on the system. However, in terms of interoperability, the important thing for the individual officer on the street is to get back on to all of these systems back at the ranch, which they can do regardless, in a sense, of the platform. It is whether you have the software which links you into it which is the important thing.
Inspector Hitch: There is always a risk with technology of buying something and it going out of date very quickly. That is less likely to happen with a platform such as BlackBerry because they have to change or they go out of business, whereas if we have an artificially created state system they do not go out
of business. With mobile data I think if we do not change quickly enough then things can easily develop and we will not be able to use them. **Chief Constable Johnston:** There is a point around Airwave where we have the creation of a monopoly supplier situation.

**Q598 Mrs Dean:** Do you agree with Airwave Solutions' assessment that the rushed way in which additional capital funding was recently made available for mobile information initiatives did not allow forces to undertake the depth of research needed to ensure the best fit with longer-term strategic requirements?

**Chief Constable Johnston:** We have been speaking to Airwave since about 2005 around mobile data and its uses to the Police Service. If I am being brutally honest, I do not think they showed a very high level of interest in it. So this debate has been around a long while; this has not just come across us. All of us, I think, have had plenty of time to think about it. The roll-out programme itself takes a number of months. We were talking about mobile data this time last year and now it comes on to the agenda to be delivered. So I think a number of months have gone by for us to work out what we would like to do. I do not think I would share their perspective on that at all. The other suppliers have shown fleet of foot, and I think forces have been able to cope with the opportunities that have been presented to them.

**Q599 Mrs Dean:** Do you agree with that, Inspector?

**Inspector Hitch:** I was disappointed that Mr Bobbett did not get asked the question how much would his solution cost, because I think he would be a lot, lot more expensive than that. For what extra it would offer, if anything. I am not a great fan of going that route. That is a personal view.

**Q600 Mrs Dean:** Has Bedfordshire collaborated with other regional forces to share good practice and build joint solutions?

**Inspector Hitch:** Yes, we have. We worked very closely on our initial tender for mobile data with Hertfordshire, as a joint tender, but Hertfordshire, in the end, chose to go a different route. It was all very amicable but we did decide to go in different directions. We work very closely with TDP, we work closely with West Yorkshire, Cambridgeshire—with all other forces that got BlackBerries we share ideas. I do sometimes wish that people were more willing to do that, and that there was more of a national focus on that, because I think it would be quite beneficial. Some people are rather precious about their ideas and their little inventions, which I think is a shame.

**Q601 Mrs Dean:** What are the barriers to collaboration?

**Inspector Hitch:** I think the biggest barriers I have faced to collaboration are personalities. It is as simple as that.

**Q602 Margaret Moran:** You are probably aware of Slip End village, on the border of Bedfordshire but which has most of its crime in Hertfordshire (?). What do you say to the residents there who may receive services from Bedfordshire or from Hertfordshire? They are the people we should be concerned about, surely, so how can we ensure that this fragmentation does not penalise our citizens? What do you say to the argument that fragmentation also prevents us from getting best value from global companies because small forces like Bedfordshire simply are not viable for those companies?

**Inspector Hitch:** I know that we are working closely with Hertfordshire in many different areas. We have a joint major investigation team and we are working on a joint firearms team, so that is coming. In terms of the actual technology and the cost of it, the BlackBerry lady here said earlier that it is the same price; we do not get any discount for buying 10,000 or one device; it is a set, agreed amount. So I do not think there are regular savings with regards to that particular purchase in combining with other forces. One of the real problems is that the back end systems of the forces are different, and that is where it gets really difficult because the device itself will work but it has to talk to the back end systems. So unless we have the same command and control system and it is sharing the same information on the same platform, then to link into it would be pointless because we would be looking at the wrong incidents. Is that clear?

**Q603 Tom Brake:** I wanted to return briefly to something that Chief Constable Johnston said, which was about not being funded for the National Intelligence Database. Presumably it would be unacceptable for you not to be funded, so it is going to happen at some point from some source.

**Chief Constable Johnston:** Yes.

**Q604 Tom Brake:** Possibly, is there the risk of a delay before you are able to? If that were to happen, could you explain to the Committee what the consequences, operationally, of that delay would be?

**Chief Constable Johnston:** We would be out-with the whole intelligence system for the UK, so we would not be able to interrogate the central database, we would not be able to feed the intelligence base, and we would not be able to draw off records that are freely available to other forces up and down the country. It would have a dramatic impact on our ability to operate.

**Q605 Tom Brake:** Just moving back to this issue, in what way could the Home Office and the NPIA facilitate quicker adoption and implementation of new technology with what they should prioritise? I think Inspector Hitch identified replacing the people as one of the ways of implementing technology more quickly, but have you got any other views, either of you?

**Chief Constable Johnston:** No. I think taking on their role and responsibility to bring people together to have these discussions before we spend money is
a good thing. That would help us to spend money wisely, and they are engaged in that process. In fact, they will be calling us all in as part of the roll-out of mobile technology to get lessons from that with a view to developing a common approach going forward, because we see this mix and match arrangement as being very much a temporary affair.

Q606 Tom Brake: But they cannot enforce a common approach, can they?

Chief Constable Johnston: No, they cannot, and there is some debate to be had about the relationship between funding streams and IT. We are looking for a common approach, and this was the approach taken with Airwave, where the funding was provided centrally and everybody went in the right direction. It does not always make sense for an individual force to go in a particular direction—just to make that point. With the Airwave system, when I was with the Metropolitan Police, we just bought a new radio system. So although for United Kingdom policing the business case stood up, for the Met, actually, it did not. So I think it has to be something about the control of the funding going forward.

Inspector Hitch: Mobile data is, I think, more of a people project than a technology project. Far from getting rid of the users, what we need to do is actually engage with them more and find out what they really want, and help them to use it and help them to change the working practices.

Q607 Tom Brake: That is something that the NPIA, for instance, can help with in terms of training.

Inspector Hitch: Yes.

Chairman: Chief Constable, Inspector, thank you very much for giving evidence. We are most grateful to you. If there is anything that you missed out in your evidence that you feel would be helpful to the Committee, it would be very useful to have it in writing. Thank you very much.

Witnesses: Mr Paul McKeever, Chairman, and Mr Ian Rennie, General Secretary, Police Federation of England and Wales, gave evidence.

Q608 Chairman: Mr McKeever and Mr Rennie, thank you very much for coming to give evidence today. We did not have an opportunity, first of all, of congratulating you on your election as Chairman of the Federation, but, also, saying goodbye to Jan Berry, who has given evidence to the Committee on many, many occasions. Would you pass on our best wishes to her in her retirement, following her holding the office? I gather she is planning a long holiday at the moment within the Police Negotiating Board with the Official Side, and that has started already.

Q611 Chairman: Have you started your negotiations over the current year’s pay award?

Mr McKeever: Yes, we have. The pay round started sometime ago and we are in negotiations at the moment within the Police Negotiating Board with the Official Side, and that has started already.

Q612 Chairman: The subject of today’s inquiry is new technology. Of course, your members are at the very forefront of the use of new technology. We have had a lot of Chief Constables and we have actually had your members here—we had a custody sergeant from Ealing who came to give evidence to us—but it is your members who will be operating new technology. In your written submissions to this Committee you talked about the need for an integrated system across all the various authorities, and a system that was integrated to the criminal justice system. What exactly did you mean by that?

Mr McKeever: At the moment we have a fragmented system, not just through the criminal justice system but across the UK Police Service as well. We would like to see a single system throughout the United Kingdom. Criminals do not stay in one force area, they move from force area to force area, and we would like the facility to be able to put in one single name at any point in that system and find out what is happening with that individual with their case or cases. We do not have that at the moment and we would like to see it in the future. From point of arrest through to the custody system through to the administration system prior to being sent to the CPS, and then from the CPS on to the courts and, hopefully, to the Prison Service as well. That is the line we would like to see at the moment.
Q613 Chairman: Are there particular areas that you think should be prioritised? We have taken evidence from people from BlackBerry and Airwave today; it is obviously an expensive process and it is a big process, as you have outlined. Is there a particular area that you would like to see prioritised?

Mr McKeever: We would like to see more central control over the actual contracting of some of the systems that are being introduced. There is fragmentation around the country and I think people have already alluded to the fact that some forces, perhaps, do not have the resilience or resources to contract as they should, and perhaps that should be done centrally—for best value, for a start, and, also, to get that standardisation across the piece.

Q614 Gwyn Prosser: Mr McKeever, you might have heard the previous witnesses when they were asked about ways of speeding up the implementation and adoption of new technology. The Chief Constable of British Transport Police talked about earlier planning connected with funding, and our colleague from Bedfordshire Police said it is all to do with individuals and more engagement with individuals. What is your view? What is the view of the Federation?

Mr McKeever: I think that both, in part, are correct in what they say. We feel on occasions that the practitioner’s voice is not heard enough in the implementation of some of the systems. They are the people that are going to be using the devices, or the kit, that is actually out there, and the police officers should be asked what is actually workable and what is not. One of the interesting features of the Police Federation conference recently was we had Mr Bobbett come along and he appeared to be a little surprised by some of the failings within the Airwave system that were pointed out to him by practitioners on the ground, particularly from the Metropolitan force.

Q615 Gwyn Prosser: Do those voices get heard? Does that go back up the line?

Mr McKeever: They are being heard now. They were not heard, I think, certainly up till conference, but I know that Mr Bobbett has made efforts to speak to the particular officers individually and to address their concerns. That is encouraging. One of the problems is that those implementing the systems on the ground, or within forces, are not themselves practitioners and they do not fully understand the operational necessities and needs of the police officer on the ground, and perhaps on occasions they make assumptions. To involve the practitioner at the basic level and right way through the system would be beneficial because there are solutions out there, and that is something that one or two of my colleagues, again in the Metropolitan service, have found out once they have probed Mr Bobbett and some of his colleagues. That was not something that was apparent when they tried to address it in-house within the Metropolitan Police Service.

Q616 Mr Winnick: In your written submission you state that while the number of individuals applying to be police officers appeared to outweigh the number of vacancies available, “there is” (and I quote from your brief) “still a gap in our understanding about the quality and consistency of applicants to the force”. So, does that mean that those who are applying in many instances are not suitable for the police?

Mr McKeever: I think we do not know. We do not know. It appears that there are not records kept of those who do not make it into the force. We have the records of those who do join the force—they are there and they are on record—but we do not know what standard of recruit is failing to get into the Police Service. That is the point that we are trying to make in relation to that sentence. I had to read it twice myself when I read through the evidence before coming here today, so I can understand, Mr Winnick, why you are picking us up on that. However, it does appear that there is not good record keeping in relation to those who fail to get in the service, so we are not sure how deep the quality is of those applicants who are applying.

Q617 Mr Winnick: What about those who are actually approved and become police officers? Do you feel the quality has gone up or down or is consistent?

Mr McKeever: That would have to be a subjective opinion. I think, if you ask any police officer who has served for 30 years, like myself, it was always better 30 years ago. Clearly, the high point was when I joined the Police Service—

Q618 Mr Winnick: Everything was always better before—we know that!

Mr McKeever: I am unwilling to make a subjective judgment on whether recruits are better. I am certainly very impressed by some of the young officers and new recruits to the service, and they have my complete support in what they are trying to do.

Q619 Mr Winnick: The Chairman has already made reference to police pay, but clearly—whatever the rights and wrongs of what has happened very recently (and you know what the Select Committee decided to do)—it does appear that police pay is not a disincentive to those wishing to join the police force.

Mr McKeever: It appears to be on the surface, but unless we have that further evidence to say who is not getting into the service we do not know how wide that band is of people who are trying to join, and how suitable they are. It may be that there are very few suitable candidates applying and they are the ones who are getting in; it might be it is much broader and there are many good candidates coming forward. Until we actually get that evidence it will be hard to say.
Q620 Mr Winnick: Your predecessor made the comment that Sir Ronnie Flanagan’s proposal for greater user of support staff could lead to a “de-skilled force that’s only dealing with confrontational situations, like a paramilitary force”. Would you take that view?

Mr McKeever: Yes, I do. One of the fundamentals, as I see it, to British policing is the use of discretion, and actually having contact with the public not just in confrontational situations but across all policing areas. I think we are in danger of losing that by compartmentalising and re-engineering the Police Service. We need to have that contact with the public so that we are policing by consent rather than by coercion. That is not the road that we want to go down. Although there might be some short-term cost savings in relation to compartmentalisation, I think, in the long term, you actually lose the underlying ethos of what the British Police Service is about.

Q621 Mr Winnick: Mr McKeever, there is the feeling, which may well be unjustified, that the Police Federation, frankly, are not very happy with support staff and the rest of it because they see it—and, obviously, your job is to represent at all times the police force—as undermining the position of the police. What do you say to that?

Mr McKeever: There is certainly a role for support staff within the Police Service. There has been support staff in the Police Service ever since I have been a police officer, fulfilling a number of different functions. What we do not want to see is for those support staff to be taking police officers away from the softer contact that we have with the public and, thereby, seeing police officers only coming into contact over the hard, confrontational aspects of policing. That cannot be good.

Q622 Mr Winnick: You think it would harm the reputation and image of the police force if such a situation—which the Government I am sure would deny is happening—occurred?

Mr McKeever: Of course, Mr Winnick. In fact, I think it has started happening already to a degree; the public are seeing police officers more and more just in that confrontational role, and that is a real shame. That is not how the British Police Service should go, in my eyes.

Q623 Mr Winnick: If I can just put this point to you: my constituents (and I am sure this applies to all my colleagues) who write to me about anti-social behaviour wish the police to become involved. They do not see it quite in those terms; they do not see the police as dealing with a confrontational, almost paramilitary situation; they want the police officers to deal with the sorts of situation—

Mr McKeever: And so they should.

Q624 Mr Winnick: --- which I have just described. Your fears seem to be far removed.

Mr McKeever: There is a time for it but I think police officers have to be engaged across all aspects of policing and not just in that sort of area. Yes, the public will be satisfied if we deal effectively with the very sort of situation that you describe there, but they need to have that contact and reassurance with the police in other areas too for them to trust and to actually want the police to come and deal with their problems.

Q625 Tom Brake: You have not actually said this, so I am going to encourage you to: are you actually saying that the role of PCSOs is part of this process of de-skilling police officers in terms of the face-to-face contact with the public?

Mr Rennie: I do not think we necessarily see the role of a PCSO as being involved in that. I think the PCSOs were introduced for really good reasons: a high-profile, public reassurance out in the communities—the eyes and ears of the police. I think that is important. What we have missed is that that role is so important that it used to be done by police officers, but over the passage of time because of the other demands on police officers we have not had sufficient capacity or resilience to still do that. So I think their introduction is really important and that they perform that role, but I think it is important that that role is controlled and it does not stray into the use of police powers, otherwise all you are introducing is another tier of policing and you are placing them in confrontational situations and then into the criminal justice process that police officers operate, thereby taking PCSOs away from the front line of performing the important role that they are doing within communities. Operational resilience is a serious issue in the police, and I am not just talking numbers. I want to allude to the skilling-up or de-skilling of police officers because I think it is an important point. We are now starting to find that our members, the student officers within their two-year probationary period are having difficulty acquiring the 22 national occupational standards to be confirmed in the rank, and that is because they are unable to perform certain roles because those roles have been passed to other people—civilian interviewers, civilian investigators—so they are not having the opportunity to perform those roles and they are having difficulty acquiring the national occupational standards. These are basic skills that police officers need on the street and need to be skilled-up. The other one is also de-skilling people; when you introduce civilian investigators and civilian interviewers, operational detectives are not performing that role and where do we get the next generation? The example I would use is that, recently, at an NPIA conference on operational resilience I raised this issue, and sitting next to me was an operational detective sergeant from Surrey who was in the model1. This man was at the top of his game and an exceptionally experienced officer that the public expect to investigate the most heinous criminal acts in this country, and to investigate them professionally and bring the perpetrators before the courts. When I asked him if in the current process of modernisation he would be able to acquire those skills to get to that level, his answer was “No”. I

1 The term model refers to the Surrey Model being used as the basis of the Workforce Modernisation pilots
think that is a serious operational performance resilience issue for the Police Service, because if you start to take away all these little parts the little parts add up to the sum of the whole of what makes a police officer that operates through the processes on behalf of society.

Q626 Martin Salter: I think it might be useful, Chairman, if you do not mind, if I turn the questions the other way round because we have moved on to the area of PCSOs. It seems to me, Mr McKeever, that the Police Federation position has softened a little from some very trenchant criticism a few years ago about PCSOs—plastic policemen and all the rest of the stuff. I am pleased about that because that did not accord with the experience we have on the ground of the high value that, certainly, police officers in my constituency and, I would suggest, across the country—in other words, your members—attach now to their partnership working with the PCSOs. Can you clarify for me the Federation’s current thinking on the role of PCSOs? We take your point about your worries about the warranted officers’ interface with the public being more negative and more confrontational because, if you like, the more positive stuff is being done by the PCSOs, but you will accept that on the ground that kind of team work, that partnership work and that management of PCSOs by warranted officers has, by and large, been successful. 

Mr McKeever: That is what many of our members actually tell us, so it would be churlish to try and deny that. There are a number of caveats on the points you made there, and I would put some more as well. To ensure that there is not creep, if you like, of the operational areas that the PCSOs work within, we would like to see some standardisation nationally of the sort of areas that they are going to work within. At the moment, they are used in all sorts of disparate areas within different police forces. I do not think there is a single model, and speaking to Mr McNulty recently he said that there is not even standardisation of the PCSO uniform, and that is something that I think we will probably see a change in as well. I am very cognisant, having travelled to France when I was a young man and seeing a number of different people wearing different uniforms and having no idea who they were or what they did, and being very grateful for the fact that in this country, even though I was not a police officer then myself, I knew what a police officer was. I think we need to make that distinction today as well. Who is actually a warranted police officer and who is a Community Support Officer? If that means standardisation of uniform I think that is a good thing, but we also actually have to look at the powers that they are exerting too, so that there is some simple control over those powers that they exercise.

Q627 Martin Salter: That is very helpful. Are you prepared to put on record now that, notwithstanding your desire to see clarification in terms of responsibility and standardisation in terms of uniform and delineation of powers, the introduction of Police Community Support Officers has been successful?

Mr McKeever: We would still like to see fully warranted officers rather than Community Support Officers. The resilience that you get with a fully warranted officer is much greater than that of a Community Support Officer, but we have to recognise that they are there, yes.

Q628 Martin Salter: But have they been successful? Has it been a successful initiative? Even if you would not have started from here.

Mr McKeever: I think it is a bit like the curate’s egg: in parts, yes.

Q629 Martin Salter: You have obviously got a great career as a politician ahead of you, I can see! Can I move to my earlier question? There was an IPPR report back in February arguing in favour of greater use of specialist officers in a whole area of serious crime. We also had the ACPO lead on workforce modernisation. Peter Fahy is quoted as saying: “the office of Constable is a fundamental aspect of policing but we need to remove those tasks that do not require the skills that can be put elsewhere. I believe the era of the omni-competent” (whatever that is) “officer is over”. What do you think is the right balance between generalist and specialist officers?

Mr McKeever: You need to keep generalist skills within the Police Service. If you do not keep those generalist skills then you are going to lose the resilience to respond to incidents as they occur. By the very nature of policing, we are an emergency service; we do not know what is going to happen tomorrow, next week, next month or even next year. We can make some educated guesses about what is going to happen but, as was seen by the bombs that went off in London sometime ago, suddenly there can be an imperative that we have to deal with, and we need that resilience to be able to respond to it. If you go down the line of having specialist skilled officers predominantly I think you are going to lose that resilience, and we are not going to know it until that imperative raises its head.

Q630 Martin Salter: What you are saying to us, if I can just be clear, is that there should be a baseline of skills—

Mr McKeever: Absolutely, yes.

Q631 Martin Salter:—and then, over and above that, specialisms that officers can go into should they choose that as a career path.

Mr McKeever: As happens now, yes.

Q632 Gwyn Prosser: On the question of PCSOs, if I may, yesterday my constabulary in Kent published an interim report on the impact of PCSOs. Personally, I am very much in favour and the Committee in the past has shown favour towards the concept, but not unanimously. The interesting thing was it showed (it was not very glowing, to be honest) very little impact on areas where there were PCSOs
in place and areas where there were not—very little impact on general crime, some impact on vehicle crime, and the biggest plus point, I suppose, was raising people’s confidence in the police presence, and assuring them on the perception of crime, which has eased off considerably. Do you think those sorts of attributes, if you like, would be sufficient to retain them? I say that because Mr Salter has talked about the rather trenchant view that the Federation might have taken in the past, and it seems to be moderating, but my (and I am great friends with him) local Police Federation spokesperson yesterday said that this is a sign that they should be scrapped and we should go back to fully warranted officers.

Mr McKeever: Without seeing the report it is hard to comment on the particulars of it, but it does seem that the people who seem most reassured by PCSOs, to me, are the very people who should not be reassured by them, and they are, perhaps, the ne’er-do-wells on the street.

Q633 Gwyn Prosser: Really?

Mr McKeever: They know that they do not hold the full, warranted powers that a police officer would have. Perhaps a member of the general public is reassured to see a uniform walking along, and many of the uniforms do look very similar to police officers, and you are not going to know what it is you are dealing with, but I can assure you that some of those ne’er-do-wells do know the difference because they are engaging with them on a regular basis, and all too often they are just used as bait for their entertainment.

Q634 Gwyn Prosser: Finally, quickly, you have talked about the dangers in your view of increasing powers. In my personal experience of PCSOs, and I have talked to lots of them and we have had them in Kent for a long time, the most enlightened of them specifically do not want to have extra powers because it would detach them from that definition which you eloquently outlined in your introduction—the reason for them being there. So where is the pressure coming from? Is there a pressure coming to increase powers?

Mr Rennie: Throughout the workforce modernisation issue, which PCSOs will be involved in, and other roles (and I use the term “civilianisation”—and I know in some quarters that is unacceptable but that is the best way to describe it; I cannot think of a better way) there are some serious concerns about how we measure what is working and not. There are some real difficulties around that evaluation of the benefits of the modernisation process and giving certain roles to certain people. I think it would be right to identify here that in Essex they have “looked the other way” and not taken those roles and recruited more police officers, and they are, in effect, advocating that they are having better results by having more police officers and not going down the workforce modernisation route. I appreciate that within that workforce modernisation there is going to be some form of evaluation by Deloittes, and we have some real concerns to make sure that that is correct, because previous evaluations that were done by Accenture in Surrey clearly raised issues that have yet to be addressed in the workforce modernisation. As Paul’s predecessor, Jan Berry, said, the problem at the moment is that we herald pilots and trials as a success before we actually evaluate them. What we do not want to do is roll things out so far that we cannot roll them back in, because once we lose the policing as the model is in this country, which is the one that is held up around the world as the police model, it is very difficult to get back, particularly on recruitment, because you cannot recruit a police officer today and they will be effective next week; it takes quite a number of years. So once you start to lose that with numbers and resilience it is very difficult to get that resilience back. We do have serious concerns about the modernisation, and there needs to be a step back and a look to see what is value for money, what is efficient and what is going to be the best model to deliver the policing in this country that the public deserve.

Q635 David Davies: Mr McKeever, is it the case that if a PCSO is put into a confrontational situation where somebody does not want to be arrested or where two people are fighting each other, that PCSO is under an instruction not to interfere and not to get involved?

Mr McKeever: That is correct; they are not to enter into any confrontational role whatsoever.

Q636 David Davies: Therefore, it is probably misleading to suggest, as it has been, that having a PCSO is as good as having a police officer on the streets.

Mr McKeever: No, clearly they are not; they are there for a singular purpose and that is to reassure the public and act as the eyes and ears of the Police Service. They are not there to deal with the more formalised aspects of policing.

Q637 Mr Clappison: You said a moment ago that discretion in individual police officers is a very important part of policing in this country.

Mr McKeever: Vital.

Q638 Mr Clappison: I suppose that an over-rigid adherence to performance targets would really go against that, would it not?

Mr McKeever: Very much so. We are very much opposed to the performance target culture within the Police Service at the moment. It is very good at measuring the quantitative aspects of what is being done, but it does not look at the qualitative aspects at all. If you take it down to the basic level, if you have a motorist who is stopped and is given a lecture about their driving, often, in my experience, they have been more willing to take that and perhaps amend their ways than if you take them through the hard process of reporting them and putting penalty points on their licence. That is not going to show up in targets. So we are losing that because, clearly, it is going to be better for the officer to report that person because there is a tick in the box.
Q639 Mr Clappison: You spoke about the culture of policing in this country and policing by consent, which is so much a feature of our service. I am sure that the public do respect the professionalism and bravery of individual officers, but do you get a sense that the culture of policing by consent and the public attitude towards the police in general is as strong as it used to be?

Mr McKeever: It is weakening, I am pretty sure of that. The regard that the police were held in even a few years ago has changed somewhat and it is on a downward slope at this moment in time.

Q640 Mr Clappison: This would be across society; not just people who are up to no good, but very much the law-abiding members of the public as well.

Mr McKeever: Such as my father, who got three points on his licence for doing 36 miles an hour, yes.

Q641 Mr Clappison: Going back to the point I made earlier on: how would you wish to see the police's performance being evaluated?

Mr McKeever: Clearly, it has to be evaluated, but at the moment it is done really just on a statistical basis. You have to have it evaluated by good quality supervisors, at sergeant level and inspector level, as well. The public, surely, want to have those supervisors out on the street making sure that critical incidents are dealt with, and the public are being dealt with, in a fashion that is of a high quality rather than just looking at the amount of work that is produced. I think that hands-on supervision is a very important aspect of how things should go in the future as well, rather than just looking at the statistical data.

Q642 Tom Brake: Can I come back to the baseline skills, which was raised by Mr Salter? Is there anything that the police are currently being taught in their probationary period that they do not need to know, and, secondly, is there anything that they are not being taught that they need to know?

Mr McKeever: I heard recently that people are now being taught discretion, which was always a fundamental aspect of policing in my day, and I think it is sad that officers have to be taught what discretion is today. That should be absolutely core to the way they deal with matters. That they are being taught it is good but that they have to be taught it, I think, is a sad reflection of how far we have actually gone in performance and the target culture.

Mr Rennie: The important thing is that there is a little bit of science that has gone into what is the role of a police officer through the integrated competence framework and the national occupational standards, as the skills and competences that you require and that society requires a police officer to deliver the quality service. That is the issue. That is scientifically shown. They are national occupational standards, so those are the skills and competences required. Police officers are not able to get them or there is a de-skilling of those. There are some significant issues that will impact on the service that we deliver to the public.

Chairman: Mr McKeever and Mr Rennie, thank you very much for coming to give evidence to us today. Mr McKeever, the best of luck for your term of office. I am sure we will be seeing you very frequently. Thank you very much.
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Witness: Professor Sir Al Aynsley-Green, Children’s Commissioner for England, gave evidence.

Q643 Chairman: Thank you very much for coming to give evidence to the Select Committee. As those present will know, this is a lengthy inquiry into Policing in the 21st Century and we have taken evidence from a number of different witnesses. We went to Monmouth yesterday to take evidence from the Welsh police and we looked at the use of Taser equipment. What, in your view, are the main reasons why young people carry weapons?

Sir Al Aynsley-Green: May I preface my response by saying I welcome this opportunity to meet you today and to share our views with you. I strongly support the initiative you are engaged in: policing in the 21st century. 11 Million, that is my organisation, looks forward to working with you and we hope I can persuade you that we have a resource which will be of interest to you. Over three years we have been in touch with countless children and young people across the country and we have good information on what they are feeling about what it is like to be young today in England. I extend a warm invitation to any of you personally or as a group to come to my organisation and be briefed by my staff so you know firsthand. In terms of the concerns of children about crime, can I just say that this is a strong focus for us in our organisation. Children and young people very much drive what we do. We have an annual planning cycle whereby we contact countless children across the country which has been greatly enhanced by our new website.

Q644 Chairman: That is very helpful and I wonder whether you can do us a note on what the organisation does. As time is short, I wonder if you would address your remarks to the questions that we have from the Committee. Why do you think young people carry weapons?

Sir Al Aynsley-Green: This is a very complex area and there is no one answer which covers all the reasons. We know that children themselves are very concerned about their own safety. This annual planning cycle I talked about voted on violence in society as the key issue that concerned children and young people across the country and they want us to investigate it.

Q645 Chairman: You are telling us they carry these weapons because they are afraid.

Sir Al Aynsley-Green: Yes, there is a fear, a perception of fear, in society. We know this starts in the earliest of years. We know that 8, 9, 10, 11 year-olds tell us of their perception of violence in society and the fear they have they will be attacked and a number of children carry knives in particular for their own defence. That does not condone the carrying of knives but that is the reality and the perception in many locations in our country. We know too that there are profound social issues about deprivation and poverty and there are issues about inequalities which certainly relate to the occurrence of crime.

Q646 Chairman: Could you give us some hard and fast figures about how many children carry weapons?

Sir Al Aynsley-Green: I do not have that figure to hand. We do not know ourselves how many children carry weapons. What we do know from surveys, for example, is it is minority of children who carry weapons and it is a minority of them who are actually charged at the present time.

Q647 Chairman: Could you comment on an article in the newspaper about the 9 foot fence that you have built around your property in order to protect you from young people who are involved in anti-social behaviour? I am not saying we believe this article but this may be an opportunity for you to comment on it.

Sir Al Aynsley-Green: I am pleased that you feel you do not believe what was written on the Mail on Sunday last weekend. It is not true that I have erected a 9 foot fence around my house. The fence they referred to actually is owned by the local authority. I live next door to a cricket field and all the houses in that locality have fences of one kind or another to protect them from stray balls. It is completely untrue that I have erected a fence to protect myself from local anti-social behaviour. That does not mean, however, that I have not been seriously engaged with our own local community on the scourge of anti-social behaviour. A window in my house has been smashed as a result of such behaviour but I have worked with even those who are most difficult to understand why they are engaged in this.

Q648 Chairman: Are you saying it was smashed because of a cricket ball?

Sir Al Aynsley-Green: No, this was criminal damage.

Q649 Chairman: What are the main reasons why you think people hang around in the way they do, not just your house but other houses, causing misery to some residents?
Sir Al Aynsley-Green: First of all, hanging around on a corner has been an activity for young people for generations. I suspect many of us in this room hung around in localities to be with our friends and to do the things young people do. There is a perception, however, generated not least by media coverage, that this is an activity that should not be encouraged. We have talked to children and young people all over the country. In Doncaster last year I was out on a bitterly cold night in a blizzard walking the streets with the children seeing what they had to say about their lives. They said we have nowhere to go, we have nothing to do, adults do not like us, adults do not want to work with us and the consequence is we have nothing to do. I do believe this is a really important aspect of the behaviour patterns we are seeing today.

Q650 Mr Winnick: The point that critics would say is you accuse various people, perhaps the media, of demonising teenagers, that some of the criticism is unjustified yet you yourself, like many people up and down the country, apparently have been the subject of teenage hooliganism. Do you think there is any sort of contradiction in the attitude that you take?

Sir Al Aynsley-Green: I argue there is no contradiction whatsoever because my view on crime is robust, it is on the public record and can be consulted. I do not condone crime of any nature. Violent crime needs to be subject to the full force of the law through the police and I support the police.

Q651 Mr Winnick: There is a genuine problem which affects my constituents, as well presumably the constituents of all my colleagues here, of anti-social behaviour and hooliganism which, in many instances, for those who do not have the accommodation you have—and I am not criticising—and who live on various estates find intolerable especially at night.

Sir Al Aynsley-Green: I argue dealing with this problem has to be everybody’s business. There is no one agency that can be responsible for this. A very good example of what can be done relates to the mosquito device.

Q652 Tom Brake: You mentioned that young people have nothing to do. Is there any evidence that the funds from dormant bank accounts which are supposed to be invested in youth services is beginning to flow and generate something for young people to do?

Sir Al Aynsley-Green: We have no direct evidence for that because we have not looked for it. What I can tell you is in localities where adults are responsible, who are trying to build intergenerational dialogue, are trying to set up organisations, they live a hand to mouth existence actually finding the money to keep their organisations afloat. I do argue that community cohesion is the way forward. I do know of places where, by getting the young people and the older generation around the tables with agencies, youth services and the police to explore ways forward, things can be done.

Q653 Chairman: Can you clarify your position on the use of stop and search powers against young people?

Sir Al Aynsley-Green: Again, despite what has been alleged to be my view in the media, my position is robust and is in the public domain. Stop and search, not least informed by what children themselves say, can be a very useful instrument.

Q654 Chairman: You support stop and search for children.

Sir Al Aynsley-Green: At this moment in time it may well be a very useful instrument to get the knives off the street which is the imperative. However, my rider, which has been the subject of substantial criticism, is that we must make sure that these powers are used sensitively and appropriately.

Sir Al Aynsley-Green: I argue dealing with this problem has to be everybody’s business. There is no one agency that can be responsible for this. A very good example of what can be done relates to the mosquito device.

Q656 Chairman: Do you have evidence they are not?

Sir Al Aynsley-Green: From what children tell me, there are issues in some localities about relationships with the police. There are examples of very good relationships with the police but children tell me of their concerns. I can announce today we are just about to launch a special consultation with children across the country through YouGov about what their views of the police are. I can tell you that through our buddy groups which we have set up with our annual theme this year they support stop and search as long as the event itself is handled properly. We know that a lot of good work has been done through Safer Schools but one single episode of a hostile or difficult encounter can damage and destroy that relationship.

Q657 Chairman: But you feel it should be done sensitively.

Sir Al Aynsley-Green: Exactly, with respect, as adults would demand.

Q658 Chairman: How would it be different to doing it to adults?

Sir Al Aynsley-Green: I welcome steps being taken in some police forces. I understand in Essex new recruits are being exposed to the issue of being stopped and searched and what it feels like to be stopped and searched.

Q659 Chairman: How would it be different to dealing with an adult?

Sir Al Aynsley-Green: It is the event itself, the approach. We know with the new powers there does not need to be reasonable suspicion but the person needs to be apprehended. I would argue the circumstance differs from one to another. Someone who is obviously about to commit a crime may well be handled quite differently to a kid who is just hanging around on the street corner.
Q660 David Davies: That is not correct. There has to be reasonable suspicion unless there is a Section 60 in force but there are not many Section 60s in force.
Sir Al Aynsley-Green: I take your point.

Q661 David Davies: I am grateful for your clarification of that, not least because I have served as a police officer myself and have conducted many stop and searches and have found guns on a 16 year old. Many police officers found your comments highly offensive. Are you prepared to withdraw the suggestion that police are antagonising young people? Are you also aware that all police officers when they undergo stop and search training stop and search each other so every police officer, as far as I am aware, in this country has undergone stop and search and has experienced it?
Sir Al Aynsley-Green: There are 39 police forces in England.

Q662 David Davies: 43.
Sir Al Aynsley-Green: There are 140,000 police officers and 11 million children in the country. Inevitably there will be a huge range of opinions about what is actually happening to children and also a range of attitudes from one police force to another. I am the first to support the police.

Q663 David Davies: Have you ever contacted any of the police forces where you think there is a problem because of young people you have spoken to?
Sir Al Aynsley-Green: Yes, most certainly I have. For example, because of the hostile criticism for the misinterpretation of what I said in the media I wrote an article in Police Review which generated substantial response from police officers, one of which was the force in Southwark which is my own home territory. A consequence of that is I have been working with the local inspector in Southwark to understand more what it is like for them. I intend to get out with them on the beat. My staff are also going out and working with schools in these localities to find out what it is like. I am not against the police. I am not against stop and search. I do not condone crime and I do not condone anti-social behaviour.

Q664 David Davies: Is not the real reason why people are carrying knives and guns because they know the chances of actually getting stopped and searched are very slim, that the changes of being prosecuted for it are still very slim despite the welcome news from the government, and the chance of getting any meaningful sanction if by chance they happen to be convicted are also very slim because there are still large numbers of cautions being handed out? Basically people know they can get away with carrying knives and guns and that is why they are doing it, and people like you, some would say, are actively supporting them.
Sir Al Aynsley-Green: That is a view you may have. From what children tell me, they are carrying knives because of fear.

Q665 David Davies: The easiest thing to take away that fear is to stop and search more people who are likely to be carrying knives so that fear can be removed.
Sir Al Aynsley-Green: That is why I support stop and search at this moment in time, to try and de-escalate what is a major crisis.

Q666 David Davies: Automatic prosecutions for anyone carrying a knife?
Sir Al Aynsley-Green: If anyone commits a crime they should be subjected to the full force of the law. I would argue that there may well be different circumstances. I am very concerned indeed about increasing the criminalisation of young people.

Q667 David Davies: Even if they are carrying a knife or a gun?
Sir Al Aynsley-Green: At this moment in time this is a very important issue and there needs to be a prosecution. I do urge that we must look at this objectively and with evidence.

Q668 David Davies: What evidence do you need? Something like 30 young people have been killed on the streets of our major cities. What sort of evidence do you need before you appreciate that the police have a difficult job and need the support of people like you and not to be told they are antagonising young people.
Sir Al Aynsley-Green: I am not in denial of the police. I support them but I do challenge them for their attitudes and behaviour as has been informed to me by some people in this country.

Q669 Chairman: Do you think you may have a bit of a communication problem in dealing with the media and what you are doing?
Sir Al Aynsley-Green: I think there is a communication problem in both directions, if I may say. Some commentators have given intemperate comments which do nothing to add to a serious and systematic debate on this subject.

Q670 Chairman: What can be done to improve this communication? Clearly you have a very important role to play but also it is important that parliament and the media scrutinise what the Children’s Commissioner says. How can this be improved?
Sir Al Aynsley-Green: By this kind of event, for example, and I would also urge, by personal contact with parliamentarians. We do try very hard to meet them and I have given an invitation today. In terms of relationships with the media, I would like to argue that we are thoroughly professional in what we do say but my statute, under the Children’s Act 2004, says speak for children especially those who have no other means of having their voices heard and I include in that children who are seen to be disruptive and difficult.

Q671 Martin Salter: What are your views on the recent announcement that over 16s will be prosecuted rather than receiving cautions when found carrying knives for the first time? I ask this question in the
context of the quite abysmal re-offending rates we have for young people in our country. I think in some categories it is between 70% and 80% of young people who are incarcerated for the first time will re-offend within two years. Whilst incarceration may be a temporary solution, one can cut the argument the other way that all we are doing is putting people on a moving stairwell and they are back inside in no time at all.

**Sir Al Aynsley-Green:** That is exactly right. With my powers of entry I go into prisons to talk to young offenders and hear their life experiences directly from them and they have some fairly scary things to say about the reasons why they are in conflict with the law. We do not oppose availability of strong custodial penalties for violent offences. That is absolutely crystal clear. We recognise the importance of public protection and the importance of the victim but there are really important issues about the youth justice system in general. As we have said, all four Commissioners in our recent report to the UN Committee in Geneva last week think that the treatment of children, especially highly damaged and highly vulnerable children, should be seen through a different lens to the treatment of adults.

**Q672 Martin Salter:** That does not take us very far in terms of why our criminal justice system has such poor re-offending rates in terms of young people. Do you have any views on that?

**Sir Al Aynsley-Green:** Yes, I do indeed, from having been to prisons and listening to children themselves. First of all, we are incarcerating more children in this country than any other European country. The consequences of that circumstance on the prison estate are substantial. Prison officers tell me of their difficulties having the resources to employ meaningful education and rehabilitation methods. I think we are also sitting on many, many young people who have undiagnosed and untreated special needs such as mental health problems, drug addiction issues and also learning difficulties. We, like others, have asked for a fundamental review of the youth justice system and we look forward to the Youth Crime Action Plan which the government will be publishing in the next few days and weeks. We have contributed to that debate through our intelligence across the country.

**Q673 Martin Salter:** Can I put a concept to you that has been articulated to me by prison governors that actually we are not incarcerating first time young offenders for long enough because there is very little you can do with a young offender who is on a two or three month sentence if they are coming to you illiterate, unable to compete in the jobs market, with mental health problems, drug addictions and all sorts of behavioural issues. Instead of being pink and fluffy about it actually what we need to do is to have longer first time sentences so that the rehabilitation programme can be targeted, focused and effective.

**Sir Al Aynsley-Green:** It is sad that children have to be incarcerated to get an assessment. I would urge that there is a much better process of assessment when these children come through even before they appear before the courts. Magistrates tell me of their difficulties in getting proper psychiatric assessments for young people. They go to prison where often that is only place and the first time they have the chance to be properly assessed. We need a much more rigorous and more accessible assessment process which will then decide those who actually need help for their problems and those who need to go into prison and those who could have alternatives. It has been done in other countries with great success.

**Q674 Mrs Cryer:** When this Committee was doing another inquiry we visited Feltham young offenders' institution and many of the young men we met were there because of carrying or using knives or guns. They gave various reasons but it did dawn on us eventually that many of them had either been expelled from school and/or been thrown out of home. Is that what you are finding?

**Sir Al Aynsley-Green:** That is certainly true. School exclusion is very strongly related, as you well know, to crime. The reasons for school exclusion are multiple. It pushes the whole issue upstream. I support governments who want early identification of families at risk, early intervention with programmes that recognise these potentially troublesome children and intervening early before they start causing trouble.

**Q675 Mrs Cryer:** Have they been thrown out of home as well?

**Sir Al Aynsley-Green:** Many of them have. There are also issues about children in the care of the state many of whom become young criminals themselves, so how effective are we as corporate parents. I do make the point that by the time a child has got to prison we have failed. We must be upstream looking at the early indications and early interventions.

**Q676 Mrs Dean:** You said that more young people are being imprisoned in this country than any other country. In your opinion are more young people and children committing crimes in the first place in this country and, if so, why?

**Sir Al Aynsley-Green:** I do not have information on that partly because we have very little information on youth crime. I particularly welcome the view that the prime index should include experiences of children with crime. Many children are victims of crime and we do not know the size of that problem let alone the implications for it. We need much more analysis and information about what is going on. The crime rate is falling at the same time as prison use is increasing. What does that tell us about what is going on?

**David Davies:** Prison is working?

**Q677 Mrs Dean:** How effective do you think the government's anti-knife advertising campaign will be in preventing young people from carrying weapons?

**Sir Al Aynsley-Green:** In terms of the social marketing, we welcome the fact that a government is taking this and is involving children and young people themselves in the solution rather than adults having the arrogance to pontificate as to what should be done. We do believe that many children have false
beliefs and understanding of the law and that needs to be encouraged. We welcome Safer Schools programmes, and certainly primary school children tell me how much they appreciate policemen coming in to their premises. We are just about to complete a literature review, which we can share with you in due course, about how effective these social marketing techniques are but I think we must have much more engagement with the children rather than just looking at information about them.

Q678 Tom Brake: Can I ask you whether you think that in England we have a view of young people that is much more negative than in other countries? How come when in England people have rolled out mosquito devices there has been no debate whereas in other European countries they look at this as a human rights issue for young people? Are we different here in our attitude to young people?

Sir Al Aynsley-Green: The evidence we have, and we commented on it in the public record, is that we think there is something different in this country. For example, in a survey of the media coverage of children quite recently over 70% of media articles are negative towards children with endless repetition of words like thugs, yobs, hoodies, et cetera. We also know that most of the articles relate to crime by young people but the vast majority of crime is done by adults and not by children. We think the mosquito device is a powerful symptom of a profound malaise in our society. It is not the answer despite what some people actually say about that. It is indiscriminate and it is not tackling the root cause of the problem. Look at what can be done in Corby for example, where the local MP with the police, the community services and the children, have had these things turned off. By investing in youth services there has been a 46% reduction in the call-outs of the police. It is everybody’s business to tackle this very profound problem in society.

Q679 Tom Brake: Do you think the difference in attitude that we have perhaps contributes to what you have described to the UN as an overly punitive approach to the way we deal with the misdemeanours of young people?

Sir Al Aynsley-Green: We think it does and that is reinforced by what children themselves think about this which is why we are trying to encourage people to celebrate the fact we have so many fantastic children and young people. At the 11 Million Takeover Day last year 11,000 children worked with us to show the world how by working with children you actually improve things rather than endlessly demonising them.

Q680 Tom Brake: When you describe our system as being overly punitive, you highlighted the fact there are, in your view, too many children in prison, is it also about the length of sentences? In what way is our system overly punitive?

Sir Al Aynsley-Green: We are anxious to explore the journey of young people through being in conflict with the law and each of the milestones to try to unpick what is going on. We are trying to get children themselves to tell us what happens at each stage of the process. I have also been to Sweden and to Canada to see how they are tackling youth justice. In Canada the Youth Justice Act some six years ago has transformed the whole incarceration of children. I believe there has been a substantial reduction in the incarceration rate by much more flexibility at first point of contact with the police, much more emphasis on proper hard hitting community services, much more information and evidence of restorative justice. In this country very good things are being done in Essex and in Thames Valley with restorative justice where the perpetrator is confronted with the victim and that seems to be extremely effective. I am sorry to say this does not seem to be a well received mechanism throughout the whole country. I would like to explore the efficacy of these alternatives to immediately locking up children in prison.

Q681 Mr Winnick: Do you think that many people would be rather surprised that you exercising your right, which no-one wants to take away from you, of complaining in your official capacity to the United Nations that Britain has what you describe as a punitive approach to youth crime? Would you be surprised at the surprise that people undoubtedly would feel about that?

Sir Al Aynsley-Green: First of all, it is not just my view. This is the concerted view of all four of the UK Commissioners in our different jurisdictions. I am not surprised people would be surprised because I do not think they know what is going on.

Q682 Mr Winnick: The impression would be given that we are engaging in flogging and other beatings of various kinds which have long been banned fortunately in this country but which apply sadly in many parts of the world. The impression that would be given is we are engaging in those sorts of practices.

Sir Al Aynsley-Green: From some of the media coverage there are people who would like to have flogging and naming and shaming brought back into our civilised society. I think the low age of criminal responsibility is an interesting point: it is eight in Scotland and ten in England, Wales and Northern Ireland. You can be criminally charged at ten before you are able to own a dog. In other European countries the age of criminal responsibility is much higher and they have a welfare approach to the management of young offenders rather than a punitive approach.

Q683 Mr Winnick: Is it possible that the Human Rights Committee of the United Nations, perhaps Zimbabwe or Uganda or some other countries, would be sending a Commission to the United Kingdom to see how badly we are treating young people?

Sir Al Aynsley-Green: I would hold on to the objectivity of the UN Committee. I appeared before them with my three colleagues last week in Geneva and you are right, members do come from a wide range of different countries.
Q684 Mr Winnick: They are coming to Britain to investigate. Is that what you would like the United Nations to do?

Sir Al Aynsley-Green: The rappateurs will be coming to this country in the next few weeks before our government appears in the session in September. I also remind you that we are the worst, according to the UNICEF report, of the 21 richest countries in the world in the context of our outcomes and the well being of our children. There is a substantial body of evidence, which some people may deny and others may want to debate, which does show that this country is not delivering as it could do, as one of the richest countries in the world, for the benefit of our children and young people. I am not surprised to hear you say that the population may be surprised about these things because it has not been exposed to them against the endless noise of the problems of children.

Q685 Bob Russell: You mentioned earlier the youngsters saying there is nothing to do. Do your deliberations include working with the recognised youth movements in this country? Have they told you that if they had some of the resources that currently go into locking up young people they could actually deliver outcomes to prevent young people going inside?

Sir Al Aynsley-Green: Yes, that is a message I hear repeatedly across the country. I believe the youth service until how has been under-valued, under-appreciated and under-resourced. Remember there are something like 50,000 young girls who want to be Girl Guides in this country who cannot and why, because adults are no longer volunteering to work with them in their localities.

Q686 Chairman: Why is that?

Sir Al Aynsley-Green: For example, the Criminal Records Bureau checking. I do not deny the importance of this but it is perceived to be a real obstacle for adults working with children. They often in their localities flounder trying to find their way through the morass of getting that to enable them to work with children.

Q687 Bob Russell: The cost of the meeting halls?

Sir Al Aynsley-Green: Exactly, and the cost of running these services. I welcome the government’s focus on youth, on play, et cetera, but we cannot change things until adults themselves are prepared to listen to and to work with children.

Chairman: I am not sure whether Mrs Moran was a Girl Guide but she has the next question.

Q688 Margaret Moran: I was an impeccably PC Woodcraft Folk person. Have you ever been out at night with the police looking at what young people are getting up to?

Sir Al Aynsley-Green: I have been on the streets with young people. I mentioned my experience in Doncaster. I am working with Southwark in arranging that.

Q689 Margaret Moran: You have not been out, like many of us have, with the police at night seeing what young people are getting up to?

Sir Al Aynsley-Green: No, but it is my intention to do just that.

Q690 Margaret Moran: Would that not lead to a view that your approach to all of this is rather academic rather than the practical experience that we know our constituents and we see every day? What would your response be to that?

Sir Al Aynsley-Green: That is a charge that you might lay against us. I would defend it by saying we have been in existence for three years. We are trying to set up our primary function which is to listen to what children have to say and then to complement that by what other organisations have to say. That is why I attended the Association of Small Convenience Stores to hear their views about the mosquito. I intend to do just what you are saying, to go out with the police and work with them.

Q691 Margaret Moran: Three years on it seems to me a little surprising you have not got there yet. Are we not talking about a vicious circle where many young people are actually victims of crime by other young people? Does your approach not portray a greater emphasis or a greater compassion to those who are actually perpetrating the crimes and ignoring the plight of victims who are also young people who deserve our support?

Sir Al Aynsley-Green: Exactly, and I am glad you raised the issue about victims. One has to have immense support for victims and in some places through restorative justice, which I mentioned just now, victims are having a chance to confront their perpetrators which I welcome very much. I would make the point that many young people themselves are victims of crime and what is going on and hearing their views is also important. Very often they are not seen and not treated as victims. Remember that many people go on to offending behaviour after being the victims of other difficulties so it is a very complex area indeed and I have no one quick fix solution to it.

Q692 Margaret Moran: My point was very much that young people are victims. What work have you done, because the balance does not appear to be right, at least in the media, between your emphasis on sympathising with the perpetrator as opposed to the young person that is the victim. What practical steps have you done working with those young victims to prevent them perhaps going on to be perpetrators because of the fear they have experienced?

Sir Al Aynsley-Green: At this moment in time, with our major theme for guns and knives, we are working with what we call buddy groups across the country. We are listening to children’s views and we are looking at it from several aspects. First of all, why they are so afraid in society, what their experiences are having been victims, and what they feel are the answers to our solutions. We are trying very hard to get into this debate.
Q693 Margaret Moran: You do not have an answer. Sir Al Aynsley-Green: I do not have an answer today but we will have in the course of the next few months.

Q694 Mr Streeter: Where does parenting fit into all this because you have not mentioned that at all yet?
Sir Al Aynsley-Green: I can tell you that children and young people tell us that parents are the most important people in their lives and with their families. It is not a surprise but it needs to be reinforced repeatedly that this is what children feel about the importance of their parents. They want family stability. They are desperately concerned about the break-up of families and the consequences they see affecting their peers in classes. Parenting is crucially important and as a nation, I would argue, we have not given parenting the importance and the emphasis it deserves. I would argue too that parenting should start before you become parents. I have been to Canada to see the Roots of Empathy programme, which I commend to you so please look it up on Google, which is a parenting programme for 3 to 11 year olds.

Q695 Chairman: Unfortunately the budget of the House of Commons does not extend to your budget so we will not be able to go this year.
Sir Al Aynsley-Green: Roots of Empathy is an amazing programme to install in young children the principles of parenting. Can I also make the point that there are very substantial numbers of children, we estimate getting on for 2 million perhaps, who are exposed to hidden harm in households where there is domestic violence. 12 million episodes of domestic violence are recorded where there are drug addiction and alcohol problems. These children are living in very difficult and very violent circumstances so not every parent is an angel and we need to have systems to look at those that are not and deal with the consequences. Of course the corporate parent I alluded to already. We are failing our children in care.

Q696 Mr Streeter: Opening up the British Crime Survey to under 16s, you talked a lot about listening to children and presumably you would support 10 to 15 year olds also being included in that survey.
Sir Al Aynsley-Green: Most certainly.

Q697 Chairman: Did you say corporate parent? How would you define the corporate parent?
Sir Al Aynsley-Green: I am talking about children in the care of the state looked after by local authorities.

Q698 Chairman: How many buddy groups are there in the UK? You do not cover Scotland.
Sir Al Aynsley-Green: At this moment in time we started with 100 children who advise us on the priority. We have refined it down to six buddy groups in different parts of the country at the moment.

Q699 Chairman: Who chooses the buddies?
Sir Al Aynsley-Green: We now have over three years of work and an extensive network of collaborators with voluntary organisations, for example, who are very, very happy to work with us and they are giving us access to their children.

Q700 Chairman: In today’s newspaper you have advertised for a deputy commissioner and chief executive. What happened to your last one?
Sir Al Aynsley-Green: My current deputy commissioner, who has been quite amazing in his work with us, is doing something I applaud. He is taking one year out to be a father to his family whilst his wife has a change of career direction. Before his children start school he is taking a year out. The importance of fathers please note.

Q701 Chairman: In respect of the internet, and most of us should declare our interest because some of us are parents of young children as well, and the length of time that a young person or a child spends on the internet where they are picking up ideas about crime, because that is the parameter of this inquiry and that is why you have been called here today to look at children and policing, have you done any work in respect of the internet and children?
Sir Al Aynsley-Green: Yes. First of all, the internet is an incredible instrument for children. The opportunities provided are extraordinary and we are capitalising on that through the development of our website. We have worked with children to develop our website. Of course there are concerns, as Dr Tanya Byron has recently remarked in her report. She also emphasises the ignorance that many parents have about what their children are doing and how to protect them on the internet. We are working with children through our own internet to understand what they feel about it.

Q702 Chairman: A number of members of the Committee asked you for a number of facts, for example how many children carry weapons.
Sir Al Aynsley-Green: We will do our best to respond to your very quickly.

Q703 Chairman: That would be very helpful. Thank you for coming to give evidence to us.
Sir Al Aynsley-Green: May I reiterate my invitation to visit us and to see for yourself and to learn exactly what we are doing and not what the newspapers say we are doing.
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Q704 Chairman: May I welcome Bob Jones and Phil Blundell to this session of the Home Affairs Select Committee this morning. This is another session in our inquiry into policing in the 21st century. We are very pleased to have representatives of the local authorities here. May I refer everybody to the Register of Members Interests where the interests of members of this committee are declared. Mr Jones and Mr Blundell, thank you for coming. How, in the current climate, are local authorities able to set priorities and also hold police forces to account?

Mr Jones: It is clearly our responsibility to have the final say on the policing plan whilst hearing the views of our professional officers and of course, having most importantly heard the views of our local communities. In the past, our own priorities and targets have tended to be a little frozen out by a whole detailed list of national targets. In more recent years, we have had some movement, particularly in the latest PSA round, where we have more headroom to establish local targets, have proper bottom-up local targets set by the local communities. We feel there is movement in the right direction but obviously we would wish to see further movement.

Q705 Chairman: Do you have enough support from central government—we will be hearing later from the Police Minister—in respect of what you are doing?

Mr Jones: We do feel that, since the establishment of the National Policing Board, we have managed, rather than having central government policies, increasingly to have tripartite polices. We feel we have been fully consulted and involved in those and been able to influence. Again, we do feel there has been significant progress in terms of making the policing environment a real and tripartite one.

Q706 Mr Streeter: How do you respond to Sir Ronnie’s findings that some police authorities do not have the skills and the capacity to do their job? How do you think that could be improved?

Mr Jones: I would answer that in two ways. In terms of the actual composition of our governance structure, our members, in fact because we are able to supplement elected members with independent members, we are able to add substantially to both the skill and diversity of those particular members. I think Sir Ronnie is mainly referring to the amount of support that police authorities have, and I think he has a relevant point. The issue is, looking at the history, that police authorities have always been faced with this position in terms of “do you want to have an officer supporting you?” if that would be the cost of a police officer or PCSO on the streets. Of course, up until last year we also had the position that we had to ask the permission of the chief officer to get any additional staff. I think his point is a valid one. I do think it is likely to be addressed by the fact that from 1 April next year we will be subject to inspection. If we do not have the capacity to do our duties to ensure the community is properly heard and to hold the police to account, then clearly that will be picked up by the inspection process. I think that will produce a counter to the quite natural concern about not taking resources away from frontline policing.

Mr Blundell: Essentially police authorities see their job as one of attempting to balance out the demanding needs of local communities with strategic demands; both are legitimate. Sometimes they do not both see eye to eye, and that is when our work is most difficult. Sir Ronnie of course indicated that there may be some, but equally we would counter that there are some that are getting increasingly good at what they are doing. I would prefer the approach to be: can we raise the level of the poorest or the slowest to the level of the best? I think the answer is: yes, we can. There are two things that affect that: as Bob has said, the inspection regime; but, as we get increasingly closer to those communities and particularly if we start giving opportunities to communities to scrutinise us in the sense that if we have done a local deal with them, have we actually delivered somewhere back in September or October of the financial year? That in itself will increase the amount of pressure that will come from local people to ensure that we are delivering not only the national strategy but the local demands in which they have rightly been involved. The answer for me is: there are some that are very good; how can we raise everybody to that level?

Mr Jones: Sir Ronnie obviously gives a snapshot of where we are at a particular time. In terms of a movement over time, in fact I think there has been a substantial increase in the capacity and capability of police authorities, with which we hope the
Association of Police Authorities has been helpful. We have set up a self-assessment framework; we have offered support to authorities to be able to look at themselves and work out their strengths and weaknesses and be able to develop them. I think things are developing but the impetus of the inspection will develop them even further.

Q707 Martin Salter: You will be aware, gentlemen, of the criticisms of our Local Government Association in respect of the weakening of the role of police authorities within the tripartite arrangement, particularly since the setting of priorities and targets through National Policing Plan. Overlaying that was an interesting paper a while ago from the IPPR, which talked about a range of options for increasing accountability, including perhaps most controversially a directly elected police commissioner or giving local authorities power over policing budgets where they could purchase services from different police authorities. I am sure the committee would be very interested in your reaction to some of those suggestions and your assessment of whether or not the tripartite structure is still the best way of setting policing priorities?  

Mr Jones: I do feel the tripartite structure is still the best way of setting priorities. I think the nature of accountability is somewhat different in policing and we very much support accountability but there is a dual accountability, particularly of chief officers to upholding impartially the law of the land as well as the short-term views of local communities. It is, as Phil indicated, a question of balancing those two priorities. I think police authorities do a very good job at balancing those priorities. If you measure it in terms of the platform that we have created for policing services with our biggest ever reduction in crime since the police authorities came in in their existing form in 1995, in terms of satisfaction—and we wish to press onward and upward—and compare it with those services run by local government or other directly elected services, we have a much higher level of satisfaction. Accountability is crucial and I think the public want more, though I would suggest that where they want it is at the neighbourhood level, at the local level, and they do not just want it for policing: they want it for the whole of the community safety environment. We are involved in a whole series of pilots to expand that. As neighbourhood policing rolls out where we have a name for every neighbourhood, the next logical step is ensuring that we do have a voice for every neighbourhood, not a bureaucratic structure but usually building on existing structures to ensure that all the partners can deliver the whole of the needs of the local community. The police authorities have been particularly successful in their new structure in taking the party politics out of it, taking the theatre and the battles out of it. We have meaningful party political engagement supplemented by expertise and diversity from independents but we have managed to maintain a much more stable platform than we have in the past. There is a danger that any of the other models that re-inject party politics will take away some of those gains that we have made since 1995.

Mr Blundell: You are absolutely right, sir, in that there has been a plethora of reports from the whole spectrum of political activity, all of which question our role. I think in the scheme of things we are still a relatively new organisation and we have I think many successes to our credit. One of the problems with telling everybody that yes, this is the best model is that your defence is very good but you do not have much of an attack. Also, of course, it is very difficult to say ‘yes, I think we are the best model but we can get it better’ without sounding arrogant—oh, so there is nothing wrong then. Of course, yes, there are things that are wrong and there are things that could be made a lot better, but it seems to us sometimes we are the key target in the cross-wiring, which probably means that we are getting something right. In policing in particular, which no citizen can opt out of (we are all affected by policing in a way that schools are not and hospitals are not) everybody has to have policing—it is public—full stop. There is a place for a quiet reflective space where real key decisions about local needs should to be taken away in a sense from the hoorah of the crowd. It would be very easy to introduce a level of local popularism which would have its day but, in the long run, not be right. If the law is to be independent, we need to have that space, of course, including local politicians but not in a sense overrun by those who would want to follow a popular line.

Q708 Martin Salter: Moving that in this direction, can I invite both of you to put on the record what you see the practical difficulties are in terms of, say, one of the options, a directly-electing police commissioner. Bob, you talked in terms of short-term community priorities. I can see in a number of communities where perhaps people are tolerating levels of violence, drug dealing and criminal behaviour people having to say one thing in order to be elected which is completely at odds with what would be required to enforce the law.  

Mr Jones: The danger with all directly-elected models is that we see that re-injection of the party-political theatre rather than more meaningful engagement because nobody can get a majority; nobody can say that the whip will deliver the vote and we will force it through. You have to discuss, persuade and have a meaningful debate, including on the key decisions and key advice from the chief constable. The existing structure prevents that. A directly-elected model has two disadvantages: one, it is likely to re-inject the party politics; secondly, in terms of our partnership with the local level, obviously one of the major achievements since the 1998 Crime and Disorder Act is that there is much more meaningful partnership at local levels where all partners are responsible for driving down crime, not just the police. That has worked extremely well. Where you have a dual mandate, I am not sure that will help that partnership: I think it will introduce new friction to that partnership, particularly if you have people from a different political background between those two. We already have that situation in some of the districts and county councils. This will make it extremely complicated. There are all those
dangers. I would go back to my original point in terms of what the actual community wants. The community certainly wants a citizen as Prime Minister; it wants a citizen as leader or mayor of a local council. In terms of who they want to be seen leading on policing, I would say it is more akin to a school governing body where you do not want the chair of the school governors coming round telling you what teaching methods are going to be used and what aspects of the curriculum they are going to adopt and what exam board. You want that led by a professional head teacher. The role of the governing body is behind that: it is to ensure we get the right head teacher; that he or she would have the right support and follow a framework that responds to the needs of the local community; and, if the head teacher gets it wrong, moving on to the next head teacher.

Q709 Patrick Mercer: Can we move to the appointment of chief officers? You are aware of the furor that has been caused over one or two propositions. In Monmouth the week before last we heard from a number of people how vehemently opposed they were to the idea of bringing experienced civilians into the very senior ranks by direct entry. Can you explain why you propose direct entry to chief officer ranks and respond to some of the criticisms that have been made about the police?

Mr Jones: Firstly, it has been our longstanding policy and our view that police authorities should have the choice, particularly those police authorities that are not main Home Office forces such as civil and nuclear defence which of course appointed a non-professional police officer, which seems to be working out very well, and we do believe our members should have that particular choice. In respect of Home Office forces, I think the vast majority of our members would clearly see that a police professional is the only one that would have the credibility in the top job. I think the majority of police authorities would wish to see that remaining as a professional police officer. I do think it is a slightly different issue in terms of the top team. We heard at the last APA-ACPO conference that in 50% of forces at top team level human resources is not carried out by a human resources professional. In many cases we wish to see that professionalisation in the top team. We also find it would be very helpful, given the fact that we are struggling to find sufficient candidates for the command professional policing decision, that we are diverting command professionals into aspects where they are not qualified, they do not have the expertise and it could be done much more efficiently and probably at greater value by real professionals in that particular field. What we want is to have omni-competent teams, but we do not want every single member of that team to be omni-competent. Similar arguments apply throughout the force. We do need to bring in expertise such as forensic accountants; we do need to bring in people like IT specialists. The situation has been in the past that they have done all the investigation of these specialist areas, but they have then had to brief fully a police officer who uses their police powers, hands it back to them, and then they have to do the work. That is not efficient or effective. We can do it much more efficiently by the expansion of powers to those particular people and the continuation of that as we need to look at careers patterns to ensure those people are kept within the service.

Mr Blundell: Omni-competence is a wonderful concept that certainly got us through the twentieth century; I think we have to think very hard about the skills we need to meet the demands that are made on us to be efficient and effective in 21st century skills. One of the things even lay people know is that the criminals are not short of 21st century skills. If we are having people who can do all of the IT, all the employment law, indeed a lot of the finance involved in running an efficient police organisation, we are going to be very lucky to find a copper who has all the policing skills and can do that as well. Clearly at the top there is room for people with these 21st century skills to add to the policing skills of our top team. I take Bob’s view, and I think most of our colleagues do: we cannot imagine a situation where the chief himself or herself would be anything but a qualified police officer and an experienced police person in all Home Office forces.

Q710 Patrick Mercer: You cite the example of the Civil Nuclear Constabulary, which is obviously exciting and interesting. You make the point about non-Home Office forces. Having said that, the opinions that we have heard have been pretty obdurate about this. How much of a battle do you assume you are going to have?

Mr Jones: Our understanding is that as particularly the one example we have has been developing, we do seem to be realising, in terms of practice, particularly the response from the professional offices in his particular force, that there are many advantages. Increasingly we are seeing that there are professionals from the wider community safety security field, particularly intelligence in security, who can have a key role in policing. We do see that there is a need to move. Again, the issue in the vast majority of police authorities in relation to bringing this in is bringing it into the top team, not necessarily the top position.

Mr Blundell: Briefly, in response to the supplementary question, I do not see it as a battle. I think there has been a confused picture and it needs to be unpicked. In that unpicking there is a number of key issues and being fit to be a constable in the 21st century has clearly risen up the agenda, what skills do we expect them to have and how those need to be supplemented. I recognise what you are saying about obdurate. I hope this is an issue we are not going to fall out about. I am sure that we can negotiate our way through it because it is in the interests of all of us.

Q711 Mr Winnick: Clearly there is a great deal of media interest in the evidence which you are giving today. The Government apparently is considering
making chief constables more directly accountable to the Home Secretary by taking control of the appointment process. That has been flouted apparently as an idea. Do you have a view on this?

Mr Jones: Certainly if we are to have meaningful local accountability, that body must be able to appoint the chief officer. There are already considerable safeguards in respect of the national perspective in there in terms of the Senior Appointments panel and our short lists need to be approved by the Home Secretary, and so I do not see the need for any further safeguards to ensure that the national interest as well as the local interest is carried out. Various suggestions have come forward in terms of cadres, et cetera, and while it is absolutely essential that police authorities get full professional support from the HMI in that particular process, fully trained as they are at this particular moment, the position is, I would suggest, who is better than local people to know who is the best person to police that local community?

Mr Blandell: If we have argued that we do not want direct accountability to local people but we want answerability, this word “accountable” has a lot to answer for I think. Do we really mean “accountable to” or do we mean “giving an account to”? The two processes are quite different. I am all for giving an account to the local people. Coming back to your question, if we argue that on one side, we cannot argue it against the other. I would say that I think most of my colleagues believe that chief constables must be accountable to the law, as they are, and they are sworn servants of the Crown. We think that that is a principal position from which we start. Of course it is part of how we are in Great Britain that that remains the basis of the delivery of our law. That that can be managed and engaged with forces from all sides, both from the community and the Home Office, must be true and we must get better at doing that. To hand over that direct accountability either to the vagaries and micro-management potentials of central government, or indeed the popularism of the local vote, would be dangerous for policing. I think that needs to be protected.

Mr Winnick: You have both answered the questions so fully that I have no further questions.

Q713 Chairman: But you only have one out of 42.

Mr Jones: Yes. In terms of the number of people we are able to appoint from at police authority level, that is proportionate to the numbers that are coming through.

Q714 Chairman: Do you think more should come out of the Met because there seem to be quite a lot of senior officers in the Met?

Mr Jones: Yes, certainly we have 43 ACPO ranks in the Met and clearly in terms of people moving on to ACPO ranks an even bigger number. We are continually looking at the process to try to make sure that police authorities in this and in other areas have as much choice as possible. There is a whole series of schemes where we are seeking to encourage and support candidates coming through. We do need that choice. I am pleased to have been able to appoint BME officers to ACPO positions my self personally and I do believe there is the talent out there, but at the moment it does need to be helped and nourished to reach the position where police authorities become involved in the appointment process. Obviously we are also arguing as part of our submission that we should have greater say in terms of nourishing that particular talent.

Q715 Chairman: Should you have a target, do you think?

Mr Jones: I think it is helpful to have a target. Clearly under the current legislative position a quota would be perceived as difficult. I think there is still more we can do to set a target. We clearly have targets for all other ranks of police officers. I do not see it would be unhelpful to have it at this particular level.

Mr Blandell: I would ask you to bear in mind, sir, that for the things that we are responsible for our police authorities have a better representation of those women and black and ethnic minorities. I think we come out top in all of the publicly-appointed and elected services. I think the will is there. In things that we are not directly responsible for, of course we can only exercise influence within the law.

Q716 Tom Brake: Last year in your submission to this committee’s police funding inquiry you identified a projected shortfall in the year 2007-08 of £391 million, and for this year you have predicted a shortfall of £656 million. Is that going to happen and, if so, what are the implications? Is the fact that for instance my own local force tells me they are going to have to cut 14 officers linked to this and have you made any estimate of what the cuts in officer numbers might be across the country?

Mr Jones: The settlement that we achieved was roughly in line with the predictions we made in our previous submission and appearance at the Home Affairs Select Committees. Clearly there is a shortfall and that is being met in a number of ways; in more general terms by the efficiency strategy
where we have to gain 9%. Many of our colleagues have sought to supplement that not just with efficiencies and additional charges but trying, in consultation with the local community, to invest more from the local precept. As you are aware, decisions from the Secretary of State for Communities indicates we would be limited on that. One of our members of course is having to spend £1 million on re-billing which, in my opinion, would have been better invested in local front-line policing. We are constrained. The formula impacts in different ways on difference forces. Some forces are actually growing the number of police officers; others are making decisions in terms of rebalancing the total number of police officers. I would say that there is a common strategy throughout all police authorities. Whether the total number of police officers and PSCOs is going up or down, the intention is to release more police officers to the front line to do their key job and in many cases it is rebalancing the amount of support those people can get to free them from the more bureaucratic, more routine services to get on with their main job of protecting the public.

Q717 Tom Brake: Do you not feel it is your role to find out across all of the police authorities how many officers down we might be compared to last year or do you not think that is a significant factor in terms of policing ability?

Mr Jones: We have a specialist officer group that gets in that statistical information. My understanding, and I am happy to try to share that information with the committee, is that net we have probably been seeing an increase in police officers, though part of that of course is driven by the continued growth of the counter-terrorism units. I think there will ultimately be net increase. I would say the theme that all police authorities are united on, whether the numbers are going up or down, is about releasing more police officers to the front line.

Q718 Tom Brake: If you do have some information in writing, the committee I am sure would appreciate receiving it.

Mr Blundell: I simply wanted to say that as the chairman of an authority that has suffered slightly with capping, it is a very difficult situation. I think it is a situation that affects more of the small county forces in terms of how we come out of the funding. Certainly my own authority is looking towards campaigning for fairer funding. Of course the APA is a member organisation and I can see that for every one of us who feels that there are the bigger authorities. I do not think it is fair for us to pontificate on these matters.

Q719 Chairman: Last year, Mr Jones and Mr Blundell, this committee unanimously supported the police in their pay award of 2.5%. At that stage, the individual authorities had the money to pay this award in full. Is that right? Was that your position?

Mr Jones: Yes, most of them.

Q720 Chairman: Was it your position also that the police ought to be paid that full award?

Mr Jones: Yes.

Q721 Chairman: What has happened to this money that has not been paid over?

Mr Jones: It has helped to tide us over into the next financial round.

Q722 Chairman: Did you wait until the end of the judicial review before you started to spend it?

Mr Jones: Effectively we would have been able to make the money available under the plans because clearly it would only have been part of the way through a year. It was carried over, usually to supplement reserves or other costs. It has been carried over. It would have been available should the judicial review have come to a different solution.

Q723 Chairman: What is your view about the next pay settlement? The Government is keen to have a three-year settlement.

Mr Blundell: Can I declare that I am Chairman of the staff side of the PNB and I have a particular interest in this matter?

Q724 Chairman: You must tell us what is happening and not just declare that.

Mr Blundell: A lot of it of course has taken place within normal rules of consultation and arbitration and whatever. We have made attempts to see if we can reach a three-year settlement, which we believe would be very good for policing because it would give us some time free from the argy-bargy of normal negotiations in order to do a lot of the police development we need to do. It certainly seems to me that for the last two and a half years since the index was either abandoned or asked to be abandoned we seem to have been in a very tense situation with our Police Federation representatives. We would like to do a three-year deal. We have got very close to it one or twice but I fear that it may not be working out.

Q725 Bob Russell: Mr Jones—and I do not think I will put this question to Mr Blundell—would you be using your best endeavours to see that police officers get the money of which they were robbed?

Mr Jones: We have used our best endeavours. We will continue to use our best endeavours as we believe it gives a suitable environment where we can get on with discussing a whole series of other things, particularly work force modernisation. You will forgive Mr Blundell’s position of course. As Chair of the official side of PNB, he is still involved in rather tense negotiations, which are currently going on to try to resolve the issue. While we obviously wish to share as much information as possible, clearly I am sure you will accept in a negotiating position sometimes there are some difficulties which may work against achieving successful negotiations.

Q726 Bob Russell: The goodwill of police officers would be greatly enhanced, would it not, if that missing money was somehow put on the table?
**Mr Jones:** Our view is that the whole of that particular process was completely unhelpful in terms of relationships. We would like to draw a line under it and get on. We felt that the best way to draw a line under it would be to pay the money. Clearly that is not going to happen. We still wish to move on.

**Mr Blundell:** Could I report, just to let you know the spirit of last year, the PNB itself, without the vote of the Home Office, did ask the Home Secretary to implement in full, as did Scotland and as did the PSC. Our view was that that should have happened at that time. The word “robbed” is fairly emotive.

**Q727 Bob Russell:** What word would you use?

**Mr Blundell:** I would use “blocked” I think. I would want to report that we have started on a very much happier basis this year and lessons have been learnt from last year and that is certainly keeping our side together. People have gone a long way to meet that unanimity of purpose. I do not think we will see that again.

**Chairman:** Mr Jones and Mr Blundell, thank you very much for coming today. I am sure at some future date you will be giving evidence to the select committee again.

---

**Witnesses:** Ms Cherie Booth QC, Chair, and Mr Liam Black, Commissioner, Street Weapons Commission, gave evidence.

**Q728 Chairman:** Ms Booth and Mr Black, thank you very much for coming to give evidence to the select committee. We are conducting an inquiry into policing in the 21st century. We have heard a great deal of evidence since we started the inquiry. Later we will be hearing from the Police Minister, Tony McNulty. Ms Booth, you and your fellow commissioners have been undertaking important work regarding street crime. It is that that we wish to ask you questions about today. I think the whole country was shocked at the recent death of Ben Kinsella, a 16-year old who was apparently stabbed to death on the streets of London. He was stabbed four times after a party celebrating his GCSE examinations. Do you think that the Government has the right statistics concerning knife crime, or is it a much bigger problem?

**Ms Booth:** First of all, of course Ben’s death takes to 17 now the youngsters that have been stabbed to death here in London this year. Sadly, his is not an isolated incident and it is not simply a London-based phenomenon either; 31 teenagers have been stabbed to death in Britain this year. I think we have to understand of course that crime overall has gone down and the Government itself has acknowledged that violent crime has not decreased. One of the disturbing trends that we have found more than anything is that it seems that younger people are now carrying guns and that in itself of course brings more dangers because lack of maturity does not help when you are carrying a gun. Carrying a gun is dangerous in itself but when it is young people who are carrying guns, things can escalate out of control. You ask about the statistics. I think there is more we can do in relation to the statistics, particularly since the collection of statistics does not acknowledge what is happening to children under 16. Clearly, as we now find younger people are carrying knives, we need to look at that. One of the things that struck us when we took our evidence is that it a much bigger problem.

**Q729 Chairman:** How many witnesses have you had?

**Ms Booth:** Off the top of my head I cannot remember, but we are told from behind the figure is 50. One of the witnesses we heard from in London was Mike Walsh, who is a doctor in the Royal London Hospital. He is there at the front end. We were asking him about the statistics of people who are presenting to our hospitals with wounds from guns or knives. There is no doubt whatsoever from the statistics he gave us that those figures are moving up. Certainly, if we are looking at collecting these statistics, we need to see more co-operation between the primary care trusts, the health service in general, and the police and authorities collecting the statistics. I think there is a whole area there that is not reflected in reality.

**Q730 Chairman:** Do you think we are underestimating the amount of knives and guns that are out there being carried? Obviously we have to accept the statistics that the Government puts out. Have you discovered that perhaps it is much worse than people think?

**Ms Booth:** Anecdotally it seems clear that the perception is that it is much worse. I think the evidence we heard from both people on the street and indeed backed up by the figures we were getting from the hospitals is that there are more people presenting with injuries caused this way. One of the reasons why it is not being picked up in the statistics is because the statistics have not looked at people under the age of 16 and because this is almost a new phenomenon that younger children are now carrying knives and, sadly, using them, the statistics are not looking at the right areas; they need to broaden what they are looking at, both in relation to the age of the people who are carrying knives and also where they are getting the figures from.

**Mr Black:** Going into this area was new to me and specifically this. I thought it would be an easy question to answer how many people are stabbed and shot in this age range in the UK. You find very quickly you enter this hall of mirrors where no-one can give you an answer. Some of the evidence that sticks in my mind is that the Merseyside Ambulance Service in written submission to us reckoned that 50% of the stabbing victims that they pick up do not turn the perpetrator in to the police; they do not report it. They will say that it was a bread knife or that they had fallen over when they know very well that it is a stab wound. If that is true, and we have no reason to believe it is not true, then suddenly
rather than these murders and killings being a terrible thing going on over there, you back away and think: my God, is this way bigger than we thought it was? As Cherie was saying, again when you talk to people in the hospitals, you get a sense of an enormous number of young people presenting, many of whom do not involve the police and it does not become official in that sense.

**Ms Booth:** I think you have to understand of course there is a difference between guns and knives. Guns are clearly something that has no other use, if you like, but knives are freely available. There is no way that we could possibly stop knives in our society. The trouble is that the sharp knife that will cut through your fingers or some part of your body will also cut through somebody’s arm. One of the things that Mike Walsh was saying to us is that often the young people, because they do not understand about anatomy, think that if they stab somebody in the leg, that is not so harmful but in fact of course if you stab somebody in the leg and you sever an artery, then that is very harmful indeed.

**Mr Black:** Janet Dean was saying that the reason there are hundreds of young people being murdered in cities like London is that most of them, thank God, do not know how to use a knife properly and if they did, we would be confronted with a really appalling situation.

Q731 **Mrs Dean:** Can you tell us how much evidence you have taken from young people themselves and can you tell us anything about their views about guns and knives and indeed the police action?

**Ms Booth:** I was particularly keen that we should try to find out from young people themselves as much as possible. On the other hand, I am also very conscious that a formal hearing as we had in our five cities with cameras is not necessarily the best setting for a young person to feel comfortable. So, in relation to the formal setting that we had we did not have many 16-year olds giving evidence there, but we did have possibly people in their 20s; in Manchester some young women gave evidence (one was 21 and another 23) who were trying to do something in their local communities. We also had evidence from former offenders who, having turned their lives around, were now trying to transmit better messages to young people about why there is no glamour at all in guns and knives. We heard important evidence I think from mothers and parents: the children of some had been the victims of crime and they were now going out into the schools talking to young people and passing on these messages. Outside the formal hearings, we also of course made an effort to go and visit some of the community groups and schemes that we were talking about, some of whom later gave evidence. In the course of that of course we did meet with young people. I can remember vividly in London when we saw the Boyhood to Manhood project there they assembled a whole range of young people, including a group of year 6 pupils from the local school. We are talking of course about 11-year olds. I was quite shocked to talk to the 11-year olds and in chatting with them about going on to the secondary schools and what they were looking forward to many of them, even at that age, told me that they were frightened about going round the streets of London, especially as they are now moving, of course as you do at that stage, from essentially their parents taking them to and from school and into a world where they are going to be a lot more independent. As young as 11 some of these young kids were telling us they were worried about not feeling safe. Then we talked in that group and in other groups to older children who would say, “We carry knives to protect ourselves”. We have to get this message over that carrying a knife is no protection at all. The other message we must get over to young people is that this is not glamorous; this is not a glamorous thing to do. I think that is quite a difficult message to get over sometimes.

Q732 **Tom Brake:** I wonder whether your research has established what the most effective response is when a teenager is found in possession of a knife and what is most likely to stop that teenager carrying a knife in the future.

**Ms Booth:** If only there was a magic wand solution to this, then we would all grasp it. Unfortunately, it is not as easy as this; this is a multi-faceted problem and it needs a multi-faceted solution, which involves all the difference agencies, from the enforcement end where we are looking at the police and police powers through to what the community can do and also what we can do to help the young people themselves, some of whom at least have come from backgrounds where they have not really had the sort of upbringing and parameters set for them that we would like to see set for our own children. So there is not a magic wand solution to this. One of the things we were impressed with I think is the way that groups are coming together. I know you are going to hear after me about the experiences in Hackney. We took evidence there. We had both the Mayor of Hackney and the Police Commander come. I for one was very impressed by the fact that the two work so closely together. Each of them acknowledged that with their different roles, the police primarily concerned with enforcing the law and ensuring that crime does not pay and also the local authority wearing their social services hat, their education hat, particularly their youth service hat, were trying to see how best we can provide alternatives for these young people.

Q733 **Martin Salter:** There has been a lot of parliamentary, legislative and judicial activity in recent years, none of which has really appeared to impact on the problem. On the face of it, we have seen the Violent Crime Reduction Act raise the maximum penalty for carrying a knife from two years to four years; people are now three times more likely to go to prison than they were 10 years ago for carrying a knife, up from 6% to 17%. It seems to me that the real problem is not so much what we do here but the fact that out there carrying a knife has become almost a legal fashion accessory. How on earth do we challenge that?

**Ms Booth:** I absolutely agree with you. I say that we have to take the glamour out of this. It is really important that in our society young people do not
get this idea about the way you get respect—and “respect” is a word that comes up a lot but it is not the sort of respect the Government’s Respect Agenda is talking about; it is quite different and it is almost a distortion of the word “respect”. It is also about young people who have perhaps limited horizons. One of the things the Mayor of Hackney said to us—I used to live in Hackney so for me it made sense—is that we do not understand that for some of these kids to go to a club in Shoreditch is like an adventure and they do not even go into the West End. In other cities we have heard about this whole postcode division. Research seems to show that certain children have such limited horizons and meet limited numbers of people, so they do not understand what other opportunities there are. The sorts of work that we saw that seemed to work for these young people were ones which gave them a different way of seeing that they could achieve status and feel good about themselves, which was not based on crime and a glamorous idea that the ones who got the girls and the flashy cars were the ones who carried the knives and guns. Liam of course can talk to that because of his experience.

Mr Black: What struck me going round the country was where the police do what the police are supposed to do and do it well has a very strong impact. All the committee were very impressed with Hackney where they sit down and say, “It is that person and that person who are causing the trouble in this borough, so we are going to target them and let them know we are all over them”, and then they were aware that while the police are doing that, the rest of the community through the local authority, voluntary agencies and so on, should be doing what it does very well. We were also impressed with Merseyside. There are parts where I think it does not work so well. There is a lot about partnerships. Sometimes you have to stop people and ask them to say it again to understand what they are talking about. Part of the answer to this terrible problem that we face as a society is getting each actor to do their thing really well and not be drawn into other activities too much. Speaking personally, it seems that the one institution that has not collapsed totally in many of these communities is the police because we cannot allow the police to collapse. Lots of things have done so; voluntary agencies are desperately trying to keep going on short-term funding or no funding. The police are trying to do their stuff and sometimes many of the other actors are not getting it together very well. If we had better co-ordination in areas where it is a real problem, we might see some more impact on the streets. At the moment it strikes us that a lot of those young people who are driven by some talk about fear and fashion are falling through the cracks and not getting picked up by anyone. It is easy to say, is it not: better co-ordination and much more clarity about what each actor’s role is. Once the police get drawn into sort of paramilitary social services, you have a real problem. We saw some fantastic, on-the-ground community activities. The greatest and the good all said the same thing: please tell the people who make the decisions that it is very difficult to get the money in order to keep this great work going.

Q734 Martin Salter: It is also about better role models, is it not?

Mr Black: Yes, all of that but a lot of those agencies are trying to make that real and they cannot do it.

Ms Booth: We saw these people who do provide role models. This is not a one-size-fits-all. What works in a community in Croxteth in Liverpool where the knife and gun crime problem is basically a white, deprived, urban community problem and what works with the black kids in Hackney may not be the same and they need different role models. We saw in Liverpool someone who actually reached out to kids by taking them on sailing and diving courses and we very insistent that the kids said please and thank you and were polite, all the things that you might say are old-fashioned values, but it worked in that community. What is worrying is that these people who do well at delivering services do not necessarily do so well at bureaucracy and filing in forms and doing the fund-raising. What we need to do is find a way whereby we can let all these different local groups get access to the funding by taking away the burden from them of applying for the funding, filling in the forms. There must be a way of helping them so that other people can do that work for them.

Q735 Chairman: I am sorry to cut you off but we do need slightly briefer answers from our witnesses to get through all the questions.

Ms Booth: We could go on for ever!

Q736 Mr Streeter: Is the commission being told about what is going on in other major European countries? I am wondering if what you are describing is a peculiarly British phenomenon that we are seeing growing up in the last decade or so. Is it something about or culture; have we imported something or is it happening across Europe?

Ms Booth: Unfortunately, we did not have the opportunity to see any other evidence about that. We heard from some academics who had views about that, but I suspect that the problem of disaffected youth is not a uniquely British phenomenon.

Q737 Mr Streeter: The knives and guns I mean?

Ms Booth: I think knives again are not a uniquely British phenomenon either because knives are everywhere. The trouble is, as I say, once you glamorise violence you have a problem, do you not; you have people seeking status.

Q738 Gwyn Prosser: Ms Booth, we are all looking forward to learning lessons from your findings. One of your colleagues on the commission has criticised the composition of the group, saying it is full of academics and lawyer types. There are a few lawyers in this room. Guardian Unlimited went on to comment: It is time for the great and the good to meet some of the real scary kids. Can you tell us how many of those 50 witnesses were kids themselves?

Ms Booth: As I explained to you before in my previous answer, many of the 50 witnesses were not the kids, not least because it is not the right environment to bring young people, but in so far as
we went out to speak to young people, we absolutely bent over backwards to do that. As someone who has also been President of Barnardo’s, I feel very strongly that we need to listen to young people and to hear their voices, but we have to hear their voices in the right forum, and that is not necessarily the formal proceedings. We did a lot to meet and speak with them. Liam himself, with his experiences with Fifteen, meets a lot of young people.

Mr Black: I do not how many lawyers are on the commission. I am not a lawyer.

Q739 Gwyn Prosser: It was not my comment. It was the comment of one of your commissioners.

Mr Black: I know that Mark who said that spent quite a bit of time meeting local young people. Those meetings were set up for him by the commission secretariat. In all these processes you wish you had more time, you wish you had more resources. Tom is not a lawyer and maybe I am now one of the great and the good. I think the process was pretty good.

We saw a lot of different people on the street up to chief constable. I think we got a pretty good picture. Mark who said that has some great experience, which he fed in, which was really helpful.

Q740 Mrs Cryer: Are you finding with particular police forces a measure of success in dealing with gun and knife crime? I think from what you have told us, you are finding that it is not just the police action; it is also voluntary groups that are having difficulty. That is what we found about 18 months ago when we did another inquiry. We met young people from all over London. There are many really good groups out there. It is up to you what you want to talk about, whether you want to talk about good policing that is really working or whether you think that in addition to that we need the voluntary groups that are working. Apparently £5 million is being given by the Government to combat knife and gun crime in the hot spots. One of the bits of money is going to go on home visits and letters to parents of young people known to carry weapons. Do you think that is a good idea? Is that going to have an impact?

Mr Black: I think it is a good idea, so long as it is one of many good ideas along the whole spectrum from when young people are in school until when they hit the criminal justice system. What struck us when we met senior police officers, as I said, was the difference around the country. Where it really seems to work is where this is really clear and very targeted and the parents of the children that are being stopped or arrested are communicated with very clearly about what is going on. I think that is very important.

Ms Booth: We should not disregard the parents. Many of them perhaps do not even know what is happening to their children, and when they do know can do something about it. It is not just the police and the voluntary sector; there obviously is a role for the Government and particularly for local government in this as well. One of the things that also came out, I think, from the commission was that we do not have a one-size-fits-all answer. We cannot go back to the idea that we have local authorities just setting up standard youth clubs. It needs to be a lot more flexible and adaptable to that, not least because if you are going to reach these children, you need people who are prepared to go out and be at the places and at the times when the young people are going to be there. It is not use having a facility that is between 9 and 5 when that is not really the time when you need to connect with these youths.

Mr Black: One really great example in Birmingham, the West Midlands Mediation Service, was doing really specific things like this. They know that John Smith who is in prison for five years for some gang-related offence is coming back out on to the streets in a few months’ time. They will go into the prison and say: “We are going to help you get ready.” There is someone waiting for him outside, the brother, father or friend of the person that he had hurt. They deliberately try to negotiate a truce between those people, so that when they come out the cycle does not go on. The police are involved and the guy running it was a police officer. It is very impressive with simple, targeted intervention with the support of all the various actors. I think more of that would be good.

Q741 David Davies: How many response officers, i.e. police constables who have carried out arrests within the last six months for offensive weapons, have you spoken to?

Ms Booth: In Merseyside the Chief Constable came along but he came along with his support officer who was in the community. In addition to that we heard from officers in Hackney. We heard from officers who were on the ground in Glasgow. We heard from an officer who goes into the schools and does policing work there. We are very conscious of course, and we should always remember that the police officers who go into these dangerous situations are also putting their own lives on the line. I know that that is something that you are concerned about.

Q742 David Davies: Do you meet any of these people in private? Often what police officers tell you in front of a Chief Constable is very different when you talk to them privately.

Ms Booth: We certainly did meet some of them outside because we did not just have our public hearings; we also had investigations where we went around. As it happens, of course I do have to meet a lot of policemen and so I have had the opportunity to talk to them myself.

Q743 David Davies: Did they tell you, and this is a big issue, that police officers are very often stopping people for minor offences; they do a PNC check and discover that person has a recent conviction for carrying knives or guns. They are then unable to search them because they have to be arrested and because their human rights will suggest that it would be unfair for a police officer to search somebody without evidence that they have a knife or gun on them there and then. Did those police officers tell you that this needs to be changed and that anyone
who has a recent conviction for carrying a knife or gun who is stopped for committing a further offence should be liable to a frisk?

Ms Booth: One of the interesting things we found when we saw this, it was not specifically about that, was that in Merseyside for example when they were doing their targeted policing and doing a run on the number plates for stolen cars, when they find those cars, they have been going there and stopping the people. They were telling us that it was amazing in stopping the cars what else they found.

Q744 David Davies: Speaking as somebody who is a warranted police officer and has been in that situation, can I put in my bit for you to change the Human Rights Act so that when somebody is stopped for committing an offence and has a recent conviction for carrying guns or knives, a police officer be allowed to pat them down?

Ms Booth: I do not think that is a matter of the Human Rights Act; it is a matter of ensuring that in every way we do it we balance the rights of individuals.

Q745 Bob Russell: I believe you said that already this year in the first six months there have been 17 fatal stabblings in London?

Ms Booth: Yes, Sunday being the 17th.

Q746 Bob Russell: What is the figure for the UK?

Ms Booth: I think the figure is 31 teenagers.

Q747 Bob Russell: Does the 31 include the 17? It is 31 in total. What is the number of gun deaths in the same period? You will understand where I am coming from when you answer?

Ms Booth: That includes guns as well.

Bob Russell: It would be helpful if we had the breakdown.

Chairman: We have the police coming.

Q748 Bob Russell: I understand that. I understand the breakdown was 4:1 knives and guns.

Ms Booth: That would not surprise me in the slightest.

Q749 Bob Russell: The reason for my question is that I gain the impression from what has been said earlier that knife crime is far more prevalent than 4:1 against guns. If that is the case, have we as a country got the balance wrong because I get the impression that we are more concerned about gun crime than knife crime yet all the evidence is that knife crime is a massive problem in comparison.

Ms Booth: I certainly think we should be concerned about knife crime. As a parent, I am concerned about what is happening when my children go on the street, and I know that I am not unique in that by any means. I talked before about seeing some of the witnesses we had who were mothers. There was one lady in Birmingham and she actually went into the school and talked to the children both about her son and about what happened to him but, also, about what knives can do. She had some pretty graphic material, which actually made children realise that these knives are not just toys; that they can do really serious harm.

Mr Black: One of the facts that sticks in my mind, again, as somebody who came pretty fresh to this (and which I now ask everyone I meet) is: what percentage of crime do you think involves a firearm? Everyone says: “40%? 30%?” It is 0.5%. Of that 0.5% how many of those firearms are replicas or toys? I think it is half. So you are talking about a relatively small impact that has devastating impacts on anyone that is involved in that. My personal view is that the knife problem, and the easy access to knives, is a much bigger issue that we face than young people and guns.

Q750 Bob Russell: I have a constituent whose son was knifed to death who does exactly the same and goes into schools.

Ms Booth: It is very powerful.

Q751 Bob Russell: What did your investigations tell you about the relations between the police and the communities where this kind of crime—knife crime—is prevalent?

Ms Booth: On the whole, we were impressed with the work that the police do with the communities. There is absolutely no doubt, from ACPO downwards, that the police are fully aware (they are part of the community) of the necessity to be seen as part of the community, but you have to always bear in mind, of course, that in the end the police are the enforcers and therefore there is a line over which they cannot go. A policeman is not going to be as accessible as someone who is a youth worker, simply because they are a police officer; they are in uniform. The police certainly see it as part of their role to co-operate and work with and through voluntary agencies and the local authorities.

Mr Black: I think it is worth saying we saw a lot of good stuff but, again, it struck me everywhere we went the alienation felt by lots of young people in very poor communities from everybody. Inevitably, a lot of the young people we see are the ones that have been saved, have been taken up; there are lots of young people out there that are way beyond conversations with the great and good like us, plus local community organisations and the police. In those cut-off communities and those gangs of young people this kind of discourse is largely irrelevant. Cracking that one is the answer.

Q752 Mr Winnick: Sometimes the allegation is made that because of the incompetence of the police, and worse, into the murder of Stephen Lawrence and the inquiry which showed that the Metropolitan Police was racist there is a sensitivity amongst the police force in questioning youngsters who are black who may be carrying knives. Do you think there is any justification for those allegations?

Ms Booth: I think the police are very well aware of the mistakes of the past and have bent over backwards to ensure that they are not repeated again. I also think it is pretty clear that, as we discovered when we were talking to people who had
involved with this—the total policing and what is happening in Hackney—there are many members of the black community who actually welcome that because they see that it is their children who are being killed. If you look at the pictures of the children who are being killed in London (if you saw our programme last night) you will see that many, many of them are black children.

Q753 Mr Winnick: It is sometimes described as “black-on-black”, and this is, of course, of concern but that if it is not “black-on-black” it is of less interest to the police and the community generally.

Ms Booth: I do not think it is of less interest to the police at all; I think they see it as their role to protect the community. Part of that community is, of course, the minority ethnic community. Cooperation between that community and the police actually is the best way to protect everybody.

Q754 Mr Clappison: Could I ask you, Ms Booth, as a lawyer and a high-profile lawyer (and I think it is a good thing to have a lawyer involved in this), from your experience as a lawyer, about the response of the criminal justice system to this? I think you have said—it is implicit in what you have said—that the gravity of the problem is the number of young people who are simply going out with a weapon, in particular with a knife, because if a young person goes out with a knife they do not know where it is going to end up. That is the problem. All the evidence is that the number of young people going out with a knife has increased greatly in recent years. The Government says the number of people dealt with by the police for this, for possessing an offensive weapon, has gone up from just over 6,000 to over 10,000 in the last ten years. Do you think that the criminal justice system is sending out a strong enough message about this when about a third of those who are dealt with are dealt with by way of a caution without being prosecuted at all, and when only a very small number of those who are prosecuted are given a custodial sentence?

Ms Booth: The criminal justice system is part of a continuum, if you like. If we are going to deal with this problem we have to see it from beginning to end. The beginning, of course, starts in the community and it moves on to detection by the police. Of course, if young people think they can carry knives and no one is ever going to pick them up carrying a knife then they are more likely to take one out, whereas if they think when they carry a knife that they may well be detected, that is going to make a really big difference—which is why I think the Hackney experiment is so interesting. They go to places where it is known that people have had knives and bring knives, and then they set up their search arch, either they find knives, which is good, or else they deter people from bringing the knives in the first place. A knife left at home is a knife which is not going to cause any danger. Then we go on, of course, through that into how you deal with the young people when they pick it up. Of course, the ones that go on to the court system—what happens to them? One thing I am absolutely sure of is that we have to have flexibility within the system, because, in the end, the punishment always has to fit the crime, and if the police are having some discretion to know who they should charge and who they should not charge and the judges do not have the discretion in sentencing to ensure that the punishment does fit the crime then that is not justice either. The other thing is, beyond the court room we also have to think what happens next, and that goes to what happens in our prisons, how we deal with young people in our prisons and it also goes beyond that to what Liam was talking about with the mediation service—about what happens to these people when they come out, because if they just go back into exactly the same situation as when they came in the cycle starts again. This is a whole process which goes through the entire—

Q755 Mr Clappison: I appreciate that because it is a familiar argument, but it is not just the risk of detection that deters people; it is also what happens to them when they are detected. If they feel that nothing significant is going to happen to them when they are detected that will not act as a deterrent. At the moment, as matters stand, young people are far more likely to be cautioned than they are to go to prison. Can I give you an example? Last month the magistrates’ guidelines were issued to magistrates as to how people caught in possession of a knife should be dealt with. The simple fact of possession of a knife (which I think we both agree is the very serious essence of the problem), the starting point for simple possession of a knife in the magistrates’ guidelines, which have just gone out last month to magistrates up and down the country, is a band C fine. Do you think that a fine is a sufficient deterrent for everybody possessing an offensive weapon—to stop them from going out, carrying a knife they might face a fine?

Ms Booth: I think you have to understand, in relation to the sentencing guidance that you are talking about there, that this is a complicated issue. One of the interesting things the public have to understand is that sentencing is not just something done on the whim of the judge. As a Recorder myself and someone who has to sentence people myself, every year we go to training seminars where we have to actually do trial sentences and are concerned to make sure we are all consistent. Every three years we have to go to a residential course, and we have to follow the guidelines which are assembled by best practice and experts as to what the best way of dealing with these matters are. So you cannot just pick one little sample in the book that you have taken and say: “This shows that the courts are being lenient in relation to that”. There is a whole spectrum there, and your job as a sentencer is to see the individual before you, assess actually what the circumstances are in relation to that individual and then be guided by the documents we have, which say that in the particular case you place an individual in that category, you then use that as your starting point and do make the punishment fit the crime.
Q756 Mr Winnick: What about the safety of the public? Should that not be a very important factor in the minds of all those responsible for sentencing?

Ms Booth: As someone who sentences myself and as someone who goes to seminars and meets many other judges who sentence, the safety of the public is always in the mind. One of the things you think about with the judicial—

Chairman: We do have the Policing Minister walking up and down the corridor outside. We must not keep Mr McNulty waiting.

Q757 Mr Clappison: I hear what you say. Sending, particularly, a young person to prison is not an attractive proposition, but this is a serious situation because we have too many young people going out with knives. Can I make an analogy with the situation of somebody who drinks too much and then goes out driving? We have said that somebody who goes out and drinks and drives will go off the road—they will know that with certainty. Do we not need something of a similar approach to deal with knife crime, so that people know they will face a serious penalty if they go out with a knife—if they go out with a knife at all? Just being in possession of a knife will result in a serious penalty and not just a fine.

Mr Black: I will not comment on the legal side because I do not know anything about that. What I will say, though, is that one of the witnesses, who you would have loved, in Liverpool, a former gang member, said: ‘Here’s the answer. The answer is the Government say: ‘In six months’ time a new law will end it. Everyone will know that.” In a lot of these cases, for example, “Here’s the answer. The answer is the Government say: ‘In six months’ time a new law will end it. Everyone will know that.”

Q758 Chairman: I have a final question which I wish you to answer in 30 seconds, each of you, and I do not want an answer about messages; I want a practical thing that you can do. If you were Home Secretary for one day, what one practical thing could you do in order to reduce the number of knives and guns out there on the streets?

Ms Booth: I think that this idea of taking the glamour out of crime and having a highly visible police presence which actually cracks down on, in the way we have seen in Hackney, and harries criminals is a good approach.

Mr Black: Speaking personally, what I would like to see (we had a rough sleepers’ initiative in London) is a really targeted initiative in those areas where this is a problem that would include an easy way for really, really good projects on the ground that are diverting young people away to be properly funded and get a lot of this bureaucracy out of the way and enable people that are doing great work to carry on doing that rather than get buried under paperwork.

Q759 Chairman: Thank you both very much. We could have gone on all day, but we have the Policing Minister and the Chief Superintendent of Hackney to give evidence. Thank you both very much indeed.

Ms Booth: Thank you for having us.
Q762 Mr Winnick: You will know, of course, Chief Superintendent, of the concern not only of the murder which took place in London over the weekend but the number of other youngsters who have been murdered. There is general concern over the lack of public safety. I wonder, therefore, if you feel there is any change needed for those who have been found in possession of guns and knives.

Chief Superintendent Dann: I think, from the police point of view, in relation to the sentencing, which is the five year minimum sentence, we are very supportive of that. What we are finding is that that is not always the case, and that that minimum sentence is not always being offered there. In respect of the actual possession of a firearm the five-year sentence, we feel, is appropriate.

Q763 Mr Winnick: And knives?

Chief Superintendent Dann: Knives is a very complex thing, and obviously it is the thing that is probably troubling us more than anything else at the moment. I could quote you statistics about how we have reduced knife crime on the borough. I can give you the fact that in the last two years 93 juveniles have been before the youth offending element and only four of those 93 actually received a custodial sentence; the rest were referral orders, supervision orders and those types of order. Again, I am not even sure what was done about breaches of those. Then when you look at that list of 93 names, within that there are people who are dead; there are people who are on bail or who have been charged with murder. So even when they are into the judicial system they are still committing crime or ending up dead.

Q764 Mr Winnick: Do you feel there is any justification for the view that the police are not sufficiently proactive in dealing with suspects who are carrying knives for aggressive purposes?

Chief Superintendent Dann: No. Particularly with Operation Blunt 2, which is ongoing in the Metropolitan Police at the moment, we are extremely proactive in relation to tackling—

Q765 Mr Winnick: Stopping youngsters you believe, regardless of whether they are black, white or Asian—stopping them and searching?

Chief Superintendent Dann: There are a couple of elements to it. One is the intelligence-led element to it, and I saw Mr Vaz on TV last night talking about the intelligent targeting of individuals. That is extremely difficult to do. How do you know who is carrying a knife? Who gives you that intelligence that someone is carrying a knife? The kerb team that I have, I have 10 officers working on that full-time, targeting 20 people, and that is driven by an intelligence team behind it, linking in with youth offending teams and other teams. To actually identify those ten to 20 people is very, very difficult, and then to supply the resources into continual visits to the homes (122 visits in six months to home addresses) is a problem for me. I think the stop and search element also brings with it a degree of reassurance and a degree of prevention as well. We have actually seen a reduction in the number of people carrying knives since we have gone with this Operation Blunt 2.

Q766 Mr Winnick: A reduction?

Chief Superintendent Dann: A reduction in the arrests of people in possession of knives.

Q767 Martin Salter: Thank you, Chief Superintendent. Two quick questions on legislation. You seem to be implying, given the legislative activity that we have seen on knife crime in particular, that we can legislate till the cows come home but there is a cohort of young people out there who remain impervious to it, even when they are in the judicial system, and that the real problem is lifestyle choices and knives being seen, almost, as a fashion accessory.

Chief Superintendent Dann: Yes. I firmly believe that is the case. There is a large element of the criminal youth who see it as a lifestyle; it is a cultural, lifestyle issue to carry a knife. If I look back at a couple of murders in Hackney late last year—two in particular—we profiled all the people involved in that, from the witnesses to the suspects and the victims. You look through these profiles going right back to when they were at school and you can see the profile of how they ended up where they were: from interaction at school, bullying (at some point they all became a victim which is actually quite interesting and we were looking at whether there were intervention opportunities that we missed in that), low-level criminality, theft from motor vehicles, predominantly a degree of rape or sexual assault, gang rape, (which is something we are encountering more and more in the borough, and then into robbery, robbery at knifepoint, possession of a firearm, dead or murderer. You can see this pattern building up in these individual people that are coming to notice. In the first four months of this year we arrested 62 people in possession of knives; only 13 of those were first-time offenders. So there are other people already in the criminal system and still committing crime.

Q768 Martin Salter: Earlier intervention is something that comes through as something that is required, yes?

Chief Superintendent Dann: It is, but my view is that by the time we become involved—

Q769 Martin Salter: It is too late.

Chief Superintendent Dann:—it is too late. I know there are a lot of suggestions about 0-3 year-olds and 3-9 year-olds, and so on, but we actually do not become involved really until they are aged 10-11. I have an officer in every secondary school on the borough, a Safer Schools Officer, but that is the first real interaction, unless they have come to notice for criminality.
Q770 Martin Salter: One quick question on the Law Lords’ ruling about the use of anonymous witnesses, in terms of bringing cases to trial. Do you hold that it is important that the Government does plug this or resolve the situation?

Chief Superintendent Dann: Definitely.

Q771 Chairman: Do you see this as a crucial part of your enforcement activity?

Chief Superintendent Dann: This is critical to what we do. We hosted a Trident event about six to eight weeks ago, which was all about special measures, and at that event of over 200-300 people, we had housing officers and youth workers who want to be able to explain to these youngsters that come to them who say: “I have witnessed something. I want to talk but I am frightened”. We need those special measures. I know Louise Casey makes mention of it in her recent report, but my understanding is that it has all-party support as well, but it is critical to what we do. If someone can walk into a room or down a street with a firearm and shoot someone in the head we do. If someone can walk into a room or down a street with a firearm and shoot someone in the head and think nothing of it because they do not expect to be identified, then I think we have got to have these special measures in place.

Q772 David Davies: Chief Superintendent, do you feel that the current stop and search laws give you the flexibility that you need to deal with this problem? Specifically, is it a concern for you that police officers can stop people for minor offences that are not going to be arrestable, discover that they have recent convictions for knife and gun carrying and yet that police officer is, technically, unable to search them?

Chief Superintendent Dann: Dealing with the first part of it, I believe the legislation we have is sufficient. Using our section 1 powers and using section 60 powers, where we believe there is going to be violence in our locality, I think the balance is right; I think section 1 (reasonable grounds) and all the issues that link to that, is correct. The second part of the question—I am sorry?

Q773 David Davies: If an officer stops somebody for a ticket evasion or something—a PNC—and discovers that six months ago they were arrested for using a knife on someone, that would not be grounds under section 1, according to police trainers.

Chief Superintendent Dann: No, it is not in itself, but you have to take account of all elements. That could be part of the jigsaw of the picture to lead you to search.

Q774 David Davies: I think some police officers may interpret it rather more, shall we say, pragmatically than others, but the general view from police trainers is that simply stopping somebody for an offence that is unarrestable and then discovering they have a recent conviction for a relevant offence, is not grounds, under section 1; unless you can actually see that gun butt or knife sticking out of their pockets or see the outline of it, you have not really got grounds for searching them. Many officers say that is wrong and should be changed.

Chief Superintendent Dann: My own personal view is no. I do not think it is wrong, though I think it needs more than just that previous conviction. When was the previous conviction?

Q775 David Davies: Six months ago?

Chief Superintendent Dann: That could lead as part of the jigsaw; what area are you in, what is the time of day, the locality, is it an area for violence? There is a lot more to it, I would suggest, than just that one element in isolation.

Q776 David Davies: Will you be targeting these people and saying: “Okay, you were convicted six months ago so for the next three years expect to be frisked every time that we speak to you for another offence”? Would that not help you?

Chief Superintendent Dann: I do not believe it would do; I actually think that would create more conflict and tension in the community. I think the approach we have taken with our kerb unit, where we take account of lots of different elements, is to identify those who are unwilling to engage in intervention and diversion and target those 20 violent offenders on the borough. They have more than just a previous conviction, although all of them have previous convictions for violence and minor offences.

Q777 Tom Brake: Can you tell us whether you believe that the Local Area Agreement is central to tackling gun and gang crime?

Chief Superintendent Dann: It depends on the interpretation, and we are still running in our borough from the three-year stretch targets which actually encompassed reducing Trident offences and tackling violence as well. So I have probably an advantage over some boroughs that may not have had that, but I do believe the Local Area Agreements allow you, should your borough require that response, to actually look for funding support and engage with our partners in the local authority to tackle that particular element.

Q778 Tom Brake: Could you say whether the Local Area Agreements and, particularly, the resources that the police put into it, are a priority for you, or at times when finances are tough is that not, in fact, one of the first areas that the police seek to take money out of so that they can concentrate on frontline policing?

Chief Superintendent Dann: No. The relationship I have with local authorities is absolutely superb in Hackney, and we really stand shoulder to shoulder in what we do. Actually, it helps obtain funding opportunities. For instance, they have recently paid for a small drugs squad for me, a sergeant and four, and a town centre team of two sergeants and eight, above and beyond my target strength. So because of these Local Area Agreements and what we have put into that, and jointly agreed that, we actually have that opportunity to tackle those problems which involve the community and voluntary sector as well in designing particularly to tackle those issues jointly.
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Q779 Mrs Cryer: I wonder if you could tell us how you combat gang related crime. I am particularly interested because I have two gangs in my constituency and the only reason we are stopping them hurting each other is by a very high level of police presence there. I am wondering now how long we are going to have to do this. I wonder if you could just talk about how you deal with it.

Chief Superintendent Dann: Certainly. It is slightly just talk about how you deal with it. We are going to have to do this. I wonder if you could police presence there. I am wondering now how long them hurting each other is by a very high level of constituency and the only reason we are stopping combat gang related crime. I am particularly careful about peer groups and kids that hang about, and the definitions that we have of peer groups, gangs and organised criminal networks. I feel in tackling the gang issues in Hackney a disproportionate amount of my time and resources are employed in keeping a lid on those gang problems. To actually dismantle those gangs, not just disrupt (and we had an operation last year where we arrested 26 members of a gang and recovered firearms, drugs—that gang reared its head a couple of weeks ago and is still a continuing problem to us, even though we arrested 26 of them for serious offences) we do spend a considerable amount of time. We talk about level one—so on a borough where I am I can tackle level one criminality; I can put operations in, I can do high-visibility policing, but actually to get in there with undercover officers and make it the bigger (what we call) level two response, I have to bid for that as every other borough in the Metropolitan Police Service has to. For me, one of the biggest challenges is the gang issue in Hackney.

Q780 Mrs Dean: Could you tell us to what extent a Safer Neighbourhood model is employed across different wards in Hackney? How do you ensure you target local police resources where they are most needed?

Chief Superintendent Dann: The Safer Neighbourhood Team—I have got 19 wards in Hackney and every ward has a sergeant, two constables and three community support officers. I also have the extra officers I mentioned funded by the local authority in Shoreditch to deal with the night-time economy, and a Dalston town centre team as well on top of that. They are dedicated to those wards. There is a tasking process and it is a tasking process that exists where fortnightly they come together and the response to whatever the current intelligence is, they provide the support for that. On top of that, there is a daily management meeting that takes about an hour each day in which the inspectors oversee the Safer Neighbourhood Teams partnering to make sure that we can move the resources however we need to. The bid for me around Safer Neighbourhood Teams—and I have to say I think they are an absolutely fantastic asset and we should never go away from what we have put in place—is actually mainstream Safer Neighbourhood Teams (neighbourhood policing) as opposed to it being an add-on to what do. It is absolutely critical, the relationship they build up, not just in dealing with gangs and local issues but the counter-terrorism aspects as well—gaining that knowledge and those contacts in the community. I have no doubt that the Safer Neighbourhood Teams in Hackney are one of the main drivers of the confidence levels. The public attitude survey of last year—from being the worst out of 32 boroughs with 22% we have now moved to 63% on the borough. Throughout the year we have crept up. We have been the worst for three or four years and, over the last year, a number of initiatives, including that, have improved the confidence levels to above the Met average.

Q781 Chairman: Thank you very much. When we came to Hackney we did see on the walls of a police station photographs of people who you were targeting. How useful is that process in identifying those responsible?

Chief Superintendent Dann: It is useful in that it continually reminds the officers of the people that we are targeting, as this is part of the intelligence-led process. The actual briefing the officers get on a daily basis (we have each of three shifts that come in) is a separate, bespoke briefing for each of those, so it is continually updated. You will have seen the “curve offenders” as we call them (they were the top ten and we have now extended that to the top 20 people because I mainstreamed that pilot project and it doubled the size of it to tackle these top 20 offenders), and they are the people that I want my officers to get in the face of because these are the people who have refused to engage or are unwilling to engage in any intervention diversion with youth offending teams, with diversion programmes or with my mobile intervention team (the local authority joint mobile intervention team). So those photographs are useful, undoubtedly, to remind officers of the people that we are targeting.

Q782 Chairman: If there was one law or one procedure that you could change in order to make your life easier, what would that be? Tell us very briefly.

Chief Superintendent Dann: Certainly. Thinking that question would come or a similar question, I actually got to five points, but the main one, for me, I have to say, I think, is clarity around the role of the police in what we are doing. I now have officers engaged in schools, I have officers engaged in youth offending teams, mobile intervention teams—the role of the police seems to have gone like that. What are we there for? I think we need some clarity around that. That includes all the processes. Why do we take lost property? Why do we take lost dogs? Is that what was they should be doing? My belief is I think we need to fundamentally review what policing is about. What do the community want of our police? What do the community want? You have some people saying: “Enforcement. Let’s enforce. That is your job”; other people are saying we should be in
prevention, education. It is such a complex business now, policing, so I think we need to take a bit of a time out and say: “Okay, what are we here for?” “What are we meant to be doing and what do the community want us to do?” Otherwise we are going to just get pulled from pillar to post.

Q783 Chairman: Chief Superintendent, thank you very much for coming today and for allowing us to come to visit your police station. Please do keep us informed of any developments in your area of activity. Thank you very much.

Chief Superintendent Dann: Thank you very much.


Q784 Chairman: Minister, thank you very much for giving evidence. I am sorry if you have been kept waiting to come in.

Mr McNulty: No, that is fine.

Q785 Chairman: As you know, this Committee has been conducting an inquiry into policing in the 21st Century. When you last spoke about this in Westminster Hall you told us that the Green Paper, which was the response to Sir Ronnie Flanagan’s report, was going to be coming out very shortly. Do you have a timetable as to when this is going to be published?

Mr McNulty: Very shortly. Before the end of term, I think I can say with some confidence, and hopefully a lot more before the start of term.

Q786 Chairman: It may well be, because our inquiry is due to be completed at the end of this term, as you put it, that we may ask you to pop back in again to clarify one or two areas.

Mr McNulty: I think, given the timing, I would be very, very happy to do that. If it works out to squeeze that in before the recess, fine, but if it is a September session, or whatever, I shall make myself available. I think that is entirely fair. Specifically on the 21st Century, if I may say—the board outside described this as an inquiry into policing in the 31st Century, which I might struggle with!

Q787 Chairman: This Committee is known to be way ahead of itself? Can I ask you, because we have taken evidence during our inquiry about the recruitment and retention of ethnic minority officers, about the current situation in the Metropolitan Police, where we have one senior officer in an employment tribunal, and another threatening to go, possibly, to an industrial tribunal, and another threatening to go, possibly, to an industrial tribunal, sitting a few doors away from the Metropolitan Commissioner. I do not want you to comment on the individual cases, because I know you will not be able to, but is this a good image for the Metropolitan Police at this moment? You are the Minister for the police.

Mr McNulty: As you rightly say, I will not comment on individual cases in any way, shape or form; that simply is not for me to do. I think, nationally, in terms of targets for BME recruitment all our forces are there or thereabouts but I do think a lot more needs to be done. Interestingly, one of the useful side-effects of the introduction of PCSOs was that that has proved a very successful pathway for many from the BME communities to start as a PCSO and then move into policing. I do not think it was anticipated that it would be a recruitment conduit for BME officers to join the police but it has proved to be. The targets are something around 8-9% depending on the force, and most are absolutely in line to at least come close to that, but I think the target is but the start, I would say, and all forces can and should do better.

Q788 Chairman: Are these the targets set by Jack Straw when he was Home Secretary, following the MacPherson report? As far as senior officers are concerned, we took evidence from members of the National Black Police Officers’ Association when we were in Reading in Mr Salter’s constituency, and there was concern about progress to the highest levels of the police force. I note what you say about not wanting to comment on individual cases, but it cannot be a good thing, can it, that so many officers make the allegation of racism against the Metropolitan Police?

Mr McNulty: It is not, with respect, so many officers; it is, as you suggest, two in process or dealt with and one potentially going the same route. If the notion is that somehow under Sir Ian Blair, or indeed, Len Duvall’s leadership either or both are racist, then I think that is not with any foundation whatsoever, and I would certainly decrie those who suggest that either Ian Blair or Len Duvall are racist. I would not paint the picture as bleakly as the coverage of one or two cases suggests. However, in the broader context, can and should we do more in the Met—which actually has one of the better records on BME recruitment and retention compared to other forces—or, indeed, in other forces, then absolutely, yes, we should.

Q789 Chairman: You have not intervened in this or propose to intervene?

Mr McNulty: I have no intention of intervening. It is a matter for the Metropolitan Police Service, in the first instance, then the Metropolitan Police Authority and then Mr Boris Johnson, as the Mayor of London.

Q790 Chairman: We will be hearing from him on 15 July when he comes to give evidence to this Committee. Let us move on to other aspects of policing. We have just heard from the Street Crimes Commission, under the Chairmanship of Cherie Booth, and of course we read in the Evening Standard and other newspapers about the tragic death of Ben Kinsella, the 17th young person in London to be stabbed to death since the start of this
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year. This is a very worrying statistic. Are you concerned about the number of young people who have knives and guns in their possession?

Mr McNulty: I am very, very concerned—hugely concerned—and government must do all that it can. Interestingly, when these matters, largely around guns rather than knives, were a matter of real debate around some tragic cases this time last year, any time I appeared on the media to put the Government line I would try to say to people that this is actually society’s issue; it is not just government but we need to understand what parents are doing, what schools are doing, what we are collectively doing in terms of education awareness and huge amounts of the preventative work as well as simply the enforcement side and whether we have the legislation right or not. The response to that this time last year was always: “Yes, but what are the Government doing?” as though that was all a cop-out and the Government had some sort of magic wand. Happily, despite the tragic circumstances, this time round whenever I have discussed it with colleagues in the media, the response has been an acceptance that, actually, this is about all of us, right from, as I say, parents, through schools, teachers, awareness training—everything. The last time I was on the TV on this I said as starkly as I could, because I think we need to get this message across, that young people who go out equipped, certainly with knives, have the potential to end up either dead or in prison, and it has to be as stark as that. The notion is that it is now almost becoming a fashion accessory when young people go out, and what would have previously been minor altercations between young people seeking to enjoy themselves now end up in tragedy, as in the case of Ben Kinsella and a whole host of others. We, collectively, must do something about that. I was very pleased that Judge Igor Judge said that the courts needed to take a greater responsibility in terms of utilising the legislation that is available. That is absolutely commendable. We look all the time and review legislation to see if there is more that we can do, but I think we have got the balance about right.

Q791 Chairman: We will be coming on to some of the other aspects of this, especially bail, a little later on. In respect of these tragic deaths, is there not something that the Government can do immediately? You are no pushover, as far as fighting crime is concerned. Why are we not being tougher on this?

Mr McNulty: I think we are, and I am very gratified at the community’s response in London and elsewhere when the police get a whole lot tougher, using section 30 and section 60 powers to almost cordon off an area, flood it, effectively, with policemen and stop and search young people without suspicion. We are at a stage now where we have got the community saying: “Can we have more of that please?” As and when the former Mayor and the previous Mayor carry out Operation Blunt and Operation Blunt 2, setting up in an area with search warrants, knife search arches and really do bear down on an area, based on intelligence, it works and works very, very effectively, and I would encourage our police forces to do more of that. They are doing that all over; I was in Liverpool just last Friday and saw the results of the same huge, broad approach in the particular area, partly about anti-social behaviour but, equally, about driving out knives and guns from our streets.

Q792 Gwyn Prosser: Mr McNulty, I would like to ask you about local policing. Do you agree with one of Sir Ronnie Flanagan’s conclusions that the balance within the present structure of policing has become too unbalanced, and that the Home Office are far too much involved in local policing?

Mr McNulty: I am sure that was Ronnie’s sentiment, but I am not sure he put it quite like that. However, I do, and we spent the last year or so trying to get to a place where we define far more readily the strategic oversight that the Home Office has and what we expect and anticipate from our local constabularies and, indeed, right at the neighbourhood policing level. I do sincerely think that it is the Home Office’s job to set the broad framework and it is for constabularies and their local politicians to determine the priorities within that framework, with incumbent responsibilities as well as rights, if I can put it in that way. One of the things we are looking at in the Green Paper, which I am happy to discuss when I return, is how you get that balance right between affording much greater autonomy to forces who do the business and are excellent in terms of their performance across all range of measures, and how you intervene with those who are not as successful. It is about getting that absolute balance right. I do believe that.

Q793 Gwyn Prosser: Have you got any thoughts about introducing more accountability at local level?

Mr McNulty: We do. We will spell it out further in the Green Paper but there is the vexed issue of not quite the democratic deficit because the politicians who sit on police authorities are elected, albeit indirectly—they are not elected directly to the policing function—but, I think, at least looking at the notion of directly electing police authorities, or somewhere along the line getting a democratic dimension into local policing, I think, is right and proper. That is happening more and more at the very localised level with the growing importance of Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships, Local Area Agreements, where a whole range of partners including the council come together to pursue joint and shared policies and outcomes, but I am not sure it is quite right yet at the police authority level.

Q794 Mr Streeter: The President of the Police Superintendents’ Association told us that the police are “hitting the target but missing the point”, and we have all, of course, been to our own chief constables, and so on, and talked about the target culture which does distract from effective policing or policing as they would want to. You are going to introduce these new systems. How are they going to differ from
the previous regime, and have police authorities throughout England and Wales bought into this new system, do you think?

Mr McNulty: I think they have because much of the key elements of the new system reflect the concerns of police authorities and police forces. We were told, for example, that the “offenders brought to justice” target did not discriminate between the seriousness of particular crimes, and crimes at the lower end had the same “value” as those at the serious end, which is where we get this rather elaborate lexicon now about cream buns, cucumber slices and all sorts of other faintly ridiculous “crimes”. Last summer when we launched our new crime strategy we reflected those concerns, and have said from the centre now, in terms of targets and performance, that serious crime is and should be the focal point. That is not to say that all the gains made on the lower end, high volume crime somehow do not matter any more, but we think the CDRP/LLA type process, where all partners come together locally, will deal with that sufficiently. Also, within that, the new “offences brought to justice” target, which is an appropriate measure of performance, I think, is effectively tiered; so it is not the case that one “crime” is equal to the others. I freely admit that we have to do more—they are also reflected in the new Public Service Agreements—to get across to the people that there has been that shift, and that shift will be reflected in all the new performance arrangements. I was at the committee meeting of the Police Federation sometime ago where someone suggested (not a million miles away from what you are saying chief constables are saying) that the Home Office were about to reflect far more readily serious crime, and when were we going to do that. This was some nine months after we had introduced the crime strategy. So, clearly, we do need to have the dialogue with people to make sure that people understand that we have shifted, and I think there is a broad consensus across both the staff associations, ACPO, APA and the Home Office that we are now, with the crime strategy, the PSAs and all the other elements around it, in the right place. That is not to traduce the last five or six years in terms of targets; I think that performance regime and target regime was absolutely necessary to get the police forces to a stage where we could now move on from that and focus more readily.

Q795 Mr Clappison: Can I ask you about the funding side of this because several witnesses have told us there is a gap in level two policing, to do with serious crime. The Association of Chief Police Officers estimates that the police required an additional £300 million to tackle serious and organised crime. What is your response to that?

Mr McNulty: I do not know anything about the assumptions made in this or any other case. When people talk about gaps, I know there has been ten years of rising investment in our Police Service, and quite rightly, and I think that closing the gap that O’Connor recognised a couple of years ago is still an imperative, and a lot of good work is being done up and down the country—some with help and assistance from us in terms of seed corn money more than anything. However, where I think I would disagree with ACPO is that the gap and the importance of protective services is not new, and this is not an add-on to routine, everyday policing; it is part of what they should be doing anyway. I think there are excellent examples up and down the country of collaborative projects between forces to close that gap at the serious and organised crime end. Equally, and in passing, I would say I have had discussions with both ACPO and SOCA to talk about at the very high end in terms of serious and organised crime (those are almost supra-regional) where SOCA could be focusing with ACPO a little bit more.

Q796 Mr Clappison: SOCA is?

Mr McNulty: Yes.

Mr Clappison: Thank you.

Q797 Tom Brake: For the second time in just a few days I have heard a senior police officer talk about policing mission creep. Chief Superintendent Dann, who gave evidence before you, from Hackney, talked about police involvement in schools, lost property, youth offending programmes, and so on. Do you think that it is time for the police, perhaps, to refocus on possibly the basics in terms of enforcement? Can we expect to see something in the Green Paper along those lines?

Mr McNulty: I think that is, in part, very, very simplistic, and I would go back to what I said about knife crime. The more police do alongside other agencies with young offenders, with the education and awareness process in schools, hopefully, the less likely it is young people will offend. Getting the balance right is absolutely crucial, but I think most of the sort of activities you describe are quite properly activities carried out by Neighbourhood Policing Teams, Safer Neighbourhood Teams and are part of our latter day view of what 21st Century policing is all about.

Q798 Tom Brake: Can I move on briefly to Sir Ronnie Flanagan’s recommendations? He made an estimate that an extra 2,500 to 3,500 officers could be freed up if paperwork was cut back on. Do you think that is a realistic target (he made this announcement in February) and, if so, when do you think we could see those officers coming on stream?

Mr McNulty: I hope, in the longer term, it is an underestimate. I think Sir Ronnie was focusing very much on stop and search and the consequences of de-politicising (?) that particular process. Two points: certainly, firstly, with the £50 million that we have now distributed to get more and more police on our streets with handheld devices to prevent them both having to rush back to the station and rush back to the station and carry out paperwork too often, the early signs from the forces that are already implementing that get are very encouraging, in terms of hours saved and paperwork saved. Secondly, Staffordshire carried out a sort of paperless policing model experiment that Sir Ronnie, again, was very taken with, and the Home
Secretary said the results from that were very, very encouraging but, with respect to Staffordshire, it was one particular type of force and that we should spread that out a bit. So we got the West Midlands, Leicestershire and Surrey along with Staffordshire to work with the Staffordshire Police on that model of a move to paperless policing. Other forces are getting involved as well but not on a force-wide basis. Again, the results from that are hugely encouraging. When I was at Liverpool last week, effectively, the police go out in their car and take the office with them and have, effectively, all the equipment they need in the car. When they get back to the office they simply take the laptop into the office and do whatever they need to do in terms of paperwork and putting the paperwork elsewhere within the computer system—hugely, hugely encouraging—even when alongside the mobile fingerprint scanner in the back and a whole range of other services, effectively, turning the police car into a mobile police station. Those types of things are hugely encouraging, and I think there will be much more of that as we develop into the 21st Century. So his original estimate of 2,500 to 3,500 man-hours saved, or equivalent number of staff saved, will, hopefully, be a woeful underestimate.

Q799 Tom Brake: Do you have your own figure then of what might be a more accurate estimate? 
Mr McNulty: No, because things change almost on a daily basis in terms of the application of that technology. We have said in terms of the four pilot forces (Staffs and the other three) that we want to do a full assessment of that by October/November, some six months after they start, and then I think we will have at least an indication of the sort of notional hours and equivalent posts saved. I will happily report that back to the Committee.

Q800 Chairman: Some have suggested that what Ronnie Flanagan was talking about was a reduction in the number of police officers.
Mr McNulty: I thought that was a bit unfair. He did talk about somewhere around the 140,000 mark not being sustainable into the future. To be fair to Sir Ronnie, I think he meant that in the context of if many of the suggestions he has made were not taken up in full. I have said at the Police Federation conference that somewhere round 140,000 is about the norm and will endure, and that our role collectively was to ensure that more of the 140,000 were freed up to get on with the policing, on the frontline and on our streets, rather than simply a fixation (that we, collectively as politicians, are guilty of) on defining good policing as just a number.

Chairman: We now have a question on technology from our IT expert, Mr Russell.

Q801 Bob Russell: Thank you, Minister. The Chairman felt that I was the ideal person to ask a question on technology.

Mr McNulty: I am sure that is right.

Q802 Bob Russell: I think that is his little joke, so do not take that too seriously! Minister, the Chief Executive of Airwave Solutions Limited has told us that Airwave’s system has over 99% geographical coverage, which is obviously a very impressive statistic. However, I am sure you will be aware that a less impressive statistic is that 92% of delegates at the Police Federation annual conference voted that the Airwave system is “inadequate”. So, clearly, there is a perception and a reality issue there to address. In that context, what steps will you and the Government take to ensure that problems with the Airwave network are resolved to ensure adequate coverage for policing in general but particularly with the Olympics here?

Mr McNulty: I think that is a very fair question. I would say, I think, that the reality is much closer to what Airwave was suggesting than the Police Fed, but I know, in the City, in the next breath, that there have been teething problems and issues. I have met Airwave a couple of times, principally, to be fair, to talk about getting on with making some of our deep stations in London accessible to Airwave, and that does continue apace, which I am very, very grateful for. There are difficulties, not least around surges of activity, which we do need to try and understand more readily. Funnily enough, one of those was the Police Federation’s march, because so many of the officers brought their Airwave radios with them. So we do need to understand what that surge in capacity does, not simply for the Federation march but for other big events like that that are not uncommon in a London context. I know that people—certainly the Met—are fully on the case in terms of ensuring the durability of the Airwave network for the Olympics and more generally in terms of policing in London, but I would not underestimate what a huge advance this has been. It is one of those strange things that you do not want to shout from the rooftops, but actually getting to a stage where principally every single police officer in the United Kingdom can now contact each other is a huge advance. You do not want to shout about that, in part, because the public will say, I think probably quite rightly: “What do you mean—they could not talk to each other beforehand?” We did have, in this area, as in others, and it is a historic thing, instant IT solutions on 43 or more different police force bases rather than some sort of communality. Airwave brings that communality, and certainly one of the things I want to explore in the Green Paper is what quite properly should be directed from the centre (I think IT is a good example) and what should more readily be left to a regional, force or even local basis.

Q803 Mr Winnick: One of the themes in all the evidence we are hearing. Minister, is, of course, the question of public safety. The Ministry of Justice released figures earlier this year that show that 60 out of 455 murder suspects awaiting trial have been released on bail, and there was the notorious case, as you of course know, of Weddell who, while he was
Mr McNulty: As you properly say, these are matters for the courts in the first instance, and I know that the Lord Chancellor, Secretary of State for Justice is going to carry out a review on the utilisation of bail, particularly in terms of serious crimes. However, in many of these instances, if you apply whatever the 21st Century equivalent test is of the man or woman on the Clapham omnibus, some of them do, frankly, not with stand any real scrutiny in terms of justification. It is not for me to second-guess what each individual judge has come to in terms of their decision around particular bail applications—I do not know the context—but some of them do stretch comprehension.

Q804 Mr Winnick: We have had evidence, for example, from Chief Constable Sir Norman Bettison on behalf of ACPO who said that: “bail is used more than it has been for some time”, and I am quoting, “and, therefore, what we confront as operational police officers is the frustration of people being given bail only to commit further offences”, and he also recommended tagging. While of course, as you say and rightly so, the separation of the executive from the court, the court decides, nevertheless at the end of it all the Minister of Justice, Jack Straw, is holding a consultation exercise. Could I ask you therefore if it is a matter for the courts, as you have told us and we agree on that, the purpose of the exercise is what really?

Mr McNulty: As I understand it, the Ministry of Justice quite properly will set the strategic framework and guidance within which the rules of bail apply and I think that is quite proper in this regard. They are not making decisions on bail applications in a vacuum, there is a strategic framework and guidance policy around the whole issue of bail and it is quite proper that we look at that because I think it does go in part to the integrity of the justice system.

Q805 Mr Winnick: Are you at all surprised—because, as one politician, I certainly am and I am sure the general public are—that someone who has actually been charged with murder can be given bail?

Mr McNulty: If the decision were mine, I should look long and hard at the context within which someone was given bail and it does strike me as rather strange that someone should be. Again, it is not my area of expertise and I do not want that to be understood to be traducing or second-guessing anyone who has made a decision, but it does strike me as rather strange to say the least.

Mr Winnick: We share that view.

Q806 Mr Clappison: A quick one on that because the process of bail is governed by the Bail Act which has been in operation over 30 years now, but the Ministry of Justice has launched a consultation on it. As part of that consultation, will they be looking specifically at cases where somebody has re-offended, and I am thinking particularly of course of the Weddell case, that they will particularly look at those cases where that has happened to see what lessons can be learned?

Mr McNulty: I do not know if that is part of their criteria but, if it is not, it should be and I think from what the Lord Chancellor has already said I would be surprised if they were not looking at some of those cause célèbre cases and high end cases that have got sufficient coverage in the press and people are quite perplexed about. I should think that will be part of their review, yes.

Q807 Martin Salter: Looking at collaboration, Minister, between the various police forces, the Home Office abandoned a while ago its plans to merge the 43 forces in England and Wales. Do you regret that you had to abandon that and do you not think there is still a powerful case for a smaller number of strategically sized forces?

Mr McNulty: Given that this all occurred some three or four weeks after I took up this role, I remember it well. I am not sure I regret it in the sense that I think the way in which we were seeking to carry out the mergers, ie on an enforced basis in all but one situation, was probably not sustainable. I do not think we had sorted out sufficiently the finance base of the relative constabularies so that got in the way as well, the whole issue of rate equalisation and precept equalisation. As the only way to respond to closing the gap and Denis O’Connor’s report that failed and we had to move on and I am very, very grateful that across the country all police forces have taken up the issue of collaboration with some gusto.

Are mergers entirely off the agenda? Yes, in a sense of being enforced from above. I do not think the Home Office would be Jesuitical in the sense that if a couple of smaller forces came to us and said, “Having assessed all of the circumstances, we think a merger between us should be an option”, that we would get in the way of that and, indeed, we would probably encourage it. I still start from the premise that I think, without re-opening the entire merger debate, 43 constabularies for the best part of 50-odd million people in England and Wales is too many.

Q808 Mrs Cryer: Minister, sections 120 and 121 of the Serious Organised Crime and Police Act potentially enable civilians to undertake the role of custody sergeant. We have had quite a lot of information through witnesses which says that this is not a very good idea. Do you still propose to enact this legislation?

Mr McNulty: What I did about a year ago when it was the first opportunity to enact the legislation was say to all parties, including Thames Valley who were very enthusiastic, that actually I thought this might be a step too far and I wanted to put a moratorium on it for a year where all sides could review it in far more depth and come back to me because the role of sergeant in the custody suite is hugely important. I have seen many custody suites up and down the country where the civilianisation of all but the pay sergeant and the inspector above them has happened
and it worked very, very well. I have spoken to many ex-warrant officers who were custody officers who would be the first to say it has worked and worked very well. That work has now been done and I am very happy on balance to let the Committee know that I will be looking in the future for a suitable opportunity to repeal that statutory provision because I do think the work done over the last year has taught me that it probably is a step too far and I would effectively confirm that pay sergeants should remain in custody suites, but it was a very useful exercise.

**Chairman:** Thank you for that announcement, Minister.

**Q809 Mrs Dean:** The Local Government Association and the House of Lords Merits of Statutory Instruments Committee, amongst others, have been sceptical about the benefits of alcohol disorder zones. Are you confident that would be a useful tool in tackling alcohol-related crime and what more will the Government do in this area?

**Mr McNulty:** I think it will be; we will wait and see. I know that my colleague Vernon Coker had a huge debate back and forth with the Joint Committee on Statutory Instruments just trying to get the thing done. Like a lot of things, of itself the answer would be no, but in keeping with a whole range of other things that we do in terms of policing and alcohol and other methodologies like dispersal orders, like working very, very closely with the industries and taking tough and tougher action against them—fairly recently I think a Tesco’s in the North East was closed down for three months because it sold alcohol to underage children—taken as a whole, alcohol disorder zones could be part of a very, very positive picture. What I want to get to is a position, which I think we are at, where the police have a whole suite of powers and other policies at their fingertips along with local authorities and others and it is for them in the local area to determine which mix of the policies and laws are most appropriate for their own context.

**Q810 Chairman:** In respect of the alcohol industry offering, as they do, happy hours and discounted drinks and even in supermarkets, it is so cheap to go out and buy a crate of beer; in some cases cheaper than buying a crate of water, why is the Government not doing more about this issue?

**Mr McNulty:** I think it is something we keep constantly under review. I know that Vernon, the Parliamentary Under Secretary, meets the industry on a regular basis and I think the industry are starting to get much, much more serious but they should be assured that if they do not in a sustained way, we will have to take further action. I do deprecated the use of, on the one hand, alcopops and, on the other, happy hours that seem to go on for about four hours where they are virtually giving the drink away and you cannot but arrive at a conclusion that they are encouraging irresponsible drinking. It cannot be right that anyone in this room—

**Q811 Chairman:** Except if you are Spanish on Sunday night perhaps, celebrating something?

**Mr McNulty:** I think we can forgive them for that, it was a good night for football.

**Q812 David Davies:** Minister, I think this will concern you, you will know that only 40% of those who are convicted of carrying guns actually receive the minimum sentence. Your Government has brought these sentences in, you obviously feel strongly about it. How do you feel about the 60% who do not get the minimum sentence? Would it surprise you to know that I know of cases where people who have been convicted for a second time for a firearms offence are not given any prison sentence at all, but given a sort of community order? That is the second time convicted with a loaded firearm.

**Mr McNulty:** This is why I was very pleased that Sir Igor Judge said in that recent appeal court hearing that the courts needed to take much greater responsibility certainly for knives and I think by implication for guns too. It is not enough for us to set mandatory sentences and sit back feeling terribly pure if they are then not being utilised in full by the criminal justice system. I fully accept that in some cases, but certainly not 60%, there may be sufficient extenuating and contextual circumstances to allow mitigation but, no, I am not satisfied with those figures and I think the judiciary know that it is something they need to work on better in future.

**Q813 David Davies:** Do you think it would be fair to say that the judiciary have lost all touch with reality in some cases and you and I, as elected politicians, albeit from different parties, are absolutely representing people and are elected to do that and yet the laws that you and I may pass, and even agree upon, are not being enacted by unelected but very well paid members of the judiciary?

**Mr McNulty:** A couple of points. At least, in the first instance, you did not vote in the same lobby but I will let that pass.

**Q814 David Davies:** I supported pieces of your legislation.

**Mr McNulty:** In the broader context, as a Home Office minister, you will not get me to say that the judiciary have lost all sense of reality and I do not accept that. In the first instance, the judiciary have a very difficult job to do. I think it is right and proper that with the Sentencing Guidelines Council and the majesty of Parliament through legislation we do set parameters in terms of sentences. Do I think they should be more readily applied by our independent judiciary? Yes, I do and it is a frustration sometimes that they are not.

**Q815 Mr Clappison:** Could I briefly come in on that. I know what you said, that you share the concern that the public has about the prevalence of knife crime and the increasing number of young people, according to perceptual evidence, who are going out with knives on a casual basis as a fashion accessory. You mentioned the Sentencing Guidelines Council,
which was put in place by the Government to hand down suggested guidelines to magistrates’ courts and they are pretty well bound by those guidelines when they are passing sentence. Just last month the Guidelines Council sent out guidelines on this very subject to the magistrates’ courts on dealing with possession of bladed articles/offensive weapons. For the simple offence of being in possession of a knife—and in many cases this is the root cause of the problem, it is the fact that somebody has gone out with a knife at all because they do not know what it is going to lead to—they give the starting of the range of sentences as a band C fine. Do you think that a band C fine can be an appropriate sentence for going out equipped with a knife?

Mr McNulty: No, I do not frankly and I think it is incumbent on all of us, and I include the Sentencing Guidelines Council in that, to take the whole issue of this fashion, the gratuitous use of violence, this very, very tragic set of circumstances we have now culminating in just last night, as you say, with Ben Kinsella and start to take their responsibilities far more seriously.

Q816 Mr Clappison: I am grateful to you for saying that because it will be the case, though, that when, for example, a young person comes before the magistrates’ court in the future for the simple offence of being in possession of a knife without aggravating circumstances, particularly where they plead guilty and get the credit for that in mitigation, the starting point for the magistrates’ court is going to be a fine. That is what is going to apply in courts up and down the country. What can be done about this, because this is what is going to happen without more from somebody else?

Mr McNulty: I would ask the Sentencing Guidelines Council to reconsider that and take full cognisance of the broader view in the country that knife crime starting—absolutely right—with possession is very, very serious and needs to be treated accordingly.

Q817 Gwyn Prosser: Minister, neighbourhood policing has been received well in my constituency of Dover and Deal and right across Kent it is working well, but in Louise Casey’s recent review she talked about the disparity and the variation in the way it is installed and the use of community support officers, and she called for some sort of standardisation. Do you support her view for one particular pattern of policing and how will you implement that?

Mr McNulty: We will respond to Casey in full in the Green Paper. At the ACPO APA conference last week, I assured them that the Green Paper will not be called the “McNulty Review” so the Home Office for the next year is only talking about Flannigan, Casey and McNulty as some sort of dogey firm of Irish solicitors but, nonetheless, I think she does make some good points. We are already looking and making some good points. We are already looking and taking seriously the notion of the standardisation of uniform nationally so that whatever you are in the country, you know what a PCSO looks like. I had the great fortune to be at the James Review police dinner last November, or whenever it was, and they quite properly had a PCSO of the Year award, amongst other things, and all of the nominees from each of the forces up and down the land come and get a prize before they give the award. It was good for me to see this sort of fashion show of what a PCSO looks like in the best part of 50-odd forces because it included the Scots and the PSNI and a lot of them did look very, very much like utterly indistinguishable police officers. I think there is a view that says it is a different brand, it is supportive and complimentary and a PCSO should be a PCSO wherever you are in the country, so I have got some sympathy with that. Last November we looked at a first cut of standardisation of powers and put a whole host of powers on a statutory basis that all PCSOs up and down the country would have, but then added a whole load up to and including the potential for half hour detention before a police officer arrives and put that second swathe into the discretionary category at the discretion of the Chief Constable. Louise Casey’s review said very clearly she thought that was confusing and rather like a warrant officer there should be a whole array of powers potentially at the disposal of a PCSO and then they would be tasked accordingly within that. That is something we will look at in some detail and respond in full to at the Green Paper and perhaps we can discuss further when I come back after the Green Paper, but it was very helpful.

Q818 David Davies: We know what their role is and it is different from that of a police officer, but it would cost virtually nothing to give every PCSO a warrant card to swear them and to allow them to make an arrest if they saw an offence being carried out in front of them. Surely that would give the public a bit more confidence in what they do?

Mr McNulty: I think the great success of PCSOs has been their distinctive, supplementary and complimentary role to the police force and I do not think I would treat a warrant card as glibly as you apparently do.

Q819 David Davies: I am not treating it liberally, I am saying if you see—

Mr McNulty: You just said, “Buy a load and give them to PCSOs”.

Q820 David Davies: No, you swear them in, they have already done all the training they would need.

Mr McNulty: They have not done the same training as a police officer, with respect.

David Davies: They have done more than a special constable.

Q821 Chairman: This is very helpful and thank you for that, Mr Davies. I have a couple more questions. Julie Spence, the Chief Constable of Cambridgeshire, has been critical of the Government in not responding flexibly enough to changes in immigration, especially Eastern European immigration, and the resources that are available. Is she right to be critical?

Mr McNulty: She is right to the extent that the Government collectively is very slow in responding to large growths of population over a particular
short period of time, I think that is a fair point and, to be fair to Julie, that is essentially what she meant. The lurid headlines linking what she was saying to crime surges because of immigrants was not what she was saying at all, I know you are not suggesting that. We do need to get some greater flexibility and resource allocation in those terms. I am going, I think, this week or next week to the Migration Impact Forum with ACPO to talk in detail about these matters and how we might take them forward more readily. We do use absolutely the latest projections for population when we are looking at resource allocation. You will know that across Government we are looking to make that far more attuned and flexible in terms of responding to different circumstances of both sharp increases in population but equally sharp decreases and we need to get them more fleet of foot, I think.

Q822 Chairman: After the Reading session we wrote to you about the grant to the National Black Police Association. Can you give us any progress on whether that has been restored?

Mr McNulty: I said very clearly to the National Black Police Association that, given the series of financial irregularities over the last couple of years and the internal audit carried out by the Home Office, once each and every one of the Audit Commission’s recommendations were met we could talk about restoring the grant. The last of those elements, there were two actually, but the penultimate one about detailed accounts for the last couple of years has yet to be forthcoming so I will not be turning the grant back on. As a last point, we did ask the IPCC to look in detail at the internal management and financial management structures of the NBPA and they will be reporting in due course.

Q823 Chairman: In respect of those authorities the Government has capped, do you have any messages for them about the capping process?

Mr McNulty: I would say as strongly as I could to Lincoln, that even though the budgetary process is now concluded and they are capped in year, I do appreciate they have difficulties, some historic, some germane to their particular setup at the moment and I stand ready to talk to them. I would say the same to the other six authorities that were not capped this year but at least were given indicative capping or notional budgets for next year that I applaud all the work they do and stand ready to talk to them if they have problems in terms of finance before the next budget round.

Q824 Chairman: Minister, as always, it is a pleasure to have you before this Committee. I am sure we will see you again in the not too distant future.

Mr McNulty: Surely. As I say, notwithstanding the timing in terms of the Green Paper, I will happily come back.
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Q825 Chairman: This is the final session in the select committee’s inquiry into policing in the 21st century. May I, Mr Mayor, thank you for coming to give evidence and also the Deputy Mayor, Mr Malthouse, and congratulate you on your appointment as the Mayor for London and indeed, Mr Malthouse, on your appointment as the Deputy Mayor. Can I also refer all those present to the Register of Members’ Interests where members’ interests are registered. May I start with you, Mr Johnson? Do you believe that knife crime has overtaken terrorism as the number one priority for policing in London?
Mr Johnson: If you think back to the campaign that has just gone by and lot of the flack that we took round about the autumn and Christmas for bringing this issue up the political agenda, and if you look now at what dominates the headlines, I do think that it was the right thing to do. We need to make sure that everybody works to solve this problem. I do not think it is an insoluble problem. With patience, we can make a great deal of progress. But, if you ask me to prioritise knife crime over terrorism, I would simply say to you that it is not a choice that we feel obliged to make. They are two very important priorities. I think Londoners want the maximum attention devoted to both. I do not think that the active pursuit of knife crime, or the active attempts to deal with knife crime, in any way diminish or reduce our ability to tackle terrorism.

Q826 Chairman: The Government of course has announced a couple of proposals over the weekend, the most controversial of which was visits to hospitals by those who are perpetrators of knife crime. What are your views on the Home Secretary’s proposals?
Mr Johnson: As I understood what the Home Secretary was saying, she was proposing to elaborate systems of restorative justice of one kind or another. I think that there is a great deal of potential in restorative justice. I am not convinced, as it was presented by the media, certainly the idea of visiting people in hospital would necessarily be a good idea.

Q827 Chairman: You have suggested, I think only yesterday, using football icons like Rio Ferdinand and others as examples of people who would be part of a wider awareness campaign to stop young people carrying knives because in the end, whatever legislation is passed, these young people who are carrying knives. How would that system work?
Mr Johnson: That is absolutely right, Mr Vaz. I do think there is huge potential for getting people who are admired and respected by young people to speak against the evils of carrying knives. Rio Ferdinand and other people like him can certainly be enlisted in this cause. I have to say my heart sinks when I hear or read about some of the language that is used to describe the victims of knife crime by other members of gangs—this stuff about you were a good soldier or a fallen soldier. I do think we need as rapidly as possible as a society to detonate the myth that there is anything romantic or glamorous about these tragic episodes.

Q828 Chairman: Finally from me, Alf Hitchcock has been appointed as the so-called knife tsar to co-ordinate policy. What kind of relationship will he be having with the Mayor’s Office and indeed with you, Mr Malthouse? Have you met with him? Have you discussed strategy yet?
Mr Malthouse: I have met him during my general meetings at the Metropolitan Police, but his appointment came as a surprise to us. I gather it was a personal contact from the Home Secretary that led to his appointment. Nevertheless, we will be talking to him over the week about how we can work with him and his panel. I understand his role is more to disseminate best practice across the country than to come up necessarily with any policy proposals. On the basis that we are all in this together, we are more than happy obviously to discuss our policy proposals with him in the hope that they can be disseminated across the country.

Q829 Mr Winnick: Mayor, obviously everyone must be deeply shocked by the killings which have taken place in recent months, bearing in mind even more so the ages of those concerned. However, do you feel that the danger of knife killings has been somewhat exaggerated?
Mr Johnson: I think that the risk of knife killing per se, if you look at the statistics, has not gone up. It is very important that we get across to people that London is fundamentally a very safe city. I think I saw some statistics saying that there were 70 knife
Q830 **Mr Winnick:** Do you feel that stop and search powers could be extended in order to minimise the horrors of what we have seen? I ask simply because during May and June, as you probably know, the police stopped in searching on operation Blunt about 27,000 of what are described as likely looking types and found out of 27,000, only 500—that is under 2%—had knives on them? Do you feel stop and search can help in trying, as I said, to minimise such crimes?

**Mr Johnson:** Let me say that also in that period the police, in the course of Operation Blunt 2, lifted about 732 knives or more now; they made more than 1,400 arrests for knife-related offences. So their efforts were not by any means in vain. The other day I was out at Mile End tube station witnessing one of these operations. They had a scanner and people were being requested rather than required, if you appreciate the distinction, to go through the scanner. I talked to many of the commuters about the experience and they overwhelmingly defended what was going on. I feel people do think that it is worthwhile if it means that people are deterred from carrying knives.

Q831 **Mr Winnick:** There is controversy about whether or not the Home Secretary has denied that he wanted those responsible or alleged to be responsible to visit victims in hospital. Leaving aside hospitals, do you feel there is any merit, in some instances at least, in those who were responsible for knife crimes or indeed other crimes, and we are talking particularly about young people under 21, visiting their victims and exchanging whatever they would exchange so they could see for themselves the terrible harm that they have inflicted on perfectly innocent people?

**Mr Johnson:** Yes, Mr Winnick, I do think there is merit, as I said earlier on, in programmes of restorative justice.

Q832 **Bob Russell:** Mr Johnson, I am grateful for your contribution in raising the profile of knife crime. I believe the official statistics are: one gun fatality, three knife fatalities. There is also evidence which suggests that a lot of knife crimes are not finding their way to the attention of the police. Would you therefore perhaps set up a system at the accident and emergency departments of hospitals in London to see whether we get a more accurate figure of what is really going on?

**Mr Johnson:** I do think there is a very strong case. When someone with a gunshot presents at A and E, the hospital is under an obligation to report it. I think we should look at making sure that hospitals are similarly useful in dealing with knife crime by reporting knife wounds. There is an argument to be had about whether or not this would deter people from seeking medical attention in the event of a knife wound, so we need to look at the possible adverse impact that policy might have on those who have been wounded.

Q833 **Martin Salter:** Mr Mayor, I very much endorse your approach to try to promote positive role models for young people. Other witnesses we have had before us have shown quite clearly that the rise in knife crime is attributed to some extent to the carrying of knives becoming a fashion accessory. In raising this up the agenda as we are doing here today, and we have all been doing, is there not a danger of course that by cranking it up—and some of the publicity and some of the stats quoted are, frankly, fanciful in some newspapers—that of course we reinforce that impression that knives are an essential fashion accessory? How do we square that circle?

**Mr Johnson:** I think it is a very acute point, if I may say so. I do think that is the problem that we need to solve. We need to de-glamorize knife crime; we need to make clear to people that this is moronic and wasteful. This is not the death of Mercutio taking place on the streets of London.

Q834 **Martin Salter:** Who was that? Your education cost more than mine!

**Mr Johnson:** It is a play that is readily available in all good outlets by the noted British author William Shakespeare. A guy called Mercutio was killed in a gang fight. It is worth studying the text actually.

Q835 **Chairman:** Not today.

**Mr Johnson:** I commend it to the committee. It does teach you something about the bogus atmosphere of glamour that can surround these gangs and the strong romantic sentimental feelings that can start to accrue to knife crime and gang culture generally.

Q836 **David Davies:** Mr Mayor and Mr Malthouse, some police officers feel there is a gap in stop and search powers at the moment. They are quite complicated, as you know. If a police officer stops somebody for a minor offence on which they are not

---

1 Figures provided by the Metropolitan Police indicate there were 68 fatal stabbings in 2006/07 and 73 in 2007/08, http://www.met.police.uk/crimestatistics.
going to arrest but perhaps deal with by summons, technically speaking they do not have any power to search that person, even if they discover that he or she has recent convictions for carrying knives, guns or for other kinds of violence. Would you consider asking the Home Secretary for a change in pace so that anyone who has been convicted recently—let us say within six months, 12 months or two years—anyone with a recent conviction for carrying a knife or a gun can be subject to a quick, non-invasive search, an airport style pat down, if they are stopped for any legitimate reason by the police?

Mr Johnson: It certainly seems to me to be a very reasonable proposal. We will take it up with the Home Secretary.

Mr Malthouse: Under Blunt 2, we are obviously using the section 60 search, which would cover that as well.

Q837 David Davies: I think section 60 only runs for 24 hours; it might be for 48 but only in specific areas. A section 60 only covers a tiny percentage of the capital and yet on a day-to-day basis police are stopping people for relatively minor offences, which are not going to be arrestable, and they are not able to search them, despite knowing that they are quite likely to be carrying some weapon on them.

Mr Johnson: We will definitely look at that.

Q838 Tom Brake: In the pledges that you issued in the run-up to the election, one of those was to tackle knife and gun crime. To quote from this document, you say that you are going to demand that they are treated as a high priority by the police. Was it your view therefore that they were being treated as a low priority by the police at that point?

Mr Johnson: I certainly think, put it this way, that the police were having difficulty getting through the firewalls. Are you clear that at a strategic level we are monitoring what is being done?

Mr Malthouse: I certainly think, put it this way, that the police have stepped up their operations. If you look at Blunt 2 to which Mr Winnick and Mr Vaz have already alluded, there is no doubt that they are putting a great deal more effort and energy into dealing with this problem and to the policing solutions. There are 75 knife officers now that have been specifically dedicated to the task of moving around London trying to deal with it. I think that is the right thing to do. If you talk to the Commissioner, Sir Ian, he will tell you also that he agrees as well.

Q839 Ms Buck: I want to turn to some of the issues around stop and search. First, can I ask you this? You make the point about boundaries and responsibly. I think we all absolutely endorse that. Is it not also true that 98% of these violent crimes are occurring in areas involving young people from extremely deprived and challenged neighbourhoods? Will you endorse the previous Mayor’s strategy and will you turn it into new strategy that will, in addition to a policing response to this, ensure that we are directing resources at the social and economic conditions in those neighbourhoods that are producing these gangs?

Mr Johnson: Yes, Ms Buck, that is an absolutely vital part of what we intend to do. I think last time I gave evidence to your committee, we spent quite a lot of time talking about that. I do think that the so-called soft side of this, the early intervention side, is absolutely vital if we are going to make a long-term difference. I do not think that this kind of activity, which will not necessarily win massive plaudits in some newspapers, will deliver results over the next three or four years, but in five or six years I believe it will make a huge difference. I am talking about things like re-focusing the work of the London Development Agency to deal with youth opportunity. Particularly we are looking at obviously the Mayor’s Fund for London by which we hope to raise a great deal of private sector money to give to the voluntary sector that works so hard in London to change the lives of kids, but also to work with the boroughs that hold so much of the solution in many of the operations that they are already supporting.

Q840 Ms Buck: Have you delivered, to your knowledge, the allocation of all the youth service resource that was committed in the spring?

Mr Johnson: You are talking about the £79 million youth offer. We are absolutely committed to delivering that.

Q841 Ms Buck: Has is being delivered, for example, for this summer?

Mr Johnson: Most of it is being spent through the boroughs and, yes, to the best of my knowledge it has been delivered.

Q842 Ms Buck: One of the issues that has been coming up in talking to the police about problems for example in my area is the extent to which the kids and the crews are posting what they are doing and what they intend to do on Beebo and Facebook and Utube. I have found, although some of this is being monitored at a very local level, that the information is not being tracked at a senior and strategic level within the Met. In fact, in some instances I have had people saying to me that they cannot monitor Facebook and Beebo because they cannot get through the firewalls. Are you clear that at a strategic level we are monitoring what is being done?

Mr Malthouse: I am talking about the £79 million youth offer. I do not think that this kind of activity, which will not necessarily win massive plaudits in some newspapers, will deliver results over the next three or four years, but in five or six years I believe it will make a huge difference. I am talking about things like re-focusing the work of the London Development Agency to deal with youth opportunity. Particularly we are looking at obviously the Mayor’s Fund for London by which we hope to raise a great deal of private sector money to give to the voluntary sector that works so hard in London to change the lives of kids, but also to work with the boroughs that hold so much of the solution in many of the operations that they are already supporting.

Mr Johnson: That is very interesting. I did not know that the police were having difficulty getting through the firewalls of Beebo and Facebook, but I will certainly take it up with them and make sure that we do step up our intelligence on this.

Mr Malthouse: I am aware of the problem. I know the police do look carefully at this.

Q843 Ms Buck: Now a question on stop and search. The Youth Justice Board estimate that up to 150,000 young people carry knives in London and up to 20,000 young people regularly carry knives. Mr Winnick was pressing you on the stop and search figures; I think it is about 1.5% of stop and searches actually find someone carrying a knife. We all agree that stop and search is an important tool, so there is no question of saying that it is not, but is it not the
case, as local experience is confirming, that an awful lot of people are stashing knives: they are not carrying them but know where they are so that they can go and find a knife when it comes to actually pursuing trouble? Is it necessary now to look at, for example, enhancing safer neighbourhood teams in areas of particular pressure and using intelligence as well as the stop and search process so that they find those knives?

**Mr Johnson:** The short answer to your question is of course “yes”.

**Q844 Tom Brake:** On the subject of accountability, you stated the view that the Mayor of London should have a larger measure of democratic authority over the Metropolitan Commissioner. Could you explain in what way?

**Mr Johnson:** Yes. The committee will of course be familiar with the argument about democratic accountability of the Commissioner for the Metropolis in London and the technical difficulties this poses. If you look at big city mayors in America, they tend to have some democratic authority over the police chief. That reflects the fact that the public hold the Mayor to account for the safety of their city, and it is therefore only reasonable in some way for the Mayor democratically to be able to hold the police chief to account. That is basically the essence of the point I wanted to make. It is difficult in London because, after all, the Commissioner is also responsible for counter-terrorism, which is a national concern; it is difficult to winnow out the counter-terrorism functions of the Met and therefore to have the Commissioner solely accountable to the Mayor. At the moment there is a system of joint accountability. The Home Secretary and I are joint shareholders in it. We are working very well together, I hope, and doing it that way.

**Q845 Tom Brake:** Would you require a change in the legislation to give you the sort of democratic authority which you currently do not have, I would suggest?

**Mr Johnson:** Let me put it this way. In four years’ time I am going to be held to account for the safety of people in London and for the issues that we have all been talking about. It seems to me only reasonable therefore that there should be some measure of democratic accountability on the part of the Commissioner for the Metropolis. I do think, over time, we will see a reform in this respect.

**Q846 Chairman:** If Sir Ian Blair wants another terms as Commissioner, will you be extending his term?

**Mr Johnson:** I have absolutely no intention of discussing personnel issues today, thank you.

**Q847 David Davies:** One of your priorities is to extend the powers of PCSOs. What specifically do you intend by this? May I make one suggestion, if I may, which is to look at giving PCSOs a warrant card since they currently do a lot more training than special constables who all carry a warrant card which would allow them to make an arrest if they saw an offence being carried out. It would not necessary detract from their primary role of making friends with people in the community.

**Mr Johnson:** You may or may not remember that during the campaign I certainly thought it was pretty crazy that a PCSO could see someone shoplifting and not be able or have a powerful disincentive not to apprehend that person simply because in order to do so he would have to get a warranted officer to come from wherever he happened to be and take up a great deal of his time. I do think it would be a good thing if PCSOs did have greater powers. Unfortunately, it is not possible to give them powers of arrest without effectively removing the distinction between them and he warranted officers. What we have done is give them greater powers to issue fixed penalty notices for minor offences of one kind or another—nuisance parking and that kind of thing. That has moved a small step in the direction I would think. There is a genuine difficulty in that the more you beef up the PCSOs, the more you run the risk of eroding the distinction between them and the warranted officer. As you rightly allude to in your question, one of the advantages of the PCSOs is that they do command this special sense of trust amongst communities that know that there is not a risk of them arresting them.

**Q848 Margaret Moran:** On the subject of your priorities, you have listed in your personal pledges to increase the number of rape crisis centres. Are you aware that domestic violence is much more prevalent and has a much higher attrition rate and rape crisis centres are things which I am sure we all support. Can you tell us why you appear not to have put a pledge on domestic violence and reduced the resource available to tackle domestic violence?

**Mr Johnson:** Ms Moran, I am not certain that is my position. I am certain that it is not. We are determined to make sure that London is equipped not just with one rape crisis centre in Croydon but with at least four around the city. We are going to make sure those are funded over the next year.

**Q849 Margaret Moran:** I was asking you about domestic violence. The Greater London Domestic Violence Project is renowned for the excellence of its work. I understand that you have reduced, downgraded, got rid of very many of the very important staff that are working there. Does that indicate the level of priority and why have you done that?

**Mr Johnson:** As far as I know, it is not the case. Let me say that I think you are right to say that domestic violence should be a priority because if you tackle domestic violence effectively, you will, I think, obviate a great number of more serious crimes and the people who could engage in domestic violence are much more likely to go on to more serious things.

**Mr Malthouse:** We are looking at the domestic violence strategy that the GLA has that is the framework for that work. We are looking specifically to widen it possibly to a strategy of just violence against women, under which would come domestic violence but also rape crisis centres and
other issues around honour-based killings and those kinds of broader issues. Our intention is quite the reverse, not to reduce the emphasis on violence, in particular domestic violence, but to enhance it.

Q850 Mrs Cryer: Briefly to go back to Tom Brake’s question, Mr Mayor, can you mention whether when you saw the Mayor of New York he talked about restorative justice and are they using restorative justice in New York as they are in Toronto, which has a measure of success against re-offending?

Mr Johnson: Mayor Bloomberg did not actually mention restorative justice, no, but equally obviously the salient example from New York is the whole broken windows theory and zero tolerance, which we are to some extent pursuing in the sense that I do take very seriously so-called minor crime on buses and on the streets of London. One of the things we have done with PCSOs is to double the size of the safer transport teams so that by the end of the programme there will be more people in uniform on buses than at any time in the last 25 years. We really do want to make a difference here. We will be judged on this. I do want public transport to be more agreeable and to be safer.

Q851 Patrick Mercer: There have been allegations recently, as you know, of racism at the top of the Metropolitan Police. What impact will that have on your recruiting?

Mr Johnson: Mr Mercer, I hope very much that it will not have any adverse impact whatever. I think I am right in saying that over the last period the proportion of black and ethnic minority recruits has doubled. It has gone up very considerably. I intend to continue it on that trajectory. I want to increase our recruitment from black and ethnic minority communities because London has got to be policed by people who resemble the people of London and to whom the people of London respond and identify with. I am determined to do that. I do not think that the couple of cases or at least one case that is currently in play at the top of the Met will make any difference to that agenda.

Q852 Chairman: But it must be a cause for concern. There was a report in the Telegraph last Sunday that up to 300 black and Asian officers are proposing to commence legal proceedings. Even though you obviously want to make sure you have an increase in recruitment of black and Asian people, the fact remains that this is happening. Does it not cause you concern, bearing in mind your very strong commitment to diversity and the appointments that you have made at the very highest levels of your administration?

Mr Johnson: Yes, Mr Vaz, I do think it important that we get this right. I think the 300 figure to which you refer is a national figure not in the Met. It is vital that we have a police force, as I say, that is open, welcoming and that fully reflects Britain as it is today.

Q853 Chairman: Mr Malthouse, now that you have just taken over this post, do you think that there is not a role for the Mayor’s Office in trying to mediate between the various parties, so that the damage to the reputation of the Met is not continued?

Mr Malthouse: We are obviously anxious that any employment tribunal on whatever basis resolves satisfactorily. I am not sure it is necessarily the place of elected or appointed politicians to get involved in personnel issues, notwithstanding the fact that the MPA obviously has a role in overseeing that, as I know that the MPA is a party to some of these proceedings and therefore that is the organisation through which the mediation should take place.

Q854 Mrs Dean: Mr Mayor, you have set up an innovation exchange programme with New York. You mentioned the ideas that you have had from New York about tackling crime on public transport. What else can London learn from New York’s successful crime reduction strategies and how have those influenced your plans?

Mr Johnson: There is one thing that the Mayor of New York told me about that I think is a very good idea, and that is the use of a hot line number, not to go to the police, which would enable you, if you have a difficulty with a pothole or whatever it happens to be, or you want to know why some graffiti has not been cleaned up. You can go to a central number and then we will get on to the relevant borough and sort it out. That should help to relieve some of the pressure there is on the police. That is a useful idea that the Mayor of New York shared with us. The other thing they do in New York very successfully is that they look very systematically at the statistics with the whole CompStat system. They look at what is going on in individual neighbourhoods and they break it down very ruthlessly. One thing I think would be helpful in London would be if we had a bit more public understanding of what is going on in our neighbourhoods. There are privacy issues here, as you now, and there are difficulties with crime mapping house by house, but I do think that crime mapping, if done sensitively with regard to what is happening in the broad locality, can be very useful in informing people of what is really going on in their neighbourhood. Sometimes the news will be good in the sense that they may have an impression of criminality which is completely underserved. When there is bad news, it will give people a vital tool to enable them to go to the police and say, “We have this problem in our street. Nothing is being done about it. You sort it out”.

Q855 Mrs Dean: Could that not blight a neighbourhood rather than help it?

Mr Johnson: It was Judge Learned Hand who said “sunlight is the best disinfectant”. I think that is the advantage of crime mapping. Without going down to individual house-by-house details, I do think that you can give people a powerful tool to clean up their neighbourhoods.
Q856 Ms Buck: Some very affluent neighbourhoods with relatively low crime figures employ private security patrols. Are you prepared to take some of the tough decisions that would say, “Actually those neighbourhoods do have low crime. I am going to switch resources away from those to the areas which on the statistics have the highest need?”

Mr Johnson: As you know, Ms Buck, there already are formulas in place to reflect the difficulties faced by various neighbourhoods.

Q857 Ms Buck: At a neighbourhood level?

Mr Johnson: That would be very much a matter for borough commanders.

Q858 Gwyn Prosser: Mayor, I want to ask you about the 2012 Olympics and safeguarding the games from terrorist attacks. What assurances can you give this committee that by the time the Games come you will have sufficient police resources and the number simply to keep the Games safe?

Mr Johnson: Mr Prosser, this is a serious issue for concern and it was raised by David Ross, who is my appointment to LOCOG, as something where he feels that we need to be more alert and he is worried that they are getting behind. I do think that it is vital that we establish very soon what the security architecture is going to be for the Games; that is to say, we have to know if we are going to have police milling around; are we going to have lots of security arches; are we going to rely on intelligence? What is our approach to policing of the Games going to be because it will greatly affect the experience of the punters at the Games; it will already affect the way we lay on the Games. I am afraid that not enough work has been done on this so far. I have had good conversations with Jacqui Smith, the Home Secretary, about this. She agrees with me that the Olympic Board needs to be brought fully into the ministerial discussions about Olympic security as we go forward so that the people responsible for putting on the Olympics, LOCOG, the ODA, know exactly what is in the minds of ministers.

Q859 Gwyn Prosser: When do you expect to have a fully costed budget for this policing process?

Mr Johnson: There is a budget I think of £600 million with contingency of £238 million. Obviously we do not intend to exceed that budget.

Q860 Chairman: I heard you on Radio 4 recently when you talked about the memorandum that was supposed to be signed between Ken Livingstone and the present Prime Minister. Were you able to find this memorandum? Does it exist?

Mr Johnson: I was asked whether there was a secret memorandum, if you recall, Mr Vaz, and I am delighted that you draw attention to this. I was asked to explain the existence of a secret memorandum between the previous Mayor and the Government by which London could be exposed to cost overruns and London taxpayers could be asked to pay for any cost overruns. I was able to assure my interviewer, and I assure you now, that there is no secret memorandum. There are two memorandums: one of 2003 and one of 2007. In the second, the material one is from 2007, it makes absolutely clear that London’s contribution will not increase in the event of cost overruns.

Q861 Martin Salter: Last time you appeared before us as a candidate for the mayoral position and we had an interchange on police numbers, you will recall. Over the last five years, the forces surrounding the Metropolitan Police area lost 1,000 officers to the Met as a result of a policy of the Met deliberately poaching trained officers from neighbouring forces, which is clearly good news for London and bad news for the council taxpayers from the surrounding forces. Do you intend to continue with that policy?

Mr Johnson: I remember this question last time, Mr Salter. You brilliantly divided my loyalties. My loyalties are of course no longer divided. That does not mean that any recruitment policy that we pursue in the Met will be remotely predatory or inimical to the interests of Thames Valley policing.

Q862 Martin Salter: Mr Mayor, you are advertising in Slough on bus stops about two miles from the border. You are a predator in this regard. Be proud of it. Do not apologise or do something about it.

Mr Johnson: Let me say that I think the most important thing we can do for London and for Londoners is not just to make sure that we have enough police out on the streets, which is what we want to do and what I think to a very large extent we are succeeding in doing; we have to make sure that we increase police productivity and that they are doing what we want them to do and what they want to do. That will be very much the task of myself and Kit Malthouse in the MPA over the next few years.

Martin Salter: Brilliantly dodged!

Chairman: Mr Mayor, we know you are extremely busy and we are very grateful to you for fitting us in. Before you came in, the committee had agreed to hold an inquiry into knife crime later in the year. We will obviously be looking to you and the Mayor’s Office to help co-operate with this inquiry. We hope you will be part of that inquiry later on, including of course Mr Malthouse. Thank you for coming. Can we wish you the best of luck in the task you have ahead.
Witness: Sir Adrian Bruce Fulford, member of the Queen’s Bench Division of the High Court, gave evidence.

Q863 Chairman: We are most grateful to you for coming. We know how difficult it is to fit in arrangements for coming to these committees. Can you explain to the committee the bases on which judges decide whether or not to award bail? In the inquiry that we have had so far we have been concerned at the number of people on bail who committed offences while on bail. We have had a number of witnesses who are the relatives of victims of those crimes, and therefore the role of the judiciary has obviously become of importance to this committee.

Mr Justice Fulford: Just before I answer that question, can I ask whether there is particular emphasis in terms of your interest on those who are granted bail in serious cases and in particular for murder or is it just generally?

Q864 Chairman: There will be questions particularly on that. Could you set the scene generally as to the conditions on serious crimes first?

Mr Justice Fulford: There is an approach to bail which is the same for all case in that the Bail Act lays down in clear terms, consistently with the jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights, that bail shall be granted unless there are substantial grounds for believing that the accused will fail to surrender, will commit an offence on bail, will interfere with witnesses or obstruct justice. The judge considering an application for bail will have that test pre-eminently in his or her mind. Against that background, there will be the need for the judge to be given sufficient information in order to make a decision. In the vast majority of cases that will be done by the advocates on both sides, providing the court with what is needed for the decision, but particularly with serious cases there may well be a stage in the application when evidence will be given, and particularly as regards the prosecution, from an officer in the case who is in a position to give chapter and verse to the judge in relation to the three factors that I have just outlined.

Q865 Margaret Moran: You will be very well aware of the case in my police authority, Bedfordshire, involving Garry Weddell and the absolute astonishment that bail was given in both that case and the terms upon which it appears bail was given, which seem to have been extremely lenient. Perhaps you would like to reflect on that. On the general question of murder, is it the case that there are increasing grants of bail in murder cases? What are the trends and why?

Mr Justice Fulford: May I say, first of all in relation to the original part of your question, as you will be aware, it would be inappropriate for me to comment on the facts of a particular case. I have to ask you to forgive me if I do not address that. In terms of a suggestion that there is an increasing trend or some kind of presumption for granting bail in murder cases, that is most certainly not my experience, nor the experience of the senior judiciary. Bail applications in murder cases are dealt with always either by High Court judges or by circuit judges of real experience and a decision in a murder trial to grant bail will be taken very, very seriously indeed, usually following more than one hearing—it is possible it will be dealt with at one hearing—and with the judge focusing with very great care on the three elements that I have just outlined. There is no presumption at all that bail, particularly in murder cases, is going to be granted. The standard approach which I outlined at the beginning will be followed with particular rigour.

Q866 Mr Winnick: There has been a freedom of information request which showed that 79 out of 462 alleged murders had been committed by a defendant who was on bail. I do not know what offences were involved where bail was given but it is alarming, is it not, that for the most serious of all crimes, murder, 79 out of 462 had been committed by someone who had been given bail?

Mr Justice Fulford: When a judge is considering whether or not to grant bail in a case, one of the things that he needs to look at is whether or not there is a risk that the defendant will go on to commit an offence whilst on bail, and so that is something that is going to be very much in a judge’s mind. However, unless you are going to withhold bail from everyone who is charged with an offence, there will always remain a risk that somebody who has been granted bail is going to go on to commit a further offence whilst on bail. I think it needs to be underlined, though, as a matter of real importance, that there is a difference between someone being granted bail for a relatively minor offence who then, wholly unpredictably, goes on and commits a serious offence such as murder—that on the one hand—and the other situation where somebody who has is charged with a very serious offence. If that is the case, it is of course far less likely that they will be granted bail so that they are going to be in a position to go on to commit an offence of the kind of seriousness that this committee is considering this morning.

Q867 Mr Winnick: Many people find it very difficult to understand how someone who is charged with murder—obviously everyone is innocent until found guilty and without dealing with that particular case which caused such concern and I am leaving that aside—nevertheless in general can actually be given bail, with all the dangers that a further very serious crime of murder or some other such serious crime could be committed.

Mr Justice Fulford: I entirely understand that, Mr Winnick, of course as a general proposition but one has to look at the individual facts of individual cases. Just to take theoretically as an example when you have for instance mercy killings where a partner in a marriage has been involved in a death in those circumstances, it may be felt by the judge looking at it that that was, if it was murder which is yet to be resolved by a jury, so specific to the particular facts of the case that there is simply—

Q868 Mr Winnick: That is very exceptional. Recognising that and even though I said people are very concerned, such people presumably would
accept what you have just said. Leaving aside allegations of mercy killing and the rest, where the person is being charged with murder in ordinary circumstances and being given bail, one would have thought the court should consider very seriously and more seriously, would I be right in saying, than what has been the position up to now?

Mr Justice Fulford: More seriously than the position up until now? Mr Winnick, I can only repeat in reply to that really what I said earlier; it is only judges of real seniority who deal with these applications. It is self-evident to any judge dealing with an application of this kind that there are very, very serious considerations indeed in play. One needs to scrutinise with very great care the individual facts of the particular case. To pick up on what you have just said about an ordinary case of murder, I fear no such case exists; they are all very different and one needs to look with particular care at whether on the facts as revealed to the judge there is a substantial risk that the defendant, if granted bail, will go on to commit a further offence.

Q869 Bob Russell: When real judges are looking at these serious cases for bail, do they take into account the court of public opinion?

Mr Justice Fulford: In a sense I would hope not, although of course we are all human beings living in the real world reading newspapers. When the judge sits down to decide on a particular application, he or she will look at the test, will look at the facts, and will make a decision as to whether or not there are substantial grounds for withholding bail.

Q870 Bob Russell: While accepting that every murder case is different, and I accept that point totally, will you ensure that the statistics that Mr Winnick quoted will be drawn to the attention of all judges so that they may dwell on that?

Mr Justice Fulford: It is not for me to say what statistics should be brought to the attention of judges who consider cases of this kind. I would in fact have a high degree of confidence that the judges who do deal with these cases will be aware generally of that kind of statistical background.

Q871 Bob Russell: I am grateful because until today I was not. How much are judges able to take the views of the police into account in making bail decisions?

Mr Justice Fulford: I am relieved to say to a very high degree. Particularly with cases of this kind where judges are going to be looking at the facts with extra care, you would expect a senior officer in the case to attend on the application. Certainly within my experience very often the officer will be called into the witness box to give evidence about some of the more pertinent issues in relation to whether or not bail should be granted. The views of the police are a pre-eminent consideration in relation to these applications.

Q872 Ms Buck: Further to that and specifically, the police have told us that they sometimes have particular problems because of offenders on bail having a tendency to commit sprees because of the time constraints. Is that particular issue of capacity of the police to monitor bail offenders taken into consideration at any point?

Mr Justice Fulford: I am not sure if I entirely follow the question.

Q873 Ms Buck: Police witnesses have told us that there is a particular burden on them on occasion of monitoring defendants on bail. Is it not a question of police opinion; it is a question of the police workload. That is the dimension.

Mr Justice Fulford: Yes, the ability of the police where appropriate to monitor a defendant on bail is something that a judge properly can take into consideration. If you outline the conditions that you have in mind and the police say, “It will be impossible for us to monitor that defendant”, then it may be that either you are going to have to find other conditions or bail will not be appropriate. Resource issues most assuredly can and do come into play. Electronic tagging is a very good example of this. That is a method by which defendants can effectively be placed under house arrest, but you would want maximum reassurance that the equipment is going to function and that all of the necessary back-up is there to deal with any suggested breach of the tagging conditions.

Q874 David Davies: It has been suggested that somebody who has been arrested and is being prosecuted and is facing a prison sentence will feel quite comfortable about going out and committing a series of offences, knowing that if convicted of any further offences, once they have gone back to court and been sentenced and gone to prison, they will not face any sanction for any offences committed on bail. Is that a fair summary of the current situation?

Mr Justice Fulford: I think it would be a very grave misapprehension if a defendant were to feel that committing offences whilst on bail was not going to lead to any longer sentence or lengthier punishment for them. It is a significant and substantial aggravating feature that should be reflected in the ultimate overall sentence that is handed down. If there is any misconception along those lines, we need to work harder to make sure the message goes out that there will be substantial additional penalty for that kind of behaviour.

Q875 Patrick Mercer: Do you believe that tagging orders can be an acceptable alternative to bail?

Mr Justice Fulford: I believe that tagging can be an extremely useful tool. Without going into particular cases, I have used it on a number of occasions when, if it had not been available, I probably would not have granted bail. Because I was able effectively to ensure that the defendant would remain under house arrest, I was in those circumstances sufficiently reassured that there would be no problems having granted bail. Mercifully, my hope was in each case borne out and the defendant remained within the precincts of his house.
Q876 Martin Salter: It has been said that prison contains the mad, the bad and the sad and that only the middle one should be there. The former Home Secretary has called on judges last year to jail only the most dangerous of persistent criminals owing to lack of prison places. Has that informed the conduct and the thinking of judges? Have they felt pressure as a result of both the situation with regard to prison places and the comments of the former Home Secretary?

Mr Justice Fulford: There are two issues here really: one is on sentencing and the other is in relation to bail. On sentencing, the position is absolutely clear that judges when passing sentence are effectively to ignore such things as the overall prison population, save to the extent that if you are going to an overcrowded prison it is arguable that the punitive element is going to be greater than it would be if you were going to a prison that has an appropriate number of people inside it. To that very limited extent, it can be taken into consideration on sentencing. As far as bail is concerned, it is an irrelevance. If you are dealing, for instance, with bail and murder, you are not going to be influenced as to whether or not you grant bail by the fact that there may be an overcrowding problem. It is simply is not going to come up over the horizon as an issue realistically that you are going to be facing.

Q877 Mrs Cryer: At the moment the Ministry of Justice is conducting a consultation regarding the allowing of bail for those charged with murder. Do you have a particular view on the aspects of the consultative document that has been put out? There are a number of options there.

Mr Justice Fulford: There are and I am afraid the senior judiciary are going to be putting in in the near future a formal response to this and it would be inappropriate for me in any way to impinge on the results of the work that is being done by the Rose Committee. However, so as not do duck your question entirely, can I simply say this. The 1976 Bail Act in the form that it currently is in is the result of a process of evolution. It has incorporated all of the main elements of European human rights law. Therefore, given the very clear issues that a judge needs to scrutinise with great care when deciding whether or not to grant bail, there is a real question over whether in fact change is needed and whether the case for change evidentially has been made out, but whether or not there is a need for change as far as the judiciary is concerned will be answered in the near future by the Rose Committee when they put in their response to the consultation document. It really is not for me to say.

Q878 Mr Winnick: Sir Adrian, it is not entirely a matter, is it, for the judges, as you have been explaining, because the section which caused some difficulty, section 25 of the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act, gave flexibility to a large extent to judges so that bail could be refused for alleged very grave offences. That was considered to be in conflict with the European Court of Human Rights and therefore section 25 was considered to be not in compliance with the European Court of Human Rights, so it has been dropped. To a large extent judges are restricted, are they not, on whether or not bail should be given?

Mr Justice Fulford: Mr Winnick, I fear I must beg leave to differ. You have said that section 25 gave greater flexibility. In fact, the decision of the House of Lords was that in reality it did the opposite. By restricting bail in particular cases to those situations that were considered to be exceptional, it was felt that that overly fettered the judge’s opportunity to look at each case on its merits. The House of Lords decision in the O case has simply been that rather than limiting the grant of bail in those cases to exceptional circumstances, the judge must be free to look at everything that is relevant to whether or not bail should be granted and then make a decision. So I think it is the other way round.

Chairman: Sir Adrian, may I thank you on behalf of the Committee—we know how very busy you are—for fitting us in for this evidence session.
Thank you so much for your kind letter of congratulations on my recent award of the CBE. It was very generous of you to mention it in the House and I very much appreciate your kind comments and the copy of Hansard. I have been very privileged to have worked with so many good people over the years and to have been allowed the freedom to become involved in policing issues that I have felt very strongly about such as neighbourhood policing.

I wanted to also thank you for your very real encouragement and concern with regard to policing within Leicestershire, and in particular with the issues of sustained funding. I have no doubt that your own questioning and influence supported a better than anticipated three-year settlement of 2.9% as well as the welcome support for the East Midlands Special Operations Unit.

Your inquiry into Policing in the 21st Century will also be both challenging and timely, particularly as the complexities of policing seem to accelerate year by year, and we will have the benefit of Sir Ronnie’s report to consider against these very real demands. I am confident that Sir Ronnie will produce some very tangible proposals, particularly as to the new focus of policing upon emerging threats and risks, as well as a very real debate about our understanding of police productivity and how space can be freed to improve the service given to both the vulnerable and within neighbourhoods. I look forward to the inquiry and its impact.

You also kindly asked for my views on the Leicestershire settlement and EMSOU support. As I stated, the improved position is welcome. However, due to the imposition of a 2.5% floor across the country, this still means that we will lose £9.5 million when set against the needs-based formula had it been fully applied. The settlement, therefore, leaves us significantly short in view of the policing demands of this rapidly advancing City, the known threats of organised crime and counter terrorism (including the policing needs of the East Midlands Airport), and the fact that we are not meeting current standards in relation to public protection. This position has been made more difficult by the fact that I have had to hold 164 police and police staff vacancies this year in order to ensure that the budget balances during 2008–09. Clearly I need to plan ahead for the next three to five years, and the need to sustain an adequate street presence to deal with the day to day issues of demand and cohesion in the City, as well as the new and emerging threats, will pose the Police Authority some very real dilemmas in their budgetary decisions this year.

I can assure you that the risks and threats will be very objectively mapped as I am determined that Leicestershire will remain one of the top forces in the country for value for money. In fact, this position has recently been endorsed by the publication of data from HMIC and the Audit Commission, which shows our costs to be significantly lower than our most similar forces. We also have the additional burden over the next few years of finding the cash to pay for the EMSOU investment as the central funding reduces by £1 million a year, leaving us with the need to compensate from within our existing revenue.

The Constabulary has also taken on significant new functions such as sex offender monitoring, detailed financial investigation of organised crime, and policing the internet, as well as the new dilemmas of the night-time economy. Whilst proud of our professionalism, I am concerned that if we secure sufficient funding (to the same degree enjoyed by forces that do not carry a heavy burden of debt and have benefited from the floors) then the economic and social improvement of the City could be jeopardised into the future.

I think it is important that over the long-term a mechanism is found to ensure that rapidly developing forces like Leicestershire receive their grant in full, in order that their unique challenges of tackling serious crime, neighbourhood issues and city/rural dilemmas can be addressed without the stop/start hindrances of having to hold vacancies to balance the books.

Once again your interest both locally and at national level is very much appreciated.

Chief Constable

25 January 2008
APPENDIX 2

Memorandum submitted by Research In Motion

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 Research In Motion (RIM), the manufacturers of BlackBerry devices, are delighted to respond to the Home Affairs Committee Inquiry, “21st Century Policing”.

1.2 As a leading designer, manufacturer and marketer of innovative wireless solutions, we hope to provide an insight into how information communication technologies are making a difference both to police forces and the communities they serve.

1.3 RIM is currently working with over half the police forces in the UK, and to date has deployed 12,000 devices nationwide. This represents over three quarters of the devices deployed in UK policing.

1.4 We believe these devices are making a real difference to policing in the UK, and are providing frontline officers with secure information, allowing them to make timely and informed decisions while out in the community.

1.5 The development of mobile policing solutions has attracted increasing attention over recent years.

1.6 The 2001 Home Office research report “Diary of a Police Officer” highlighted the need to implement mobile solutions which would allow police officers to spend more time in their communities.

1.7 The Home Affairs Select Committee’s July 2007 report “Police Funding” commented that:

“...there has been insufficient progress in introducing personal digital assistants across all forces; this would save considerable amounts of police officer time. We recommend that Chief Constables should ensure this technology is introduced in all forces as a matter of urgency.”

1.8 Most recently Sir Ronnie Flanagan’s Independent Review of Policing commented that 70% of information is entered into police systems more than once, and that five years after the O’Dowd report made 52 recommendations to reduce the administrative burden on frontline police officers, they still spend 20% of their time on paperwork. We firmly believe that mobile technologies have a major role to play in reducing this burden, and agree with Sir Ronnie’s assessment that:

“...there are considerable benefits to be gained from the use of mobile technology.”

1.9 We believe that there is now a political consensus around the need to provide frontline officers with the tools to allow them to remain on the beat for longer.

1.10 The Prime Minister announced in September 2007 that the Government will commit £50 million to provide police in England and Wales with 10,000 mobile devices by the end of 2008. RIM welcomes this commitment.

1.11 The Conservative and Liberal Democrat Parties have also recognised the need to implement mobile technologies, the Conservatives most vocally through their April 2007 interim review “Policing for the People”.

1.12 We have set out below a summary of our experience and work alongside UK police forces to enable effective mobile working. We would be very happy to meet with the Committee to discuss this work in greater detail, or to facilitate a force visit to see this technology in action.

1.13 In particular the following document focuses on the following areas:

— How mobile devices are helping police officers to spend more time in their communities and aiding arrests
— How mobile devices are helping police officers to make better informed decisions
— How information technologies are providing real savings for police forces across the UK

1.14 We also discuss briefly some current barriers to maximising the benefits of deploying mobile solutions in policing.

2.0 UK POLICING AND BLACKBERRY

2.1 Police forces across the UK are deploying BlackBerry devices in some of the most demanding frontline settings.

2.2 Our partners in the public sector stress the need for effective community and neighbourhood policing. The BlackBerry solution supports this need, allowing patrol officers to spend more time in their communities, rather than returning to the station to file reports.
2.3 Major deployments of the BlackBerry solution have been made across North Wales, West Yorkshire, and Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire police forces. To date, BlackBerry deployments are the most advanced in UK policing providing a high proportion of frontline officers with secure, mobile access to the:

- Police National Computer (PNC) (including firearms licences and the Schengen Visas databases)
- NICHE Records Management System (RMS)
- Warrants database
- Electoral Roll
- Command and control
- Case and custody records
- Intelligence briefings
- DVLA database
- Crime Tasking
- PNLDB (Police National Legal Database)

2.4 Functions such as these allow officers to perform more visible and reassurance policing.

2.5 The integration of the BlackBerry solution with in-Force intelligence systems allows officers to call up photographs of suspects. Retrieving a photograph via a BlackBerry device takes two seconds. This function is particularly useful in avoiding “non arrests” where the wrong person is taken into custody, wasting time and damaging community relations.

2.6 BlackBerry devices also provide the capability for local residents to directly contact their local police officer via email. Links such as these help to build understanding between communities and the authorities and can help to ensure that the public feel both secure and well served.

2.7 West Yorkshire Police has seen the largest deployment to date with over 2750 devices being issued to frontline officers. Following their implementation the number of PNC checks carried out has increased by five times, indicating a marked increase in productivity.

2.8 RIM has also worked to mobilise the force’s custom-built local intelligence application “StreetWYSE”. Accessed through the BlackBerry device, this system provides officers with local intelligence while they are on the move. The system provides positive identification through photographs and enables the officer to challenge suspects who give false details and allows officers to act immediately if there are grounds for arrest.

2.9 The Bedfordshire Police Force has also worked with RIM to develop access to common applications such as PNC, Voters and Email. Commenting on the success of the scheme, Inspector Jim Hitch, Mobile Data Project Manager, has said:

  “The BlackBerry smartphones are so easy to use we can train our officers on them in less than half a day, generating further time and cost savings. The BlackBerry smartphone works pretty much straight out-the-box, and has already developed a loyal following amongst the police officers of Bedfordshire.”

  “We used to rely on police boxes in the past and, believe it or not, there are still people in the force that remember this. Then we progressed to using radios, and soon no one could understand how on earth we coped without them. The next step on the evolutionary ladder in policing as far as I’m concerned is the BlackBerry smartphone. Its very important we start now and I am confident in five to 10 years time these will be an essential tool in policing.”

2.10 We are committed to developing systems which meet the needs of the individual police force and allow frontline officers to spend more time in their communities providing a more effective and reassuring presence. To date we have developed over 650 independent software alliances developing applications to aid this work and other partnerships across the public sector.

3.0 RETURN ON INVESTMENT

3.1 The Flanagan “Review of Policing” noted that:

  “One force estimates they have saved 51 minutes per frontline officer through the use of handheld PDAs”

3.2 An initial assessment of the return-on-investment (ROI) provided by the implementation of the BlackBerry solution by the West Yorkshire Police Force, estimates that the solution has saved more than one hour per officer, per shift, and an estimated non-cashable efficiency saving of £8.8 million a year.

3.3 The University of Leeds is currently conducting a return-on-investment (ROI) study into the implementation of the BlackBerry solution by the West Yorkshire Police Force. Once completed later this year, the University of Leeds hopes to extend its research in order to create a template for assessing the likely ROI which would be provided by the future implementation of information technologies by public sector organisations.
4.0 SECURITY

4.1 The BlackBerry Enterprise solution is available in a robust and proven commercial off-the-self format.

4.2 Robust security features are built into the heart of the BlackBerry solution, such as the ability to lock or wipe a device immediately—over the air—if lost or stolen.

4.3 BlackBerry has been approved, up to “restricted” level, by the Communications Electronics Security Group (CESG), the UK Government’s National Technical Authority for information assurance.

4.4 The BlackBerry solution is also the only mobile solution to achieve approval for EAL level 2+ under Common Criteria, and approved for NATO restricted communications. BlackBerry also has a number of other national certifications including:

- Austria—Approved by A-SIT
- New Zealand—Approved by GCSB
- United States—FIPS 140-2 Validated by NIST/CSE
- Australia—Approved by DSD
- Netherlands—Approval by DTO
- Canada—FIPS 140-2 by NIST/CSE

5.0 ADDITIONAL ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

5.1 The following current public policy issues in the mobile working space may be of particular interest to the Committee:

(a) National vs local roll-out of mobile technologies

Sir Ronnie Flanagan’s Report on policing sets out that the cost of implementing technology “would be driven down if we took a more joined up approach to the introduction of business processes enabled by new technologies”.

Policing has different demands in large urban areas, compared to rural ones. It is important that any systems meet the needs of the end user. These will change depending on the location and activity of an individual force.

(b) Access to the Driver and Vehicle Licensing Agency (DVLA) database

Current legislation sets out that access to the DVLA database is only authorised for situations where a Police Officer could require to see the driving licence in any case, such as a road traffic collision or speeding incident.

The DVLA is currently seeking a review of this legislation, to ensure that Officers are able to access this data if they have wider suspicions relating to the driver or vehicle. The feedback which we have received from the several forces we work with leads us to support these calls. Frontline officers should be provided with secure access to intelligence which will allow them to make quick decisions on-the-move about whether action should be taken.

(c) Stop and Search / Stop and Account

We welcome proposals from Government to trial the use of PDAs in Stop and Account procedures over the coming months, and the intention to roll this system out nationally before the end of the year.

We are aware through our contact with frontline officers that there will be particular relief around the removal of the current forms which must be issued following a Stop and Account incident. Under current proposals, these forms will be replaced by a business card containing details of the relevant officer, and information for the individual on how to trace their case or raise a complaint. This approach would remove the requirement for officers to carry cumbersome printers and paperwork.

We hope that these proposals may be extended to Stop and Search procedures in due course.

6.0 CONCLUSION

6.1 We firmly believe that technology has a key role to play in policing, and is making a tangible difference to services on the frontline. Continued investment from the Government in technology across the public sector will lead to increased productivity and efficiency.

6.2 Alongside this submission, we would also like to draw your attention to the document we submitted to the Greater London Authority’s 7 July Committee Review. This document contains information on how the BlackBerry solution has been used by police forces abroad. The document is available to read online here:

http://www.london.gov.uk/assembly/resilience/2006/77reviewnov22/04r-blackberry.pdf
6.3 We look forward to continuing our work alongside police forces across the UK to develop the best tools to assist them in their work.

6.4 We hope that this outline of our experience in supporting police authorities in the UK is helpful to your Inquiry. We would be very happy to meet with you, or facilitate meetings with our partners to share direct experience of these issues, and our experiences of supporting and working with the police in the UK.

11 February 2008

APPENDIX 3

Memorandum submitted by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary

2. This submission sets out the role and work of HMIC. Her Majesty’s Chief Inspector of Constabulary welcomes the opportunity to provide oral testimony on the particular issues the Committee wishes to address.

BACKGROUND

3. For over a century and a half Her Majesty’s Inspectors of Constabulary have been charged with examining and improving the efficiency of the Police Service in England and Wales, with the first HMIs appointed under the provisions of the County and Borough Police Act 1856. In 1962, the Royal Commission on the Police formally acknowledged their contribution to policing.

4. Her Majesty’s Inspectors of Constabulary are appointed by the Crown on the recommendation of the Home Secretary and report to Her Majesty’s Chief Inspector of Constabulary, who is the Government’s principal professional policing adviser. He is independent both of the Home Office and of the Police Service.

FUNCTIONS

5. The functions of the Inspectorate can be divided into three main areas:

— The formal inspection and assessment of the 43 police forces in England and Wales; the Police Service of Northern Ireland; the Serious Organised Crime Agency; the Civil Nuclear Constabulary; the British Transport Police; and the Ministry of Defence Police and Guarding Agency, including those at the Sovereign base in Cyprus. HMIC also inspects HM Revenue and Customs. Also inspected, by invitation, are the three island forces (Jersey, Guernsey and the Isle of Man); and other organisations responsible for policing such as police forces overseas. Thematic inspections are also undertaken, some in conjunction with other bodies, especially the other criminal justice system inspectorates. Inspections are conducted openly and the recommendations of the HMIs are arrived at independently. HMIs’ reports are normally published, and placed on our website; and good practice is garnered and disseminated.

— Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary plays a key advisory role within the tripartite system (Home Office, Chief Officer and Police Authority/Northern Ireland Policing Board) where its independence and professional expertise are recognised by all parties. HMIs also provide a crucial link between forces and the Home Office and, as the Home Secretary’s principal professional police adviser, the Chief Inspector of Constabulary links directly with the Home Office Crime Reduction and Community Safety Group.

— HMIC advises the Home Secretary on senior appointments in the Police Service, via the Senior Appointments Panel which HMCIC chairs.

6. In addition, the Inspectorate keeps abreast of policing issues world-wide by fostering links with international agencies such as Interpol and the FBI. HMIC also contributes to the development of inspection science through its association with other inspectorates, both within and without the criminal justice system.

ORGANISATION

7. The Inspectorate of Constabulary is independent both of the Police Service and the Home Office. HM Chief Inspector of Constabulary for England, Wales and Northern Ireland is based in a Home Office building in London and is supported by Assistant Inspectors of Constabulary who have clearly defined functional responsibilities; a financial adviser; and a small administrative staff. HMCIC visits police forces but inspects rarely; the role generally is to direct and co-ordinate the work of HM Inspectors, particularly those who have responsibility for inspecting a number of forces in one or more of the regions. HMCIC provides advice at national level and is available to advise Ministers and Home Office officials on aspects of policing, as well as the Police Service, both on operational and management matters.
8. The regional Inspectors of Constabulary are located in regional offices and are supported by a small staff. Their primary function is to inspect and assess police forces and to report their findings publicly. HMIs also have an important advisory function and seek to influence the development of policing by disseminating good practice and providing advice to police forces and police authorities. Assistance to each HMI is provided by staff officers and the financial adviser, each of whom have a key role in the inspection process.

9. One further HMI holds responsibility for inspecting Police Personnel, Training and Diversity, and is fully engaged in the inspection and performance development work of HMIC.

10. HMIC’s inspection staff are almost entirely provided by forces and others on a secondment basis, some being on short-term loan. These arrangements provide HMIC with currency of experience of policing and law enforcement.

11. Through the inspection and assessment processes and the recommendations made in published reports, the Inspectorate seeks to influence Chief Officers, the Home Office, Police Authorities and the Northern Ireland Policing Board to ensure the provision of an efficient and effective Police Service. HMIC is required to submit to the Home Secretary an annual report, subsequently laid before Parliament and published, which summarises the main findings from the previous year's inspections and provides an overview of topical policing issues.

12. Since April 2003, HMIs have been responsible for overseeing personal development reviews for chief officers. PDRs and the general process of performance review are a central component of the development of leadership in the top ranks of the Police Service.

13. The role of HMIC outside formal inspections is as important as the inspection process. The Inspectorate is well placed to provide professional advice—for instance with regard to the police reform programme—through the knowledge derived from the inspection process, the wide-ranging contact within the tripartite system and the expertise of its members.

14. HMIC is presently considering how best to configure itself to meet the needs of the Police Service and other stakeholders.

THE INSPECTION, ASSESSMENT AND ADVISORY FUNCTIONS

15. The formal inspection and assessment process is a core Inspectorate activity, through which HM Inspectors of Constabulary conduct detailed examinations of those areas of policing organisation and practice judged to be central to the efficient and effective discharge of the policing function. HMIs report on the efficiency and effectiveness of each force—and other organisations—which they inspect; that is the extent to which it achieves the best results with the resources available and that those results are the right ones. They take into consideration: the Government’s Public Service Agreement performance targets for policing; the objectives set locally by Police Authorities and the Northern Ireland Policing Board; other priorities determined in consultation with the Home Office; and issues determined by HMIs, based on trends identified during the inspection process. Inspection protocols form the basis for these inspections.

16. The type, frequency and priority of inspection is determined by the Inspectorate. They presently take several forms.

The Force (and other policing organisation) Inspection

17. HM Inspectors of Constabulary conduct detailed examinations of those areas of policing organisation and practice judged to be central to the efficient and effective discharge of the policing function.

18. Until recently, these inspections were triggered through a risk assessment process, and check on the performance of forces in key areas (including ministerial priorities and crime targets, and objectives set locally by police authorities), and make recommendations for improvement where weaknesses are identified. Focused forms of these inspections are also conducted in relation to specific areas.

19. Our assessment methodology means that regular force-wide inspections are not now mounted. However, where the force’s assessment so indicates, where there are particular concerns, or when so directed by the Home Secretary, HMIC will conduct a full force inspection.

The Thematic Inspection

20. These inspections examine a key issue across a representative number of forces, and comment solely on the effectiveness of performance in relation to that key issue.

21. This type of inspection identifies deficiencies relevant to the Service as a whole and disseminates good practice regarding a specific aspect of policing. Such inspections have proved key in identifying critical issues and sticking points and offering solutions for moving the Service forward in areas such as race and diversity, crime recording, police integrity, the use of scientific and technological advances to tackle volume crime, rape, child protection, reassurance, training and personnel issues such as recruiting, call handling, professional standards and, currently, front line supervision.
The Best Value Inspection

22. This duty of inspection, introduced under the Local Government Act 1999, gave HMIC a remit to inspect Best Value in police authorities to ensure that Best Value Reviews had been carried out in accordance with the statutory requirements and that they were likely to bring about the desired improvements. HMIC liaised closely with other Best Value inspectorates, particularly the District Auditors who also had a role in inspecting Best Value in police authorities. This activity is now generally undertaken in the context of other assessment exercises.

Basic Command Unit Inspections

THE BCU PROGRAMME

23. These inspections focused on the local aspects of policing and were aimed at improving performance and identifying and spreading good practice. Concentrating on leadership and performance, the inspections sought to identify reasons for variations in performance between apparently similar BCUs. Beginning in 2001–02 HMIC inspected every BCU in England and Wales and conducted some re-inspections.

GOING LOCAL 3 INSPECTIONS

24. Police Reform places the BCU at the forefront of community and Neighbourhood Policing and will increasingly render BCUs directly accountable to local communities for service delivery.

25. There are over 300 BCUs in England and Wales. They vary in size from over 1000 officers to just under 100; some serve densely populated, ethnically diverse inner cities, while others cover vast tracts of sparsely populated countryside.

26. GL3 ensures that future BCU inspection effort focuses upon the relatively small number of BCUs where performance indicates a need for inspection-driven improvement.

27. There are four core elements to GL3:
   — initial selection based on performance data;
   — self-assessment modelled on the core components of the Baseline Assessment, followed by validation and review to identify those BCUs which will be subject to a full inspection;
   — inspection, including a mandatory leadership audit; and
   — notional contract and follow-up activity.

28. Some inspections will also be carried out in high-performing BCUs (with the relevant force’s agreement) to highlight and share their successful approaches.

29. The intention is that the GL3 methodology strikes the appropriate balance between recognising and learning from successful BCUs, while concentrating limited HMIC resources on those BCUs which most benefit from a detailed inspection. Alignment with force-level scrutiny also ensures that the database of evidence gained from BCU self-assessment can be used by the force and HMIC in future assessments. In addition, GL3 will lead to a national repository of common strengths and areas for improvement, helping to identify national issues of concern.

Assessments of Police Service Performance

30. Our methodology for assessing police performance is based on examining key areas of work essential in a modern police force. We are constantly striving to improve the ways in which we carry out our inspections so that they not only reveal a clear and accurate picture, but also help to improve future performance in tackling crime and protecting the public.

HMIC Inspection Methodology

31. Our inspection methodology has changed radically over the years, with the pace of change accelerating in recent times.

32. Not so long ago, we conducted annual inspections of each police force, largely with the objective of certifying that the police force concerned was efficient for police grant purposes. This was a triennial inspection process, with performance assessment reviews in between.

33. We also focused our attention on where our inspection energies and resources could be best directed. Today, there are two key aspects of our work:
   — performance reviews; and
   — focused inspections.
PROGRAMMED INSPECTION

34. This new approach allows for a more in-depth, relevant and thorough assessment of those areas which pose the greatest risk in the delivery of services to the public the emphasis has been on protective services and Neighbourhood Policing. Our planned inspection programme for forthcoming years has recently been agreed with our primary stakeholders, following discussions with interested parties about where best to direct HMIC’s resources. We now refer to this as Programmed Inspection and it is currently being delivered in four phases. Phase 1 was completed in October 2007 and Phase 2 is due for completion in September 2008.

Phase 2

35. Phase 2 will focus on core areas for policing and customer engagement:
   — serious organised and major crime;
   — counter-terrorism;
   — neighbourhood policing—the final programmes’ assessment; and
   — customer service and accessibility.

36. To some extent, these continue to or build on other HMIC assessment activities. Counter-terrorism is a major preoccupation of the Police Service. It is right that at this crucial stage of police readiness to tackle the challenges in this field HMIC looks at the Service’s plans to meet those challenges.

Phase 3

— critical incidents;
— public order; and
— civil contingencies emergency planning, and the Protect responsibilities of the Service.

37. These are also important areas, and have associated links to the Police Service’s counter-terrorism work.

Phase 4

— professional standards;
— strategic roads policing; and
— leadership.

38. This set will enable us to complete an assessment of the elements of protective services. The leadership component will have the advantage of being informed by the findings of our Front-Line Supervision thematic review.

POLICE PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK (PPAF)

39. For the past three years, we have published police performance assessments jointly with the Police and Crime Standards Directorate of the Home Office. The most recent report –published in October 2007–covers assessments made and data collected for the period 1 April 2006 to 31 March 2007.

40. The seven key areas (known as “domains”) assessed were:
   — tackling crime;
   — serious crime and public protection;
   — protecting vulnerable people;
   — satisfaction and fairness;
   — implementation of Neighbourhood Policing;
   — local priorities; and
   — resources and efficiency.

41. The performance assessments reflect a combination of information that is based on data and our independent judgement.

42. An overview of the key areas of work follows.
Tackling Crime

43. This performance area focuses on reducing and preventing crime. But when crime does happen, the public rightly expect the police to investigate that crime effectively and bring the offenders to justice.

44. The assessment includes British Crime Survey measures of victimisation, along with recorded crime indicators on acquisitive crime and violent crime. These are assessed alongside measures of sanction detection rate and the proportion of offenders being brought to justice.

45. Overall performance in this area has improved. Ten police forces were graded “Excellent” and none were “Poor”.

46. Priorities which have been set for the police and their community and criminal justice partners recognise that reducing crime and bringing offenders to justice cannot be delivered by the police alone. Effective partnerships at local and national level are vital. There are many good examples of good partnership working and good practice examples are being shared through guidance and the setting of national standards.

Serious crime and public protection

47. This is a new assessment and reflects the importance of dealing with incidents and offences which are low volume but which cause the greatest harm to individuals and communities.

48. Previous assessments did not take enough account of the effort and investment of police resources and effort in tackling the most serious crimes, incidents and offenders.

49. The new assessment is derived from performance measures on:
   — life-threatening and gun crime;
   — asset recovery; and
   — deaths and serious injuries on the roads.

50. It also incorporates HMIC judgements on:
   — specialist operational support;
   — The National Intelligence Model; and
   — strategic roads policing.

51. Delivery is linked to the work of protecting the most vulnerable members of society (which is reported as a separate but related area of work below).

52. The results of these assessments confirmed that capability and capacity in relation to these aspects of policing vary across the Service and have informed forces and police authorities as to their vulnerabilities. This assessment provides a baseline from which future performance can be judged.

53. It also provides a foundation for the further development of our inspection regime and the lessons learnt are being tested in our current inspections.

Protecting vulnerable people

54. This area was first developed in 2006 as part of our Baseline Assessment Programme and replaced two existing frameworks—Reducing and Investigating Hate Crime and Crimes against Vulnerable Victims—which focused mainly on hate crimes (predominantly racially motivated) domestic violence and child protection.

55. The new single framework has four components:
   — domestic violence;
   — the investigation and prevention of child abuse;
   — management of sex and dangerous offenders; and
   — vulnerable missing persons.

56. Each of these components is linked and shares a common theme—dealing with vulnerable victims where there is a high risk that an incident can quickly become critical. Consequently, when forces were inspected in 2006 they were given a single assessment grade for their overall performance.

57. The 2006 assessment showed that many forces were meeting acceptable performance standards across the framework as a whole, a number of areas for improvement, some of which were significant, were identified within the four component parts. As a result, no force achieved an overall “Excellent” grading; only three achieved a “Good” and eight were graded as “Poor.”

58. Changes to the HMIC inspection programme in 2007 allowed the scope of the inspection to be broadened to include a more detailed scrutiny of the individual components. Each component is now assessed and graded separately, to give a more comprehensive picture.
59. Again, success in this complex and challenging area requires strong and committed partnership working—like the joint working arrangements with social services for investigating child abuse, and the Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements which are in place for the management of sex offenders. Progress is being made, but the momentum needs to be maintained and improvements need to be sustained.

Satisfaction and fairness

60. This area takes the information and feedback provided by the public about the levels of service received from the police in response to specific matters, and combines it with an assessment of how this service is delivered fairly across different groups in society. This area aims to reflect the importance of having an engaged community which trusts the police.

61. Over the past year, there have been improvements at national level, with many police forces and authorities making great strides.

62. Research also shows that the public would like to know more about—and become more involved with—the way that local policing services are delivered. When members of the public become victims of crime, it is very important that they are kept regularly informed about their case. Research shows that more people are satisfied with the progress updates they receive from the police.

63. The following took place last year:
— a Code of Practice for victims of crime was developed;
— a quality of service commitment was made; and
— National Call Handling standards were established.

64. All this helped to keep people informed about what they can expect from the police.

65. This is a very important area of work and there will be a continuing emphasis on it over the coming years.

Implementation of neighbourhood policing

66. ACPO launched the Neighbourhood Policing Programme in 2005 to support the vision of an accessible and responsive Police Service. The programme is due for completion in April 2008.

67. In 2006, HMIC inspected the programme as part of the Baseline Assessment and found that the majority of forces were advanced with their implementation plans.

68. The programme was inspected again in 2007 and focused on how far the implementation plans had progressed—including coverage, engagement and joint problem solving.

69. The standard against which forces were inspected was higher than in 2006. Overall performance has improved with more “Excellent” and fewer “Poor” grades being awarded. Given the challenges set by the inspection criteria, this is a significant achievement.

70. The HMIC inspection for 2008 will assess whether full implementation has been achieved and the outcomes realised—such as increased public satisfaction and confidence.

Local priorities

71. For the first time, the 2007 assessment included locally-selected indicators to reflect the priorities set by police forces and police authorities which work with local people to identify and discuss issues of concern. These are then reflected in improvement targets which are measured and monitored locally by the force and authority. This is an important step forward in finding a balance between national and local priorities.

72. This is also an important measure in assessing how confident the public are about the ways in which the police deliver services, as well as how the public feel about levels of anti-social behaviour, drug use and crime.

73. Public perceptions about the performance of local police forces have remained stable, although the assessments highlight the challenges that some police forces face in addressing locally identified issues.

Resources and efficiency

74. This area considers how well police forces manage their resources. Once again resource use remains an area of strong performance with no forces assessed as “Poor”.

75. Police forces also continue to demonstrate good progress against targets for efficiency improvements. All forces achieved their targets to deliver gains of 3% of net revenue expenditure, 1.5% of which must be cashable. The majority of forces are rated either “Good” or “Excellent” when assessed on the measure of time spent carrying out front-line duties.
Overall performance in 2006–07

76. Across the seven “headline” assessments, the range of grades awarded was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

77. The assessments also showed that, among other things:
- some 75% of forces received a “Good” or “Excellent” rating on tackling crime;
- victim satisfaction with the Police Service has increased;
- the implementation of Neighbourhood Policing Programme has seen good progress;
- more forces achieved a “Good” or “Excellent” rating than in the previous year’s assessments;
- fewer “Poor” grades were awarded than in the previous year; and
- forces achieved 60% of their grades as “Good” or “Excellent”.

78. This is all good news and shows the value of our developing our methodologies and adjusting our inspection approaches to reflect the needs of the Police Service and the public.

Future Joint Performance Assessments

79. 2008 will see the publication of the last PPAF assessments. Stakeholders have identified the need to develop a framework that is more inclusive of partnership activity and the wider criminal justice and community safety arena. Partners—including HMIC—have been developing the new Assessment of Policing and Community Safety (APACS) which will be first published in 2009, based on the 2008–09 financial year.

Advice on Policing

80. HMIC provides professional advice and support on all aspects of policing, including operational and management matters, to police forces and police authorities and the Northern Ireland Policing Board. The Inspectorate is well placed to act as an agent for change. The role of HMIC in ensuring collaboration between neighbouring forces and encouraging the sharing of new ideas, good practice and the timely utilisation of new equipment and techniques is considered important by the Home Secretary. This is achieved through the inspection and assessment processes, by offering information and advice to forces; and by collaboration with other agencies such as the Audit Commission. Increasingly, HMIC undertakes joint inspections with other Inspectorates. The work of HMIC, in ensuring that police services are delivered as efficiently and effectively as possible and meet public needs, reinforces the principles that services should be responsive and provide high quality services which represent good value for money.

81. During the course of inspection and assessment, HMIs also look closely at progress made by police authorities and forces in building effective partnerships with both the local community and other agencies within the criminal justice and emergency systems.

82. The Home Secretary is able to on the Inspectorate as the principal source of objective professional advice on all aspects of policing, both operational and managerial. In addition, HMIC advises on the formulation of policy proposals relating to the police, and liaises with the appropriate administrative units in the Home Office. However, HMIC does not form part of the Home Office’s policy-making function. HMIC allocates specific subjects to individual HMIs and Assistant Inspectors on which they in turn provide professional advice. The Chief Inspector of Constabulary has the right to report to the Home Secretary on any matter considered appropriate.

“Special Commissions”

83. One aspect of our work which provides us with our greatest challenge and often an opportunity for significant impact is responding to requests to assist in addressing major risks either to service delivery or the reputation of the Service, or indeed to take part in the shaping of the Service in testing environments. Often these request take the form of special commissions from Ministers.

84. Recent such commissions have included the issues arising from the death of Jean Charles de Menezes, the policing of Iraq, the delivery of policing at airports, the security of the Palace of Westminster and the capacity and capability of the Service in respect of counter-terrorism and domestic extremism.

85. In April 2005 the Home Secretary commissioned us to undertake an assessment of the capability and capacity of the Police Service in relation to some of the more serious aspects of policing. “Closing the Gap” was published in September 2005 and detailed our response to that commission. The report highlighted that there were significant shortcomings not only in service provision but also in leadership development, resilience and, becoming more critical as time passes, the financing of policing.
86. Much work has been undertaken as to how best to close the gap identified. The initial thrust for structural solutions has been replaced with a drive for more co-operative and collaborative approaches as outlined to forces and police authorities by the Police Minister in February 2007. This process includes "Demonstrator Projects" (supported by funding from the Home Office and overseen by the National Policing Board) which range from comprehensive shared "Protective Services" commands to joint major enquiry teams. The lessons learned from this programme will be shared across the Service to assist in closing the gap. However, there is a requirement by the Minister that all forces and authorities include in their policing plans how they intend to provide the appropriate level of service provision in relation to these aspects of policing.

SENIOR APPOINTMENTS

87. HMCIC provides advice to the Home Secretary on the suitability of candidates seeking senior appointments within the Police Service. He provides this advice with the help of the Senior Appointments Panel. Panel members are drawn from the Association of Chief Police Officers; the Association of Police Authorities; the Metropolitan Police Service; the Home Office; and the panel also includes an independent member. HMIs are expected to provide advice to police authorities during the selection of Chief Officers and may sit as advisers on interview panels. HMIC also provides advice on Chief Officers' nominations for honours and bravery awards.

The Home Secretary's powers of direction

88. The Home Secretary gained new powers of direction in the Police Reform Act 2002. These powers define HMIC's formal and central role in the new police performance monitoring regime.

MONITORING OF PERFORMANCE

89. HMIC's assessments of force performance which contributes to prioritising the formal inspection programme, provide feedback to Chief Officers and Police Authorities about their force's performance, both in absolute and comparative terms. HMIC liaises with the force to discuss any serious performance issues. This approach may identify a causal factor and the force may already be initiating a recovery plan to improve performance. HMIC will provide advice and guidance on specific issues and initiatives which have proved to be good practice elsewhere and which have delivered an improvement in performance.

ENGAGEMENT

90. The Home Office would decide whether a formal offer of assistance from it should be made–this type of assistance will be categorised as a formal engagement. The Home Office would continue to monitor to assess whether the action being taken is securing and sustaining improvement. If there was no significant improvement within a reasonable time scale, both in absolute terms, and in comparison to the Most Similar Force average, the position would be reviewed to consider whether more needed to be done to implement an effective recovery plan, including an escalation to a formal collaboration.

COLLABORATION

91. Collaborations are initiated where engagements have not produced sufficient improvement in performance or there are very serious performance issues to address. They involve more substantive work with forces where serious, persistent or systematic problems have been identified. The Home Office (in conjunction with HMIC and others, as appropriate) will look to develop a more in depth programme of work with the force and their authority. This could include collaboration at the more local level of a specific BCU.

92. Where appropriate, the Home Office may recommend that it would be desirable to call in expert advisers such as HMIC, assistance from partner agencies, or support from management consultants who could provide a review of structures, systems and processes as well as professional advice on finance and personnel issues.

93. The force in conjunction with their authority would be expected to work up an effective plan and show progress and improvement in the implementation of this plan. The Home Office will monitor the progress of the force and if necessary advise Ministers on whether a further inspection should be carried out by HMIC.
FORMAL INTERVENTION

94. The final level of action would involve the use of powers provided in Section 40 or 41B of the Police Act 1996. The expectation is that formal intervention would usually only follow where an attempt at collaboration had proved unsuccessful. Such a step would require prior Home Secretary approval and would only take place in exceptional circumstances, after detailed discussion with the force at earlier stages.

95. A formal inspection and assessment conducted by HMIC, under Section 54 of the Police Act 1996 (and at the request of the Home Secretary), would have to precede any direction and to conclude that the force or BCU was not efficient or effective (or was likely to become so) either generally or in a particular respect. The Home Secretary could then decide to direct the police authority to take such remedial action as is required in the direction (under Section 4), or to submit an action plan within 12 weeks setting out the remedial measures which the authority propose to take (under Section 41B). Under a Section 41 direction the authority would be asked to submit an action plan, which would be prepared by the chief officer of the force, but the authority could ask for changes before it was sent to the Home Secretary. The Home Secretary can indicate that the plan is inadequate to the chief officer and police authority, and the police authority would consult the chief officer about any revisions required. A revised plan would be submitted to the Home Secretary.

96. Clearly, though, it would have to be seen that any formal intervention steps would be wholly exceptional, and thoroughly regrettable. HMIC intends to work fully with forces in circumstances of poor performance to avoid intervention. Indeed, HMIC has solid examples, over many years, of how working with forces will drive up performance.

Other Inspection Activities

97. These include:

PERSONNEL, TRAINING AND DIVERSITY

98. Our specific interest in police training was established in 2000. Training should aim to equip police personnel with the skills they need to fulfil their jobs professionally, which this supposes that training and development is delivered consistently, effectively and efficiently in all police organisations. It is a key role for HMIC to ensure that training is delivered to nationally agreed standards, provides value for money and supports frontline policing. HMIC has also assumed responsibility for inspecting aspects of police HR and Diversity work.

PNC

99. The Police National Computer is the only truly national policing system. HMIC, through the work of a small specialist team, audits how forces (including those in Scotland) meet their responsibility to enter data onto PNC in an accurate and timely manner. The level and frequency to which a force is audited is determined through a risk based programme which closely scrutinises a number of key business areas and how they impact on force performance.

INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

100. HMIC is aware of the several national and local systems being developed for police forces to record and manage intelligence and data.

101. In addition, the IMPACT programme was developed as a result of the Bichard Inquiry Report, in which a recommendation outlined the need for IT solutions to improve the management and sharing of information and intelligence by the Police Service at national and local levels.

102. IMPACT will also deliver the Police National Database, which will replace the existing PNC. We have been, and continue to be, involved in overseeing the development of IMPACT and the standards and policies for its use.

103. During 2007 the HMIC PNC team has expanded its remit from its core focus on the PNC to include the broader areas of the Management of Police Information.

104. Forces are currently working to comply with the Code of Practice on the Management of Police Information that has been developed by NPIA. A cycle of inspections will be carried out by the HMIC PNC team on Information Management in forces in England and Wales in 2009.
EFFICIENCY PLANS

105. Police authorities are required to produce Efficiency Plans, as part of their annual Policing Plans. The Plans indicate how the efficiency gains target set by the Home Office are to be achieved, and are intended to provide a transparent, but basic, link between resource inputs and measurable performance outcomes.

106. HMIC staff, supported by external auditors, inspect the progress of the Plans of each authority and force throughout the year. Progress reports are provided to the Home Office for Ministers and the Treasury. HMIs regularly remind police authorities and forces of the importance of monitoring and linking police performance to the achievement of efficiency gains.

107. In 2006–07 the Service achieved £346m of efficiency gains, which have been recycled back into frontline policing, against a target for the year of £319m.

WORKING TOGETHER—THE JOINT INSPECTION BUSINESS PLAN

108. One of our key priorities is the joint inspection of the Criminal Justice System in England, Wales and Northern Ireland, working together with our colleagues in the Criminal Justice Inspectorates.

109. The Police and Justice Act 2006 established new duties and powers for the five Criminal Justice Inspectorates to support and encourage enhanced joint planning and working. 2008–09 will be the first full year of joint inspection under the newly-established statutory framework. However, in advance of this statutory requirement, the five Criminal Justice Chief Inspectors have produced a Joint Inspection business Plan for 2007–08 which sets out the scope and scale of activity that will be subject to joint scrutiny. The main areas of focus are:

— community safety;
— bringing offenders to justice;
— offender management;
— custodial conditions;
— victim and witness experience; and
— equality and diversity.

OUR PROJECTED WORK

110. We shall continue to build on our core programme of work as outlined in this Report by focusing on those areas of service delivery where there are the greatest concerns or vulnerabilities.

111. In view of the Government’s decision not to progress with the creation of amalgamated strategic police forces, effective collaboration between police forces and active progress towards closing the service gaps are major Police Service priorities. Accordingly, HMIC will focus specifically on forces’ delivery of protective services as a core component of inspection during the next two business years.

PROTECTIVE SERVICES

112. HMIC will carry out an inspection and review progress on counter-terrorism. The remaining protective services will be examined in depth, in prioritised sequence.

VULNERABLE PERSONS

113. Although not technically “protective services”, HMIC will also incorporate early scrutiny of “protecting vulnerable persons” into this core inspections, as well as a revisit of the inspection of professional standards.

NEIGHBOURHOOD POLICING

114. We will carry out a further inspection of Neighbourhood Policing to coincide with the Government’s pledge to provide Neighbourhood Policing teams across all areas of England and Wales by April 2008. As this comes at the three-year programme’s conclusion, our inspection will focus on outcomes, including the levels of satisfaction and confidence experienced by local people in their Police Service. We will also be analysing the degree to which Neighbourhood Policing is embedded within mainstream service delivery and into the wider Citizen Focus agenda. For this reasons, an inspection of Citizen Focus will be conducted at the same time.
FRONT-LINE SUPERVISION

115. As this Annual Report goes to press, we are carrying out a thematic review which focuses on uniformed 24/7 response policing sergeants. This review is a “snapshot in time” which looks at the role of police sergeants within all 43 police forces in England and Wales.

116. The scope of the review will focus on assessing whether the Police Service is equipping sergeants with the necessary skills to lead and manage front-line staff and effectively initially manage critical incidents.

117. The review will also:
   — identify areas of related good practice; and
   — explore and test whether the current experience profile is appropriate for the demanding role of the police sergeant.

118. The review involves reaching as many sergeants as possible through a comprehensive questionnaire which, in turn, will help inform where a number of in-depth field visits will take place.

119. The report will be completed in spring 2008.

CONCLUSION

120. HMIC’s statement of purpose notes that we set out to ensure that performance is improved. HMIC’s inspection and assessment activities are directed firmly at achieving that objective. The intention is to secure long-term, durable and sustainable progress in performance and delivery: continuous improvement for the benefit of all the communities served.
ANNEX 1

HMIC REGIONAL STRUCTURE
THE FUNDING OF HMIC

The resources for HMIC are provided directly by Central Government through the Crime Reduction and Community Safety Group of the Home Office. Each year HMIC receives resources from two separate allocations. Day to day running costs (including income) are the subject of a specific funding allocation whilst capital expenditure is accounted for separately.

2. During 2006–7 HMIC’s running costs resource consumption totalled £12.34 million. This excludes the value of staff provided free of charge by forces, estimated at £1.40 million, and income of £1.58 million.

3. The majority of our costs relate to seconded police officers and Home Office staff (HM Inspectors, non-police Assistant Inspectors, specialist support and administration staff). A key feature of the way HMIC undertakes inspections is through the use of police secondments. For many officers a secondment to HMIC is seen as an essential part of their career development.

4. April 2006 saw the introduction of revised funding arrangements for the Police Pension Scheme. As a result, the cost of each police officer seconded to HMIC rose by almost 37%.

5. For resource management HMIC is considered to be part of the Home Office and must follow their accounting and budgeting arrangements. Consequently some costs, such as HQ accommodation, corporate IT and other central services, are not charged to individual Units and do not appear as costs to HMIC.

6. Police authorities and forces in England and Wales who are funded by the Home Office are not charged for any inspections. External income is generated from the inspection of non-Home Office forces both within the UK and abroad and other commissioned work.

7. Comparisons with other Inspectorates indicate (even allowing for central costs within the Home Office not charged to individual units) that HMIC is cost effective. In 2006–7 the cost of policing in England, Wales and Northern Ireland was £12.5 billion. The overall cost of HMIC (including all its activities) is only 0.1% of the cost of policing. For the average Force, inspection activity was less than the equivalent of two full time employees.
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APPENDIX 4

Memorandum submitted by Policy Exchange

ABOUT POLICY EXCHANGE:

Policy Exchange is an independent think tank whose mission is to develop and promote new policy ideas which will foster a free society based on strong communities, personal freedom, limited government, national self-confidence and an enterprise culture.

We are committed to an evidence-based approach to policy development. We work in partnership with academics and other experts and commission major studies involving thorough empirical research of alternative policy outcomes. We believe that the policy experience of other countries offers important lessons for government in the UK. We also believe that government has much to learn from business and the voluntary sector.

1. What the Public Expects of the Police

1.1 There is much talk of the need to return the police to the state of a “force” rather than a “service”, however many members of the public feel that the police are removed from the community and treat them with suspicion.1

1.2 This has started to change with the implementation of Neighbourhood Policing, but under the new CSR settlement, man-power intensive patrols will not be sustainable without significant workforce modernisation.

---

1 Manifesto for the Met, M. MacGregor, Policy Exchange, 2005
2. How Chief Constables Determine Priorities

2.1 Within Chief Officer Teams, there has been a failure to understand and address the discrepancies between local priorities and HQ directives. Several thought that there was an asymmetry between priorities at BCU and HQ levels, which continues up the chain of command, becoming even more skewed at the level of the Home Office.

2.2 Our two most recent research reports highlight structural issues within the police service that need be addressed quickly and thoroughly. The management link between chief officer teams and BCU commanders—who must tackle local priorities—does not allow for the efficient execution of police duties on a local level. Through structured interviews and focus groups with BCU commanders we learned that “there is a complete failure at chief officer level to understand the complexity of BCU management.”

2.3 As part of our research, we commissioned a survey of England and Wales BCU Commanders. Responding BCU commanders identified the need for more regular, positive and informal contact with chief officer teams. 80% of respondents met with a member of their COT only once a month or less. With such infrequent communication, BCU commanders are unable to relay information on what is happening at street level to HQ officers who, in conjunction with the police authority, are the officials responsible for setting targets and objectives.

2.4 Greater Support is needed from Chief Officer Teams. The 2007 survey suggests that chief officer teams need to re-evaluate the level of support offered to local commanders in many forces. This is not simply about understanding BCU priorities, which is difficult because many members of the teams have not been BCU commanders themselves, but is also about ensuring that local commanders are prepared for their role.

2.5 Because BCU commanders are closer to neighbourhood policing and responsible for implementing it on a local level, force level strategy must given due consideration to the concerns of BCU commanders.

2.6 The employment conditions and management structures of ACPO level officers also needs to be reviewed. We believe chief constables should act as chief executives in their forces, chief constables should be given powers of chief executives over their police force, making police officers and staff their employees. This reform would also allow for local employment bargaining, with chief constables, rather than the Home Secretary, dictating pay and conditions.

3. The State of Performance Measurement

3.1 Central targets from the Home Office have a distortion effect on police priorities and strategy. Seven out of ten BCU commanders surveyed believe that central targets have degraded their ability to provide high quality policing, while just under a fifth think that these targets have had no impact on the quality of policing at all. In other words, almost all local police leaders believe that central targets make citizens less safe.

3.2 Respondents from focus groups believed that centrally-set targets falter in that they are measuring what they can, not what they should.

3.3 One survey respondent argued that “central targets can even be counter-productive and just confuse police officers about what the real priorities are. They also make them cynical about the objectives of the politicians who set targets to generate a good headline in tomorrow’s papers rather than because they make sense for policing in their areas.”

3.4 In place of producing plans, the Act requires police authorities to deliver reports in accordance with orders given by the Home Secretary. As a result police authorities have been less involved in establishing policing priorities and setting objectives.

3.5 Changing targets can shift priorities on a whim. Government-driven agendas, which required immediate attention and action, keep BCU commanders’ priorities in constant flux, making it extremely difficult to manage their units effectively. Each day brings a new urgent priority to an issue that someone has just discovered.

3.6 The overall view of survey respondents was that, in principle, performance management was not a hindrance to effective delivery, but that its current form was unhelpful. The overbearing influence that the centre wields has effectively tied the hands of commanders.

---

2 Fitting the Bill, J. McClory & B. Loveday, Policy Exchange, 2007
4 Ibid.
5 Fitting the Bill, J. McClory & B. Loveday, Policy Exchange, 2008
6 Fitting the Bill, J. McClory & B. Loveday, Policy Exchange, 2007
7 Ibid.
8 Manifesto for the Met, M. MacGregor, Policy Exchange, 2005
3.7 If implemented incorrectly, performance management can have unintended, and often negative, consequences. Some of these currently plaguing the police forces of England and Wales are:

- Gaming: A well established phenomenon within public services that has been recognised and deplored by the Audit Commission. It means that the application of particular targets causes distortions in operational priorities that negatively affect communities.

- Tunnel Vision: This occurs through “concentration on areas that are included in the performance indicator scheme, to the exclusion of other important unmeasured areas.” Tunnel Vision reflects the extent to which local demands on policing may be left out of the performance management regime and subsequently are not being addressed by the local police.

- Measure Fixation: This is the pursuit of success as measured rather than intended. As explained by one of our focus group participants, measure fixation can lead to police officers chasing performance targets any way they can by criminalising petty incidents that would otherwise not need police involvement.

- Myopia: This is the concentration on short-term issues to the exclusion of longer term considerations. As one respondent said: “There is a challenge in reconciling the pressure for short-term quantitative performance success required by the Home Office and the longer-term solving of problems wanted by the local public.”

3.8 A further challenge to local policing arises from the planned break-up of the Home Office. One potential problem could relate to the status accorded to high-level crime along with the fight against terrorism, which will be a priority within the reconfigured Home Office. This could affect the ability of police forced to sustain Level 1 initiatives. Participants in our focus groups believe that police officers may increasingly be “pushed up” the crime hierarchy to respond to terrorism and serious and international organised crime.

4. Police Accountability and Public Involvement

4.1 The Flanagan Review discussed several options for greater accountability but failed to recommend anything concrete. We have carried out research abroad, looking at best practice from international case studies. The US experience shows that police forces which operate under the control of locally elected officials are more responsive to local demands, more innovative in developing new strategies, and deliver a higher level of uniformed presence on the streets. In major American cities such as New York and Baltimore a renewed emphasis on targeting crime, and the assumption of responsibility by the police for “quality of life” issues, have been both popular and effective. Although the fall in crime rates across the US has been assisted by a number of underlying demographic and social trends, changes in policing in response to community pressures and strong mayoral leadership have also made a major contribution.

4.2 A key element of local control of policing in the US is local financing. Although federal funds are made available to encourage forces to undertake specific programmes, the vast bulk of funding for US forces is raised from local taxes set by the Mayor and Council or the county board. Given the coming budget shortfalls for the police service in England and Wales, we recommend that the 5% cap on local council tax increases be removed. This would give local councils the flexibility to meet police funding demands if central funding grants are not enough.

4.3 Police forces are responsible for maintaining public order and fighting crime in a defined local community; subsequently they should report to and be overseen by an authority that is elected by that community. This authority should set the targets, priorities and budgets that it feels are appropriate. It should have the power to replace a chief officer if it believes that the force is failing to deliver results.

4.4 A key implication of local control is that central government should not impose bureaucratic systems of performance measurement on local forces. Forces should be free to develop information systems which best assist their own internal management, and which meet the demands of local elected authorities for performance disclosure.

4.5 The primary ingredients of accountability are the power to appoint and dismiss senior police officers, such as the chief constable (and possibly his or her deputies), as well as the power to set a force’s priorities and determine its budget. Making police forces in the UK locally accountable could be achieved in a number of different ways.

4.6 Police chief constables and assistant chief constables should be employed on short-term contracts as in the US. It should be possible for the mayor or council leader to dismiss a chief constable or an assistant chief constable with compensation determined according to a pre-agreed severance provision in the contract.
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4.8 For effective policing, a close link between police and the local authority is required. While the police can identify problems that may generate antisocial behaviour, it will be the local authority that has the resources to respond to them. Since 1998 successive crime audits have highlighted the importance of social factors in both antisocial and criminal behaviour, and the significant role that can be played by the local authority in dealing with this behaviour. Crime reduction and disorder partnerships have been a significant first step in creating a joined-up approach to crime reduction, but CDRPs do not always align with the borders of BCUs and this is problematic in terms of accountability.

5. Roles of and relationship between PCs and PCSOs

5.1 The Safer Neighbourhoods Initiative in London has seen three PCSOs, two Constables and one sergeant allocated to each local authority ward with the aim of providing a more visible police presence. As a result of their regular patrols of the same roads and estates, these neighbourhood policing teams can build closer relationships with individuals, businesses and community groups. Additionally, the fact that they do not have the same status as a fully warranted police officer can make them friendlier and easier to approach.

5.3 The Metropolitan police needs to increase the number of officers and PCSOs working in Safer Neighbourhood teams and until this becomes the dominant component of the organisation in the boroughs.

5.4 Transport for London’s PCSOs and the British Transport Police operating in London should come under the direct day-to-day management of the local Borough Commanders.

5.5 78% of respondents reported that they did not have the freedom to vary the proportions of civilian and uniformed staff in their BCU because of force-wide restrictions (which, in turn, often emanate from the Home Office). Devolving greater control to BCU commanders would allow for more flexible deployment of staff.

6. Definition of “front-line” policing

6.1 Taking officers out of their cars and returning them to foot patrol would not only improve visibility but would also help to rebuild the link with the community.

6.2 There needs to be a high, minimum number of officers who will be on foot patrol at all times in all parts of the capital. PCSOs also need to be able to work in the evening and at night, not just during the day.

6.3 According to the National Policing Plan, published in 2002, 63.6% of police time was spent on frontline duties, though this included activities such as the preparation of case files for prosecution. Figures from the Home Office Police Service Report, on the other hand, suggested that, on average, police officers spent only about 15% of their time on visible patrol. And a 2001 study found that arresting someone—from petty criminal to serious offender—kept an officer on the beat for an average of three-and-a-half hours.

7. Police funding and the efficiency with which the various forces deploy financial resources

7.1 Police forces in England and Wales have enjoyed the full financial support of the Government over the past ten years; with year-on-year increases meeting the budgetary demands of the majority of forces. But the Comprehensive Spending Review settlement for 2007–08 to 2010–11 is much less generous and, according to the Association of Police Authorities and the Association of Chief Police Officers, will result in a reduced standard of service delivery.

7.2 Central grants are divided into a number of individual categories, such as standard spending, capital spending, special police grants and central support services. (Some have time limits and forces are expected to continue providing services from the general grant once specific funding is withdrawn.) The police reform and resources directorate at the Home Office is responsible for managing police grant funding. The breakdown of funding varies by police force and each is given a specific grant allocation in accordance with the police funding formula. The Percentage of revenue derived from police precepts ranges from 18–50%.

7.3 Central funding grants from the Home Office are set to fall. And given the disparity between police precepts per person in various police authorities, some forces will be much harder hit than others. Police authorities will naturally want to raise police precepts to cover the shortfall. However, the government has
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capped the average increase of council tax for 2007–08 at 5%. Although there is no official cap on police precept increases, police authorities face a de facto cap because of the 5% limit on council tax increases. At a recent round table discussion of the Association of Police Authorities, Jim Smith, Chairman of the Surrey Police Authority argued that the formula that determines funding grants for police forces favours metropolitan areas over shire counties. Surrey, for example, is funded at the level of a rural force, although it receives an extra 15–20% London weighting. The APA concluded that in order to compensate, central government should remove the cap on local authority council tax. Surrey is not alone. Julie Spence, the Chief Constable of Cambridgeshire, has criticised the funding formula for taking insufficient account of population increases due to immigration. Speaking in September 2007 she said: “We’ve been short-changed for a number of years, losing money as the population continues to grow. The profile of the county has changed dramatically and this simply isn’t taken into account when the government allocates funding.”

7.4 Without efficiency savings, inflation and rising costs within the police service mean that an annual increase in spending of 5–7% will be required to guarantee a constant level of service.26

7.5 Between 1998 and 2007, the cost of police pensions has more than doubled a trend that can only worsen as more and more police officers retire.27

7.6 A 2006 Treasury report stated: “The way that police forces manage both budgets and people remains short of best current practice in both private and public sectors.” It went on to explain that “the relationship between value for money and operational performance as two sides of the same coin is too often not understood.”28

7.7 Last year the Audit Commission established a board to assess police use of resources. It found that 33% of forces were performing “adequately” and 65% performing “well”. Only one force received an “inadequate” rating, but none achieved a rating of “strong performance”. The report concluded that “the ability of police authorities and forces to assess and improve value for money at a local and neighbourhood level remains underdeveloped.” The Commission recommended:

— Making better use of activity information on police officer time, to assess how resources are being applied to activities with local areas.
— Working with partners to improve data and financial performance management systems, to understand value for money at a local level and to direct resource to priority areas in the best way.
— Using benchmarking and performance data to review resource use and determine the best method for provision of services.
— Developing mechanisms to assess any savings to be made and to ensure value for money from partnerships and collaborative working.29

7.8 There is a startling lack of a clear, comprehensive modernisation agenda to stem the effects of the police funding shortfall. The police service has reached a critical juncture at which the case for a programme of modernisation has never been more pressing.30

7.9 If local police forces are to be genuinely accountable to the communities they serve, most of the money that pays for them must be raised from local taxes. These taxes should not only be raised locally, but set by the local authorities to whom the forces report. Only forces covering poor areas with small tax-bases should receive substantial central government grant.31

7.10 Local concerns over funding also need to be addressed. In a 2002 survey of BCU commanders, the majority of respondents were content with the amount of budgetary control they had, but in 2007 the majority wanted more control. When compared with the responses gathered five years ago, 28% more respondents thought that greater budgetary control would enable them to improve the quality of policing in their area: the need and desire for delegation is greater now than it was five years ago.32

7.11 One way of giving BCU Commanders greater financial freedom and flexibility would be allowing them to charge for policing events such as concerts, sporting fixtures and entertainment districts. The changes to alcohol licensing laws in November 2005 have increased the demand for night-time policing and put greater strain on BCU salary budgets, as more officers are needed to fill overtime slots during the early hours of the morning. Bars and clubs in concentrated areas should shoulder some of this financial burden.33

7.12 62% of our BCU commander survey respondents reported that they had not received proper financial training to manage their budgets.34
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7.13 BCU Commanders should have the ability to raise funds and recover costs. Some progressive BCUs will recover costs from major events, such as concerts, and the night-time economy entertainment sector following changes to licensing laws. Others will part-fund officers together with local bars, clubs or shops. However, community events should not become impracticable due to policing costs. Pragmatic charging would help to ensure that communities retained a visible policing presence in their localities.35

Conclusions/Recommendations:

— Greater managerial responsibility should be devolved to BCU commanders.
— Reform is required to improve the effectiveness of CDRPs. They should be coterminous with BCUs.
— Performance management changes are required.
— Greater support is needed from chief officer teams. Strategic considerations should also involve greater consultation with BCU commanders and local priorities.
— Both chief officers and BCU commanders should have the ability to raise funds and recover costs. There needs to be more of an enterprise culture in the police service.
— The Government should remove the cap on council tax increases, review the police funding formula and institute local pay bargaining.
— Increase collaboration through locally driven strategic alliances, and implement joint procurement initiatives.
— Create unified employment arrangements for sworn and non-sworn staff to break down the cultural barrier between the two.
— The above should be coupled with an expansion of non-sworn staff role.
— The police service should widen the use of private partnership and strengthen procurement expertise at Home Office and at force leadership level.
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APPENDIX 5

Memorandum submitted by Michael David Everleigh

1. Submission of Michael David Eveleigh.
2. I have limited my submission to the area I know well—the administration of firearms licensing by the police.
3. Executive summary:

   The current firearms licensing system ties up precious police resources, appears to have done little or nothing to prevent the rise of armed crime, is wildly inconsistent across the UK, and does little for the reputation of many police forces. Removing this function from the police would provide in the region of 800 or more police posts. Other alternatives would help to a lesser extent.

4. I have dealt with each of the points raised in turn.

What the public expects of the police; how Chief Constables determine priorities; the role of the Home Office in setting priorities;

5. There are over 690,000 firearm and shotgun certificates on issue in England and Wales, and every certificate holder has a significant amount of contact with the firearms licensing department of their police force.
6. The Chief Constable has to provide a firearms licensing service by law, but it is a very low priority in terms of resources, staff or finance.
7. The various Firearms Acts have grown in a way which has made the process of licensing firearms complex, bureaucratic and difficult to administer; difficulties compounded by the recent introduction of the National Firearms Licensing Management (computer) System.
8. In order to service the law-abiding shooter each force has a firearms licensing department, which will employ a core of administrative staff together with enquiry officers in the field—usually police staff, but in some cases police officers are employed in this role. (EG: Metropolitan Police, Merseyside Police, North Wales Police.)
9. The law abiding sports shooter simply expects friendly, efficient, timely and professional service from their firearms licensing department, but sadly the service provided across England & Wales is variable in the extreme. Northamptonshire firearms licensing department staff (for example) are excellent in this field, but many others fall far short of this standard.

10. The public expect that firearms licensing regimes will be rigorous to prevent unsuitable persons obtaining guns legally, but the current system has become bureaucratic and cumbersome, detracting from the principle of licensing the individual. A rigorous regime does not have to be unhelpful, slow and bureaucratic, yet that is what it has become in many forces.

11. This has a very unfortunate corollary—that the law abiding people who apply for certificates often come to dislike or distrust the police due to the system and the way it is administered. This is unfair on those firearms departments such as Dorset or Northamptonshire who try very hard to provide a good service.

12. The Home Office have issued a document of guidance to both the police and the public, but unfortunately it was provided hard-bound and thus cannot be readily updated with the latest legislation or best practice.

*The effect of heightened concerns about terrorism, immigration, gun and knife crime, identity fraud; the growth in cyber-crime; the Olympics*

13. Armed crime has been increasing since 1988—there are many measures, but the most “solid” is that of the number of people killed and injured by the illegal use of firearms36: around 400 in 1988, and over 3,000 in 2007—not including air weapons. During this time the number of firearm and shotgun certificates in England and Wales has declined by about a quarter.

14. At the same time the bureaucracy of firearms licensing has increased greatly, to the point where several forces have been taking three months or more to process the renewal of a certificate—often leaving the applicant holding firearms illegally.

15. It is clear that the police licensing of the law–abiding has had little or no effect on armed crime, yet it has embroiled them in a complex, costly and resource-hungry system.

16. In the short time-scale available I have not been able to discover the number of police officers and staff involved in the licensing process, but from my past experience I estimate around 800–900 police officers and staff are employed in this function. If these officers and resources were re-deployed to investigate armed crime, I believe we would see a considerable difference, perhaps saving lives in the process.

*Public involvement in local policing:*

17. A small number of police firearm licensing departments run liaison groups with their customers; some good, some poor. Where the group treats all members as equals (Essex, for example) if fosters a sense of trust and confidence in the force. Where a group is used by a force to give orders to their customers, the reverse applies.

18. Lord Cullen, in his report on the murders at Dunblane, said: “It is important that it should be borne in mind that the way [firearms licensing enquiries] are carried out has a significant influence on perceptions as to the professionalism and efficiency of the police force.”37

19. In my current role never a day goes by without a member reporting that the firearms department staff he or she dealt with had displayed a considerable ignorance of the sport. Some are honest and try hard to learn, others attempt to bluff their way through the process. Most certificate holders believe that if they object or complain when they have received poor service they will be victimised by the police—an incorrect perception in most cases, but a general perception nonetheless. It is NOT a good state of affairs when law-abiding people believe that the police are ignorant, bureaucratic, unhelpful and vindictive, yet sadly this is the case more often than we would like.

*Roles of and relationship between PCs and PCSOs: different ways in which police forces deploy staff*

20. The Metropolitan Police, North Wales Police and Merseyside (amongst others) use police officers for Firearms Enquiry Officers in the field. Using (usually untrained) police officers in this role is costly and does little to improve the relationship with between the certificate holder and the police, whilst removing those officers from their primary role.

21. Where trained police staff with a good knowledge of firearms are employed, we have seen a positive impact. Since police officers are generally paid far more than civilian staff, this saves the force money whilst improving the service and the public perception of the force. There is however, an initial cost implication in selection and training.

---

36 Home Office Statistical Bulletin 03/08 —“Homicides, Firearm Offences and Intimate Violence 2006–07” and previous editions.
Use of technology to enable police officers to return to the beat

22. The National Firearms Licensing Management (computer) System (NFLMS) has recently been introduced to all police forces in England and Wales. It has not been an unqualified success, and has caused (and is still causing) delays in the licensing process. It might have been better if the customers (the certificate holders or their representatives) of the system had been allowed some input.

Definition of “front-line policing” (ie should it include work on case files and report preparation?)

23. Firearms licensing has never been a front-line function of the police, and in fact it removes resources from that area.

Police funding and the efficiency with which the various police forces deploy the financial resources available

24. At the time of the last fees order the charges for certification covered the police administration costs, but inefficiencies have increased considerably since then, and may well be passed on to the customer. The NFLMS has in many cases resulted in extra work for the departments, again to no gain to the customer. Those departments employing knowledgeable, well trained staff who take pains to be efficient and helpful provide many benefits to their force. Those who have poorly trained staff who are “just there to do a job” and who operate a system rather than trying to be helpful and efficient do a disservice to both their force and the public, whilst wasting resources on unnecessary bureaucracy.

Difficulties in recruitment and retention, covering not just numbers but quality of applicants/staff retained

25. Often, untrained staff fall back on “force policy” to avoid confrontation with members of the public with greater knowledge of the sport than theirs. This can result in stress, often compounded by the delegation of responsibility to the lowest possible level.

26. Very few forces regard firearms licensing as anything but an inconvenient appendage to their duties and often fund it accordingly; they believe that it is not the duty of the police to “issue deadly weapons” to the public, as the majority of police officers have little or no knowledge of the sport they administer.

27. Forces who employ staff who have a knowledge and interest in the sport benefit considerably as there are fewer training implications, and the enthusiasm and expertise these staff bring to the force often results in savings and extra efficiency. Retention is also enhanced for obvious reasons.

CONCLUSION

28. It would seem that there are a number of options to improve efficiency in this area:

29. A separate civilian firearms licensing body. This would release both police officers and police resources from the onerous and complex process of firearms licensing.

As an alternative—

30. The establishment of a central control body overseeing police firearms licensing departments with both an advisory and an inspectorate function, combined with real, effective sanctions for poorly performing forces. This would allow a small reduction in staff in each police department, and would improve consistency of good practise, efficiency and effectiveness.

31. A complete review of Firearms Laws and procedures in order to streamline the current inefficient and ineffective laws and systems, thus releasing police resources.

32. (The review of firearm law is long overdue, and could be taken in conjunction with either of the other options to assist the police service to improve their service while increasing the public safety.)

BACKGROUND

33. I am the treasurer of a Home Office approved target shooting club, and I served for 32 years in various police forces in the North-West of England, including the Merseyside police firearms licensing department. I was also involved in serious armed crime investigations whilst a member of the No1 Region Technical Support Unit. I was also an authorised firearms officer.

34. I have been a sporting shooter for over 40 years, and I have worked for the British Association for Shooting and Conservation as their senior firearms officer since retiring from the police service nine years ago. I have also given evidence to the Public Accounts Committee in 1999 on the subject of the Firearm Compensation Scheme.
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MEMORANDUM SUBMITTED BY CIFAS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

CIFAS, a not-for-profit membership organisation, is the UK’s Fraud Prevention Service. With over 270 Members spread across banking, credit cards, asset finance, retail credit, mail order, insurance, investment management, telecommunications, factoring and share dealing, CIFAS operates a fraud data sharing system that enables Members to share information about fraud in order to prevent further fraud. CIFAS Members have been preventing fraud in this way for almost 20 years and in 2007, CIFAS Members prevented almost £1 billion of financial crime.

Our interest in responding to the Home Affairs Committee Inquiry—Policing in the 21st Century is related to our specific area of expertise and professional interest. As mentioned above, CIFAS is a fraud prevention organisation and our response is confined solely to those matters that are relevant to the policing of fraud and identity fraud.

Despite CIFAS Members’ best efforts and those of other organisations who have implemented initiatives to prevent fraud, this crime is still growing and causing harm to thousands of people in the UK. A recent ACPO commissioned study conservatively estimated the cost of fraud to the UK economy to be in the region of £14 billion. Put another way, fraud is costing £330 for every man, woman and child in the UK.

In our response to this inquiry we set out our serious concerns and those of our Members that given the growing threat from fraud and identity fraud these crimes are inadequately resourced and policed. Our response sets out the case to demonstrate why these crimes should be addressed by the Home Office and the police before it is too late.

CIFAS is aware that both the public’s and industry’s expectations of the police and the Home Office have changed in relation to policing of fraud and identity fraud. The governance challenges facing the Home Office and Chief Constables in this regard demand that a more proportionate response from the police is essential.

We are very pleased to see that the Home Affairs Committee is seeking views with regard to the policing of identity fraud, terrorist funding and cyber-crime. We very much hope that the Committee will consider making the appropriate recommendations to ensure that the appropriate Performance Indicators and resources will be put in place to allow the police to respond effectively to the demands of what is a serious and damaging crime.

SUBMISSION

1. There are few crimes that cause this much harm to society and that also, in some manner or form, have an impact on every individual in the UK. This is no exaggeration. In some way we all pay whether you count the cost of fraud in terms of:

   — lost revenue to the exchequer in Corporation Tax, to fund public services (thought to be in the £billions);
   — public services, tax credits or benefits obtained fraudulently, reducing the resources available to fund public services, including policing; and
   — lost income to the private sector leading to higher prices for goods and services, insurance premiums and higher interest rates;

2. It is this area of policing, and the way in which Chief Constables and the Home Office set policing priorities, that gives CIFAS and our Members the biggest cause for concern. How can it be that a crime that does so much harm (and has the potential to do even more) to every man, woman and child in the UK is effectively ignored by the majority of the UK’s police? The notable exception to this is of course the City of London Police, under the strong command of Commissioner Bowron, which does have fraud as a policing target. Even noting the excellent job that City of London Police perform, they cannot deal with every fraud that is reported to them and do not investigate many cases where the fraud is less than £1 million.

3. It is extraordinary that the agency with primary responsibility for policing crime in this country does not have fraud as a priority. Indeed, in recent years, despite knowledge of the extent of the problem having grown (even the Serious and Organised Crime Agency has fraud as its third priority) some Chief Constables have been systematically reducing fraud squad numbers until in a number of forces a fraud squad no longer exists. In those cases where forces do still have a fraud squad, the numbers are woefully inadequate and it is rare that a member of the public will have a fraud against them investigated if the value of the fraud is less than £100,000.

4. CIFAS appreciates that Chief Constables have a difficult job to do. Focusing on certain areas of crime should not be at the expense of failing to police such a harmful crime to the British public, however.
5. CIFAS understands that the police will, from 1 April 2008, have a new performance regime under APACS. Having studied the Performance Indicators that police performance will be assessed against, however, it is clear that the current approach to policing fraud, identity fraud and cyber-crime will prevail and that these crimes will continue to be largely ignored by both the Home Office and the police.

6. In recent years we have seen the crime figures in relation to burglary and street robbery dramatically diminish. This goes to show how effective the police can be in reducing crime when they are focused on a specific type of criminality. The same performance management approach needs to be applied to fraud and identity fraud. Instead we have seen exponential growth, where fraudsters are allowed to operate almost with impunity.

7. It is clear that many criminals have migrated from traditional crimes to a more modern and lucrative 21st Century crime that is not policed and where the chances of getting caught are small. It is certainly true that lack of police attention to any crime does improve the risk reward ratio in favour of the criminal. Indeed all academic studies that have examined criminal motivation cite this as a contributing factor to the type of criminality that an offender will engage in. It is therefore arguable that, by the absence of fraud and identity fraud in police performance measures, the Home Office is effectively sponsoring an increase in this crime.

8. Moreover, there are websites which not only sell all of the items that a fraudster needs in order to commit a fraud, but also the instruction manual setting out precisely what the crook needs to do to perpetrate the fraud and avoid being caught. The police and the Home Office are aware of these sites, and have been for a number of years, but have taken no concerted action to close them down. Instead the sites have become more sophisticated and have enabled many more fraudsters (and potentially terrorist activists) free rein to commit their crimes.

9. It is of course well known that terrorists use fraud to finance their activities and yet even this fact and the potentially horrific consequences have not persuaded the Home Office or Chief Constables to put fraud higher up the agenda.

10. All the time that fraud and cyber-crime are not tackled by police, the fraudsters become more and more sophisticated. A good example is the fraud attempted against Sumitomo Bank, fortunately thwarted by police, where fraudsters tried to make off with £220 million. It is time that the Home Office and Chief Constables moved fraud higher up the agenda, before there are more frauds on this scale, and before financial catastrophe occurs in the UK banking system because lawlessness in relation to fraud has been allowed to prevail and the situation actually becomes impossible to police. If such a catastrophe were to occur, how would the Home Office and Chief Constables defend having let the situation become so serious, having turned a blind eye for so long?

11. The UK financial services sector contributes around 9% to UK GDP. These organisations—in terms of the amount they contribute to the public purse—deserve to have this area adequately policed and, as a result, improve the likelihood of the criminal getting caught and prosecuted so that it is much greater than is currently the case.

12. We do acknowledge that, in recent years we have seen a number of initiatives by Government to tackle fraud. The advent of the Fraud Act 2006 creates a new general offence of fraud. This makes it much easier for police to use fraud legislation to prosecute criminals. It is written in such a way that it can keep abreast of new crimes committed by fraudsters and be used in the light of emerging technologies. The Serious Crime Act 2007 which will allow for greater sharing of fraud data, is also a welcome development as it has been designed to enable more fraud to be prevented.

13. The allocation from the Comprehensive Spending Review of £28 million over the next three years to fund the setting up of a National Fraud Strategic Authority and National Fraud Measurement Unit, a National Fraud Reporting Centre and National Fraud Intelligence Bureau and a National Fraud Lead Force are equally welcome developments and should go a long way to improve the anti fraud effort in the UK.

14. By themselves, however, these initiatives are not enough. Police services across the UK need to be tasked with fraud and identity fraud as crimes that feature in their Performance Indicators and under which their performance is assessed, otherwise the £28 million investment in the new national framework may be wasted due to a lack of joined-up Government.

15. In recent weeks there have been several Government consultations relating to policing priorities and I am enclosing copies of our responses to those consultations as part of our evidence. Some of the information submitted in this response, for example paragraphs 1 and 3 in the Executive Summary, have been used in relation to other consultations and so in this respect there is a minor repetition of some facts.

16. The documents enclosed are: CIFAS response to Assessment of Policing and Community Safety (APACS) Technical Consultation, Letter to Tony McNulty MP and Minister responsible for policing from CIFAS Chief Executive Peter Hurst, CIFAS response to Place Survey.
17. In summary, it is the firm view of CIFAS that expectations of both the police and the Home Office have changed in relation to policing of fraud and identity fraud. The governance challenges facing the Home Office and Chief Constables in this regard demand that a more proportionate response from the police is essential. The appropriate Performance Indicators and resources should therefore be put in place to allow the police to respond effectively to the demands of what is a serious and damaging crime.
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Annex

Letter from Tony McNulty MP, Minister of State for Security, Counter-terrorism, Crime and Policing

I am writing on behalf of CIFAS—The UK’s Fraud Prevention Service to express our serious concern about the growing damage that fraud is causing to society, and to ask you to do all that you can to ensure that the priority accorded to fraud by the police is escalated.

As you are aware, CIFAS, a not-for-profit membership organisation, is the UK’s Fraud Prevention Service. With over 270 Members spread across banking, credit cards, asset finance, retail credit, mail order, insurance, investment management, telecommunications, factoring and share dealing, CIFAS operates a fraud data sharing system that enables Members to share information about fraud in order to prevent further fraud. CIFAS Members have been preventing fraud in this way for almost 20 years and in 2007, CIFAS Members prevented over £988 million of financial crime.

Despite the best efforts of CIFAS Members and other organisations who have implemented initiatives to prevent fraud, this crime is still growing and causing harm to tens of thousands of people in the UK. A recent ACPO commissioned study conservatively estimated the cost of fraud to the UK economy to be in the region of £14 billion. Put another way, fraud is costing £330 for each man, woman and child in the UK.

Costs of crime estimates are, as you know, a very important tool for decision makers concerned with crime and its impact on society, and consequently should have some bearing on the way that such decision makers allocate resources to tackling it. It is therefore very disappointing to note from the recent Assessment of Policing and Community Safety (APACS) consultation that fraud does not feature as a Statutory Performance Indicator or as a Key Diagnostic Indicator. CIFAS has already responded to the consultation, but this is such an important matter that we wanted to draw it to your attention.

The Government has recently made a substantial commitment to the anti-fraud effort, by allocating over £28 million, over the next three years, to tackle fraud through the setting up of a number of national initiatives to help combat this problem. These include the National Fraud Strategic Authority and the National Fraud Reporting Centre. On their own, however, these national initiatives are not sufficient tackle the problem. Paradoxically, by omitting fraud from the APACS Indicators, the planned investments are undermined from the outset and are unlikely to deliver value to the public purse.

Fraud is an area of acquisitive crime where clear, cross-Government leadership on crime reduction is vital. It has an impact not only on the victims, but also has a ripple effect on society as a whole, as consumers’ confidence is undermined, for example in relation to buying online, in the security of information and in the banking system. Fraud is now being recognised by Government as a priority and, in order for the same impact on individuals and on society should not be underestimated.

The Government has also made a commitment to the allocation of resources to help fight crime, including through the setting up of the National Fraud Reporting Centre and the National Fraud Strategic Authority. However, if we are to have an effective tackle to this crime, it is essential that fraud is included in APACS.

With the emphasis on cutting the number of police performance indicators and a less directive approach from Government with regard to performance indicators, we appreciate that there need to be good reasons for including fraud in APACS. CIFAS is of the firm view that such good reasons exist. For example:

— Fraud is an acquisitive crime, often serious, which unlike many other crimes, is growing. The impact on individuals and on society should not be underestimated.

— The harm that fraud is doing to the UK is now widely known. From the fear of identity fraud, to the pensioner who loses his lifetime savings to a fraudster, through to the terrorists who use fraud to fund their activities, both in the UK and overseas, fraud is causing serious harm to the UK.

— Put another way, it is illogical that—one on the one hand—one part of Government recognises the harm that this acquisitive crime costs the UK economy and that there is hard evidence in the ACPO study to show that losses through fraud in the UK are at the level of £14 billion, and—on the other hand—that the agency with primary responsibility for tackling crime (the police) does not have this included in their performance assessments (with the notable exception of City of London Police).

— Fraud has never been subject to a performance target or indicator and, as a consequence, there are vast inconsistencies across the police service—not only in the way that fraud is dealt with but also in the experience of individuals who are victims of fraud as to the way their complaint is dealt with. There appears to us to be no common or visible case selection method. With the emphasis on police responding to the crimes that matter to the public, individual members of the public and businesses have a right to expect that a fraud perpetrated against them will be investigated in the same way as would any other acquisitive crime.
— Fraud cuts across the new National Crime Strategy and many of the Public Service Agreements which aim to build stronger communities and a better quality of life. The deliverables in PSA 23, Make Communities Safer and PSA 26, Reduce the Risk to the UK and its Interests Overseas from International Terrorism, are both impacted by fraud and for this reason should be included in APACS.

— While the National Anti Fraud Strategy which the Government has recently announced is welcomed and will go a long way to dealing with the anti fraud effort, there is no provision within the scope of this to deal with the investigation of low level high volume frauds. In addition, there is little scope within existing fraud squads or counter-terrorist units to deal with terrorist funding type frauds. Assessment indicators for fraud would present the opportunity for police to improve performance in these areas.

— We also attach a short supporting note that sets out additional background on how fraud affects individuals and communities and society as a whole.

We understand that APACS aims to cover policing and community safety in a balanced way that reflects relative seriousness. But if fraud is not to be included in the performance targets of the police, then effectively, there is no incentive for them to investigate fraud at all. This sends out entirely the wrong message to the police, who will—naturally—focus only on the areas on which they are targeted. It also sends out entirely the wrong message to organised criminals and fraudsters, who will know that they have free rein to practise their crimes unchecked.

So much excellent work has already been done, in terms of The Fraud Review and the tasks arising from it. Further good work is also in hand by the Sentencing Advisory Panel in relation to their consultation on Sentencing for Fraud Offences. But if the police are not incentivised to investigate fraud, all this effort and expenditure will be undermined. The consequences for the economy, communities and individuals are too serious to contemplate.

Therefore, for the above reasons, we would urge you to do everything possible to ensure that fraud is given the priority it deserves by including it within the APACS Indicators.

Peter Hurst
Chief Executive, CIFAS—The UK’s Fraud Prevention Service

January 2008

APPENDIX 7

Memorandum submitted by the British Association for Shooting and Conservation

SUMMARY

Shooting makes a significant and valuable contribution to the UK economy, particularly in rural areas.

In 2006, there were 691,508 Firearm and Shotgun Certificates issued by the police service in England and Wales.

The discharge of the firearm licensing function by the police is purely historical and no proper evaluation has been made as to whether this continues to be appropriate.

Studies by the Home Office and HM Inspectorate of Constabulary have shown that firearms licensing practice is not consistent because each Chief Officer retains discretion as to how it is conducted.

The police service does not regard firearms licensing as a core operational function and often fails to assign proper resources to it. There is also a marked reluctance to allow it to be given to another agency.

The shooting sports community perceives the police administration of firearms licensing to be costly, bureaucratic, unduly restrictive and conducted by people with insufficient levels of expertise.

There is no national set of competency standards for firearms licensing personnel.

The 1992 Home Office proposal to create a civilian licensing agency should be re-activated. Given public concerns, is it appropriate that the police should discharge an administrative function?

HM Inspectorate of Constabulary ought to conduct thematic reviews of firearms licensing on a regular basis.

The police service does not have proper mechanisms in place to take account of the views of its certificate holder customers.

The firearms licensing function should be transferred to a civilian agency.
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INTRODUCTION

1. With over 127,000 members the British Association for Shooting and Conservation (BASC) is widely regarded as a leading UK representative body for sporting shooting. BASC’s expertise on firearms licensing matters is widely recognised and we are routinely consulted by a variety of government departments and agencies (including the Home Office, DEFRA, LANTRA, the Health and Safety Commission) and other statutory and non-statutory bodies, eg the Association of Chief Police Officers and police firearms licensing departments. We work closely with the Home Office on matters of firearms legislation, and have contributed—both by memorandum and oral evidence—to a number of the Home Affairs Committee’s previous inquiries on firearms related matters. We also advise and liaise with the police service on the interpretation of the current firearms laws and the administration of the licensing process.

2. BASC believes that all who shoot should conduct themselves according to the highest standards of safety, sportsmanship and courtesy, with full respect for their quarry and a practical interest in wildlife conservation and the well being of the countryside.

3. In making this submission, BASC has concentrated on a narrow aspect of police work—the administration of firearms licensing. However, most of the areas of the terms of reference in the HAC Press Notice of 18 January are directly relevant to the way in which the police service discharges this function.

4. BASC supports the view that the administration of firearms licensing must be conducted in a fair, consistent and efficient manner whilst striking a balance between the legitimate aspirations of firearms users and the need to ensure the safety of the public.

FIREARMS OWNERSHIP AND THE VALUE OF SHOOTING SPORTS

5. The most recent statistics for Firearm and Shotgun Certificates (2006) in England and Wales show that there were 127,920 Firearm Certificates and 563,588 Shotgun Certificates on issue (total 691,508). These are issued by the firearms licensing teams in each of the 43 constabularies. This means that annually, a significant part of the public has direct contact with the police service for firearms licensing purposes.

6. In 2006, an economic and environmental study conducted by the independent Public & Corporate Economic Consultants (PACEC) showed that:
   — Shooting’s value to the UK economy is £1.6 billion.
   — Shooting supports the equivalent of 70,000 full time jobs.
   — Shooters spend £2 billion pa on goods and services.

   The possession of licensed firearms is fundamental to shooting. If the public is denied access to sporting firearms by inconsistency or inefficiency in the administration of the licensing process then this will have an adverse effect on the economic value of shooting to the rural economy.

FIREARMS LICENSING—HISTORY AND PRACTICE

7. The discharge of the firearms licensing function by the police in the UK is purely historical, starting with aspects of the Pistols Act, 1903. This was continued into the Firearms Act, 1920 where the police issued firearm certificates in respect of firearms other than shotguns and air weapons. Shotguns were first licensed by the Firearms Act, 1968 which saw a large increase in the burden placed on the police service by this function. There appears to be no evidence which would point to any quantitative evaluation ever being made to determine whether it was appropriate for the police to discharge this function. The service appears to have attracted firearms licensing in the way that it also attracted liquor licensing and similar administrative functions.

8. In March 1992 the Home Office issued a proposal to establish a national firearms control board. It examined the possibility of establishing a national non police firearms licensing agency. Two main areas of concern were identified arising from the current system:
   (a) quality of service: lack of consistency and lack of expertise; and
   (b) value for money.

   15 years on, the issues identified in this proposal remain largely unresolved. The proposal for a civilian firearms control board was shelved in 1994.

9. In 1993, HM Inspectorate of Constabulary published its report “The Administration of Firearms Licensing”. This was a thematic inspection of 12 forces which had been selected to give a “snapshot of firearms licensing administration from both an urban and rural perspective”. HMIC was very critical of those forces which it inspected and concluded “The inspection showed that the service provided to the shooting public varied between excellent and very inefficient and, most surprisingly in light of the current thrust towards service provision, few forces had any mechanisms in place for taking the views of their customers.”
The Firearms (Amendment) Act, 1997 created a requirement for an integrated database to be maintained by licensing authorities recording the details of people who had applied for, been granted, refused or who had firearm and shotgun certificates revoked. This database—known as the National Firearms Licensing Management System (NFLMS)—was finally brought on line last year.

The introduction of NFLMS imposed an extra burden on police licensing departments which in turn resulted in a serious reduction in service to their certificate holder customers. In a small number of forces, certificate holders with expired certificates are being forced to wait up to three months before their certificates can be renewed, leaving them in unlawful possession of firearms and ammunition.

In 2002, HMIC conducted another firearms licensing thematic review which examined four pilot forces with a further three added during the review to test emerging findings. Although concern was expressed by the shooting community at the time that this review took place that it was not far reaching enough, many of its conclusions were sound and were well received. The main theme of HMIC’s 2002 Review was that forces needed to achieve consistency and good practice. Subsidiary themes were competence of staff, mechanisms to test customer satisfaction and forward planning to address resource and manning levels to take account of the fluctuating demand on firearms licensing departments.

HMIC ought to conduct thematic reviews of firearms licensing on a routine basis as it is an area of significant interface between the service and the public.

Consistency of Administrative Practice

Each chief officer within the 43 forces of England and Wales has a statutory responsibility to discharge the licensing function. Although the Home Office has issued a generally helpful document “Firearms Law: Guidance to the Police” (2002) there still remains a considerable degree of inconsistency in the way in which each force’s firearms licensing department administers the certification process. In dealing with members’ enquiries, BASC’s Firearms Team invariably asks the enquirer to say which police force he lives in as the response will inevitably be driven by known local practices.

Inconsistency in licensing practice is not new. Articles in the shooting press from the 1950s onwards complain about it as a routine theme. The publication of Guidance to the Police by the Home Office in 1969 and 1989 is itself indicative of enduring inconsistency. HMIC’s 1993 report noted that “despite the publication of the booklet, ‘Firearms Law: Guidance to the Police’ there are many force firearms licensing officers who are adding their own additional criteria to the ownership of firearms and shotguns based upon subjective views and opinions. The shooting public are being subjected to differing local requirements some of which border on the discriminatory, without apparent justification.” The HMIC’s 2002 review includes 5 recommendations (50% of all its recommendations) which refer either to the achievement of consistency of practice or the need to follow the Home Office guidance.

Some progress has been made towards achieving consistency of practice by the establishment of the Firearms and Explosives Licensing Working Group (FELWG) by ACPO. This group includes representatives from constabulary regions who are expected to use their best endeavours to promulgate decisions reached at this national level to other colleagues within their region. BASC enjoys good relations with group’s Chair (ACC Adrian Whiting, Dorset Police) and it members. However, for reasons outlined above, consistency always appears just out of reach.

In BASC’s opinion, it seems likely that consistency of practice will never be achieved at a significant level as long as individual chief officers retain discretion over the way in which they conduct the firearms licensing function.

Lack of Expertise within Police Licensing Departments

In BASC’s experience, this varies considerably from force to force. The majority of firearms licensing personnel appear to have very little practical experience of firearms use. Whilst this might not be a desideratum for administrative staff, it can cause serious problems for enquiry staff who deal directly with certificate holders. Lack of expertise is often a source of conflict between firearms enquiry officers (FEOs) and certificate holders. This was recognised by the Home Office proposal in 1992 “Many police officers make enquiries of applicants for firearm or shotgun certificates are not fully skilled in handling firearms or particularly experienced in sporting weapons. The proposal continued “A further consequence is that members of the public who are themselves experienced shooters are sometimes irritated by inexpert officers and more generally by a system that many perceive to be inefficient and inconsistent.”

Concern over adequate training and expertise was referred to within HMIC’s 1993 report. In his report into the Dunblane shootings, the Hon Lord Cullen recommended that “enquiry officers should be given as much training and guidance for their work as is practicable”.

In the past, BASC has provided training for police licensing personnel; other shooting organisations have done so too. This has been small scale and ad hoc with many licensing managers saying that whilst they would welcome such training, they were not in a position to take it up due to budgetary and operational constraints. BASC has always been available to give good quality, objective advice to police licensing departments when required. In many cases, this offer has been taken up; but there still remains a reluctance
to do so within a significant section of the licensing community. BASC suggests that the reason for this is cultural, with some licensing personnel feeling that an approach to a shooting organisation somehow demonstrated inadequacy on their part.

21. BASC understands that ACPO is working towards a national course of instruction for firearms enquiry officers. However, this has yet to be achieved. Previously, BASC has made a limited contribution to FEQO training courses run by West Yorkshire Police. It is a matter of concern to the shooting sports community that no national competency standards exist for firearms licensing personnel.

VALUE FOR MONEY

22. Firearms licensing is a police monopoly. The shooting public cannot go to another agency to obtain the certificates that it needs to retain lawful possession of its firearms. This means that the service provided by the police to certificate holders must be of the highest quality. As firearms licensing is mainly predicated upon the preservation of public safety, it follows that the public as a whole is entitled to expect the licensing community to perform to the highest standards.

23. The fees payable for certificates have always been the subject of great controversy. Studies carried out by both BASC (Coopers & Lybrand) and ACPO (Multi-Force Firearms Scrutiny) in 1990 showed that because administrative practices varied so much, in many cases, certificate holders were paying more for the service than they needed to.

24. Current Treasury practice requires a full cost recovery strategy to be applied to fees. In some cases, this rewards inefficiency and penalises customers. No objective study has been conducted which has identified the core costs of licensing—ie those costs which should be borne by the public. It is difficult to see how such costs could be identified as there is such a wide discrepancy in the way that firearms licensing is conducted in England and Wales.

25. It is clear that the police service does not regard firearms licensing as a core operational function. Licensing teams are attached to different departments eg Administration of Justice, Criminal Justice Units etc. In many cases these affiliations are not appropriate and BASC hears of routine complaints from licensing managers that they are not properly staffed or resourced because their function is considered to be unimportant by middle rank managers. There is no guarantee that the fees paid by certificate holders will be allocated to the licensing department and may be diverted elsewhere.

26. This often leads to departments being under-resourced and under staffed. Not only do customers receive poor service as a result, but hard working and dedicated licensing personnel find themselves under intolerable pressures too.

27. The issue of staffing levels is aggravated by the extension in certificate life from three to five years (1994). This now means that in any five year cycle, there will be three years of intense activity where certificates are renewed and two years of no renewals. Again, licensing managers report that staff are laid off during the less busy period and are sometimes not re-reassigned when the level of work increases again. This has adverse consequences for continuity, training, retention and succession within licensing teams.

28. BASC’s research suggests that the police service employs some 800 police equivalents to administer firearms licensing. Whilst most are civilian support staff, some forces still routinely use police officers.

CUSTOMER SATISFACTION AND PARTICIPATION

29. As previously mentioned HMIC’s 1993 report noted few forces had any mechanisms in place for taking the views of their customers. ‘’ This situation has not changed. A small number of forces have commissioned customer satisfaction surveys but these were often perceived as being disreputable by the shooting community because they were produced in-house and not subject to independent scrutiny. Some shooters feared reprisals if they made critical remarks.

30. ACPO has a long standing policy of encouraging force based local user groups where certificate holders and licensing staff can meet to exchange information and to address each others concerns. The 2002 HMIC review endorsed this ‘’ Her Majesty’s Inspector of Constabulary recommends that forces establish a user group and hold regular liaison meetings with representatives of Home Office Approved Clubs and registered firearms dealers. ‘’ Take up of this helpful recommendation has been poor and very few forces (<10) hold regular meetings with representatives of their customers.

31. Most licensing managers and their staff regard certificate holders as customers who are entitled to a proper level of service, other elements within the service still look upon the shooting public as people who should be controlled. This is a cultural attitude which is changing, albeit gradually.

32. At a national level, the so-called Practitioners Group has proved to be very useful. This is a forum for firearms licensing matters whose membership is drawn from the ACPO FELWG, the British Shooting Sports Council, the Home Office and the Forensic Science Service. Whilst the group does much good work in promoting co-operation and understanding between stakeholders, it is unable to compel individual licensing departments to implement consensus decisions.
TOWARDS A CIVILIAN FIREARMS LICENSING AGENCY—RECOMMENDATIONS

33. Whilst the police service does not regard firearms licensing as a core operational function and routinely under-resources it, there is a marked reluctance to see it transferred to any other agency. In light of current public concerns about police presence within communities, the question of whether it is appropriate for the service to discharge what is a purely administrative function should be revisited.

34. The service has already taken several steps towards the creation of a national civilian firearms licensing agency. Many licensing personnel are already civilian support staff. Once NFLMS is fully established and its teething problems resolved, there will be a nationally available database and operating system for firearms licensing. That could be readily transferred from the police.

35. Although the proposed police force mergers of 2005 have been shelved, there is still considerable merit in merging licensing teams, probably based on Regional Development Areas. This would reduce inconsistency of practice and would cut costs. It would also be another step towards the creation of a civilian licensing agency.

36. In an era when the police service is under continuing pressure from public expectation to become more efficient, it is appropriate that it should shed a purely administrative function to allow it concentrate on tackling crime.

February 2008

APPENDIX 8

Memorandum submitted by the Youth Justice Board for England and Wales

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

1. The Youth Justice Board for England and Wales (YJB) welcomes the inquiry and the opportunity to submit written evidence. This note provides an outline of issues raised by the inquiry that are most directly relevant to the work of the YJB. We would be pleased to provide any further information that would be of assistance to the Committee.

Background on the YJB

2. The role of the YJB is to oversee performance of the youth justice system in England and Wales. The statutory responsibilities of the YJB include:
   — advising Ministers on the operation of, and standards for, the youth justice system;
   — monitoring the performance of the youth justice system;
   — purchasing places for, and placing, children and young people remanded or sentenced to custody;
   — identifying and promoting effective practice;
   — making grants to local authorities and other bodies to support the development of effective practice; and
   — commissioning research and publishing information.

3. While the YJB is responsible for overseeing the work of youth justice services, including multi-agency Youth Offending Teams, it does not directly manage any of the services.

Overview

4. There is clear interdependence between policing and the wider youth justice system. It is the view of the YJB that developments in policing including key issues raised by the Flanagan review have the potential to provide benefits in preventing offending and reoffending by children and young people and reducing victimisation. Reforms could potentially increase the efficiency of both policing and wider youth justice services and improve further local partnerships. Effective collaboration between the services is clearly critical to making impact on offending by this age range.

5. YJB welcomes developments signalled by the Flanagan inquiry including:
   — embedding neighbourhood policing and neighbourhood management approaches;
   — increasing local accountability and participation;
   — looking to manage risks with a return to greater discretion; and
   — the emphasis on delivering in partnership.
6. Youth justice and policing operations are interdependent, particularly in areas such as neighbourhood policing where there is routine contact with young people both as victims and offenders. The progress in policing in taking “ownership” of local community problems presents an opportunity to build new relationships with young people and wider services.

7. While only a small proportion of children and young people come into contact with the youth justice system, clearly the issue of youth crime and anti-social behaviour is of high public concern. Furthermore, significant numbers of children and young people come into contact with the police as victims and witnesses. (Research indicates that children who have offended are more likely to be victims of crime and vice versa. It is found that the more often a young person is a victim, the more likely it is that he or she will become involved in criminal activity. Furthermore, a high proportion of youth crime is committed on other young people.)

**Partnerships to Prevent and Respond to Youth Crime**

8. It is important that effective processes are in place to identify children and young people early in their criminal involvement and to deliver responses that are effective in diverting them from crime into more positive activities. This approach requires local partnerships to be effective.

**Neighbourhood policing and partnerships**

9. The mainstreaming of neighbourhood policing is welcomed and supported by the YJB. Its development is likely to have had an impact on public expectations around addressing youth crime in particular addressing the relatively high volume of low-level offending and nuisance in communities. While this sort of crime can be less serious, it is often highly visible in communities and can cause real community concerns. We support the concept within the Flanagan review report of neighbourhood policing being part of wider neighbourhood management approach and the creation of a safe environment for communities.

10. The YJB has worked with the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) youth issues group and the neighbourhood policing implementation team at the National Policing Improvement Agency (NPIA) on the development of a “youth toolkit” of effective practice. The toolkit is currently being piloted in two Metropolitan and adjacent Essex police divisions. The outcome of the pilots will be reported to ACPO and YJB making recommendation for standard practice in neighbourhood policing relating to children and young people.

11. The neighbourhood policing youth toolkit has been developed as a practical application of the ACPO strategy for children and young people providing information on promising approaches to identifying children and young people at risk of future involvement in criminality through more systematic analysis of data, information and intelligence held by the police and their partners at the local level. This approach uses well evidenced research on “risk factors” most associated with the onset of offending and reoffending. As well as working with young people already involved in offending, this means that a wider group of children and young people can be identified who are at risk of becoming more involved providing an opportunity for earlier targeted intervention to maximise the opportunity for success. The youth toolkit approach has been referenced in the Flanagan report as an example of noteworthy partnership working that is already underway.

12. As part of the approach, multi-agency action plans including police prevention packages are being developed for individual children, young people and families. Police involvement in home visits, helping ensure the young person attend school, targeted stop and search, identifying criminal associates and working with parents and are intended to provide a proactive “street level” approach to preventing offending as part of wider neighbourhood management.

13. Essential to the approach is partnership between the police, local Youth Offending Teams and wider services for children and young people. It is important that work with children and young people identified as at risk of becoming involved in offending is on this multi-agency basis. The pilots will help to test whether the approach can lead to timely and appropriate referral from policing to services, including YOTs but also wider children services, that can intervene to help reduce their risk of offending addressing issues such as re-engagement in education, health and substance misuse concerns, family support, and involvement in positive activities.

14. One element of the toolkit approach is the use of Safer School Partnerships and the YJB welcomes that the merits of deploying police in schools in this way has been recognised and promoted for adoption in the neighbourhood policing model. In helping to develop this way of working, we found it to be a very effective way for young people to gain a trusting relationship with the local police. We supporting its further adoption based upon assessment of where the greatest need is in local communities for this approach.

15. Neighbourhood policing is well positioned to ensure there is a greater understanding of the issues facing and caused by children and young people in a local community. Using that information policing can work hand in hand with other services to address local problems and help divert children and young people to more positive behaviour. There are a range of developments that can be brought together using this approach including YOT led targeted prevention programmes and developments in wider services such as
targeted youth support. In general, YJB is interested in all police forces taking an active approach to youth crime prevention in partnership with other agencies and there being clear incentives for forces to do this. Furthermore, we want to ensure that local children’s services and other partnerships are encouraged to see the police as a key partner in preventative work not just having a role in enforcement and the management of children and young people who have offended. While recognising the importance of local areas being able to be responsive to local concerns, national performance frameworks are important for encouraging cooperation. YJB welcomes that a performance indicator based on one it had set in the past for YOTs to reduce the number of new entrants into the youth justice system through effective preventative work has now been included in the new round of Public Service Agreements and the consultations on the new national indicator set for local government and its partners in England and the new Assessment of Policing and Community Safety (APACS) framework.

16. As part of an overall approach to preventing and responding to low level offending and nuisance behaviour by children and young people, YJB would welcome greater flexibility in use of discretion by police officers and community support officers to respond to minor offending, in particular first time offences. Currently there is some evidence of minor offences committed by young people leading to disproportionate processing by the police. Quicker and less bureaucratic processing of children and young people in the youth justice system can be positive if that early identification and holding to account of their behaviour is also supported with action to reduce the chances of reoffending and direct victim reparation such as restorative justice approaches.

17. The YJB welcomes the announcement in the government’s Children’s Plan that there will be a pilot of “youth restorative disposal”. With this disposal we would expect to see police action that is more proportionate to the high volume, low level offending which is consistently the public’s priority. It will be important that police officers or PCSOs using this approach prioritise reassurance and engagement with the victim and where appropriate the approach leads to referral to YOTs and children’s services and notification to parents so that the risks of future offending can be addressed. Referral on to YOTs and children’s service would provide safeguards in assessing if any further intervention is necessary.

Information exchange arrangements

18. Effective partnerships need to make good use of information sharing. Under the direction of the ACPO youth issues group, the YJB’s Wiring Up Youth Justice programme is working the NPIA to improve exchange of information between police services and YOTs. Much of this information is currently sent by fax and there have been long standing concerns about the quality of information and the speed by which it is sent. Subject to the success of a pilot scheme that is currently being run in Essex, all notifications of reprimands, warnings, penalty notices and charges will be sent by secure email, together with details of any victims who have consented to receive contact from the YOT. It is intended to complete the national rollout of this improvement process during 2008/09 providing police officers with a more simple and streamlined process. YOTs will have the opportunity to offer early intervention programmes to young people, prepare for their court work and offer restorative interventions to victims with greater confidence in the accuracy of the information they have received from the police.

Areas of heightened concern—gang and serious group offending

19. Alongside a more co-ordination and flexible approach to responding and preventing low level offending by children and young people, there clearly are benefits in effective partnership arrangements to respond to and manage more serious offending by children and young people. Responding to heightened concerns around gang and serious group offending and the possession and use of weapons by children and young people needs co-ordination and co-operation between relevant agencies. There is a range of work currently undertaken and being developed to improve arrangements and provide effective intervention. In particular, YOTs in London have worked closely with YJB and the Metropolitan police to develop a system for sharing information about young people’s involvement in the different gangs whose members have a history of serious offending. With the support of the Wiring Up Youth Justice programme referred to earlier this information sharing facility will be made available in the rest of England and Wales as part of a new management information system for youth justice. The Flanagan review has reported that effective local partnerships are critical not only to successful neighbourhood policing but policing at all levels.

20. As well as the management of those involved in more serious offending of heightened concern the YJB is interested in how policing and its partners can help to reassure children and young people about their safety in their local community to reduce any risk that young people are drawn to gang involvement or the possession of weapons to “protect” themselves. Partnership work to increase perceptions of safety and provide safe places for children and young people to socialise and be involved in positive activities are important in affected communities. Neighbourhood policing and management approaches clearly have a role in helping to understand the concerns of local children and young people and providing leadership in addressing those concerns.
21. The development of the role of PCSOs is particularly important for youth offending as a youth crime is likely to form a high proportion of the type of behaviour that PCSOs are involved in addressing. As this is the case it is particularly important that PCSOs are well trained and able to use preventative and diversionary approaches, working in partnership, to address local concerns. There is good evidence of a growing role of PCSOs in YOT led prevention programmes and YJB would encourage this development further. It allows for better understanding of the role of policing for young people on the cusp of offending and integrates policing into local community activity.

22. The YJB also has a strong interest in the role of police officers that are based in the multi-agency Youth Offending Teams. YOT police officers have an important role providing the link between the YOT and wider police force and the YJB is working with ACPO on the development of the role. It is important that the role is seen as important within forces, has appropriate status, and has an active role in information and intelligence sharing and supporting multi-agency work to address youth offending.

**Deployment of Resources**

23. The YJB is in general interested in ensuring there is a continuing commitment from all police forces to the overall Youth Offending Team multi-agency partnership. Police forces are one of the key statutory partners of YOTs and it is important that there is continuing commitment and recognition of the mutual benefits of close involvement. As well as the provision of funding and the provision of YOT based police officers, (2005–06 figures show that police forces provided 9.5% of overall YOT funding) high level involvement in YOT management boards provides a vehicle through which local youth offending issues can be addressed on a multi-agency basis. Those police services that have provided their officers and staff with access to police IT systems at YOT premises have benefited from opportunities to share intelligence in support of preventing serious offences, and we would encourage all police services to consider how they might provide such a facility to their seconded staff. Bringing together both criminal justice and children and young people’s services in the YOT partnership has been identified as key to the success of the model including in the Audit Commission 2004 review of the youth justice system.

**February 2008**
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**APPENDIX 9**

**Memorandum submitted by Nottinghamshire Police Authority**

We wish to respond in brief terms to the invitation to submit evidence to your Committee.

Members have had sight of a draft of a response to be submitted by our Chief Constable Steve Green, who we understand is to appear before the Committee, and we would wish to highlight some of the issues referred to in his response in particular our joint vision of *Policing For You*.

We would also wish to highlight some specific work being undertaken by this Authority with European partners.

As the first hearing of the Committee is to be held in Nottinghamshire we would begin by welcoming the Chairman and Members of the Select Committee to Nottinghamshire and commend to you our rapidly improving police force and reducing crime levels!

*What the public expects of the police; how Chief Constables determine priorities; the role of the Home Office in setting priorities*

In his response Mr Green highlights the Force/Authority vision of *Policing for You*.

The Notts Force and Authority have recently developed a new vision under the heading of “*Policing for You*”.

This is focused on ensuring that members of the public receive a tailored quality service taking account of their individual and the community’s needs.

We would take this opportunity to commend our Chief Constable and the members of his command team for having in many ways anticipated the findings of Sir Ronnie Flanagan in the way that this vision is being developed. We are already seeing significant dividends in terms of our demand management data.

We also believe that, under the effective supervision of their line managers, individual police officers should be empowered to exercise their own professional judgement (within certain well defined parameters).
This might involve looking again at areas that have hitherto been regarded as sacrosanct; an area that was signalled up in Sir Ronnie Flanagan’s interim report but which seems not to have figured in his final report to the same extent although we do support the references to proportionate response in relation to responding to lower level crime and the recommendation at recommendation 21 for a structured project on these issues.

We wonder though whether more rapid progress on this issue is not both necessary and desirable?

An example put forward by one of our Assistant Chief Constables Ian Ackerley illustrates this point, we feel, particularly effectively;

In dealing with an incident where a teenage son has taken money from a parent’s purse, and the parent then reports the incident to the police, would it not be better if the officer involved were given the discretion to deal with the incident, with the parents consent, by way of a reprimand to the teenager and by arranging any necessary referral to partner agencies; ie applying a problem solving approach?

This is surely preferable to the current requirement to invoke the full panoply of the criminal justice system by recording a crime, cautioning, and recording a sanction detection. But thereby potentially criminalising the young person involved and, just as importantly, involving the officer in the bureaucracy involved?

We appreciate the sensitivities involved in allowing officers greater discretion as to whether or not to record a crime but in our view this kind of radical proposal does need to be very seriously considered and implemented without delay.

Police funding and the efficiency with which the various police forces deploy the financial resources available

We also support the concept of “the right people doing right jobs” as set out in the Ministers letter commissioning Sir Ronnie’s report.

We support the proposals for developing the police workforce made in Chapter 4 of the Flanagan report.

However we do feel strongly that Forces and Authorities will require additional financial assistance if this shared aspiration is to be realised.

The committee may be aware of the work undertaken by KPMG in the East Midlands region to identify possible ways of working more effectively and efficiently on a collaborative basis.

The work of the regional collaboration team led by the Chiefs and the Chairs and Chief Executives in the East Midlands Region has been commended by the Home Office.

However, as the Committee may also be aware, the original predictions of efficiencies have had to be significantly scaled down in the light of the practical difficulties involved in civilianisation and the significantly elongated time scales involved.

We would invite the Committee to take the view that up front investment is required if “the right people dong the right job” is to be realiseable in anything but the very long term.

In the same way as accountability is best delivered locally we consider that the best lever for achievement and productivity in a Force lies with local mechanisms and with the regional collaboration agenda.

We do not consider that funding can fairly be tied to performance data, as it currently exists.

Whilst we do believe that performance should be assessed on a more “value added” basis, as is the case within the education sector, even then we do not believe that funding should follow performance, as this potentially would leave high crime areas with less funding.

We strongly believe that the current funding formula should be applied without floors and ceilings.

Public involvement in local policing

We believe that it is important to integrate the use of other local community engagement mechanisms for example Independent Advisory Group members into neighbouring policing models.

In terms of making the link with other forms of policing IAG members are able to provide a vital link between communities obtaining intelligence and managing tensions between rival sections within for example asylum seeker/refugee communities. We would emphasise the importance of engagement with young people, whether via an IAG or other mechanism.

In our view training for neighbourhood officers needs to encompass the issues of empowerment and discretion of officers referred to above. It is essential that officers not only have a full understanding of the National Intelligence Model and problem solving approaches but also an appreciation of how and when to use their professional judgement in dealing with offenders and acting in the best interests of victims.
The Local Area Agreement has an important role to play as the overarching policy document.

The relationship between LAA structures, CDROP structures and Force/Authority structures is vital in tying neighbourhood policing into the wider world of community safety.

We believe that there is scope for improving the way in which neighbourhood policing teams engagement findings inform decision-making within CDRP’s, and Force Divisional and Strategic assessments. It is essential, in our view, that not only are local issues responded to locally but also that there are effective mechanisms to ensure that issues of wider significance for the Force can reach the forum where such decisions are made.

**Police authorities**

Without commenting at this stage on the governance options in the Flanagan Final Report there is one aspect of the Authority’s role here that we consider is worthy of highlighting and that concerns the securing of potential European funds and working with European partners to help spread good policing practice.

The AGIS Project “Tackling Drugs and Reducing Crime” which is led by the Police Authority and which has received significant European funding, continues to be successful and is building towards a Conference in Nottingham on 7–8 April 2008.

All the European partners involved (Poznan in Poland, Assen in Holland and Stockholm in Sweden) will be participating in the conference, along with local partners, where current good practice in terms of mapping and disrupting drug markets, treating and managing drug using offenders will be passed on and discussed with representatives from all of the Member states.

There have already been some significant benefits and additional initiatives arising from the project;

— The LOTS project
   LOTS Project-Crime Prevention Project adopted from Stockholm- all patrol officers/PCSOS from Nottinghamshire A and B Division have/are being trained in basic drugs awareness and given information, including leaflets, of local treatment services where they can direct users to. This will roll out county wide early next year

— A new amphetamine project
   Amphetamine Project-snapshot surveys were carried out on Nottinghamshire A and B division involving voluntary testing of offenders and the gathering of existing data re amphetamine use. This project established that between 25–45% of those tested were positive for amphetamine. This indicates there may be a population of drug users committing crime and not being forced into treatment through the DIP. Further analysis is underway re results and the above information has been fed into the national strategy consultation exercise. This is the first time in UK this work has been undertaken.

— Able to work project
   Able to Work Project-following from the placements to Assen earlier this year 2 of the Notts Placementees have been working on developing a project to give ex users/offenders an opportunity to gain training/employment in the county. Following a visit to the Able Project in Wakefield, a fish farming/regeneration project, a bid has been submitted to the County Council for £25k funding for a feasibility study.

— Adopt an offender
   Adopt an Offender-Borrowed from Assen and now incorporated into the Sherwood Project-involves local neighbourhood teams working with partners to manage more effectively local low level offenders-now known as General Offender Management.

— Alcohol project
   Alcohol project-Potentially the next EC funded project-Work is underway to establish a project with European partners to establish best ways of tackling the problems associated with binge drinking and young people, in particular health issues and crime/anti-social behaviour.

We hope this gives you a flavour of the work being undertaken locally and look forward to meeting members of the Committee at the launch on the 25th February.
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Memorandum submitted by RoadPeace

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Policing in the 21st century needs to give greater priority to tackling road crime as road crashes are and will continue to be the leading cause of unnatural death. Road crime is also the most common crime, with over 1.2 million speeding fines issued last year (equal to the total number of criminal offences the government wanted to bring to justice). Speeding vehicles have been identified as the most common type of anti-social behaviour. If road crime was properly included in the national recording systems, it would dwarf other crimes. The real threat to life comes not from knives, guns, drugs or terrorists, but from drivers breaking the law.

INTRODUCTION

For the past fifteen years, RoadPeace, the national charity for road crash victims, has not only supported victims of crashes but also campaigned for a proper response to this epidemic by the government, particularly the justice sector. Road crashes are still perceived by too many as “accidents” despite many involving criminal behaviour, as can be seen by Sir John Steven’s description of Diana, Princess of Wales’s death as a “simple accident”, when gross drink driving and speeding were involved. We welcome the opportunity to highlight the need for vehicle crime usually defined and represented as “theft of and from vehicles” to be officially broadened to include driving offences and to be fully included in this consultation.

Our responses to the specific questions asked follow.

What the public expects of the police; how Chief Constables determine priorities; the role of the Home Office in setting priorities

1. The public expects the police to protect them from life-threatening activity. Too often, the debate about public safety excludes road crime, despite over four times as many people being killed in crashes than by all other causes of homicide.

2. We have heard repeatedly from our Traffic Police colleagues about how the Home Office sets the priorities and “what gets counted gets done”. Unfortunately, the reporting procedures do not always include road crime. The National Crime Statistics monitors such minor crimes such as pick-pocketing and cycle theft but not serious crimes that threaten life as speeding or drink driving. The definition of violent crime includes the threat of violence but not that from motor vehicles, even when they are being driven in an illegal manner.

3. Speeding vehicles had appeared as the lead cause of anti-social behaviour in previous British Crime Surveys but has since been dropped from the list of possible causes of anti-social behaviour.

4. The government’s recently published Cutting crime strategy does not include any mention of road crime, despite it discussing anti-social behaviour, violent crime and how to design out crime. The technology how to design out speeding and drink driving already exists.

5. The cost of road crashes to the country is underestimated, unlike that of crime. The estimated cost of £18 billion includes those fatal and injury crashes reported to the police and an estimate of the number of damage only collisions. There is no adjustment for under-reporting of those casualty crashes not reported to or by the police. Yet there is much adjustment for under-reporting when the Home Office estimates the cost of other crime.

The police in London are barely scratching the surface of all that needs to be done to change the culture of lawless roads.—Jenny Jones, London’s Road Safety Ambassador, 2007.

6. Tackling driving offences would benefit crime reduction efforts overall as there is a proven link between those who drive illegally and involvement in other criminal activities. This is why ACPO refers to denying criminals the use of the road.
The impact of the heightened concerns about terrorism, immigration, gun and knife crime, identify fraud; the growth in cyber-crime; the Olympics

7. The real threat comes from road crime with speeding related crashes accounting for over 15 times as many deaths as gun crime and over four times as many deaths as knife crime.

8. As noted by John Adams, emeritus professor of geography at University College London and Britain’s leading academic on risk, road crashes pose a much greater risk than terrorist attacks. The death toll from the London bombings represents six days of death on Britain’s roads. … It is estimated that last year more than 1.2 million people were killed in road accidents globally—more than one 9/11 every day. Yet the public fear of terrorism—and reaction to it—is on a completely different scale to that of death on the road.—John Adams, http://www.socialaffairsunit.org.uk/blog/archives/000512.php

Public involvement in local policing

9. When road safety and traffic law enforcement are included in public consultations, they are a leading concern. Traffic and road safety was the third leading area of concern identified in the recent Metropolitan Police Service public consultation, scoring higher than drugs and drug related crime.

10. While neighbourhood watches have traditionally ignored road crime, local communities have been active in community speed watch programmes run by several police services.

11. In London, all borough police forces and safer neighbourhood teams will be trained and able to clamp down on illegal drivers by the end of 2008.

Roles of and relationship between PCSs and PCSOs; different ways in which police forces deploy staff

12. Traffic police have decreased in numbers in the past 10 years and ACPO has advised us that competing demands will prevent any significant increase in traffic police in the future. It will be vital that traffic law enforcement is incorporated into the responsibilities of borough police. The Merseyside Police required borough police to undertake speed and drink drive checks. In London, the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) have recently trained all borough police.

13. We welcome PCSOs involvement in traffic law enforcement, including speed checks.

14. We understand PCSOs are involved in offering support to victims and question if this is best use of their time and if they are properly trained for this work. We are not even sure if this is happening as we have not heard of any victim being supported by a PCSO from our helpline calls or from our local groups.

Use of technology to enable police officers to return to the beat

15. Safety cameras have been proven to be very effective at reducing speeding and also crashes and casualties. There is much better evidence for safety cameras than for CCTV. Safety cameras have been very effective at freeing up police time for other duties. While speeding is the top road danger problem, speed enforcement is better undertaken by such technological means as safety cameras, black boxes, and speed limiters. Over 1.2 million fines for speeding were issued last year, the equivalent of the total number of offences the Home Office wanted to bring to justice in 2007.

16. ANPR has been very effective at identifying illegal vehicles and this has had a knock on effect at identifying other crimes. MPS Assistant Commissioner Ghaffur informed the Metropolitan Police Authority that ANPR officers in London having an arrest rate seven times higher than borough officers (Jones, 2007).

Police funding and the efficiency with which the various police forces deploy the financial resources available

17. Tackling road crime has the potential to be self-financing, unlike other crime. While safety camera revenue can no longer be invested in traffic law enforcement, the police are still able to benefit financially from the sales of confiscated vehicles, which we believe should include the vehicles of drink drivers and speeding drivers. Other countries, including New Zealand, fund traffic law enforcement from fuel levy.

18. We are concerned about the limited investment in collision investigation. The government’s estimate of the cost of police resources in collision investigation and criminal prosecution is very low. For 2005, these were £1660 for a fatal crash, £230 for a serious injury crash, £50 for a slight injury crash (DIT Highway Economics Note 1, 2006). We believe this indicates the minimal efforts expected from collision investigation.
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Memorandum submitted by SBAC

1.1 SBAC is the UK’s national trade association representing companies supplying civil air transport, aerospace defence, homeland security and space markets. SBAC encompasses the British Airports Group and UKspace. Together with its regional partners, SBAC represents over 2,600 companies across the UK supply chain.

1.2 Alongside civil air transport equipment SBAC members provide equipment to the Ministry of Defence for use in battlefield operations and the sector is also heavily engaged in the fast developing security markets for which there are many interfaces with government and the emergency services. There are opportunities for the government and the emergency services to work closely with industry to meet 21st century policing needs and SBAC therefore welcomes the opportunity to contribute to this inquiry.

2. Summary

2.1 The UK faces unprecedented 21st century policing challenges.

2.2 Boundaries between UK and overseas policing are increasingly blurred.

2.3 Research indicates that the private security industry is growing more quickly than public policing.

2.4 Industry should be considered (and embraced) as a willing strategic partner to Government and UK police forces to deliver 21st century policing.

2.5 British police forces could engage industry collectively through the UK Security and Resilience Industry Suppliers Council (RISC) where appropriate, for example when forming challenging (current or future) policing operational requirements requiring broad industry input beyond routine procurement arrangements.

2.6 The National Policing Improvement Agency (NPIA) should develop, coordinate and promote central police procurement initiatives increasingly.

2.7 Policing equipment and system needs should be articulated clearly and transparently to allow industry to respond in an effective manner.

3. 21st Century Policing—SBAC View on UK Context

3.1 The UK faces unprecedented 21st century policing challenges, in large part owing to the sustained and well-documented terrorism threat. UK police personnel figures (approximately 140,500 at the time of writing) demonstrate a limited resource and public/private sector policing collaboration is increasingly necessary to meet the challenge.

3.2 The private sector is increasingly seen as a strategic partner to both the government and individual police forces. The Private Security Industry Act 2001 (PSIA) and recent “community safety accreditation schemes” initiative are individual signs of the trend towards strengthening the UK’s policing/security capacity with private sector support. SBAC welcomes the growth of public/private sector partnership schemes to meet 21st century policing demands.

3.3 21st century policing is more than a UK-based, domestic challenge. Policing must also address (and react to the effects of) cross-border criminal activity such as organised crime, international terrorism and illegal immigration. The forces of globalisation demand new and innovative policing policy responses both at home and overseas.

3.4 The UK’s approach to policing is based on a regional, rather than a central, approach. At the highest strategic level of policing the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) agrees and coordinates central strategy, with the Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) considered as the UK’s most senior police officer. This model’s sustainability in light of the rapidly changing 21st century policing landscape should be considered during this inquiry.

3.5 Whatever the Committee’s recommended policing architecture reform (if any at all); mechanisms to allow greater UK industry/government engagement and integration with overseas policing institutions should be explored. A national policing strategy and/or a centralised procurement approach in key operational areas would be welcome steps to empower industry to support police forces effectively. A clear outline of the Government’s strategic approach for dealing with the 21st century’s transnational policing dynamic would also be welcomed.
4. **Inquiry Comments**

4.1 In support of this analysis SBAC submits comments on four specific areas relating to the inquiry’s terms of reference:

4.1.1 The role of the Home Office in setting priorities: The Home Office has a central role to play in setting police priorities and working with industry to support them. Since 2007 the Home Office’s Office of Security and Counter Terrorism (OSCT) has engaged industry through the UK Security and Resilience Industry Suppliers Council (RISC); this should continue. RISC has emerged as the single strategic point of contact between Home Office and Industry to address shared counter-terrorism issues. Collaborative formation of necessary requirements is the next natural step for the security agenda. If/when presented with a significant problem requiring industry support, individual police forces should engage the Home Office and RISC directly.

4.1.2 Use of technology to enable police officers to return to the beat: Technological support systems provide opportunities to allow police officers to return to the beat. SBAC member companies can support police and emergency services with system integration services to facilitate multi-agency working, thereby avoiding resource duplication. Increasing industry’s role in policing (personnel and equipment) would also contribute; deployment of private security personnel and equipment in “traditional” policing roles would free-up other officers for “beat duties” (eg Police officer supervision of metal detection facilities at schools could be replaced by Security Industry Authority (SIA) accredited personnel). Despite widespread concerns over the UK developing into a “surveillance society”, deployment of improved CCTV/surveillance systems (including possible emerging contributions from space) would also help reduce wasted prosecutions and thus save police time by improving poor and/or restricted coverage.

4.1.3 Police funding and the efficiency with which the various police forces deploy the financial resources available: Historically, industry has noted fragmented approaches to police and emergency service operational requirement setting and system/equipment procurement drives. Recently, improvements have been noted such as the central procurement of “Airwave” (national police radio system) and “FireControl” (infrastructure for nine regional control centres), for example. Further centralised police technology or system procurement initiatives (eg the integration of existing multi-agency solutions) would improve budgetary maximisation and operational efficiency. In future, police operational requirements’ feasibility studies could be channelled through RISC and its working groups.

4.1.4 Difficulties in recruitment and retention, covering not just numbers but quality of applicants/staff retained: PSIA 2001 provisions demand high training standards for private security personnel to undertake SIA-designated roles. Further strategic development and research around how industry (personnel, systems and equipment) could support frontline policing roles should be encouraged by the Government; particularly the Home Office, the NPIA and the SIA. Retention of private security personnel in “policing” roles (eg airport security officers) might be encouraged if they are treated as true members of the wider “policing family”.

5. **Proposed Recommendations to be Included in the Final Report**

5.1 Industry should be recognised, embraced and promoted as a key strategic partner to government and UK police services in delivering 21st century policing and security.

5.2 The policing authorities should engage industry at the highest strategic level through the Home Office and with RISC members to formulate and deploy their future technology/equipment operational requirements.

5.3 The NPIA should be provided with a robust mandate (Sir Ronnie Flanagan recommendation) and, working with RISC where appropriate, play an increasing role in centralising policing (and multi-agency) operational requirements, and the procurement thereof.

5.4 With policing boundaries increasingly blurred, UK overseas policing cooperation should be strengthened. Supporting this, British industry is in a strong position to contribute to, for example, the EU’s 21st century policing and security research, equipment and technology systems needs (eg possible future border security measures).

5.5 Policing equipment and system needs (including the integration thereof) should be articulated clearly and transparently to allow industry to respond in an effective manner.
6. CONCLUDING REMARKS

6.1 SBAC and other RISC members already support British police and emergency services with a wide range of security/ resilience equipment and systems. Industry should be considered (and embraced) as a willing strategic partner to Government and UK police forces in meeting complex 21st century policing challenges. SBAC would welcome the Committee’s recognition of industry’s critical role in 21st century policing. Continued development and roll-out of transparent procurement initiatives across all constabularies would also be welcomed, particularly in the area of systems integration requirements, as would explicit recognition of a growing need for central policing operational requirement setting. Through RISC and other existing bilateral channels, industry is ready to support the UK’s police in the 21st Century.
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Memorandum submitted by the City of London Police

1. The City of London’s particular demographics, with a small resident population but well over 300,000 people arriving at work each day in the financial institutions, give rise to particular challenges for the City of London Police. A different style of policing is therefore required to that which is found outside of much of central London. Given the concentration of businesses in the Square Mile, a major focus of the City Force is the protection of the reputation of London as an international financial centre and the institutions that form part of it. Businesses in the City experience the best of traditional British policing style, together with a technological advantage in counter-terrorist measures, and lead status in relation to financial investigations. Although contained within a small geographic area, the Force reaches across regional, national and international borders as a leader in policing the international business environment.

2. Latest crime figures show that crime in the City of London has fallen for the fifth consecutive year. In 2006–07, 7,973 offences were recorded in the Square Mile which represents a reduction of nearly 500 crimes compared to last year. This is the first time that offences have fallen below 8,000 since 2000, and represents a total 21% reduction in crime figures over five years. The Force has also performed well in detecting crime. The sanction detection\(^{38}\) rate of 35% is likely to be the third highest in England and Wales. Total detections, which include disposals where there is sufficient evidence to charge an offender, but where it has been decided not to be in the public interest to proceed with a prosecution, are at 39.2%. The Force’s Economic Crime Department has recorded exceptionally high detections of 80.2% for total detections and 78.6% for sanction detections.

3. The recent Corporate Assessment of the City Corporation from the Audit Commission reported positively on the work of the City of London Corporation in its capacity as Police Authority. It said, “The City of London as the City Police Authority has a strong track record of effective partnership working, including the Safer City Partnership, which has sustained low crime rates and low fear of crime. A 20% reduction in all crimes has been achieved in the last three years from an already low baseline. Residents’ survey results confirm that high numbers feel safe during the day (87%) and after dark (75%) including in disadvantaged wards. These figures compare well with regional and national averages and are consistently high. The City Police authority has a national and international reputation for successfully tackling areas of specialist crime including anti fraud and counter terrorism. As a result residents and City workers enjoy a good quality of life and a safe environment”.

4. The City Police is not in a position to respond to all the points raised by the Committee in its call for evidence but wishes to make the following observations relevant to its areas of expertise, that is economic and financial crime. It is important to note that the National Community Safety Plan does not mention Fraud and, accordingly, Fraud is not seen as a priority for most Forces. There is also an acknowledged underreporting of Fraud which makes it difficult to gauge the exact cost to the economy, and to individuals, of these crimes.

FINANCIAL CRIME

5. The City’s Economic Crime Unit has an enviable international reputation with the largest fraud squad in Europe, handling many hundreds of requests for assistance from law enforcement agencies around the world. The City of London Police has used its unique position and expertise to build a reputation in economic and specialist crime investigation, and is regularly called upon to investigate cases arising nationally and internationally\(^{39}\). There are strong arguments that effective fraud investigation goes hand in hand with territorial policing of the City—the high esteem in which the City Police is held clearly assists in giving its constituents the confidence to report alleged frauds.

\(^{38}\)Sanction detections are charges/summonses, cautions, offences taken into consideration, penalty notices for disorder and formal warnings for cannabis possession.

\(^{39}\)For example, the investigation into corruption in football, and the investigation with the Department of Work and Pensions re Congolese gang infiltration of the Royal Mail.
6. The City Force’s high degree of experience and expertise in the investigation of “white collar crime” was first recognised by Government in granting “lead force” status to the City Police in fraud cases for the whole of South East England. The City Force’s specialist skills in this area were also recognised in the Government’s response to the Fraud Review which suggested that a National Fraud Strategic Authority should be established and commented that the City of London Police was “the best placed police force to take on this role, having financial crime as one of its main objectives”\textsuperscript{40}. The response also endorsed the expansion of the current “lead force” role of the City of London Police “[to lend] expertise and advice to forces for serious or complex frauds, to the rest of England and Wales”. This recognition culminated in the City of London Police being recognised by the Government under the Comprehensive Spending Review as the lead agency in the fight against fraud and economic crime across the UK. Under the new arrangements, the Force will operate as a centre of excellence to increase the UK’s capability to investigate fraud cases including the setting up of a national fraud reporting centre, which will provide a central point for reporting cases of fraud.

7. In addition to its growing role domestically, the City Force has received funding from the Department for International Development for a new dedicated team to investigate allegations of overseas corruption and bribery by UK businesses abroad. To date, the City of London Police is involved with approximately seventeen cases with the Serious Fraud Office.

**NATIONAL FRAUD REPORTING CENTRE**

8. Following the Government’s announcement, work has already started on the provision of a National Fraud Reporting Centre, Intelligence Database and a Centre of Excellence for Fraud Investigation. Support to other Forces will be provided following agreed protocols. Investigative teams will be multi-agency drawn from the police, security services and the Serious and Organised Crime Agency (SOCA) with an emphasis on partnership working. Seconded officers along with police officers and civilian staff and will concentrate on problem solving, not simply enforcement.

9. National governance will be through a Strategic Authority allowing stakeholders to influence direction. When fully operational, information about Frauds and their perpetrators will be held centrally and information will be managed between the interested parties. These new arrangements will not allow Fraud to “slip through the gap” and not be reported or avoid investigation.

**JOINT WORKING**

10. The initiative to deal with the relatively new phenomenon of “Boiler-room Fraud”, that is the sale of shares in non-existent firms with the promise of high returns, is an example of the methodology in action. The police, security services and SOCA work together to undertake intelligence coordination and enforcement, the Financial Services Agency and the Office of Fair Trading have a role in educating consumers, banks are responsible for monitoring accounts and protecting their customers, and the Foreign and Commonwealth Office and Interpol work to influence overseas jurisdictions.

11. There is nothing to prevent this model being expanded into other areas of policing. The combination of industry, consumers, government departments, intelligence and enforcement agencies and regulators is a powerful force to combat crime. This blueprint could, for example, be used in tackling vehicle related criminality using the national ANPR database as catalyst, environmental crime or domestic extremism. The adoption of this approach does not necessitate a change from the current structure of Forces since local resources and expertise will still be needed to support investigations and consequent operations. In this way, Lead Force support can be seen to enhance the provision of local services without requiring the maintenance of little used skills and units in within those local Forces.

12. Government will, however, need to be mindful of the resources needed to staff and fund Lead Forces effectively. Fraud investigation, for example, requires high levels of training and expertise and candidates for these specialist roles within the police can be equally attractive to industry and commerce. Pay scales and employment packages therefore need to meet the expectations of these professionals or there will be little incentive for them to remain in public service. Forces already have difficulty in retaining analytical staff after they have been trained. The sponsored funding model similar to the Dedicated Cheque and Plastic Card Unit might, therefore, be one way this loss of skilled personnel could be addressed\textsuperscript{41}.


\textsuperscript{41} This specialist police unit was set up in April 2002 as a two-year pilot jointly funded by the banking industry and the Home Office and staffed by police personnel, fraud investigators and staff provided by APACS and its members. After the pilot the banking industry agreed to sponsor the Unit in full, and to extend its focus from counterfeit fraud to encompass other categories of serious and organised cheques and plastic crime, including cash machine and ID fraud. The Unit comprises police officers drawn from the City of London and Metropolitan Police Forces. These officers are supported by investigators from the banking industry and case support staff.
CONCLUSION

13. The City of London Police remains a territorial force with an ongoing responsibility to its residents, workers and visitors. Economic policing is an integral part of this duty. The expertise the City Police has developed in economic crime (and the staff dedicated to it) allows those skills to be redirected, when necessary in support of other, national, issues as exampled in the support provided to the Metropolitan Police following the bombings and attempted bombings in July 2005.
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Memorandum submitted by British Irish Rights Watch

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The experiences of Northern Ireland provide many important lessons for policing in the 21st Century. British Irish RIGHTS WATCH (BIRW) believes it is crucial that mistakes made in Northern Ireland are not repeated elsewhere. There are undoubtedly similarities in the challenges that are to be faced by other police services, particularly those relating to dealing effectively with a terrorist threat without alienating elements of the community.

We believe that the Historical Enquiries Team (HET) in Northern Ireland has a vital position in rebuilding public confidence in policing in Northern Ireland. The HET demonstrates the value of openly acknowledging the truth about the past and is an important example of the importance of not forgetting the past when setting priorities for the future.

In our opinion District Policing Partnerships (DPPs) have the potential to develop into an effective conduit between the police and the community they serve. We believe that the importance of community-influenced policing increases where the police service feels there is an increased risk of criminality. Many of the problems which have beset DPPs in Northern Ireland would not be replicated should this model be applied more widely.

BIRW has serious concerns regarding the introduction of new technologies. Whilst we appreciate that new technologies may increase the confidence of police personnel, this should not be at the cost of imperilling human rights. We were concerned that Attenuated Energy Projectiles (AEPs) were introduced in Northern Ireland without proper consultation and have serious concerns regarding the PSNI’s failure to carry out a full Equality Impact Assessment before piloting the deployment of tasers. We believe that such a course of action could have serious consequences and will probably lead to deaths. The significance of these failures is enhanced as they concern less than lethal weaponry; it is imperative that the introduction of any such technologies should be managed with the greatest attention to human rights. The Police Service of Northern Ireland (PSNI) have failed to engage in simple processes designed to protect the most fundamental human right, the right to life.

BIRW is fundamentally opposed to the use of tasers, PAVA spray and AEPs. We believe that whilst equipping officers with tasers and PAVA spray may facilitate the return of police to the beat, the use of such technologies equates, at the very least, to cruel and inhuman punishment. Both incapacitants and tasers rely upon the infliction of pain as a means of enforcing compliance. Whilst we accept that the use of force will inevitably inflict some pain on its victims, neither of these technologies represent an attempt to minimise the infliction of pain. The suitability of plastic bullets remains questionable. Whilst AEPs are yet to be responsible for any fatalities studies do nothing to prove they are less likely to do so than the previous generation of baton round which has been responsible for 14 fatalities and numerous serious injuries in Northern Ireland.

BIRW is pleased by the recent decision by the House of Lords to renew the policy of 50:50 Catholic : Protestant recruitment to the PSNI. The PSNI also needs to make a continued commitment to its Catholic recruits. This effort to recruit, retain and promote needs to include not only Catholic officers but also women, the disabled and ethnic minorities. We believe that the experiences of Northern Ireland clearly demonstrate the importance of a representative police service, especially in times of increased tension.

BIRW are pleased by the recent decision by the House of Lords to renew the policy of 50:50 Catholic : Protestant recruitment to the PSNI. The PSNI also needs to make a continued commitment to its Catholic recruits. This effort to recruit, retain and promote needs to include not only Catholic officers but also women, the disabled and ethnic minorities. We believe that the experiences of Northern Ireland clearly demonstrate the importance of a representative police service, especially in times of increased tension.

BIRW also pleased to note the significant improvements made by the PSNI with regard to police training. These improvements include recent moves concerning the integration of human rights standards into training schemes and special training regarding the use of force. BIRW believes that the PSNI's Code of Ethics is potentially a significant document with regards to setting standards for policing; for this potential to be fulfilled it is crucial that where patterns of breaches emerge they are addressed. We believe that the PSNI demonstrates that effective policing is facilitated, not hampered, by respect for human rights.
1. Introduction

1.1 British Irish RIGHTS WATCH (BIRW) is an independent non-governmental organisation that monitors the human rights dimension of the conflict and the peace process in Northern Ireland. Our services are available free of charge to anyone whose human rights have been affected by the conflict, regardless of religious, political or community affiliations, and we take no position on the eventual constitutional outcome of the peace process.

1.2 British Irish RIGHTS WATCH welcome this opportunity to make a submission to the Home Affairs Committee regarding Policing in the 21st Century. We support an open approach to the reform of policing and the canvassing of a wide range of opinions concerning this important topic. BIRW has monitored developments in policing in Northern Ireland since our inception in 1990.

1.3 British Irish RIGHTS WATCH believes that there are many valuable lessons that can be learnt from the conflict in Northern Ireland; in particular from the reform of the police service in Northern Ireland, subsequent to the Patten Report in 1999.42 Whilst this is in part because the police service in Northern Ireland has undergone a thorough reform more recently than elsewhere in the UK, it is also significant that the police in Northern Ireland have already had to address a number of the issues, especially those relating to terrorism, which are now perceived to represent more widespread challenges across the United Kingdom. In this submission, we have only commented on those aspects of the Home Affairs Committee’s inquiry about which we have direct knowledge arising from our work.

2. What the public expects of the Police: Dealing with the Past and the Historical Enquiries Team

2.1 Since the conflict in Northern Ireland began there has been a tension between sections of the community and the police service. These tensions were exacerbated by a number of incidents in which the police were responsible for causing serious injury and even, on 64 occasions, death.43 Whilst it is important to recognise that the police in Northern Ireland were under enormous pressure during this period, the Police Service of Northern Ireland (PSNI) has been correct in identifying the need to address the past in Northern Ireland to enable it to police to future effectively.

2.2 The Historical Enquiries Team (HET) was established in Northern Ireland to assist in bringing “resolution” to those families of victims affected by deaths attributable to the conflict in the years between 1968 and the Belfast/Good Friday Agreement in 1998. The HET has been asked to re-examine all deaths attributable to the conflict and ensure that all investigative and evidential opportunities are examined.

2.3 A budget of £34 million has been allocated over a six-year period, starting in 2005, for dealing with all the unsolved murders arising out of the conflict. The HET is one of four agencies funded under this budget, known as the Legacy Project, the other three being the Police Ombudsman (PONI), the Public Prosecution Service (PPS), and Forensic Science Northern Ireland (FSNI). None of these agencies has a specific allocation within the budget, but each must bid for its own costs, although FSNI’s costs may be included with those of the HET in future, since the HET commissions work from FSNI as a provider of services.

2.4 According to the latest figures available from the HET they are examining 3,268 conflict-related deaths, arising from 2,516 incidents. 997 investigations into incidents have been opened so far, of which 242 have been completed or are nearing completion.44 Although the HET has needed to take some cases out of chronological sequence, in chronological terms they have reached June 1973.

2.5 Thus, halfway through the project, the HET has started work on 40% of all the incidents it needs to investigate, and 76% of those cases are yet to be completed.

2.6 There are many reasons why the HET is taking a long time to deal with cases. Here we would like to highlight just three of those reasons:

— the inability of the RUC to cope in the past with the large number of murder investigations generated by the conflict, alongside their role in combating terrorism;
— the fact that so many of the HET’s investigations are equivalent to major crime investigations such as the Soham murders, but are not resourced as such; and
— the fact that collusion has complicated the work of the HET on many levels.

2.7 The very poor clear-up rate of conflict-related killings has meant that the HET is finding a disproportionate number of cases which, were they to happen today, would immediately acquire the status of a major murder investigation. If one assumes hypothetically that £30 million of the £34 million allocated

43 This figure includes deaths due to the RUC, Garda and Metropolitan Police (London). Lost Lives, David McKittrick et al, 2nd edition, 2004
44 E-mail from HET to BIRW, 17 January 2008
to the Legacy Project goes to the HET and FSNI, that would mean that there would be under £12,000 per incident available to the HET. Yet the HET has on its books landmark murder after landmark murder, including McGurk’s Bar, Bloody Friday, Robert Nairac, La Mon, the Droppin’ Well, the Shankill Road bombing, the six deaths investigated by the Stalker/Sampson Enquiry, Teebane, the two soldiers murdered in Casement Park, Claudy, the Miami Showband murders, and the Disappeared, to name but a few cases, chosen virtually at random.\(^{45}\) Many of these cases, of course, concerned multiple deaths.

2.8 The HET is a unique experiment. To the best of our knowledge, nowhere else in the world has such a team. Inevitably, it very existence has raised high expectations among many of the families who still do not know the truth about what happened to their loved ones. In our work with victims we have found that they are seldom if ever interested in revenge or retribution. What they want above all is to find out the truth about what happened. They also want to be reassured that what happened to them will not happen to anyone else—an expectation that has all too often been unfulfilled. Thirdly, wherever possible, they want justice. They want those responsible, including not only perpetrators but instigators and those responsible for bad policies, to be held to account. However, victims are not unrealistic about what the justice system can deliver, and this aspiration for justice is often linked to the wish to ensure that the past does not merely repeat itself. These are very powerful, legitimate feelings, held right across communities, and we believe the HET is playing a very important role in meeting at least some of those expectations.

2.9 BIRW believes that aiding the discovery of the truth is a crucial function of policing; we believe this should be reflected in any determination of priorities. Whilst we support the work being undertaken by the HET we are concerned that it is under-resourced and that this may damage its efficacy.

3. **Public Involvement in Policing: District Policing Partnerships**

3.1 The District Policing Partnerships (DPPs) in Northern Ireland are autonomous bodies established by the Policing Board in co-operation with local councils. DPPs work to give a voice to community views on policing, contribute to the formulation of policing plans, monitor local police performance and co-operate in preventing crime across Northern Ireland. DPPs were established in accordance with the aspirations of the Belfast/Good Friday Agreement and the recommendations of the Patten Commission on the reform of policing.

3.2 We welcome initiatives which consult with local people about local policing strategy. DPPs represent one method, adopted by the PSNI, of achieving greater community involvement in policing. However, our experience of the situation in the Ballymurphy area of west Belfast has indicated that this engagement needs to be increased and refined in certain areas. Our sources indicate that while the PSNI is employing a multi-agency approach to the violence in Ballymurphy, not all local residents have been engaged in the process. This has led to confusion about police action (or perceived inaction) and a lack of impetus to engage with the police. We consider that the PSNI needs to develop local strategies to draw in disillusioned sections of the community, as part of a continuing process of consultation and engagement.

3.3 BIRW welcomes the news that the first meeting of a DPP in west Belfast involving Sinn Féin has taken place\(^{46}\) as part of Sinn Féin’s recent commitment to policing, but are concerned by reports that Sinn Féin councillors in Strabane have been unable to fill their positions on the area’s District Policing Partnership.\(^{47}\) We believe that it is inherent in the concept of DPPs that they are representative of their community. More needs to be done to engage local politicians in policing, otherwise some sections of the community will be left without a voice.

3.4 It is unfortunate that DPPs have been hampered in their efforts to monitor local policing by intimidation from both republicans and loyalists. Proposed changes to DPPs, toward a model of Community Safety Partnerships will mean that the DPPs’ main function, monitoring the effectiveness of the police, may be subsumed by the duties and responsibility of the Community Safety Partnerships and thus the DPPs’ original role will not be given due account or attention. While we acknowledge the benefit of moulding of partnerships between DPPs and the Community Safety Partnerships locally, national standards in police monitoring should not be ignored. It would be unfortunate if local DPPs were to become inconsistent with one another owing to local variations, which could result in a watering-down of national standards.

3.5 In our opinion DPPs have to potential to develop into an effective conduit between the police service and the community it serves. Many of the problems which have beset DPPs in Northern Ireland are simply the result of local conditions and would be unlikely to be replicated should this model be applied more widely.

\(^{45}\) There have been a few prosecutions in some of these cases, but not of the major perpetrators

\(^{46}\) Policing “first” for west Belfast, BBC News, 30 November 2007

\(^{47}\) Sinn Fein fails to fill DPP posts, BBC News, 05 December 2007
4. Use of Technology to enable Police Officers to return on the Beat

Attenuated Energy Projectiles

4.1 Adopted by the PSNI and the military in Northern Ireland on 21 June 2005, an Attenuated Energy Projectile (AEP) is the most recent evolution of the rubber/plastic baton rounds widely used during the conflict in Northern Ireland. It was introduced following research commissioned by the Northern Ireland Office to search for a less lethal alternative to the plastic bullet, as recommended by the Patten Commission on police reform. Plastic and rubber bullets have had a long and controversial history in Northern Ireland since their introduction in the 1970s. This controversy is largely due to the high number of fatalities caused by what purports to be a non-lethal weapon, although the readiness of the security services to resort to plastic bullets has also resulted in an incalculable number of serious injuries.

4.2 The AEP’s principal difference from its predecessor, the L21A1, is that it has an air pocket in the nose of the bullet which collapses on impact, thereby diffusing the force of its contact. In theory, it should be less likely to cause fractures, for example of the skull. The Defence Scientific Advisory Council’s sub-committee on the Medical Implications of Less-Lethal Weapons (DOMILL) has produced a statement on the comparative potential for causing injury of the AEP as compared to the L21A1.48 It concludes that the risk of an AEP impact to vulnerable areas such as the head and chest “will not exceed” that of the L21A1. Nor does the AEP pose a greater hazard to the chest or abdomen. In other words, in these respects the AEP is no safer than the L21A1. Its only benefits are that it is less likely to penetrate the skin, and that, should an AEP strike someone’s head, “the severity and incidence of skull fracture is likely to be lower with an AEP”, the bullet will intrude less into the brain, and it will result in less brain damage. However, DOMILL warns:

“The clinical impact of the reduction in damage to the brain and overlying skull from the AEP cannot be assessed confidently because of limitations in current models for this type of impact.”49

4.3 Whilst the introduction of AEPs was undoubtedly intended to reduce the risk of fatalities, as indicated above, DOMILL research was unable to conclude anything beyond the fact that the risk with AEPs “will not exceed” that of the previous generation of plastic baton round. This is all the more concerning when the record of plastic baton rounds is considered. Although intended as a non-lethal weapon, seventeen people have died as a result of the use of rubber and plastic bullets. Between 1970 and 15th November 1998, 55,834 rubber bullets and 68,995 plastic bullets were fired, 124,829 in all50. Rubber bullets resulted in three deaths, giving a ratio of one death for every 18,611 bullets fired. The 14 fatalities caused by plastic bullets result in a ratio of 1:4,928. Thus plastic bullets were more than four times as deadly as rubber bullets, despite the fact that they were intended to be safer.

4.4 Regrettably in 2005 AEPs were used within three weeks of their introduction, after an unofficial moratorium on the use of plastic bullets which had lasted for two and three quarter years.51 AEPs have continued to be used sporadically since then; most recently it is understood that seven rounds were fired on 1 August 2007 due to a civil disturbance in Bangor, County Londonderry.52

4.5 Recent events in York have raised further concerns regarding the use of AEPs. It is understood that North Yorkshire Police used an AEP to incapacitate a man claiming to be carrying explosives.53 BIRW would suggest that AEPs are patently unsuitable in such situations. We know of no evidence indicating that there is no risk that the impact of the AEP may not detonate the explosive. The use of AEPs in scenarios such as this would appear to indicate a wilful disregard for the right to life. The inherent unsuitability of AEPs in such situations undermines yet further the questionable usefulness of equipping the police with such weaponry.

4.6 BIRW also has concerns regarding the manner in which AEPs were introduced as a new technology. Concerns centre on the fact that there was no consultation exercise prior to their introduction. A number of human rights groups took the view that the Chief Constable could not purchase AEPs without consulting the Policing Board because they could be considered as novel and/or contentious items. However, after taking legal advice, the Policing Board seems to have concluded that the Chief Constable was only under a duty to notify them of any such expenditure, and they do not have the power to approve or disapprove his decision to deploy AEPs, or, presumably, any other weapon. If this is true, then it is a matter of grave concern, given the important role played by the Policing Board in ensuring that the PSNI complies with human rights standards54.

49 Statement on the comparative injury potential of the attenuating energy projectile (AEP) L60A1, and the L21A1 baton round, DOMILL, April 2005
50 Hansard, House of Commons, 19 November 1998, col. 741
51 Twenty one AEPs were fired on 12 July 2005 in Ardoyne, and a further eleven on 4 August 2005 in Woodvale in north Belfast, all of them by the police. (Reply to Freedom of Information request made to the PSNI: F-2005-02695, 19 December 2005 (July and August))
52 Shots fired during town trouble, BBC News, 02 August 2007
53 Man shot after explosives claim, BBC News, 11 February 2007
54 According to the Policing Board’s website, one of its key functions is “securing, promoting and supporting professional, human rights and ethical standards within the police service—http://www.npolicingboard.org.uk
4.7 In our opinion, once plastic bullets are available to a police force, their use becomes inevitable, and once they are used, experience shows that abuse also becomes inevitable. Although physically different from live ammunition, both in form and effect, the firing of plastic bullets from a weapon has the same psychological effect on police officers as the use of an actual firearm. They give the police officer concerned such a disproportionate advantage over an unarmed civilian, however riotous his or her behaviour, that the officer is very likely to resort to it as a means of self-protection that can be operated at a relatively safe distance from any opponent. This may also mean that police officers will fail to make full use of any opportunity that may exist or arise for defusing violent situations by less draconian means that might be attempted by unarmed officers. We recognise that, however well-trained police officers may be, and however tight the guidelines under which they operate, in the heat of the moment and especially when in fear for their own safety or that of their colleagues they are likely to over-react. Furthermore, in public order situations the use of plastic bullets (especially if it appears to be indiscriminate) may provoke an already riotous crowd to become even more violent. A weapon that has caused so many fatal and serious injuries during the history of its deployment is, we argue, unsuitable for use in crowd control in any civilised democracy.

Tasers

4.8 BIRW is fundamentally opposed to the introduction of tasers. Our opposition is based primarily on the belief that tasers can be considered, at the very least, cruel and inhuman punishment. Whilst we accept that the use of force will inevitably inflict some pain on its victims, with tasers the infliction of pain is the means of incapacitating people, rather than a side effect of their use. Furthermore, whereas where other means are used it is possible for the operator to use restraint and to try to avoid inflicting unnecessary pain, with a taser a high level of pain is inevitable. While the manufactures make it clear that the taser should not be used on those with a dysfunctional heart, pregnant women or small children, it is unclear how this can work in practice.55 How will a police officer know if a suspect suffers from a heart condition? The scope for accidental and serious injury as a result of taser use is great. Amnesty International carried out research into the use of tasers in North America. Their report found that since 2001, more than 70 people had died, with the numbers rising each year.56 A recent independent American study cast further doubt on the safety of tasers. This study indicated that the use of tasers on pigs caused irregular heart rhythms to develop, resulting in two deaths.57

4.9 The PSNI’s adoption of tasers is of special concern to BIRW. It is however, some consolation that the Chief Constable of Northern Ireland has decided not to use tasers as a method of crowd control, especially considering the fact that the presence of petrol, usually in the form of petrol bombs, at riots is commonplace and the use of a taser could cause conflagrations. We expect that tasers will be used on a very infrequent basis in Northern Ireland. Infrequent use could be problematic in itself in that officers may have forgotten their training. It calls into question the case for the PSNI expending a considerable sum of public money on such a weapon.

4.10 We are also concerned to note that non-firearms officers with the MET have recently started to trial tasers.58

4.11 BIRW are concerned to note the manner in which tasers have been adopted by the PSNI, we are particularly concerned with the PSNI’s failure to carry out a full Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA) before deciding to pilot the deployment of tasers. We believe that such a course of action could have serious consequences. We consider the PSNI to have been in breach of their duties under s. 75 of the Northern Ireland Act 1998. A comment by the Chief Constable, Sir Hugh Orde, that an EQIA would delay availability of tasers59 indicates a disregard for both human rights and the mechanisms and processes designed to protect those rights. This failing is exacerbated by the nature of the technology; the use of less lethal and lethal force requires a stronger commitment to human rights to ensure that the application of such force remains conscionable.

Incapacitant sprays

4.12 BIRW has long held concerns regarding the use of CS spray by police forces. Both CS and the propellant methyl isobutyl ketone (MIBK)60 are irritants that can damage the eyes and cause severe problems for people with respiratory disorders such as asthma, skin conditions such as dermatitis, and other diseases such as hypertension, all of which are common conditions among the general population. Furthermore, research into the effects—particularly the long-term effects and the effects of CS and MIBK in combination—of CS spray, is lacking. Police officers in particular run a high risk of cross-contamination when CS is used, whether by themselves or by fellow officers, and also run the risk of frequent exposure. The difficulty of de-contaminating both the skin and clothing after exposure is a further concern.

55 Phase 3 Report, UK Steering Group, Chapter 5, paragraph 32
56 Excessive and lethal force? Amnesty International’s concerns about deaths and ill-treatment involving the police use of tasers 30 November 2004, p. 2
57 BBC News, 30 January 2008
58 BBC News, 10 December 2007
59 “I must protect my officers” by Chris Thornton, Belfast Telegraph, 7 September 2007
60 As the Steering Group recognises—Phase 3 Report, Chapter 7, paragraph 25
4.13 The increasingly widespread use of PAVA (pelargonyl vanillylamide) sprays also engages our attention. PAVA is one of a number of incapacitant sprays often referred to generically as “pepper sprays”. The Northern Ireland Prison Service is due to complete a 12-month trial in April 2008 and worryingly a number of English and Welsh police services have either adopted PAVA or are currently trialling it. When PAVA is used as an incapacitant, it is sprayed into the eyes, and its aim is to incapacitate and/or to obtain compliance by causing acute pain. According to ACPO:

“PAVA primarily affects the eyes causing closure and severe pain. The pain to the eyes is reported to be greater than that caused by CS.”61

4.14 For that reason, BIRW is opposed to its use in the same way that we are opposed to the use of tasers. The use of PAVA raises the prohibition on torture and cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment because it inflicts intolerable pain. We accept that the use of force will inevitably inflict some pain on its victims, but with PAVA, as with the Northern Ireland Policing Board, it is the means of incapacitating people, rather than a side effect of its use. Furthermore, and again in common with tasers, whereas when other means are used it is possible for the operator to use restraint and to try to avoid inflicting unnecessary pain, with PAVA a high level of pain is inevitable. To force another human being to act, or refrain from acting, in a particular way by means of the infliction of pain amounts at the very least to cruelty and may very well be torture.

4.15 These concerns are compounded by evidence that indicates that police forces understand PAVA to be “safer”62 than CS and that officers feel the need to draw and use PAVA sooner than CS sprays.63

Other use of force

4.16 BIRW has been concerned to learn that the PSNI intends to deploy 28 specialist armed units throughout Northern Ireland to deal with the residual threat from dissident paramilitaries for organised crime. Against such a background it becomes increasingly obviously that “less lethal” technologies are not an alternative to but supplement the considerable armoury of conventional weaponry already available to the PSNI.

5. Difficulties in Recruitment and Retention of Police Officers

5.1 Engaging with the community is about leading by example. BIRW are pleased by the recent decision by the House of Lords to renew the policy of 50:50 (Catholic : Protestant) recruitment for the PSNI.64 The use of this policy has undoubtedly increased Catholic recruitment to the PSNI, but the impetus for Catholic entries is still weak. Not all fault for this lies with the PSNI. External factors include the fact that Sinn Féin only signed up to policing last year. While its previous refusal to engage with policing reflected the opinions of their political constituency, it also sent a negative message to the nationalist community as Sinn Fein only signed up to policing last year. While its previous refusal to engage with policing reflected the opinions of their political constituency, it also sent a negative message to the nationalist community as the unionists' unwillingness to allow the PSNI to adequately reflect Northern Ireland's communities continues to promote the old stereotypes about the RUC and policing in general.

5.2 The PSNI also needs to make a continued commitment to its Catholic recruits. This effort to recruit, retain and promote needs to include not only Catholic officers but also women, the disabled and ethnic minorities. There is a need for the PSNI to recognise the difficulties facing these groups within the PSNI and to prevent the service from becoming Catholic “bottom heavy” and Protestant “top heavy”. While we are not advocating a policy of 50:50 promotion, there does need to be recognition by the PSNI of the problems facing officers once they have joined the force. BIRW correspondence with the Policing Board has indicated that of the 2,420 student officers appointed during the period 2001–07, 70 have resigned or been dismissed—53 of these individuals were Catholic.65 The Policing Board stated that the reasons behind this were: “behaviour/discipline issues; personal reasons; or family work/life balance issues.”66 However, such problems are likely to beset both Protestant and Catholic recruits equally, and do not account for the higher number of Catholics who do not stay the course. Finally, there is a need for the PSNI to address sectarianism within its ranks. This will undoubtedly have an impact upon the recruitment and retention of Catholic officers.

5.3 BIRW notes reports that despite a population of over 30,000 Poles in Northern Ireland, and over 600 applicants for positions in the PSNI, not one Polish national had been successfully recruited as at June 2007.67 We are anxious that attempts are made to ensure “new” ethnic minority groups are also represented...

---

61 Incapacitant Sprays: Notes for Guidance on Police Use, ACPO, April 2005, paragraph 6.1
62 BBC News, 22 January 2008
63 Comparison of CS and PAVA: Operational and Toxicological Aspects, by Graham Smith, Martin Macfarlane, and Jasmin Crockett, Police Scientific Development Branch, publication no. 88/04, page 7
64 This policy, introduced on the recommendation of the Patten Commission, provides that the PSNI must aim for 50% of its new recruits to be from a Catholic background.
65 Correspondence from the Northern Ireland Policing Board to BIRW, 15 January 2007
66 Correspondence from the Northern Ireland Policing Board to BIRW, 15 January 2007
by the PSNI. We are glad to note that the PSNI has been working with their Polish counterparts to this end. This is obviously an issue that is becoming of increasing relevance elsewhere in the UK, given the recent influx of EU nationals.

6. Training

6.1 There has been fairly sustained criticism of the PSNI’s training schemes by human rights organisations such as ourselves, the Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission, and oversight bodies such as the Oversight Commissioner. It appears that the PSNI continues to resist the full integration of human rights into the culture and operation of the police service. The “Course for All”, for instance, has been viewed as failing to adequately educate PSNI officers in human rights. For example, the Oversight Commissioner, in his 14th Report, raised the issues of the limited evaluation of courses, and the lack of any analysis of the impact of such training.

6.2 We are pleased to note that subsequent to completion of the human rights audit, the PSNI’s human rights training advisor reported that there was a high level of human rights integration in all areas. However, we echo the concerns of the training advisor regarding amongst other things, inconsistent references to the PSNI’s Code of Ethics, the failure to contextualise the integration of human rights training and confusion between the European Convention on Human Rights and the Human Rights Act 1998. We also share the Northern Ireland Policing Board’s concerns regarding the lack of a coherent and systematic approach to human rights training at a district level.

6.3 BIRW is pleased to see that the PSNI has adopted the recommendations of its own Human Rights Advisors and is providing specific training regarding the implications of the use of force. We are especially pleased that human rights principles and standards are integrated into the training.

6.4 The need for uniform and robust monitoring and evaluation of human rights training cannot be underestimated. We agree with the Human Rights Advisors to the Policing Board that both the internal and external evaluation of training is important. BIRW believe this should be a matter of urgency for the PSNI.

6.5 More positively recent changes made to the appraisal system for police officers, particularly the inclusion of references to the Code of Ethics and human rights, represent a step forward. This should contribute to an increased resonance of human rights, equality and ethics in the daily working lives of officers, and by incorporating it within the appraisal system, ensuring that the development of related skills and knowledge is related to personal goals.

6.6 BIRW welcomes the fact that the PSNI has produced a revised Code of Ethics. However, we feel that this document remains a missed opportunity in some regards. We are particularly disappointed that the possibility of starting to come to terms with some of the more opaque aspects of policing during the conflict has not been used; we believe that Article 7 of the Code (integrity) should have reflected the PSNI’s commitment to avoid collusion in criminal offences. Furthermore, revision of the Code could have been used as an opportunity to emphasise the rights of the individual under article 6 ECHR, as part of Article 2 of the Code (police investigations).

6.7 We are concerned to note that there under the previous Code of Ethics a clear pattern of breaches emerged with the highest percentage being breaches of Articles 7.2 (integrity), 2.2 (police investigations) and 1.5 (professional duty) of the Code. It is crucial that the PSNI does not permit any lapses from the high standards set by the Code of Ethics to become endemic; the PSNI must be proactive in this regard. BIRW believes that it is crucial that the PSNI continue to integrate the Code of Ethics into all training materials.

7. Conclusions

7.1 The experiences of Northern Ireland provide many important lessons for policing in the 21st Century. BIRW believes it is crucial that mistakes made in Northern Ireland are not repeated elsewhere. There are undoubtedly similarities in the challenges that are to be faced by other police services, particularly those relating to dealing effectively with a terrorist threat without alienating elements of the community.

7.2 We believe that the HET in Northern Ireland has a vital position in rebuilding public confidence in policing in Northern Ireland. The HET demonstrates the value of openly acknowledging the truth about the past and is an important example of the importance of not forgetting the past when setting priorities for the future.
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7.3 In our opinion DPPs have the potential to develop into an effective conduit between the police and the community they serve. We believe that the importance of community-influenced policing increases where the police service feels there is an increased risk of criminality. Many of the problems which have beset DPPs in Northern Ireland would not be replicated should this model be applied more widely.

7.4 BIRW has serious concerns regarding the introduction of new technologies. Whilst we appreciate that new technologies may increase the confidence of police personnel, this should not be at the cost of imperilling human rights. We were concerned that AEPs were introduced in Northern Ireland without proper consultation and have serious concerns regarding the PSNI’s failure to carry out a full Equality Impact Assessment before piloting the deployment of tasers. We believe that such a course of action could have serious consequences and will probably lead to deaths. The significance of these failures is enhanced as they concern less than lethal weaponry; it is imperative that the introduction of any such technologies should be managed with the greatest attention to human rights. The PSNI have failed to engage in simple processes designed to protect the most fundamental human right, the right to life.

7.5 BIRW is fundamentally opposed to the use of tasers, PAVA spray and AEPs. We believe that whilst equipping officers with tasers and PAVA spray may facilitate the return of police to the beat, the use of such technologies equates, at the very least, to cruel and inhuman punishment. Both incapacitants and tasers rely upon the infliction of pain as a means of enforcing compliance. Whilst we accept that the use of force will inevitably inflict some pain on its victims, neither of these technologies represent an attempt to minimise the infliction of pain. The suitability of plastic bullets remains questionable. Whilst AEPs are yet to be responsible for any fatalities studies do nothing to prove they are less likely to do so than the previous generation of baton round which has been responsible for 14 fatalities and numerous serious injuries in Northern Ireland.

7.6 BIRW are pleased by the recent decision by the House of Lords to renew the policy of 50:50 Catholic : Protestant recruitment to the PSNI. The PSNI also needs to make a continued commitment to its Catholic recruits. This effort to recruit, retain and promote needs to include not only Catholic officers but also women, the disabled and ethnic minorities. We believe that the experiences of Northern Ireland clearly demonstrate the importance of a representative police service, especially in times of increased tension.

7.7 BIRW is also pleased to note the significant improvements made by the PSNI with regard to police training. These improvements include recent moves concerning the integration of human rights standards into training schemes and special training regarding the use of force. BIRW believes that the PSNI’s Code of Ethics is potentially a significant document with regards to setting standards for policing; for this potential to be fulfilled it is crucial that where patterns of breaches emerge they are addressed. We believe that the PSNI demonstrates that effective policing is facilitated, not hampered, by respect for human rights.
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APPENDIX 14

Memorandum submitted by Nottinghamshire Police

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

There is an ever-expanding police mission, every element of which requires additional resources and frequently the acquisition of new skills. This comes at a cost—most notably the abstraction of resources from the visible front line. This submission identifies a number of these areas and puts a cost to the investment required to undertake the work. It illustrates how Nottinghamshire police is working hard to re-introduce the quality factor after years of the all-pervasive numbers-driven inspection culture. Finally it identifies the social responsibilities of those in commerce and industry whose business has a disproportionately negative impact on the communities we police, and it questions their permissive self-regulation.

1.0 INTRODUCTION: THE PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT AGENDA—CHANGE MANAGEMENT

1.1 In the Review of Policing—Final Report, by Sir Ronnie Flanagan, reference is made to the ever-widening mission of the service, ranging from counter terrorism to child protection and community policing. My intention, in this submission, is to identify those issues which have significantly impacted upon the running of Nottinghamshire Police and to offer some recommendations to help the service gain further control over crime and disorder in the UK, most notably by demanding more from our business community in terms of exercising greater social responsibility.

1.2 I will evidence a number of changes that Nottinghamshire Police has undertaken during my eight years as Chief Constable. These changes have been necessary to deal with significantly increasing areas of business and emerging crime trends. For example, the emergence of internet-based child pornography is hugely labour intensive and demanding of technical expertise but, quite clearly, cannot be ignored. The same
is true of terrorism. The organisation must change to accommodate these developments. However, there is a
cost to this process which can impact, in the short-term, on efficiency, funding and staff morale. This involves
officers attached to specialist crime squads who, whilst not visible to the public, are right at the front of the
fight against crime. At times these changes can give the impression of having achieved little more than
standing still in terms of the “traditional” crimes with which the British Bobby is commonly associated.

1.3 To go back again to the 1950s, often cited as the halcyon days of policing, the world was a gentler
place in many ways. Terrorism had not yet impacted on the world, yet today there is not a police force in
the country that doesn’t have an attachment of officers working on this desperately sensitive issue, trying to
prevent terrorist atrocities. You don’t see these officers patrolling the streets—but they are there, every day,
working long hours, in often stressful and dangerous situations.

1.4 Behind the scenes, officers are committed in ways unforeseen a few decades ago—dealing with such
issues as the computer-based crimes generated by paedophile offenders; sophisticated scams which defraud
people of their homes, businesses and savings; large-scale, historical child abuse cases which have surfaced
after decades of suppression; organised crime which operates through national and global networks. Every
one of these crimes requires rigorous investigation. Not one of these issues can be brushed aside—the public
rightly expects a fully professional service to deal with this criminality.

1.5 We have responded to the increasingly sophisticated criminal networks with increasingly specialised
teams of officers: intelligence management units; the dangerous persons management unit; financial
investigations; high-tech crime unit, fraud squad; anti-vice squad; major crime; scientific support; Special
Branch; roads policing.

1.6 The force also has to plan, with other emergency services, to ensure it is able to deal with large-scale
disasters; train crashes, plane crashes, fires; major evacuations. The public, quite rightly, expects the best
possible service in the worst possible circumstances. All of these issues require staffing. These officers are all
drawn from the same pool of officers who—50 years ago—would have been patrolling the comparatively
law-abiding streets.

1.7 The reality for the visible front-line officer today is this ever-increasing abstraction to specialist roles,
in units that require additional training most notably around information technology. Within this document
I have identified 231 warranted officer posts that have been generated to undertake these new and highly
specialised tasks. Invariably these postings have been to front line work but a front line that is not visible
to the public. Many, if not all of these, departments require more staff than I am able to provide to meet the
demands placed upon them.

1.8 In 1995–96 Nottinghamshire Police had 2,344 officers. Today we directly employ exactly the same
number. The 231 officers identified in the previous paragraph represent nearly 10% of my total officer
strength. These specialists need to be abstracted from the total visible front line strength.

1.9 I must make it clear that we do not post warranted officers to specialist departments as a matter of
course. We have a very active Work Force Modernisation programme which is increasingly releasing officers
from “back-office” work to front-line roles.

1.10 The modern police officer requires more than ever, a panoply of skills far in excess of those of the
legendary “bobby on the beat” of yester-year. I would go so far as to suggest that it is only a matter of time,
with the changes to police pension conditions, that the service will see a brain drain to industry where
specialist knowledge commands higher remuneration. This is a reality already faced by the police
information technology managers who struggle to attract and keep those with specialist skills, on salaries
that don’t reflect the commercial rate.

2.0 THE EVER CHANGING DELIVERY AGENDA

2.1 Government-imposed changes in the last decade have required organisational restructuring. A not
exhaustive list includes:

— National Crime Recording.
— National Incident Recording Standard.
— Victim Code.
— Quality of Service Commitment.

Changes in legislation most notably in the area of anti-social behaviour.

2.2 Whilst dealing with these organisational changes, forces across the country were further challenged by
the terrorist atrocities of 9/11 and the subsequent attacks in the UK and abroad. These radically affected
the demand for resources within “protective services”. This urgent demand created a resourcing conflict at
time when the public and Home Office were demanding the delivery of neighbourhood policing.

2.3 A significant impact on policing has been the increasing obsession with inspection. Between 2004 and
the end of 2008 my force will have been subjected to 51 inspections, each of which has required the force to
invest in detailed research, audit and review processes, and management commitment. This cannot be
achieved without taking officers from front line duties and the question has to be asked: are we now spending
more time inspecting than actually “doing”? These inspections have been conducted by the HMIC, other areas of the Home Office, ACPO/APA, the Audit Commission, NPIA (previously NCPE), and Nottinghamshire County Council.

2.4 In addition to the above, the force spends, and has spent, considerable time researching and implementing efficiency savings, through both regional and force working groups. Whilst it is highly desirable to create a best value culture one has to ask the question whether we are investing valuable time in the creation of “artificial” non-cashable efficiency savings in order to comply with Home Office imperatives.

3.0 Conflict of Demand

When the Police Superintendents Association articulated the point that new resources had been absorbed by new and emerging business, the scale of impact was questioned. So it may help if I offer hard evidence of the conflict of demand in my own force to demonstrate that it has not always been possible to deliver improved conviction rates through additional funding.

3.1 Nottinghamshire Force Crime Directorate (FCD)—Drugs

3.1.1 The Drug Interventions Programme is a key part of the Government’s strategy for tackling drugs and reducing crime. It is working: drug-related crime has fallen by a fifth since the programme started and record numbers of people are being helped to overcome their drug misuse. Introduced in 2003, with new elements phased in each year since, the programme works to get adult drug users out of crime and into treatment. These programmes operate throughout England and Wales with additional “intensive” elements operating in areas with high acquisitive crime.

3.1.2 Nottinghamshire Police started drug testing “trigger-offence” offenders in September 2001 as a pilot site. By 2003 Nottinghamshire was identified as an intensive Drug Intervention Programme (DIP) area and all persons over the age of 14 arrested for trigger offences were drug tested for Class A drugs on charge (Opiates and Cocaine). By April 2004 all custody suites in Nottinghamshire were on-line and testing. In December 2005 testing was changed from on charge to on arrest, which resulted in an increase of tests performed. In April 2007 the testing of persons under the age of 18 was stopped. Now all persons over the age of 18 arrested for a trigger offence are drug tested for Class A drugs (Opiates and Cocaine) and those who are positive diverted into treatment.

3.1.3 The partnership work between Nottinghamshire Police the County DAAT and Nottingham CDP continues. In 2006 10,519 persons were tested (876 per month) with 34% positive test rate. This compares with 538 persons in 2001 (44 per month), and 3,494 in 2003 (291 per month) when the change to test on arrest was made. The team also deals with approximately 70 to 90 breaches of restrictions on bail and failures to comply with initial and follow up assessments in any one month. Each of these entails an arrest and an amount of officer, custody and court time.

3.1.4 The Drug Testing Team is part of the FCD Drugs Directorate and comprises: one Inspector, two Sergeants, two restrictions on bail officers, five data in-putters, trackers and administrators (all the above overseen by a Chief Inspector); 29 detention officers, funded by the Home Office to support this work.

3.2 Nottinghamshire Prolific and Priority Offender Scheme (The Sherwood Project)

3.2.1 The Sherwood project was established in Nottinghamshire in January 2004. It has since expanded to cope with the increasing demands of offender management. The Project works to deliver the Prolific and other Priority Offender (PPO) Strategy as a single, coherent initiative in three complementary strands to reduce crime by targeting those who offend most or otherwise cause most harm to their communities. The three strands are Prevent & Deter, Catch & Convict, and Rehabilitate & Resettle. The identification of offenders is co-ordinated by the Multi-Agency Intelligence Team (MAIT), using a scoring matrix to prioritise dwelling burglary, robbery and serious auto crime offenders. A further weighting is applied to known Class A drug offenders. Once selected the offenders are categorised into three levels.

3.2.2 In order to ensure effective management of all these offenders, the Sherwood Project has 24 staff working across the county. The total cost of managing this project is approximately £2.4 million per annum.

3.3 Special Branch

3.3.1 The threat from international terrorism has remained at Severe since July 05 (except for one month in summer of 2006 when it was raised to Critical). Operational intelligence development activity has increased locally, regionally and nationally. This activity that has been influenced locally by the creation of the Midlands Counter Terrorism Support Unit (MCTSU), the regionalisation of elements of the Security Service and tasking from ACPO(TAM) and the National Co-ordinator of Special Branch. Other areas of threat such as domestic extremism and Irish related terrorism continue to make demands on Special Branch resources.
3.3.2 The development of the Regional MCTSU has increased demands on local Special Branch. Whilst they provide resources at Level II (cross border), much of the recent intelligence development has commenced at Level I (force). The security services’ objectives aimed to double productivity in 2006–07 and to double this again in 2007–08. This work impacts directly and proportionately on Special Branches. SB’s operational intelligence development activity has increased by 83% in the last six months. Our joint security service activity has increased by 300% and is still increasing. The HMIC recommended in 2005 that SB should be 2% of force establishment. This would equate to 52 SB staff in Nottinghamshire. In reality it is 13 officers (0.52%). This includes four funded as Dedicated Security posts. Overall we have seen an additional five warranted officers working in SB in Nottinghamshire.

3.4 Dangerous Persons Management Unit (DPMU)

3.4.1 In 2000, DPMU work was carried out by three DCs within the FCD. By 2007 that had increased, force-wide, to one Inspector, five Sergeants, 16 PCs and two administration officers—an increase that reflects the rise in the number of registered sexual offenders from approx 400 in 2000 to 1,029 by January 2008.

3.4.2 The Multi-Agency Public Protection Agreements (MAPPA) Strategic Management Board was formed in 2001. This formalised multi-agency management of registered sexual offenders and the relevant categories of violent and other sexual offenders. The Sexual Offences Act 2003 increased the number categories of offences managed by MAPPA as well as increasing the length of time that certain offenders must remain registered. Between April 2007 and February 2008 we held 586 Level 2 meetings and 62 Level 3 meetings compared to a mere handful eight years ago.

3.5 Sexual Exploitation Investigation Unit (SEIU)

3.5.1 In 2000 the Vice Squad comprising one DI, one Sgt and six DCs dealt with on and off street sex. In 2006 the Vice Squad effectively became the Sexual Exploitation Investigation Unit. Its remit is to deal with child sexual exploitation, child Internet grooming, the off-street sex industry, indecent image and immoral earnings investigations. Referrals increased from four in 2000 to 105 in 2007. The Hi-Tech Crime Unit has grown from one PC to one Sgt and five PCs. Sixty percent of its work is generated by the SEIU. Additionally people trafficking has emerged as a major organised crime. In the last year alone we dealt with seven such investigations involving foreign national offenders and assets worth £250,000.

3.5.2 In order to deal with the remaining on-street sex industry we have formed a new multi-agency unit comprising one Sergeant, two PCs, two PCSOs, two Neighbourhood Wardens and a drugs worker. This additional team has been needed to deal with on-street prostitution, which can no longer be resourced by the SEIU.

3.6 Child Abuse Investigation Unit (CAIU)

3.6.1 Referrals to the Child Abuse Investigation Unit have increased from 1,345 in 2000 to around 2,100 each year between 2004 and 2007. To investigate these offences to the standards set out in “Achieving Best Evidence” we have been required to use video interviews with victims and witnesses in every one of these cases. The CAIU also deals with the Serious Case Review Process, which looks at child deaths and how effectively agencies worked together prior to the death in order to learn lessons. This has been a considerable area of growth post 2007. This process is to be replicated in terms of serious further offences for MAPPA-managed offenders and also within the sphere of safeguarding vulnerable adults.

3.6.2 Collectively, the additional staffing resources for dangerous persons management work is considerable, with an increase (from 2000) of one Inspector, five Sergeants, 13 PCs and two police staff, and one Inspector as Force MAPPA Policy Officer and Training Co-ordinator.

3.7 National Intelligence Model (NIM)

3.7.1 The organisation has had to make significant investments in terms of staff and money to ensure the NIM has been fully embedded in all our systems and processes. The NIM has provided us with a more formal structure to set priorities from national to neighbourhood level. Accurate understanding and analysis of the challenges faced (as defined in the NIM guidance) allows priorities to be set at each level. By linking neighbourhood policing into the NIM we have ensured that the public are involved in setting priorities and that we meet their expectations. These priorities are used as an information source and feed the force strategic assessment. Risk assessment ensures that we are focusing our efforts where they are most needed and where we will be most effective.

3.7.2 The staff investment is huge. From a handful of officers, we now have 110 warranted officers working in intelligence units force-wide. These officers undertake a whole variety of functions both out on the street and within specialist investigations. We also have 24 officers in Force Intelligence supporting NIM and the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000.
3.8 Automatic Number Plate Recognition (A.N.P.R.)

3.8.1 ANPR is now embedded into our core policing role. We currently have two fixed systems deployed, one in Nottingham with 22 cameras on 16 main routes; and a further one on the A1 Trunk Road near Newark. Further to this we have five CCTV centres with ANPR readers installed, enabling ANPR to read CCTV images in any of the 12 towns/conurbations. This system is used by all levels of crime investigator, from Special Branch and SOCA to the Force Intelligence Bureau, Homicide, Firearms Intelligence Unit and the Tactical Unit.

3.8.2 The primary cost of this system has been the vehicle fleet set-up. We now have 26 “advanced” patrol vehicles equipped with ANPR readers which collectively “read” 175,000 vehicles each day. Further to this we have a team of one sergeant and eight PCs, plus a dedicated intelligence officer. The Basic Command Units are now setting up teams to work with this equipment, which is limited in supply, as an additional function to the daily work of response officer.

3.9 Fatal and Life Altering Crash Investigations

3.9.1 Both before and after publication of the “Road Death Investigation Manual” there were a number of changes in how we investigated fatal and life-altering collisions. These changes have focused upon the skills and training of officers who undertake this role. Detective Sergeants and Inspectors now engage in 18 weeks of training to meet the minimum standards whilst Detective Constables undertake 12 weeks. We have 13 warranted officers, including supervisors, working within this department and a further nine working within Accident Investigation by Mathematics (AIM) who undertake crash scene “forensic” examinations.

3.10 Forensics In Nottinghamshire

3.10.1 There have been significant changes to, and developments in, the forensic support services in Nottinghamshire, not only with regards to systems and techniques but also in tackling volume crime. Since 2000 there has been a significant improvement in quality of service, with a 50% increase in crime scenes visited (16,500 to 25,000) and massively improved response times, increased forensic identifications (1,050 to 1,750) and more DNA “hits” (200 to 600). This comes with a cost, however, of an additional 14 Crime Scene Investigators.

3.11 Professional Standards Directorate

3.11.1 Following the implementation of the Police Reform Act 2002 there was a dramatic increase in the recording of complaints (785 to 1,219). This additional work required the establishment of an Anti-Corruption Unit which also conducts investigations into computer misuse. We have also established a Vetting Unit to undertake all levels of vetting for new members and designated posts. PSU staffing has now risen from 25 in 2003–04 to 38 for 2008–09 with a net increase of 15 warranted officers.

3.12 Partnership working

3.12.1 The Force works increasingly closely with partners. Officers are seconded to Trading Standards and the Fire and Rescue Service. We are putting ever-increasing financial resources into anti-social behaviour (ASB) work, Neighbourhood Watch, Crime Reduction Managers and Licensing Officers; as well as funding officers to work on reducing business crime and co-ordinating the partner-led “weeks of action”. This represents additional spending of over £1.8 million, including four warranted officer posts.

3.12.2 In the broader area of “diversity” we have seen significant increases in the development and management of equality schemes dealing with race, disability and gender. Further to this, we have undertaken multi-agency community cohesion work and developed strategic Independent Advisory Groups to support our counter-terrorism work. The Hate Crime team, of four officers, has undertaken important work, particularly at times of heightened community tensions.

3.12.3 We have also increasingly spent in the area of Youth Justice and the broader preventative agenda. Legislation and Home Office drivers have dictated that certain work areas have a specific and dedicated police response. For example, the implementation of Youth Offender Teams (required by the Crime and Disorder Act 1998) requires 10 officers. We have also deployed 16 dedicated youth issue officers on BCU's as well as a Restorative Justice team.

3.13 Criminal Justice

3.13.1 In the wider criminal justice world we have been required to invest significantly in terms of staff, time and finance to comply with a variety of imperatives. For example Criminal Case Management through statutory charging caused huge inefficiencies with officers taken off the streets for hours whilst they waited in long queues for a CPS lawyer to make a charging decision on frequently low-level offences. Sir Ronnie Flanagan’s report has recommend that only the most complex cases should be referred to CPS lawyers for
charge decisions. Effective Trial Management through the CJSSS project seeks to limit court adjournments, a worthy aim, but one which has caused significant abstractions for training, and a doubling of the number of suspects on bail. Under the No Witness No Justice scheme we were originally funded for 5.5 posts (this ceased after three years). The function now requires 21 staff and the force carries the full costs of these salaries. Additionally there have been significant increases in the cost of interpreting services. On one BCU alone the cost of interpreters has risen from £40,000 to £140,000 over five years. Moreover there is an increasing use of identification technology within the criminal justice system and changes in legislation which have led to the expansion of the ID unit, with revenue costs running at £270,000 p.a.

3.13.2 At the same time we have been working to deliver a swathe of new imperatives including the Quality of Service Commitment, Victim Code and Witness Charter as well as Penalty Notices for Disorder, Street Bail and Conditional Cautions. We have also had to deliver Safer Detention at a time when there has been a 60% increase in prisoner throughput (since 2000). The time taken to process detained persons has increased with the requirement to carry out more substantial risk assessments. Those categorised as “at risk of self-harm” have increased and these individuals require constant supervision: a task that has to be undertaken by police officers or staff. We also face increasing problems with people in need of long-term mental health and/or detention. Police cells cannot be the appropriate place for people in need of treatment, but “untreatable” patients, turned out into the community, have increasingly caused problems and the police have become the first, and often only, resort.

3.14 Information Technology

3.14.1 Our Information Technology Directorate (ITD) has had to supply ever-increasing numbers of computers whilst upgrading network software systems. We have rolled out the National Airwave digital radio system as a personal issue radio scheme. “Blackberries” providing voice and data access have been introduced to a number of senior staff and are utilised by technical support teams in the course of their duties. This is being expanded to allow officers on the beat easy access to computer systems away from their base, saving time and improving officer visibility. The IT Directorate has spent in the region of £2.5 million per annum on new projects and developing the existing technical infrastructure. Since 2000 this equates to a new business spend of £17.5 million, with an additional 13 posts.

3.15 Learning and Development (Training)

3.15.1 The Learning and Development Department has rolled out a considerable number of new training programmes, these include:
- PCSO training.
- Citizen focus training to facilitate a customer focused working.
- Safer Neighbourhood training to support local policing partnerships.
- Professionalising of core roles including detectives, drivers and firearms officers.
- Leadership development.
- National Intelligence Model.

As a direct consequence, staff have increased from 41 to 56 (mainly non-officer).

3.16 So far, I have focused largely on changes to centralised services. I will now briefly highlight some of the changes that have been required on Basic Command Units (BCUs):

3.16.1 Management of Crime. The increased scrutiny of crime reports has meant that, in recent years, the number of staff involved in linking, validating, and monitoring the process has grown at a significant cost to the organisation. At the same time, in an effort to deal with volume crimes with low potential for detection, crime desks have been established. Whilst saving the time of warranted officers these teams require considerable staffing.

3.16.2 Management of Sources (Informants). Dedicated Source Handling Units have been set up as this work requires specialised support. On our biggest BCU, a team of one Inspector, one Sergeant and four DCs, can only run a relatively small number of live sources at any one time due to national protocols. Clearly there is the need to double or even tripe the size of these teams.

3.16.3 With more arrests than ever before, we have now established sizeable Prisoner Handling Teams to increase our operational effectiveness and return officers more quickly to the streets.

3.16.4 The most challenging programme of work has been the roll-out of Neighbourhood Policing, the significance of which you will be well aware. The resource implications are massive, particularly when trying to protect officer time from the reactive role and emerging threats (previously identified).
4.0 The Public Agenda

4.1 The public increasingly, and rightly, expect us to manage risk effectively by identifying the risk and putting in place appropriate plans to manage it. Decisions and plans must be clearly documented. Work has to be prioritised based through proper risk assessment, increasing bureaucratic processes.

4.2 Whilst working on the aforementioned organisational changes, we have seen a commensurate change in the expectations of the public, with regards to both quality of service and demands for instant information. There is also heightened public concern around particular types of crime such as terrorism, illegal immigration, gun and knife offences, identity and computer fraud. Public demand has increased with the wider availability of technology like mobile phones and the Internet. Similarly the Freedom of Information Act 2000 has increased demand on the police, placing the service under sometimes unmanageable staffing pressures.

4.3 The enhanced use of performance data to compare one force with another, as well as one BCU with another, increases the scrutiny on police managers who are required to produce ever more detailed performance reports for comparisons that mean little to the average member of the public.

4.4 The increasingly obsessive performance scrutiny culture has often been at the expense of quality and use of discretion. The joint vision of the Chief Constable and Police Authority seeks to redress that balance in the years ahead. *Policing for You* illustrates how we will work to deliver a customer-focused service which puts the quality back into policing with a bespoke service for the people we serve. It is defined as “*Policing for you by working in partnership to protect and reassure through a visible and accessible service that is flexible and responsive to community and individual needs*.”

4.5 Why do we need a new vision?

4.6 Policing for You is more than a statement of intent. It represents the strategic direction set by the chief officer team and Police Authority for the coming years. It is a recognition that whatever policing priorities and reforms may emerge and however unrelenting the demands on our service, quality will be at the heart of everything we do.

4.7 As one would expect, Policing for You does not lessen the importance of reducing crime and increasing detections. But important as crime reduction and detections are, they cannot be our only objectives and obligations. It is every bit as important to deliver strong protective services that minimise terrorist activity and serious and organised crime. We must embed the National Intelligence Model into our daily work. So, to provide the truly local and tailored service we strive to achieve, we must invest every hour of policing time effectively and efficiently.

5.0 The CSI Effect

5.1 Within the last month, one of Nottinghamshire’s specialist CID burglary teams arrested a prolific offender as a result of forensic identification, following a lengthy and detailed investigation lasting over a year. The suspect, on speaking with one of the arresting officers, was perplexed as to how he had been caught: he stated that he faithfully brushed down all his clothing (including his underwear) every night prior to going out to burgle. He did this to avoid leaving DNA at a scene. He even ensured the batteries in his torch were wiped down to prevent his fingerprints being obtained should he lose it. Having thought about his arrest for a number of hours he even asked if it was because a geographical profile had been written about him. It transpired that this burglar watches every police-based television programme. What I refer to is known colloquially as “the CSI effect”. American crime scene investigation dramas have produced a generation of criminals who know tactics and capabilities almost as well as the police. The consequence for the service is that the investment to catch one burglar is now far in excess of what is used to be. Investment is incrementally undermined by criminals’ knowledge.

5.2 The increasing sophistication of the service we provide is challenged by the criminals whose survival depends upon outwitting the police. The increasing tactical awareness of criminals is blunting the cutting-edge of our technological and forensic advances. We have to be more sophisticated yet, but this comes at a price. Therefore we have to invest back into core business. To do so we must reduce the bureaucracy that is strangling our service.

6.0 Recommendations for Action—Businesses Buying Time

6.1 To allow this investment back into core business I would submit that we broaden the base of those with a statutory responsibility to reduce crime and anti-social behaviour, particularly those industries whose core business contributes to the problem. Those, for example, who market alcohol at irresponsible, underage drinkers should carry some of the responsibility for managing the inevitable public disorder that blights our towns and cities. Partners, in both the private and public sector, surely have a responsibility to “design out” crime, a concept which has much to deliver in terms of public safety. With less demand on avoidable police activity we will be able to provide the tailored, quality service we strive for.
6.2 The British Retail Consortium suggests that retail crime costs every household in the UK an extra £90 each year on their shopping bills, and 75% of this group are seriously worried about crime and the effect on their businesses. This is hardly surprising as shoplifting in 2006–07 totalled 294,304 crimes. Clearly this industry has a vested interest in helping the police to reduce crime and I am sure their insurers would thank them for it.

6.3 The Home Office has indicated its intention to crack down on business crime and has identified a number of initiatives:

— Appointing Business Crime Reduction Advisors.
— Helping small retailers in deprived areas.
— Encouraging secure design.
— Reducing drug-related retail crime.
— Launching the Action Against Business Crime Group, a joint venture between the Home Office and the British Retail Consortium.

6.4 My key point, however, is that businesses can do much more. Police and local authorities have a statutory obligation to work together to reduce crime and disorder. I advocate taking this one step further. Is it not possible to require businesses with a significant negative impact to deal with the consequences of their trade?

6.5 Making off without payment for fuel could be prevented simply by “pay before you pump”, a principle my force has attempted to negotiate with local petrol retailers without success. Similarly we have a wave of new offences caused by new technology, such as theft of satellite navigation systems or SatNav’s, a whole generation of which were sold without security key coding—so the stolen goods could be immediately used by either the thief or the person they sold it on to. To quote a Home Office Research paper: “Opportunity Makes The Thief”. Self-regulation by the industry allowed this to happen and I would suggest, if I were a cynic, that the industry benefits from theft because of a re-sale opportunity to the victim of the crime. From the same research paper:

6.6 “Social and technological changes produce new crime opportunities. Any new product goes through four stages: innovation, growth, mass marketing and saturation. The middle two stages tend to produce the most theft. Thus when laptop computers first came on the market, they were rather exotic machines appealing to only a few consumers. As their price declined and more people began to understand their uses, the market for them began to grow. At the same time they began to be at risk of theft. These risks remain high at present while they are being heavily promoted and are much in demand.”

6.7 For the purpose of illustration please consider the following numbers for theft of SatNav’s in Nottinghamshire:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Thefts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003–04</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004–05</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005–06</td>
<td>1,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006–07</td>
<td>2,431</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If business was required to secure the first generation of all new technologies, how many offences could be prevented and how much police time saved?

6.8 Technology, whilst a bonus, is a double-edged sword and, without proper regulation, can be a considerable hindrance to police officers. Many valuable officer hours are wasted attempting to access CCTV images that are not compatible with police equipment. The number of formats on which evidence is presented makes it logistically impossible to have the requisite number of image players to view this evidence in real time. The result is further periods of bail for suspects and a slowing down of the Criminal Justice process. Regulation of the process, requiring businesses to deliver evidence in specific formats would significantly reduce wasted time and therefore increase officer availability. The vast increase in seizure and processing of CCTV has led to the creation of a dedicated unit, with staffing costs alone totalling £190,000 p.a. in addition to the capital investment.

6.9 Yet a further example of where businesses could assist is with “theft” of mobile phones. We are required by the National Crime Recording Standard to record anything that is reported to be a theft as a theft, assuming there is no evidence to prove the contrary. There are, however, a significant number of “crimes” reported to us where we have grounds to suspect that an offence has not taken place, yet because we are unable to prove this we have to record the crime. However it is common for a lost phone to be reported as stolen to qualify for an insurance replacement. The mobile phone industry will tell you it doesn’t encourage people to report lost phones as stolen so a new phone can be issued free of charge—but we know it happens. During the last year we had 6,688 mobile phones reported stolen—over 18 a day, every day!
6.10 The Licensing Industry and Major Sporting Events

6.11 The two main ‘time-thieves’ who divert officers from tackling the full range of BCS Comparator crimes are the licensing industry and holders of major sporting events. Whilst we have a role in policing the impact of these industries, it should be understood that these two sectors actually control the allocation of warranted officer resources nationally. It is no exaggeration to state that the whole focus of officer shift patterns is to deploy sufficient resources at weekends to cope with alcohol-fuelled disorder, and football violence.

6.12 The net effect is there are fewer officers on duty during the rest of the week to deal with other types of crime and fewer opportunities to be seen in their communities. This has a major impact on local policing because the neighbourhood bobbies are re-deployed to weekend and late night work to help their colleagues cope with the un-relenting demand.

6.13 I would also like to raise the issue of availability of alcohol. Successive Governments have resisted the urge to regulate the industry. Bars and nightclubs encourage excessive drinking with cheap cocktails and extended happy hours in vertical drinking establishments which pack in the maximum numbers of customers with minimal comforts. Supermarkets draw customers with cut-priced alcohol making it, at times, cheaper than a bottle of water. Advertisers market products to young people and manufacture drinks that appeal to immature taste buds. All this encourages young people to buy alcohol at an age when they have not yet learnt responsibility. I have said before that I do not suggest the drinks industry has operated outside the law. What it has done is sacrifice responsibility for bigger profits. It has displayed an easy disregard for the pernicious impact on society. We must stop pretending the drinks industry is like any other and recognise it for what it is: the purveyor of a dangerous drug. It has already proved itself unworthy of self-regulation. It has ruthlessly exploited our youth without regard for the consequences. It has stretched policing to the absolute limits.

6.14 The question is, who matters most to those with the power to change this imbalance—the long suffering, law-abiding public or the drinks industry for whom profit is king? Businesses have stock responses about personal freedoms and the industry’s contributions to the tax system. But its impact is disproportionate to its contribution. We cannot continue with this liberal self-regulation. The police force has become the medic for society’s entirely preventable, self-inflicted wounds. We look to our politicians to take a responsible lead and insist on regulation.

February 2008

APPENDIX 15

Memorandum submitted by Navigant Consulting

1. Navigant Consulting is delighted to respond to the Home Affairs Committee’s Inquiry—21st Century Policing. In this context we would specifically like to raise our concerns about online crime and its growing impact.

2. Navigant Consulting specialises in preventing, detecting and investigating risks or threats to people, premises and financial and intellectual assets.

3. We have a vastly experienced and independent group of forensic accounting and business investigations professionals, with approximately 1,800 full-time consultants worldwide. They include forensic accountants, former senior law enforcement investigators, computer forensic experts, security consultants and corporate recovery specialists.

4. Of particular interest to the Committee may be our work alongside the public and private sectors to develop systems and practices which help to protect organisations against the increasing threat of online crime.

5. In particular we have worked as advisors to the Ministry of Justice in the UK. Internationally, our consultants have advised the Department for Homeland Security in the United States, and worked on projects with a range of law enforcement agencies, including the New York Police Department on their Zero Tolerance initiative, and following the 9/11 attacks.

6. The Internet is a fast evolving environment which is now relied upon by business, individuals and Government. As this technology develops, it creates a number of opportunities for criminal activity. The Internet provides a particularly safe environment for criminals to operate as they can remain anonymous and at arms length from their victims, often operating from foreign territories.

7. Phishing scams, denial of service (DOS) attacks, botnets, worms and viruses are increasingly being utilised by criminals to gather information on individuals to commit a number of crimes, most notably. It has been estimated that a crime is committed online every second. These include financial fraud, identity theft and organised crime activity.
8. In particular, Navigant would like to bring to the Committee’s attention a fast growing area of communication online which facilitates crime and which we are concerned is currently being overlooked. Internet Relay Chat (IRC) channels are online forums and “chat-rooms” which exist within the “deep web”, beyond the public facing World Wide Web. The majority of IRC channels are discussion areas for legitimate day-to-day subjects, however there also exists a subset referred to as Private IRC channels. These channels are usually accessible only by invitation and cover “darker” subjects such as hacking, credit card fraud, identity theft, and all extremes of pornography including pedophilia and computer games copying.

9. Users of these Channels are highly capable Internet technicians and hackers. These individuals are often young, aged between 13 and 20 years old, and have learnt their skills by participating in these online groups. They can often spend in excess of 12 hours a day online, participating in these groups, developing new skills, sharing information and competing to demonstrate their abilities. At any one time there can be thousands of individuals participating in this activity.

10. There is increasing evidence that these individuals are being targeted by criminals who understand the Internet and are able to infiltrate these groups. Over time, they will seek to gromm these targets by teaching them new skills, and develop their talents while pretending to be a peer within the group. Once trust has been established, criminals are then able to set challenges, and even straightforward tasks. For example, a criminal may ask a target to demonstrate their skills by hacking into a major retailer’s database to retrieve card details and passwords for 1,000 individuals.

11. It is important to note that in the online environment, a criminal can take on a number of personas which all contribute to this process. For example, they may take on the role of a friend to the hacker, a teacher, and a subordinate giving the impression that he is learning from the target in order to build a trusting relationship. A criminal will use these personas to guide the target down illicit tracks that they would not normally follow.

12. Once a “hack” is successful, personal data is often sold on, swapped or stored for future use. This activity occurs without the knowledge of individuals, the organisations who hold their information, or the authorities. An experienced US undercover operative who worked to assess the type of activity in Private IRC channels wrote of his experience:

   “From bedrise to bedrest, seven days a week, I rode the boards and forums of numerous carding sites using a nickname. I recorded private messages and IRC chats for my employer as “carders” schemed to, among other things, sell stolen credit and debit card numbers, defraud the George Bush and John Kerry campaign sites, drain hundreds of thousands of dollars from bank and investment accounts, sell access to Paris Hilton’s T-Mobile account and run phishing scams against U.S. Bank and the FDIC.”

13. This information has the potential to aid terrorist attacks, or fund serious organised crime operations across the world. Most worryingly, it is extremely difficult to monitor and prevent. IRC channels have dedicated communities with common interests—this means members trust each other and work together. Our own experience shows us that these forums are capable of producing upwards of 500,000 lines of conversation in a weekend which, when analysed will be found to hold upwards of 20,000 pieces of personal information.

14. The following is an example of IRC data and the level of personal information that can be obtained:

   **CARD DETAILS**
   - 5444-6970-1358-5671
   - Exp.: 04-2006
   - CVV2: 555

   **PERSONAL DETAILS**
   - James Smith
   - 21 Satmar Dr. #202
   - Monroe
   - N.Y. 10950
   - Tel: 212-869-9675
   - D.O.B.: 07-25-1951
   - SSN: 127-41-2575
   - PIN: 4444

   **EMAIL DETAILS**
   - james.smith@verizon.net

   **BANK DETAILS**
   - Bank of America
   - Rtg Num: 022000015
   - Acc. Num: 6301613686

   **ADDRESS DETAILS**
   - 21 Satmar Dr. #202
   - Monroe
   - N.Y. 10950
   - Tel: 212-869-9675
   - D.O.B.: 07-25-1951
   - SSN: 127-41-2575
   - PIN: 4444

---

* Fictitious
15. However, activity within private IRC channels goes well beyond the exchange of credit card information and the associated identity data, it includes:

— Mass theft of personal data.
— Sharing, teaching and developing new skills amongst members.
— Advice on the use of stolen personal data.
— Advice on the purchasing, and the sale of, the necessary hardware to either “skim” credit cards (electronically copying the contents of the magnetic strip) or deactivate the PIN number.
— Purchasing “skimmed” and cloned credit and debit cards.
— Facilitation of fake identification papers and credit/debit cards.

16. We recently conducted a study of activity in this area. The key findings of this research were that:

— 16,000 card numbers were collected over a week.
— 5,000 unique card numbers also had personal identity information related to them.
— Over 500 banks were involved.
— Over 50 countries were involved.

17. We are constantly engaged with this activity, assisting our clients in defending themselves and responding to threats. As such, we have seen major growth in recent years, and have some significant concerns about awareness of this activity, and the way it is being addressed.

18. To effectively tackle this type of crime, we believe that the police and Government, working with private organisations and individuals, should focus on the following activity:

— Resourcing: The police must be provided with adequate resources to engage with this crime. This is a complex area, and requires a highly refined policing approach. As outlined above, the online spaces where this activity takes place are extremely difficult to trace and infiltrate. Individuals undertaking in this activity spend the majority of their time, night and day, engaged in the IRC channels. As such, simply providing existing officers with technical training will not be successful. Imposters are easily recognised by the online community, therefore the police must look to utilise “good” hackers who are able to engage with these online forums without raising suspicion.

— Independent review bodies: We agree with the recommendation of the House of Lords Science and Technology Committee in its 2007 report, Personal Internet Security, that Government should establish a cross-departmental group to focus on this area. We welcome the Government’s response that it will develop a high-level Government/industry working group to develop a more coordinated approach to tackling crime committed using computers.

We believe the purpose of such a group should be to advise Government, police, and other relevant bodies on existing dangers, and the steps which should be taken to negate them. Effectively such a body would perform an auditing role for Government and industry, assessing existing systems, and providing guidance on how these can be developed and enhanced.

— Awareness: We were pleased to see that the recent Strategy Unit discussion paper, Realising Britain’s Potential: Future Strategic Challenges for Britain, recognised that:

“during the first half of 2007, nearly 32 million illegal attempts to acquire personal information electronically* were detected worldwide, an increase of more than 150% over the previous six months”—* Microsoft (2007) Security Intelligence Report

However, we are concerned that this statistic, and others like it are too broad, and do not provide sufficiently detailed and robust information on the problem, and how to combat it. This was highlighted by the Lords Science and Technology Committee in its report, Personal Internet Security:

“Figures on the scale of the problem, are hard to come by. Indeed, the lack of data on identity theft is symptomatic of the lack of agreed definitions or detailed statistics on almost all aspects of Internet security.”

This lack of information on the levels and types of online crime, means that awareness remains low. This was illustrated recently by Sir Ronnie Flanagan’s Review of Policing, which made no reference to the Internet, or the challenges to policing posed by online activity. We acknowledge that the online space is only one area of focus for 21st Century policing; however, we believe it is a key growth area for criminals in future and should be addressed as a priority.

To combat this, we believe there should be extensive research into the scale of online crime, its variations and its economic impact, which will provide an accurate picture of the current environment, and allow better decision making as to how it can best be tackled.

19. While this is an issue globally it is our experience that in the main, those “carders” and “hackers” who are based in the UK will target their attacks against UK business and Government. We believe it should be the responsibility of Government’s and law enforcement agencies in each region and nation to address this activity.
20. We hope that this document provides an overview of the core online challenges facing policing. Based on our experiences and work to date, we believe that online crime will remain a major growth area for serious criminals and terrorists over the years to come. As technology becomes more sophisticated it creates both opportunities and threats. We believe it is vital that industry, Government and individuals understand these threats, and take action to keep pace with them and negate their impact.

21. We would be delighted to meet with the Committee to discuss the issues outlined above in greater detail, and our experience more generally working alongside a range of law enforcement agencies to tackle organised crime and terrorism.

15 February 2008

APPENDIX 16

Memorandum submitted by the Police Federation of England and Wales

BACKGROUND

1. The Police Federation of England and Wales welcomes this inquiry by the Home Affairs Committee into “Policing in the 21st Century.” As the body that represents the interests of 139,000 police officers, we bring together views on the welfare and efficiency of the force, and take responsibility for their presentation to both Government and other opinion formers. We would welcome the opportunity to provide further written or oral evidence to assist the Committee in their inquiry. For more information about the Police Federation please visit www.polfed.org.

2. It is our belief that a more holistic review of policing has been required for some time. The last thorough review of policing was back in 1960 (Royal Commission). Since which there have been a number of more narrowly focused reviews which have led to continuous piecemeal change. As the breadth of the terms of reference for this inquiry demonstrate we have more than reached the point when the purpose, structure, governance, accountability, workforce and reward system of policing have become confused and inefficient; necessitating a comprehensive review.

OVERVIEW

3. Sir Robert Peel’s original “purpose of police” still remains appropriate today—protection of life and property, maintenance of order, prevention and detection of crime, prosecution of offenders against the peace. However, there is a need to understand how this operates in a modern setting where the structure and environment in which these responsibilities are discharged has irrevocably changed. The police increasingly now need to act in partnership across policing borders and with other agencies including the public, Government, local authorities, business and even the media. Clarity is therefore required as to who is responsible for what aspect of policing in order to provide a strong and successful amalgam.

4. The Police Federation believes the Government’s priorities for policing in the 21st Century are in danger of developing a police service that resembles a production line of specialists. Whilst the provision of specific skills is undoubtedly vital, a police service without officers who have a range of skills and experience will be ill-equipped to cope with the varied and volatile nature of policing across multiple locations. We believe that each and every police officer needs a foundation of skills and experience upon which they can later build and develop specialisms. We therefore repeat our call for the Office of Constable to remain as the heart of the police service. However, there is a need to understand what this traditional office means in 2008.

5. As we have previously stated there are plenty of roles that support staff and PCSOs can undertake which will free up police officer time and resources. But care must be taken when re-engineering the police service, not to arrive at a position where police officers deal only with confrontational situations where coercive powers are required or serious crime investigations. This would be tantamount to establishing a paramilitary force and fundamentally different from policing by consent. We feel that a proper definition of operational policing would therefore be useful in this context.

6. The police service faces many challenges which, in the main, are correctly identified in the recent Flanagan Review. We remain concerned, however, as to the direction of some of the recommendations and conclusions contained within the report. In particular, it is disappointing that the Review does not recognise the merits and resilience of the availability of multi-skilled and sworn police officers. This may result in the Government continuing to pursue increased numbers of non-sworn police staff at the expense of police officer numbers, thereby reducing resilience and skills still further. There are local and regional variations in both the requirements and priorities of policing and it is our belief that further reflection is required to establish the right governance arrangements at a regional (cross-border) and national level.
What the public expects of the police; how Chief Constables determine priorities; the role of the Home Office in setting priorities

7. Reassurance remains at the heart of many aspects of policing. At a basic level, the public expect to see a uniformed professional police officer on patrol, to attend quickly when they call them, to listen, and to communicate effectively on the progress of incidents. The public also realise that some crimes are not detectable but they do expect the police to care for their well-being and to be civil in their response. It is our view that the Office of Constable is essential to fulfil this role as it ensures impartiality, independence and discretion whilst incorporating personal responsibility.

8. Policing is delivered at three levels—local, national and international. Each level requires to be integrated and complement the others but should remain distinct in terms of accountability and governance. Appropriate levels of funding and resource need to be allocated to each level so that they can operate together as an effective entity with complimentary priorities being set on a local, cross-border and national scale. The current policing structure is locally based. There are 43 separate and autonomous forces supported by a range of common police services and national standards. Individual forces are required by law to provide mutual aid when additional resources are needed for incidents such as serious crime or public disorder, but the local Chief Constables remain responsible for meeting such additional requirements. In contrast, whereas responsibility for policing has been devolved to the local level, control—in terms of setting priorities—remains at the centre. We believe that the priorities for policing should be driven from the bottom up, by the concerns and demands of local communities on the ground not from the isolation of Whitehall. Micro-management from the centre, despite the best intentions, simply distorts local response. We therefore welcome those proposals in the Flanagan Review which seek to devolve most of the priority setting.

9. We still believe in the value and importance of the tripartite system of governance and feel that it can succeed at both a local and national level if some of the grip of Whitehall is relinquished. Furthermore, current anomalies such as the National Policing Board not being a statutory body and yet assuming statutory status also require redress.

10. We remain concerned at the gap in Level 2 policing that still persists. In recent years most focus has been given to the ends of the crime spectrum leaving the middle (including serious and organised crime) largely overlooked. We do not have confidence that SOCA is filling this gap in an effective way and this disappointing performance has been at the cost (in terms of the loss of experienced detectives and officers) of the police service. We believe that any future reform of policing should take this into account and finally close the gap and we continue to propose the re-introduction of a national and/or regional crime squad to deal more effectively with Level 2 crime. Such a unit would need to be integrated with community policing as well as national priorities and requirements.

11. Any review of policing priorities can not be distinct from a review of accountability and performance measurement. Accountability through performance regimes has tended to concentrate on those areas which are easier to calculate (“record”) and as such have focused on crime alone. Yet there are a series of expectations on the police—including civil contingencies, public order event control, prevention, and the tracking and monitoring of offenders—that are not as easily captured in “performance measurement”. For example, the hours of assistance and immeasurable reassurance provided by officers involved in the recent spate of floods did not count towards any target tally or appear on any performance management spreadsheet. Despite the pressure to meet these responsibilities on a force by force basis, they are not at present reflected in centrally (including Home Office) set priorities. However we acknowledge that some of the recommendations of the Flanagan Review, if implemented, will make a difference as far as targets are concerned.

12. The Criminal Justice System is a good example of the problems that can be created by confused and muddled priority setting for the various forces and agencies that operate within it. For example where as the police are set a Statutory Performance Indicator (SPI) to increase the number of detections, at the same time the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) have their own Key Performance Indicator (KPI) which puts them under pressure to reduce the number of failed prosecutions. The result is a police service more likely to pursue charges and cautions and a CPS who have become more risk averse, requiring at least a 51% chance of success before they will even consider proceeding with a prosecution. In addition, Chief Constables on a force by force basis have to make decisions based on their own unique funding pressures. These are in no way coordinated with other forces and often lead to the removal of one skill set within a force above another based purely on economic decision making and not as a reflection of the overall priorities of the communities they serve. For example; if all forces were to independently reduce their dog sections by a third, the availability of this specialist resource, both within force and across borders, would be heavily restricted, reducing resilience and risking public safety. Constantly evolving requirements have changed the nature of policing. They have turned a force of generalists into specialists—and as such it is slowly limiting the ability for the police to be able to provide a flexible, resilient and responsive service.
The effect of heightened concerns about terrorism, immigration, gun and knife crime, identity fraud; the growth in cyber-crime; the Olympics

13. The evolution of policing requirements—in particular the rise of counter-terrorist activity and unexpected, one-off event handling—has inevitably meant that force resource capacity management has become tougher. As a consequence, Chief Constables are having to make resource decisions based on subjective risk assessments, yet risk changes quickly through time and the preparation for dealing with specialist threats or events requires sustained training and planning. A recent ACPO audit of specialist crime skills showed a clear shortage in a number of vital skills that would be required by police officers facing such challenges.

14. Each individual force is faced with its own unique skills and resource challenges, but their responses are not in anyway strategic at a national level. With terrorist threats, for example, London and other major cities that are most at risk are training their forces to respond to these specific circumstances. Whereas other forces are not making significant counter-terrorist investment or the necessary strategic partnerships, despite the reality that many of the sources of terrorist discontent are burgeoning and manifesting in their communities. Whilst the development of counter-terrorist hubs is to be welcomed; further consideration needs to be given to their governance, accountability and workforce arrangements. Officers from forces outside the one in which the hub is located are currently required to formally transfer. This may act as a disincentive to suitably qualified officers. As forces seek to prioritise, rationalise and make best use of their limited resources, active consideration is being given to establishing collaborative arrangements between forces. Whilst sharing resources and buying power is to be welcomed, full consideration needs to be given to the legal status of the new bodies being established.

15. Frontline operational officers are facing increased threats to their personal safety from gun and knife attack. They are left to use conventional self-defence techniques, a police baton and incapacitant sprays, all of which offer a degree of risk to both the officer and the assailant. The Police Federation has consistently called for the deployment of Taser for all frontline officers in England and Wales. Taser is proven to be a less lethal option which can safeguard the public, suspects and police officers. Making Taser equipment and training available to all officers will go a long way towards ensuring that public and officer safety remains paramount in today’s volatile climate. We understand the need for a phased roll-out of Taser but we advocate that the timescales for this are reviewed in order to maximise the benefits of this technology and made tighter if necessary.

16. We would like to add to the list of heightened concerns the subject of public attitudes towards alcohol consumption. There is a dominant aspect of British culture that encourages and celebrates the excessive consumption of alcohol. Frontline police officers now have to deal with the unpredictable and uncertain consequences of combining that culture with 24-hour licensing. We have to ensure we have sufficient police officers on duty 24 hours a day to deal with the increasing minority of people who persistently drink to excess and then cause trouble. We remain fundamentally opposed to the relaxation of licensing laws including licensing arrangements and longer opening hours. Our role has been made more difficult as a consequence of an increase in alcohol related incidents and we would welcome and support a review of alcohol-related crime and public attitudes to consumption.

17. The prospect of the 2012 Olympic Games brings into sharp focus the problems of resources and just how an already overburdened police service will cope with this event. The Olympics will create an additional demand on policing. As forces provide mutual aid to each other there will remain the “business as usual” demand with a finite number of officers. Forces need to plan for this and police officer staff associations should be involved in that process. The skill shortage mentioned above becomes all the more urgent with the realisation that the Olympics are only four years away. Serious consideration also needs to be given to the Airwave radio communications problems that already exist and will only be exacerbated by an event of this size and nature. As experienced during last year’s Notting Hill Carnival, the Airwave network cannot cope with a high concentration of officers using the system in one place. There also remains the huge problem of communications for the emergency services working on the Underground system. This was brought to light during the tragedy at King’s Cross in 1987 and 20 years later has yet to be satisfactorily solved. Whilst Airwave can now be used on some Underground lines, the roll-out remains piecemeal and has taken too long. We sincerely hope that the full system will be up and running long before the start of the Olympics.

18. Immigration continues to have a major impact on police resources which have been unable to keep pace with the rapid rate of development and change in local communities. This issue adds to the persistent challenge of policing diverse communities. Whatever the long term economic benefit to the UK, current police funding arrangements fail to properly account for the additional demands to policing caused by mass immigration, ie cultural clashes, minor crime, translation costs.

19. The advent of cyber-crime and identity fraud has brought with it the requirement for a different type of policing to be developed, one that does not involve a visible presence within the local community or a location for an offence to be committed. The need for specialist teams to be formed in order to tackle crimes of this nature has seen a redirection of resources away from response and CID teams. Recognition needs to be given to this effect on the resilience of frontline resources. We also recommend a review of the level of contribution that business and industry can make towards prevention and detection of crime in this area so that decisions can be made about the level of police resources that should be dedicated to it.
Public involvement in local policing

20. We recognise the need for local priorities, public expectations and public satisfaction to be incorporated into a more balanced and meaningful set of performance measurements that get away from crude, one-dimensional statistics. These should not merely focus on response times or appointments kept but on the quality of service the public feel they have received.

21. Given that the majority of volume crime is committed by local offenders it is logical that the performance of the police should be measured against local policing needs rather than national performance indicators set by the Home Office. However, local priorities must also take cognisance of, and be balanced against, national demands.

22. We recognise the need for the public to be better informed about crime and policing issues. We would like to see greater public access made available to clear information and data (including how that information was gathered and interpreted) that is unbiased and not politically driven. We welcome the calls for the future when the next generation of retiring police officers only involved to deal with confrontations, enforce the law and carry out arrests, far from being poorly attended and we have a concern that, by definition, public consultations can be both self serving and self electing and do not necessarily represent the communities they should be supporting. We also feel that there is an over-reliance on these traditional forms of consultation which can prove ineffective in communities that are culturally and ethically diverse, difficult to reach or are not based on geographical boundaries. Consideration should be given to using IT more effectively to undertake public consultation.

23. Police authorities across the country organise regular focus group meetings with members of the public with the aim of identifying local policing priorities. These are of mixed success with sessions often being poorly attended and we have a concern that, by definition, public consultations can be both self serving and self electing and do not necessarily represent the communities they should be supporting. We also feel that there is an over-reliance on these traditional forms of consultation which can prove ineffective in communities that are culturally and ethically diverse, difficult to reach or are not based on geographical boundaries. Consideration should be given to using IT more effectively to undertake public consultation.

Roles of and relationship between PCs and PCSOs; different ways in which police forces deploy staff

24. The Police Federation has always maintained that there is a strong requirement for a uniformed patrolling officer at a neighbourhood level who can provide reassurance within their communities, and we have recently outlined what we would envisage to be the role description for a PCSO (please see Appendix A for more details).

25. We remain steadfast in our call for the standardisation of PCSO powers. We feel that the powers set by the Police Reform Act 2002 were completely undermined by the provisions of the Police and Justice Act 2006 which, whilst standardising PCSO powers on one hand, provided chief officers with the discretion to designate additional powers to different PCSOs with the other. This has lead to confusion both within the police service and with the public as to what a PCSO can be expected to do. We therefore call for chief officer discretion to be removed. It should be remembered that it was this discretion which led to 16-year-old PCSOs being recruited and deployed.

26. In the light of ever increasing demands on sworn officers, we question whether we can afford the luxury of employing what are essentially semi-sworn staff that do not have the same level of flexibility and omni-competence as fully sworn and experienced police officers. Direct contact between the police and the public has been at the very heart of policing by consent. If this direct contact is dominated by PCSOs, with police officers only involved to deal with confrontations, enforce the law and carry out arrests, far from achieving policing through partnership, police officers will be reduced to policing by coercion. This raises the question of whether there should be more to the role of a police officer than just the use of police powers.

27. Whilst we can appreciate the argument for having un-sworn individuals carrying out tasks which are thought to be repetitive or “mundane” and therefore freeing up police officer time, it is important to get this delicate balance right. If police officers no longer carry out a particular function then they lose that experience and the skills. For example, we know of forces that use PCSOs to conduct house to house enquiries. Whilst this frees up officer time for other tasks it also means that officers face losing this type of vital experience in a public facing role.

28. At present when police officers become specialists they have already been fully trained in all the generalist skills they may require. Although they might not practice them regularly they are able to put them into place as and when they are required. PCSOs (or other staff who might come in to fill a specialist role) do not have this level of general training, experience and career background. As such they are not adaptable in the support they can provide on the ground and, as a consequence, the flexibility and responsiveness of the police service as a whole is becoming diminished and could be compromised.

29. The current programme of workforce reform is significantly built on the experience of multi-skilled and experienced police officers. In particular retired police officers are taking on roles as PCSOs, interviewers, statement takers and other “back office” functions. This reliance is clearly storing up a problem for the future when the next generation of retiring police officers will no longer posses the general skills and experience to pass on.
30. There remains a significant concern that there has been little independent evaluation of the role and value of PCSOs. Anecdotally there will be evidence from some forces of PCSOs exceeding their function/powers on numerous occasions; but in turn there will also be support from serving officers who are grateful for any assistance as they struggle with meeting the demands on them. Likewise, there has been little independent evaluation of the wider workforce reform programme advocating a mix of police and support staff. It is premature to conclude that the mix delivers greater flexibility, resilience and efficiency particularly as the national evaluation of demonstration sites is not due to commence until spring. Ministers and chief officers must guard against declaring the experiments a success before they are formally launched.

31. In addition the advent of PCSOs has actually added to the workload of individual police officers in other ways. Given their role in the community, they often draw out information on possible crimes that would otherwise have gone unreported. Whilst this is undeniably advantageous in tackling crime and making communities safer there needs to be some assessment of the effect this is having on the work load of police officers who are left to act upon any intelligence brought to light. An appropriate adjustment to resources should be made accordingly to ensure that police officers do not continue to be overloaded in this regard.

**Use of technology to enable police officers to return to the beat**

32. Several years ago we asked our members what piece of equipment would assist them most and the answer was a hand-held device with single data entry capable of populating all the required record fields. We therefore welcome the recent Government announcement of £10 million for 20,000 hand-held devices and we await with eagerness the national roll-out of these.

33. It is the belief of the Police Federation that new technology has a vitally important role to play in making it easier for officers to spend more of their working time “on the beat”. However any new technology must come in the form of an integrated system that is fully compatible across all forces and the Criminal Justice System. We simply cannot afford to continue the current trend of multiple forces procuring multiple new technology solutions that are unique and not compatible in either resource or functionality across the force. This is a difficult challenge that will require investment in hardware and training—but it will be worth it in terms of how it could add real value to policing.

**Definition of “frontline policing” (ie should it include work on case files and report preparation?)**

34. Whilst it is important to have an idea of what is meant by “frontline policing” we feel that the characteristics of that “frontline” can vary in relation to the type of police work being conducted and the nature of the environment it is conducted in. In rural areas, where resources are more scarce, officers will require a different set of skills and competences than officers in urban areas where specialist teams exist. Resilience benefits are gained from officers that can bring a richness of contribution to case files and report preparation whilst also being able to be deployed and ready with the required skills to face an emergency situation.

35. We consider that, rather than focussing on the definition of frontline policing, more can be gained from having a clear definition of operational and non-operational policing. We would still concur with the definition outlined in the 1990 Operational Policing Review.

“The purpose of the police service is to uphold the law fairly and firmly; to prevent crime; to pursue and bring to justice those who break the law; to keep the Queen’s peace; to protect, help and reassure the community; and to be seen to do this with integrity, common sense and sound judgment.”

There is clearly no advantage to having experienced, fully-sworn police officers filling non-operational roles.

**Police funding and the efficiency with which the various police forces deploy the financial resources available**

36. At present there are clearly too many forces with too many headquarters and too many cost centres. In addition due to the anomalies of historical agreements funding remains imbalanced with some forces gaining more funding proportionately than others.

37. We recognise the need to establish a level funding playing field, as referred to in the Flanagan Review. Sir Ronnie proposes a phasing out of the “floors and ceilings” that currently exist and moving towards a fuller application of the funding formula based on objective need. Any move of this nature is likely to cause particular hardship and financial challenge to the smaller, rural forces. The impact of this will need to be explained to rural communities.
Difficulties in recruitment and retention, covering not just numbers but quality of applicants/staff retained

38. On the surface, the number of individuals applying to be police officers appears to outweigh the number of vacancies available. However, there is still a gap in our understanding about the quality and consistency of applicants to the force. This problem is intensified by the lack of detailed analysis of records kept on those candidates that are unsuccessful with their applications, many of whom turn to PCSO opportunities as an entry point to policing.

39. As of 2006 there has been in place a national policy to conduct exit interviews when officers decide to leave the force. However this process has not been running long enough to provide definitive evidence. Some assumptions—such as that people stay within the force because of the attraction of the pension scheme, or that young people are more transient in their careers more generally nowadays—are as yet unproven. We have witnessed a dramatic decrease in morale amongst police officers, particularly those who work on response teams or in the CID general office. A significant number report that they are considering a change of career or are leaving this country to join forces abroad. The resulting loss of experience to the police service of England and Wales cannot be easily or quickly replaced.

40. The Police Federation remains disappointed that, despite assurances of record numbers, there was a fall of 647 police officers in England and Wales during the six months to September 2007 (last recorded six month period). This at a time when ring fenced funding for PCSOs was extended for another year, and we saw an 80% increase in PCSOs between October 2006 and September 2007. Clearly the challenge to recruit the right officers into the right forces, and to retain the officers with the skills and experiences required in the changing policing landscape is a very significant one.

41. As in all sectors pay issues are a very important factor in both staff retention and recruitment. The recent failure of the Government to honour the 2007–08 pay award in full was an act of bad faith that has broken the important bond of trust between the police service and the Government. Current serving officers have taken little comfort in the promise of future multi-year deals and still await greater evidence that these deals will be respected and honoured in full. Likewise potential recruits to the service will now be thinking long and hard about the value placed in a police officer by this Government. Trust in a fair negotiation machinery needs to be restored.

Annex A

ROLE PROFILE FOR COMMUNITY SUPPORT OFFICERS

PURPOSE OF ROLE

To contribute to public safety and provide reassurance by:

— liaising with and giving support to members of the public, particularly victims of crime and disorder;
— affording one of the means by which the police can more effectively give information to the public and reporting back on citizens' needs and views;
— proactively gathering and reporting intelligence on offenders, crime and disorder to the police and acting as material witnesses;
— performing visible and vigilant patrol in a uniform distinctively different from police uniform; and
— the use of appropriate powers.

LIMITS ON ROLE

For their own protection and that of the general public community support officers (CSOs) should not be deployed on, or allow themselves to be come involved in, situations involving confrontation with members of the public.

TASKS

Providing they have been adequately trained, CSOs may be deployed on any of the following tasks:

Patrol and observation

— In urban areas, foot patrol singly or in pairs or with a constable targeted on town/city centres, shopping centres, street markets, bus stations, car parks, and known hotspots for anti-social behaviour, drug dealing, etc.
— In rural areas, lone patrol or patrol with a Community Beat Officer on foot or bicycle covering villages, schools, events and hotspots.
— Engaging with members of the public, and liaising and co-operating with partners such as traffic wardens, retail security staff, school liaison officers and social workers.
— Reporting sightings of known offenders and on their whereabouts and associates.
— Watching out for suspicious activity, alerting the police to this and keeping the suspect under observation until the arrival of a constable.
— Watching out for, noting and reporting the registration number of untaxed vehicles and any other vehicle irregularities.
— Watching out for persons in breach of anti-social behaviour orders (ASBOs), approaching such persons requiring their name and address and detaining them (only with their consent) until the arrival of a constable if need be.
— Watching out for fixed-penalty offences and issuing a ticket to the offender.
— Detaining with consent persons suspected of shoplifting until the arrival of a constable and then assisting the constable to take the suspect to a police station if so required.
— Dealing with section 59 nuisance vehicle offences.
— Confiscating alcohol/tobacco from young persons within statutory powers.
— Guarding crime scene premises and cordon duties.

**Acting as a material witness**

— Noting in pocket book incidents that have occurred on patrol and observations made.
— Providing a witness statement of any criminal activity witnessed on patrol.

**Conducting enquiries**

— Conducting house-to-house enquiries relating to minor crime and anti-social behaviour.
— Conducting enquiries into missing persons.

**Post-incident customer care**

— Making follow-up visits to victims of crime to reassure them, update them on the progress of investigations and provide crime prevention advice.
— After risk assessment, follow-up visits following calls to domestic incidents.

**Crime prevention/safety advice**

— House-to-house calls to give crime prevention advice following a series of burglaries.
— Setting up a stall in host retail premises to put ID marks on mobile telephones and provide security advice.
— Inspecting premises on request and providing crime prevention advice.
— Visiting schools and youth clubs to give road safety advice or run “cyclewise” courses.

**Community liaison/consultation**

— Holding ward surgeries, listening to the concerns of local residents, explaining to them and updating them on any police action and reporting on surgery outcomes.
— Attending residents’ meetings.
— Assisting in the set up of new Neighbourhood Watch and other.

**Watch schemes such as Shop Watch, Farm Watch, etc**

— Encouraging and coordinating the work of existing Neighbourhood Watch and other Watch schemes.
— Engaging with young people by helping to set up youth clubs and encouraging and assisting existing youth clubs.

*15 February 2008*
APPENDIX 17

Memorandum submitted by Airwave Solutions Limited

1. Further to the House of Commons Select Committee on Home Affairs’ announcement of its new inquiry into policing in the 21st century, I write to offer a submission from the perspective of my organisation, Airwave Solutions Ltd (hereinafter referred to as ASL).

2. Executive Summary: ASL designed, built and maintains the Airwave service, the police’s radio communications network in England, Scotland and Wales. As such, we believe we are well-placed to offer a view on one of the terms of reference your committee will consider—“the use of technology to enable police officers to return to the beat”. The recently published Review of Policing report by Sir Ronnie Flanagan highlighted the issues around police time, the use of “mobile data” and Airwave’s capabilities in this area, and I will be taking the opportunity to expand on those issues in this submission.

3. Submission: Airwave is widely regarded by the police and government as a success, partly because it was delivered on time and on budget, but also because in one fell swoop it has provided a harmonised level of modern communications capability across the entire police service, replacing a patchwork quilt of discrete radio systems, some reliant on old post-war technology.

4. Given the highly devolved nature of UK police governance, the application of consistent standards across the police community and making procurement decisions that achieve economies of scale has often been a struggle. Airwave stands out as a notable exception.

5. Therefore it has been a disappointment to ASL that the political effort that created and facilitated Airwave, a success story that Government should be credited with has not been used to maintain momentum in the field of mobile information, a point remarked upon by Sir Ronnie Flanagan in his report published last week:

   “. . . Adopting disparate IT solutions across 43 forces is a potentially huge loss of opportunity and is only likely to further complicate the range of processes and systems currently operating service wide [3.31]. . . Airwave is an example of an initiative that demonstrated service wide benefit but was met with considerable resistance. The lack of ability to compel forces to adopt this new technology meant it took almost 10 years to implement a project which is now demonstrating real benefits [3.33].”

6. Airwave has worked with one Force (Lancashire) with the initiative to take a strategic interest in the potential value of mobilised information. This has enabled their police officers to conduct more business on the beat, without a need for further large-scale public investment. Yet this initiative appears to be unappreciated and the mobile information story since 2005, when the Airwave network was completed, is very much one of forces going their own way, developing local projects relying on local proprietary technology with little effort to reflect the national strategic vision of the original Airwave project.

7. Again, Sir Ronnie Flanagan highlighted the more business on the beat point—time-saving—in his report:

   “. . . One force estimate they have saved 51 minutes per frontline officer through the use of handheld PDAs [3.24].”

8. As we can see, these observations are well articulated by Sir Ronnie Flanagan. He specifically recommends standardising processes, systems and information sharing, not to mention joint IT procurement to exploit economies of scale, in the context of using the Airwave service more effectively and further exploiting the original Airwave investment:

   “The service must act corporately in the implementation of mobile information solutions or we will waste millions of pounds on 43 different but similar IT solutions for operational processes which are all based on the same criminal law [3.27].”

9. The recent announcement of a £50 million capital grant, designed to fund activities that would fulfil the Prime Minister’s target of putting ten thousand devices in the hands of officers by September 2008, is a very welcome push in the right direction.

10. However, the impact of this additional funding is that the very tight timescales set by the National Policing Improvement Agency (NPIA) against which forces may bid for support has led to concerns that they will be unable to fulfil the requirements adequately to prepare quality bid documentation, such as scoping and defining the wider business benefits, processes improvements and operational requirements they wish to be “mobilised”.

11. Indeed, following consultation with senior stakeholders across several forces, whereas forces will undoubtedly be keen to avail themselves of additional capital funding for mobile information initiatives, some are expressing concerns that they would ideally have liked more time for forces to complete the required depth of research to ensure the best fit with longer term strategic requirements and hence best use of the central funding available. Sir Ronnie Flanagan’s “corporacy” points are particularly pertinent here:

   “Acting corporately will mean that, on occasions, some forces will have to make compromises for the good of the service. Currently though, there is no central body or indeed person, who has the ability to make decisions or mandate solutions “for the good of the service” [3.33].”
12. Our concern is that though this short-term investment may deliver a “critical mass” of technology to push forward the more widespread introduction of mobile information technology, the timescales involved may not allow forces to align fully with Sir Ronnie Flanagan’s recommendations (specifically Recommendations 10 and 11).

13. In response, we have been discussing with forces various proven mobile information solutions we can provide that would align with Flanagan, be deliverable within the Prime Minister’s timelines, and leverage the original Airwave investment. Naturally, the capital grant has given organisations like ASL a commercial opportunity, and others will doubtless be conducting similar dialogues with forces at this time.

14. But this should not detract from our major concern, which is to ensure any central investment available to support mobile information initiatives at a time of scarce resource should be made in a strategic, not local, way, building on existing strategic communications platforms like Airwave.

15. As a final point, it is worth noting that one challenge faced by the police community as well as those supplying technology solutions to them is that of measuring and demonstrating quantifiable business benefits. This may be one reason why mobile information rollout has been slow and fragmented, as without an indication of where benefits will be realised it is difficult to justify an investment case. Other causes may be the plethora of solutions on offer and the differing business processes employed by forces that would be impacted by mobile information technology, that do not lend themselves to straightforward comparison and measurement.

16. In an attempt to address this, ASL is developing a simple model, based on a series of reasonable process assumptions, that aims to indicate an appropriate return on investment in terms of quantifiable business benefits. We would be very happy to take you through this if it is of interest to the Committee. Furthermore, if so, you should also consult the NPIA, who have made great strides in respect of assessing the benefits of the original Airwave investment.

---

*Airwave launches mobile data applications to speed up stop & search and identity verification*

- Mobile Stop & Search ensures faster completion of encounter forms, reduction of data re-entry.
- Mobile Validate enables speedy access to identity verification while on the beat.

February, 2008—Airwave, Britain’s public safety radio communications provider, has today announced the launch of two new mobile data products: Mobile Stop & Search and Mobile Validate, designed to enable efficiencies in the way police carry out stop & search and identity verification procedures.

Airwave Mobile Stop & Search allows officers to use PDA (personal digital assistant) and MDT (mobile data terminal) devices to complete stop and search forms electronically. Currently stop and search forms are filled in on paper at the scene, and then re-entered into the forces’ IT systems when the officer returns to the station. Mobile Stop & Search from Airwave enables officers to complete these forms remotely—removing the need for time-consuming data re-entry. The mobile-based forms have been designed to facilitate faster information capture by pre-populating much of the required information with prior PNC (police national computer) and voters checks—reducing the time needed to conduct each stop and search.

Simon Eggleton, Head of Products, commented: “There are two main problems with stop and search as it currently stands: it takes too long to complete the forms and requires data re-entry at the station, allowing mistakes to creep in through human error. Airwave’s Mobile Stop & Search solves both these problems by reducing the time it takes to complete the forms, and ending the need to re-enter data.” Additionally, Mobile Stop & Search will improve the service to the public by reducing the amount of time needed for each search procedure.

Part of Airwave’s mobile data suite, the Mobile Stop & Search application supports mobile printing connections to facilitate form and receipt printing where necessary. The data can be carried on Airwave’s world-leading TETRA network and can also be supported on GPRS where needed.

Mr Eggleton continued: “Airwave already has a great reputation through its radio network which offers Britain’s emergency services robust, secure and interoperable communications. Our mobile data product suit has been designed to conform to the same high standards while meeting the very real needs of officers on the beat today and improving public experience.”

In addition, Airwave has launched its Mobile Validate solution for PDAs and MDTs in response to the need to combat the use of false identities by individuals being stopped and questioned. Airwave’s Mobile Validate allows officers mobile access to identity validation sources such as the electoral role in order to efficiently and effectively confirm the identity of an interviewee. This solution speeds up the identity verification process and increases the chance of accurately identifying a suspect. The safety of police officers is also enhanced as dangerous suspects can be identified in a much shorter timeframe.

Mr Eggleton said: “Identity verification is a very important part of a policeman’s job, but one which can be time consuming and inefficient. Mobile Validate allows the police to check identities via mobile data, freeing up radio frequencies and control room resources for priority communications. Along with Mobile Stop & Search, Mobile Validate highlights the strength of Airwave’s mobile data offering. As police forces
across the country look to deploy such services, our message to them is simple: there is no need to wait to deploy a mobile data solution; we have the network and applications in place for officers to start benefiting from mobility today.”

---

**Supplementary memorandum submitted by Airwave Solutions Limited**

Further to Airwave Solutions Ltd’s chief executive Richard Bobbett’s appearance before the House of Commons Select Committee on Home Affairs on Tuesday 10 June (as a part of its Inquiry into Policing in the 21st Century), I am pleased to enclose answers to the follow-up questions asked by the Committee. The Committee asked for further information on:

1. Airwave communications between London Underground tunnels and the surface.
2. Airwave coverage during the police pay march in January.

1. As of Wednesday 18 June there were 104 out of 125 underground London Underground stations fully working with Airwave, around 83%. Of those 104 sites 87 have been tested by users and accepted into service, around 70%. The remaining 13 are currently going through the testing and acceptance phase.

   The whole programme will be complete by December 2008. This work will enable the police and other emergency and public safety services to communicate fully using the resilient and secure Airwave TETRA network between the surface and deep underground in the event of an incident.

2. There was full Airwave coverage during the police pay march (23 January 2008), as required by the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS). I have checked with both our Network Management Centre and the MPS and neither report any adverse incidents during the march.

3. Lancashire Constabulary has extensive experience of utilising mobile data and has been working with Airwave to develop first the ideas, then the solutions, to ensure that mobile data really makes a difference to officers on the beat.

   Having completed a proof of concept and pilot, the Constabulary embarked on the biggest multi-bearer implementation of mobile data ever conducted by a UK police force, using around 1,000 handheld personal digital assistants (PDAs) and 200 fixed mobile data terminals (MDTs). The ground-breaking trial won external recognition—Lancashire won the Guardian Award for Innovation in 2006 and the European Public Sector Award in 2007, beating competition from 28 other countries.

   Lancashire Constabulary’s solution includes the use of a number of applications on Airwave’s highly secure Mobile Application Gateway (MAG). The MAG enables officers to access the police national computer (PNC) on the move, carry out checks against national and local databases and update files in real time.

   The force also uses tasking and briefing applications that minimise the need for officers to attend face-to-face briefings at the station when starting their shift—allowing them to spend more time being visible in the community—a key driver in reducing fear of crime. Access to mobile email, as well as to local databases held on the force’s Sleuth system, is also making officers’ lives much easier. In addition, the Constabulary is using Airwave to transmit colour images of suspects and wanted and missing persons to officers over the resilient and secure TETRA network.

   Lancashire Constabulary’s Head of ICT Stuart Fillingham said: “We estimate that mobile data already contributes to efficiency savings that are starting to allow every officer to spend at least an extra hour on the beat per shift, and this is only the very tip of the iceberg. We can see where and how officers are using mobile data and all the evidence shows that it is making a positive difference.”

   Lancashire Police’s key learnings:
   — Officers will only really use mobile data if there is a direct and immediate benefit.
   — Try not to expose officers to partial solutions.
   — Availability, reliability and relevance is key.
   — Log-on must be simple.
   — Service continuity is vital.
   — Take a user-driven approach.
   — Don’t get seduced by technology.
   — Be end-to-end process driven, not device driven.
   — Articulate business benefits from the outset.

   One example listed was that of an officer who spent some time checking vehicle details at a weighbridge. He was able to check a high volume of vehicles by cross-referencing their details on the PNC, which led to several illegal vehicles being taken off the road.
Stuart Fillingham said: “Before mobile data, an officer might stop a suspicious vehicle and have to check the vehicle and person’s identity via a sequence of calls. That meant a wait of some minutes, which was not only time consuming and uncomfortable for the officer and the person being stopped, but also potentially left the officers unprepared for a dangerous situation. Now, they can check the vehicle’s details on the PNC and their own intelligence systems and find out details of the car and the owner before they’ve even stopped them.”

Lancashire is completing a force-wide roll-out, with the addition of a further 800 PDAs and additional MDTs. The Constabulary also plans to start using other applications that will enable electronic form completion and data input. And, though it has originally used GPRS devices for some activities due to the previous lack of TETRA-enabled devices, it is clear that the resilient TETRA network will be the choice on which to go forward, and in Command and Control as well.

“TETRA is as good as or better than GPRS in terms of speed and performance. A lot of people condemn it as unsuitable for data, but our experience has been very positive. Congestion and availability on public networks such as on GPRS is an issue. Coverage with TETRA is better and it’s proved cheaper too.”

Summary

Airwave Solutions fully supports the recommendations for the use of new technology in Sir Ronnie Flanagan’s report—Review of Policing. Sir Ronnie Flanagan specifically highlighted the “more business on the beat” point—time-saving:

“. . .One force estimate they have saved 51 minutes per frontline officer through the use of handheld PDAs [3.24].”

These observations are well articulated by Sir Ronnie Flanagan. He specifically recommends standardising processes, systems, information sharing and joint IT procurement to exploit economies of scale, in the context of using the Airwave service more effectively and further exploiting the original Airwave investment:

“The service must act corporately in the implementation of mobile information solutions or we will waste millions of pounds on 43 different but similar IT solutions for operational processes which are all based on the same criminal law [3.27].”

Sir Ronnie Flanagan’s “corporacy” points are also particularly pertinent here:

“Acting corporately will mean that, on occasions, some forces will have to make compromises for the good of the service. Currently though, there is no central body or indeed person, who has the ability to make decisions or mandate solutions “for the good of the service” [3.33].

Airwave Solutions has been discussing with forces various proven mobile information solutions it can provide that would align with Flanagan, be deliverable within the Prime Minister’s timelines, and leverage the original Airwave investment.

Airwave Solutions would like to ensure that any central investment available to support mobile information initiatives at a time of scarce resource should be made in a strategic, not local, way, building on the existing resilient and secure strategic communications platform.

I hope this letter answers the Committee’s questions. We would be happy to discuss any of its content in more detail should you wish.

24 June 2008

APPENDIX 18

Memorandum submitted by the Home Office

1. The Home Office is delighted to respond to the Home Affairs Committee’s call for evidence as part of its enquiry in to policing in the 21st Century. We have previously submitted a comprehensive response to the Committee on police funding. This new enquiry is timely, following the publication of Sir Ronnie Flanagan’s Review of Policing in England and Wales and the planning work that the Home Office is already engaged in, helping to shape the future direction of policing.

Policing Priorities

2. The current policing structure in England and Wales is defined by the tripartite relationship, the principle of which is that responsibility for policing is shared between the Home Office, Chief Officers and Police Authorities. As such the priorities for policing are derived both at a national, regional and local level. In all cases their main drivers are the Public Service Agreements (PSAs) which are agreed by Departments and the Treasury in response to the government’s vision for, amongst other things, safer communities. At
the national level these PSAs are, in part, reflected in the Home Secretary’s Strategic Priorities for Policing. The National Community Safety Plan (NCSP) sets out what the PSAs mean in practice for local delivery partners, including the police, but the Strategic Policing Priorities are the most explicit translation of the PSAs in to priorities for the police.

3. The new PSAs published in autumn 2007 place a stronger focus on more serious violence (particularly involving the use of firearms and other weapons), alcohol related crime and anti-social behaviour. This is in addition to the continuing need to reflect the increased threat to communities posed by violent extremists. They also provide greater flexibility for local partners to deliver local priorities, with an emphasis on increasing public confidence through improved quality of service by the police.

4. We have changed the PSA targets so that people are given greater flexibility to focus on what matters locally. We are changing the Offences Brought to Justice target so that it focuses on efficiency in tackling serious crime and reducing associated paperwork, removing the perceived incentive to chase relatively small crimes to meet a target.

**OUR OBJECTIVES**

5. As we look forward to meeting the challenges of 21st Century policing the Home Office’s key objectives are to give police forces greater freedom to respond flexibly to local concerns, through neighbourhood policing and bureaucracy reduction, whilst focusing sharply on seriousness, through greater collaboration on protective services, tackling serious and violent crime and continuing to protect people from the terror threat.

**GREATER FLEXIBILITY**

6. We are encouraging flexibility by driving ahead with the implementation of neighbourhood policing. Neighbourhood policing teams provide a new means for people to be become engaged in setting local priorities and making their communities safer. April 2008 will mark the real start of this new approach with every person in England and Wales able to contact a dedicated team for their area. Sir Ronnie Flanagan’s report recommended the closer integration of neighbourhood policing teams in to a neighbourhood management approach locally and the Home Office is working with the Department for Communities and Local Government to make this happen. A new focus on measures of public confidence and satisfaction in performance frameworks will help ensure that this cultural change is fully embedded.

7. There are currently 3,600 teams, consisting of over 13,000 Sergeants and Constables and 16,000 Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) dedicated to neighbourhood policing. Public awareness of local teams is already high (54% of people aware in January 2008 according to a Home Office/Ipsos/MORI poll).

8. A major element of neighbourhood policing teams is the part played by PCSOs in engaging with their local community, providing high visibility reassurance and dealing with low level crime and anti-social behaviour, and they are vitally important to the effective delivery of flexible community based policing.

9. We also want to promote flexibility by reducing unnecessary bureaucracy. The Home Secretary has welcomed Sir Ronnie Flanagan’s recommendations in this area and agrees that the police service and all its partners have a part to play in reducing this.

10. The office of constable lies at the heart of policing and freeing up officer time by reducing bureaucracy is a major priority. We have responded to the police service’s request to allow greater flexibility in how they use their resources, through the suspension of controls on the Crime Fighting Fund, previously ring-fenced for police officer posts, and through granting some civilian roles limited police powers. This will assist the service in moving towards the optimum workforce mix that will enable police officers to focus on the frontline.

11. We are making optimum use of technology to enable officers to focus on providing the most visible and accessible police presence in the community. The Prime Minister has announced a £50 million capital fund to support this work and to give the police wider access to 21st Century crime fighting technologies. The successful use of such technology has included the use of electronic fingerprinting units and new generation Airwave radios which provide vastly improved officer to officer communication. These innovations have contributed to the good progress that has been made in increasing the time police officers spend on the frontline. The latest Police Performance Assessments show that officer time on frontline duties again increased in 2006-07, for the third successive year.

**FOCUSBING ON SERIOUSNESS**

12. We are focusing on seriousness, particularly violent crime. The British Crime Survey shows that total violent crime has decreased by 31% since 1997 and we have had significant recent successes in reducing the most serious violent offences recorded by the police. However, there is still more to do, particularly in relation to more serious violence including homicides, serious wounding and serious sexual offences such as rape.
13. There is heightened concern about gun and knife crime, particularly the carrying and use of weapons by young people. The Government takes this problem very seriously and is determined to do all that it can to solve the issues. The Tackling Gangs Action Programme has made £1 million available to police services in four target areas for police-led interventions to tackle the problem of gang-related violence, which often involves the use of weapons. The Home Secretary has announced further measures to address violent crime in the Tackling Violence Action Plan.

14. All police forces and authorities need to look beyond their boundaries to play their part in meeting new challenges and police forces working together will be an ever more important part of the way policing will be delivered in the future. We are improving the capacity and capability of police forces to work together to bring improvements in protective services, covering areas such as serious crime; counter-terrorism and extremism; serious, organised and cross-border crime, as well as public order, civil contingency planning, critical incident management and strategic roads policing. The work that police authorities are doing with forces to develop protective service improvement plans should be embedded in local policing plans that are being drawn up for spring 2008.

15. Terrorism is one of the most serious challenges facing the UK and it remains of the utmost importance for the police and the security services to have the capability to protect the public and disrupt terrorist attacks. We continue to provide more resources for the police to ensure that they have the capacity to respond to the threat. In 2007–08, the police received £472 million in specifically targeted grants, and we will continue to invest in this area. The police service is working closely with the Home Office to ensure that the additional resources available address the priorities for counter terrorism policing across the country. This includes the establishment of three new regional Counter Terrorism Units (CTUs) in the West Midlands, Greater Manchester and West Yorkshire, in addition to the five existing regional Counter Terrorism Intelligence Units (CTIUs).

16. The 2012 London Olympics is a major security and public safety issue, with events scheduled to take place across the country. The Home Secretary has already made an allocation of funding for the additional demands on the police arising from the Olympics which will be used to ensure that the events take place safely and securely. An announcement will be made as soon as practicable.

MEETING THE CHALLENGE

17. The Home Office and its partners are approaching these challenges from a position of strength. Overall crime is down. The latest BCS figures showed that the number of crimes recorded by the police fell by 9% for the period July to September 2007 compared with the same quarter a year earlier. It also showed a statistically significant decrease in the risk of being a victim of crime.

18. We are investing in delivering a fully-effective police service for the 21st Century. The Police Service in England and Wales will continue to benefit from the significant increase in resources that has taken place over a sustained period. Government grants to police forces will have increased by 19% in real terms between 1997–98 and 2008–09. We have also retained the ring-fence element for PCSO funding and have uplifted their budget to £324 million for 2008–09.

19. Achieving significant cashable improvements in efficiency and productivity is central for police authorities (members and officers) and all police managers. With this in mind we have worked with ACPO and the Association of Police Authorities to develop an Efficiency and Productivity Strategy to assist the service.

20. After very careful consideration the Home Secretary announced a police pay award for 2007–08 which was affordable and consistent with Government policy. She has now written to the Police Negotiating Board asking them to discuss the possibility of a multi-year deal for 2008 and beyond based on the index used by the Police Arbitration Tribunal in their recommendation for the 2007 award, and looks forward to receiving their views.

21. The fact is that policing remains an attractive vocation. There are over 142,000 frontline officers in England and Wales and over 90,000 police staff, including the 16,000 PCSOs. Police officers have one of the strongest recruitment and retention positions in the public sector with an average of six applicants for each police officer post. Only 1.5% of officers voluntarily left the police service (England and Wales) in the year ending 31 March 2007, with the equivalent figure for the whole economy being 11.5% or 7.8% across the public service.
22. Greater investment will only be effective if it is backed up by an effective performance management structure. Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) inspected performance management in all 43 police forces in 2007. All forces met the minimum requirements, none were graded “poor” and six forces were graded “excellent”. We are not complacent about this success and the current national performance management arrangements will ensure that underperformance is identified and tackled swiftly and effectively.

23. These performance management arrangements include the Home Office’s Police Crime and Standards Directorate (PCSD) who concentrate on performance improvement; HMIC who focus on inspection; and the National Policing Improvement Agency (NPIA) who provide training and address capability. The Home Office has also developed Partnership Support Programmes, to support local areas and partnerships to identify and address the issues needed to deliver improved performance.

24. These issues will be driven by the priorities set by the PSAs and the content of Local Areas Agreements (LAAs) agreed between central government and local government and it partners. From June 2008 LAAs in England will be the only place where targets can be set for outcomes delivered by local government on its own or in partnership with agencies such as the police. There are no LAAs in Wales but Local Service Boards are being developed to work across public sector organisations to resolve cross cutting issues.

25. Where there are performance concerns against LAA targets or against any of the other indicators contained in the Local Government National Indicator Set action will be taken at an early stage to address it. The Home Office will retain the ability to monitor and intervene in cases of underperformance on Home Office issues, such as policing, under these new arrangements.

**Next Steps**

26. The next step for the Home Office will be responding in full to the recommendations made by Sir Ronnie Flanagan in his Review of Policing. His product is challenging for all stakeholders in policing, including the police themselves. The Home Office is committed to meeting this challenge and will be publishing a Green Paper in the spring with proposals for a reformed performance management framework, greater flexibility for frontline officers and strengthened local accountability.

APPENDIX 19

**Memorandum submitted by the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC)**

**Summary**

The Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC) has oversight of the police complaints system. The IPCC’s responsibilities include publishing annual statistics on complaints against the police. This information provides important feedback to the police on public perceptions of the quality of policing.

Current data suggests that there are levels of public dissatisfaction with policing. Complaints of neglect/failure of duty and incivility together represent a high proportion of all complaints and are also the fastest rising categories of complaints. This may suggest a mismatch between what the police service delivers and what the public expects to be delivered, creating a risk that public confidence in policing will be eroded.

Concerns about neglect and failure of duty are also a significant factor in the relatively few high profile and serious cases that the IPCC investigates independently.

However, whilst the annual police complaints data and learning from IPCC investigations suggest there may be a mismatch between expectations and delivery, it also offers a readily available driver for improving police performance and for enhancing a customer-service culture within policing.

**Introduction: the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC)**

1. The Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC) is an independent statutory body created to deal with complaints and allegations of misconduct against the police in England and Wales. In addition, the IPCC remit includes cases involving death or serious injury following contact with the police requiring an independent investigation irrespective of whether there is a complaint or allegation of misconduct.

2. By law the IPCC Commissioners must never have worked for the police service in any capacity. They are the public, independent, face of the IPCC.
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3. The IPCC replaced the Police Complaints Authority (PCA) and has significantly stronger powers than its predecessor. The IPCC’s powers include:
   — investigative powers: the IPCC may independently investigate cases, oversee police investigations of cases, or leave cases to be locally investigated by the police without oversight;
   — an appeal function whereby complainants who are unhappy with how the police dealt with their complaint may appeal to the IPCC; and
   — the power to direct a force to convene a disciplinary tribunal and, in exceptional cases, may direct that the tribunal be held in public.

4. The IPCC has a Guardianship function over the police complaints system the basis of which is to increase public confidence in the police complaints system in England and Wales and, in doing so, contribute to increasing confidence in policing as a whole. This has four main elements:
   — a duty to increase public confidence in the system as a whole;
   — promoting accessibility of the complaints system;
   — setting, monitoring, inspecting and reviewing standards for the operation of the whole system; and
   — promoting a learning culture so that lessons may be learnt from the system.

5. The complaints system includes arrangements for Local Resolution whereby complainants may have their concerns dealt with quickly at a local level and receive an explanation or apology as appropriate.

POLICE COMPLAINTS STATISTICS AND WHAT THEY REVEAL ABOUT PUBLIC EXPECTATIONS

6. Statistics regarding complaints against the police in England and Wales are published annually by the IPCC. The most recent set of annual statistics were published in November 2007 for the financial year 2006–07. The statistics show that 28,998 complaint cases were recorded during the year, an increase of 10% (2,730) on the previous year.

7. What the statistics also show is that nearly half of all complaints against the police are allegations of neglect/failure of duty and incivility, accounting for 45% of recorded complaint allegations. In addition, theses allegations represent the categories of complaints that have the largest increases, compared with, for example, the category of “Other Assaults” complaints which have steadily declined in numbers over the past four years.

8. Complaints of neglect/failure of duty and incivility concern things such as rudeness, not keeping someone informed about a case as promised, and failing to investigate a crime properly. These are sometimes perceived as relatively minor matters but, for the law abiding citizen, their contact with the police can have a profound impact on their confidence in the police service as a whole.

9. The figures for complaints of neglect/failure in duty and incivility suggest that there may be a mismatch between what the public expects of the police service and what the police service is currently delivering or able to deliver. These types of complaints can often be avoided.

10. The opportunity the police service has is to use the existing complaints data as valuable intelligence when assessing the gap between policing performance and public expectations; and to identify ways in which the gap between expectations and delivery can be reduced. Sometimes this may be achieved by providing information on the challenges of policing; sometimes it may be by enhancing the training and supervision given to front-line officers; and sometimes it may be by changing the policies and procedures behind policing operations. These all represent ways in which the police service can learn from complaints data to enhance its ability to provide a public service. Key to all of these is a strong and visible management grip on local complaint data and handling.

11. The IPCC’s remit extends beyond cases involving complaints from members of the public, and includes a second category of cases involving allegations of misconduct against a police officer, and a third category of cases involving death or serious injury (“DSI”), when there should be an independent check on the integrity of policing irrespective of any complaint or allegation of misconduct.

12. This third “death and serious injury” category includes instances when a civilian has died after contact with the police. What these cases may have in common with the neglect/failure in duty complaints is that the public’s expectations of the police may not have been met. For example, the IPCC has dealt with a significant number of cases where the families of victims of murder or other serious crime believe the police have not offered their loved ones effective protection. Sometimes this is correct and failures in the service offered by the police have led to tragic consequences; sometimes, despite the terrible consequences, family expectations of what could have been done are not realistic. Similarly, in our most high profile case, the investigation and trial concerning the death of Jean Charles de Menezes focused on whether the police should have done more to keep the travelling public and the victim safe—not on the spilt second decision of officers to use lethal force.

13. It is important that there is independent scrutiny of policing in these situations to consider whether
the policing response was appropriate. It is also important that these cases often provide learning
opportunities for the police and the public. A good example of this learning approach has been the IPCC’s
research into police related road traffic incidents that involve serious/fatal injuries. This research was
undertaken in collaboration with the police service. It recognized that police pursuits are often dangerous
and challenging police operations. The issue facing a police driver confronted by a civilian driver who
chooses not to stop when required to do so is whether a pursuit increases or reduces the risk to other road
users—not just how best to apprehend a suspected offender. The IPCC’s research has identified
recommendations that if implemented by the police service (as is anticipated) will enable the police service
to enhance their management of the risks created by some civilian drivers and thereby reduce the risk of
people being killed.

The Implications for a “Customer-service” Approach to Policing

14. Research (as yet unpublished) suggests that approximately 73% of the general population would
complain if they felt really unhappy about how a police officer behaved towards them. Research also
suggests that in fact a far smaller percentage of the population who have felt really annoyed by the conduct
of a police officer actually go on to report a complaint; and a high percentage of those who do go on to
complain are left dissatisfied by the police handling of the complaint.

15. The implication of this is that the number of people who have been really annoyed by police conduct
is higher than the number of recorded complainants and that large numbers are dissatisfied with the way
the police handle complaints that are made.

16. This research reinforces the concerns described above about a mis-match between the public’s
expectation of the police and what the police service delivers.

17. In his recently published report, Sir Ronnie Flanagan includes a review of public confidence in
policing in England and Wales. He rightly recognizes that a lack of “customer awareness” on the part of
the police can impact adversely on public satisfaction with the police. He says:

“A genuinely enhanced customer service approach [by the police] would help increase trust,
confidence and satisfaction. . . Overall confidence is driven by contact and information. . .”

18. He goes on to report that people want to be assured the police:

“are doing a good job—that they are listening to people’s concerns and expectations and feeding
these into local priority setting. . . A commitment to provide a high quality service which
recognizes that “every contact leaves a trace” needs to be the core of day-to-day [police] activity.”

Sir Ronnie stresses the need to implement fully citizen-focused policing.

19. In this context, and in the language of customer service, police complaints data represents important
customer feedback on policing. Whilst of course, each complaint must be dealt with individually, the
analysis of local trends offers the police service intelligence on performance, insights on how service can be
improved, and an opportunity to the police to demonstrate that it is “listening” to local communities.

Conclusions

20. Setting the police complaints system in the context of customer service and police performance,
demonstrates how the police complaints system is not simply there to handle individual complaints or
allegations of misconduct but can be a ready driver for improving policing performance and police culture
in exactly the way Sir Ronnie’s Report suggests is necessary.

21. The complaints data certainly suggests that the police service must take action to address the rising
number of complaints concerning neglect/failure of duty and incivility if public confidence in policing is not
to be adversely impacted. This direction is reinforced by the learning from some of the IPCC’s most serious
investigations.

22. The IPCC is continuing to work with the police service, with police staff associations, and with
community groups to develop the complaints system in a way that will further support and enable the police
service to develop its customer service ethos, and thereby underpin public confidence in policing so vital to
our society.

IPCC
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APPENDIX 20

Memorandum submitted by the National Policing Improvement Agency

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. The National Policing Improvement Agency (NPIA) had its origins in a proposal put forward by the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) in response to the Government’s 2003 Green Paper Building Safer Communities Together, with detailed proposals included in the Police Reform White Paper Building Communities, Beating Crime published in November 2004. The Agency was subsequently established by the Police and Justice Act 2006 and began its work in April 2007. As a Non-Departmental Public Body (NDPB) the NPIA is sponsored and funded by the Home Office, reporting to the Home Secretary. It is represented on the National Policing Board (NPB) and the Agency’s executive leadership is drawn from the police service. The Home Secretary’s Strategic Policing Priorities for the police service provide a framework for our business. This submission sets out those areas of NPIA’s planned programme of work considered to be of most relevance to the Committee’s terms of reference.

2. The Agency is a policing organisation acting as a central resource to the police service, working with ACPO, APA and the Home Office to improve the delivery of policing to the public. Alongside the improvement programme, the Agency is responsible for managing critical national infrastructure. On behalf of the police, the Agency also develops wider links which support the adoption of proven ideas from academia, other public sector organisations, the private sector and policing organisations around the world.

3. The NPIA’s improvement mission is to work with the police service to increase public safety and reassurance. The Agency does this through:
   — the development and maintenance of critical national infrastructure, for example, the Police National Computer (PNC) and the Airwave programme;
   — innovation in professional practice for implementation across the service, for example, Neighbourhood Policing and Workforce Modernisation;
   — support for the establishment of a culture of learning, change and self-led improvement, for example through the Leadership and Learning and Development programmes; and
   — supporting the productivity agenda, through better procurement and in information systems and workforce strategies.

4. NPIA delivers nearly 50 national services which support operational policing. Some of these services—fixed and wireless communications networks and the Police National Computer (PNC)—are designated as part of the UK’s critical national infrastructure. Others provide forces with the systems for recruitment, initial and further development, and promotion, which play an essential part in the careers of every police officer.

5. If we are to meet the changing demands of the service, we must be ready to refocus our resources and develop new programmes where they are needed. In 2008–09 for example, the NPIA will develop new business to support the counter-terrorism priority, the Home Secretary’s crime strategy and the implementation of those recommendations from the Flanagan Review that rest with NPIA. The publication by the Home Secretary of a Green Paper on policing, planned for spring 2008, is likely to identify further roles for the NPIA.

6. The Agency has taken over responsibility for the Schengen Information System, the Police National Missing Persons Bureau, the Central Witness Bureau and parts of the Assets Recovery Agency. It will also provide significant support to the police service’s work in creating a safe and secure environment for the 2012 Olympic Games.

7. In common with other public services, the ambition to deliver better services is set in the context of a tight spending round for the next three years. If we are to manage within these constraints, we will need to examine critically our own capacity and capability and strengthen our ability to match resources to priorities.

NPIA WORK PROGRAMME

8. The NPIA’s planned work programme for 2008–09 relates to eight improvement priorities:
   — Serious and Organised Crime.
   — Protective Services.
   — Counter Terrorism.
   — Trust and Confidence.
— Efficiency and Productivity.
— Information & Intelligence Management.
— Criminal Justice.
— Leadership.

**SERIOUS AND ORGANISED CRIME**

9. The NPIA will provide a range of support to assist the police service in this area. This includes the National Strategic Assessment; research and analysis; guidance and doctrine development; assisted implementation of programmes; specialist support for the investigation of crime; leadership and development courses in realistic learning environments; and, support provided through science, technology and communications systems.

10. From 1 April 2008 NPIA will have the statutory duty under the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002, as amended by the Serious Crime Act 2007, to train, accredit and monitor financial investigators across the law enforcement community. The aim is to increase Financial Investigation capacity and capability in support of the Home Office targets for harm reduction and the specific target for assets recovered of £250 million by 09/10. The NPIA Proceeds of Crime Centre and its training partners will offer training places to support the growth of capacity and capability.

11. We will continue to support the police service through providing advice and support for serious crime investigations.

12. In addition to the provision of specialist support to forces, the development of specialist training and the use of immersive learning techniques, the NPIA seeks to harness advances in science, technology and forensics to enhance policing techniques for investigation and operational patrol, leading to improvements across the police service.

**PROTECTIVE SERVICES**

13. NPIA will contribute to the development of detailed Protective Services Standards which will enable forces to determine whether they are currently capable of delivering the protective services as required by ACPO. These Standards will allow forces to develop their Protective Service capability against a common qualitative benchmark, and provide HMIC with a national assessment framework that will inform an assessment of compliance. It is intended that the standards will assist force and regional implementation planning, aid proactive risk mitigation and identify gaps both in local and national services requiring further development eg skills development and technology.

**COUNTER TERRORISM**

14. Support to counter terrorism and violent extremism will be a key area of work for the police service for the foreseeable future, and the NPIA has a crucial role to play through a number of programmes and services that will support the national strategy.

15. Working with and alongside local communities through the delivery of the Neighbourhood Policing programme will help support local partners and community groups in engaging in a range of policing activities from intelligence and investigation though to intervention by disruption and prosecution.

16. Improving key assets within the critical national policing infrastructure will support strengthening border security and improve intelligence systems which will assist in the identification of suspect terrorists.

**TRUST AND CONFIDENCE**

17. The first phase of the Neighbourhood Policing Programme ends in March 2008 with the public having access to Neighbourhood Policing Teams in every area of England and Wales. The police service will now need to focus its attention to ensure Neighbourhood Policing is properly embedded and resilient to meet a number of challenges over the coming years. These include meeting increasing public demand and expectations, protection of communities from internal and external threats, and effective resource usage. Working with Local Authorities and CDRPs, the NPIA will support the LAAs to deliver neighbourhood management outcomes. The next phase will continue to draw upon research and the emerging evidence base of what works and provide tailored support, guidance, learning and development to enable the service to improve Neighbourhood Policing. Responding to the recommendations within the Flanagan and Casey Reviews will form a significant part of the work plan, as will responding to the Home Secretary’s Strategic Policing Priorities, including integration of the work with neighbourhood management.
EFFICIENCY AND PRODUCTIVITY

18. The National Workforce Modernisation Programme will increase capacity across the core policing capabilities, and provide tools for effective demand and resource management, freeing up capacity for front line policing. The programme offers guidance and support to police forces to modernise processes and reconfigure workforce mix. The programme will provide examples of this in action through the demonstrator site programme in 13 forces.

19. The NPIA has been commissioned to implement the Prime Minister’s commitment to increase the number of mobile devices available to front line officers to 10,000 during 2008–09. The NPIA will manage a programme of central and local investment to enable forces to develop mobile information systems and to create a sustainable basis for the continuing development of mobile information systems across the police service. As part of the programme, the NPIA will roll out the mobile fingerprinting kit (Lantern), beyond the current trial areas.

INFORMATION AND INTELLIGENCE MANAGEMENT

20. The NPIA has established the role of Chief Information Officer (CIO) so that it can take a strategic lead in the development of information systems across policing. The CIO will ensure that the roll out in forces of the IMPACT programme, and in particular the Police National Database (PND) over the next three years, becomes the opportunity to deliver an information strategy for the police service (ISS4PS) which increases forces’ ability to work together on information sharing and the development of common standards. The CIO will work with forces to improve their capability to deliver information systems, and will promote innovation through the development of strategic relationships with the academic and supplier communities.

21. There will be continued focus on effective delivery of major new capability in the police service. The Airwave programme is nearing completion. Substantial progress has been made to increase security and network availability. The coming year (2008–09) will see the installation of the permanent infrastructure of Airwave in the remaining London Underground stations delivering a consistent single radio communications network for the first time. The Agency will support the police service and other partners in maximising the operational benefits of the Airwave service and will hold the service provider, Airwave, to account for effective delivery.

22. NPIA will create a capability for interoperability between all the emergency services using Airwave. Doctrine and training modules will be delivered to the services in 2009, including training for Airwave trainers in forces, tactical advisors and Gold and Silver incident commanders. The Interoperability solution will be a crucial element of the security arrangements for the 2012 Olympic Games.

23. Preparation for the next phase of the IMPACT programme is underway and it is planned that the contract for creating the PND will be awarded in 2008. The first phase of implementation will be completed by December 2010. It is possible that some early functionality might be delivered during 2009.

24. The reconfigured Schengen Programme (SIS II) will provide access to alerts raised by other EU Member States for UK front-line police forces and other Law Enforcement Agencies via existing links to the PNC. UK Police Forces and other agencies will be able to raise alerts with fellow EU Member States through the PNC and the SISII system.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE

25. The Custody and Case Preparation (CuCP) programme will be completed in 2008. This will connect forces’ electronic case preparation solutions to the Criminal Justice System and Courts systems. Case Preparation will be deployed in all the Metropolitan Police Service boroughs. Together, these projects will deliver more effective management of criminal justice processes and improve the effectiveness and efficiency of bringing offenders to justice. These benefits are already reflected in force efficiency plans, and their impact will grow.

26. The Prosecution Team Streamlined Process Project is jointly managed by ACPO and the CPS. This project supports the overall delivery of the Government’s CJSSS Programme to ensure the effective and speedy outcome of cases in the magistrates’ courts. The streamlined process aims to deliver more proportionate police and prosecutor preparation for anticipated guilty and not guilty plea cases suitable for disposal in the magistrates’ courts. Importantly, this includes a significant reduction in police paperwork. NPIA will support the testing and evaluation of the new processes.

LEADERSHIP

27. The police service employs more than 240,000 people nationally and over 80% of policing budgets are spent on people related activities. It is therefore essential that there is clear direction and support to maximise the talents of police staff. The development of leadership within the police service is a critical ingredient across all levels and disciplines and remains a major factor in investigations, public inquiries, critical incident management and day to day decision-making across the service.
28. In short, this means planning and development to ensure the right people with the right skills are in the right place at the right time. This provides a focus to support forces to identify, select, deploy, develop and retain the right people for policing and to develop the NPIA as the national professional human resources support for the police service.

29. Particular challenges for policing need to be taken into account, for example, addressing the complexities of resource management and workforce modernisation. Building on progress in the first year, key strategic programmes will be further developed and implemented—these include the Leadership Strategy, the People Strategy, and Workforce Modernisation. Recommendations from reviews on selection and promotion for the Strategic Command Course and the High Potential Development Scheme, as well as various Leadership and Development Programmes, will be implemented. These will reflect the current and future needs of policing and will be robustly evaluated on a regular basis to ensure they represent excellence, and relate to changes in legislation and policing imperatives. We will work towards the integration of equality and diversity within employment practice, thereby ensuring recruitment, development and promotion is solely based on merit.

30. The People Strategy for Policing will provide a strategic framework and direction for people management and development activity in order to support policing in defining, acquiring, retaining, developing and progressing the right number and mix of officers and police staff in order to deliver strategic policing priorities across England and Wales.

31. The complex role of policing in the 21st century demands leaders of the highest calibre. We have a police service in the UK that is internationally respected. Research however suggests that we need to enhance the capability of all leaders to equip them with the skills and knowledge to tackle the challenges that the service faces. The Leadership Development Strategy will ensure that talent is identified and developed. It will deliver an integrated and progressive development programme for leaders across the service. We will focus on three critical domains, professional, executive and business policing skills. This will contribute significantly towards a well led police service which has the trust and confidence of the communities it serves.
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APPENDIX 21

Memorandum submitted by the Five Police Forces and Authorities of the East Midlands

Introduction

This evidence is submitted by Derbyshire, Leicestershire, Lincolnshire, Northamptonshire and Nottinghamshire police forces and authorities. We welcome the Committee’s inquiry and the opportunity to submit evidence to it.

Our evidence shows that the demands on the police are growing rapidly. The public and government expect more from the police service within an increasingly complex policing environment. Chief constables face difficult decisions about the best use of their resources to minimise harm to the public in the face of growing threats and about what constitutes acceptable levels of risk. Government funding for policing in the East Midlands is inadequate, with authorities not getting the level of general police grant the government funding formula indicates they should. Police forces and authorities across the region are committed to improving productivity by making better uses of police officers and staff, deploying modern technology and cutting bureaucracy. The East Midlands region is at the forefront of collaborative working between police forces and authorities to deliver policing services economically. Even so, we believe that expecting chief constables and police authorities to square the circle of increasing demand and inadequate funding through greater productivity is likely to be unrealistic.

What the public expects of the police; how Chief Constables determine priorities; the role of the Home Office in setting priorities

Public expectation of policing is driven by many factors including peoples’ experiences, the experience of their friends and neighbours, national and local media coverage and political debate. A service user’s satisfaction and expectations are largely influenced by local factors, whereas perception of the police is generally influenced by a combination of national and local factors.

However, people tend to be more concerned about what is happening or what they perceive to be happening in their immediate neighbourhood. They want to be reassured by more visible policing.

Police authorities and police forces put substantial effort into identifying public concerns. The methods used are illustrated in the section below on public involvement in policing. Other sources of information are used to determine what the public want, including the British Crime Survey, media coverage and views of politicians who are the public’s direct representatives.
What the public aren’t clearly sighted on is the increased focus on protective services and the many specialist areas of policing that compete with neighbourhood policing for resources. The need for specialist policing provision could compromise the ability to meet local demand and deliver neighbourhood reassurance. The accountability and expectations of policing have expanded in these areas, for example in relation to managing sex offenders and around child protection. The application of health and safety law to the police service, in the light of the prosecution of the Metropolitan Police Commissioner following the shooting of Jean Charles de Menezes, requires chief constables to provide a response to identified risk, such as the mapping of organised crime gangs, known sex offenders and the Friday and Saturday night drinking culture. This is not a case of chief constables applying resources to these areas because they are risk averse; it is a combination of prosecutions, the implications of the Civil Contingencies Act, and government expectations within the National Policing Plan.

Chief constables have to take account of other factors in determining the policing services they will deliver. Central government sets out its priorities for policing through Public Service Agreements, the National Community Safety Plan and the Sustainable Communities Strategy. A key aspect of the top down priority setting is the timeliness of this for forces and authorities. National parameters are often not received until January or February with police funding not finalised until the end of February. Forces and Authorities have to decide their priorities for commencement in April.

National priorities are accompanied by local priorities that are set from the bottom up. Public consultation and links to neighbourhood policing priorities set the framework for more specific local objectives. These are articulated by Police Authorities through local policing plans that must be prepared by 31 March. Local priorities are influenced by partner agency requirements, expressed through Local Area Agreements. Partnership working is beneficial but it adds further to the complexity of the policing environment.

Ultimately, chief constables have to balance the threat, harm and risk associated with all of the demands for policing and the resources available to them. Also, they have to take into account the style of policing required by the public. Quality of service is an important element in achieving public satisfaction with local policing and is currently high on the agenda of all five forces.

The effect of heightened concerns about terrorism; immigration, gun and knife crime, identity fraud; the growth in cyber-crime; the Olympics

All of the issues highlighted appear in force strategic assessments. All add further to the burden on police forces in the East Midlands. In addition to the areas highlighted in the Committee’s question, the police have to deal with a wide range of civil contingencies, the public and others, perhaps do not see the wider role of policing for floods; foot and mouth etc. These incidents place a further demand on the police when capacity is already stretched. Moreover, this is compounded by officers who have the skills and responsibility for specialist operational capacity that may be required simultaneously.

Public perception and the fear of gun and knife crime is greater than the reality across the East Midlands. This perception has been fuelled by media coverage. This has galvanised and focused the police forces into working ever more closely with partner agencies to tackle the issue, pooling resources and sharing expertise. In certain force areas, significant investments have positively impacted upon a reduction in gun and knife crime. An example of this is illustrated below:

East Midlands Special Operations Unit Case Study: Operation Kaross was a successful East Midlands Special Operations Unit (EMSOU) investigation into a team of West Midlands armed robbers committing cash in transit offences in Derbyshire, Leicestershire, West Midlands and Scotland. The violence used was escalating and guards were shot during offences in Derbyshire and Strathclyde. EMSOU was instrumental in identifying the location of the main suspect and securing his arrest. In total, seven people were arrested; four were primary members of the gang. They were charged with conspiracy to commit armed robbery, assault with intent to rob and assisting offenders. A firearm used in the offences was recovered.

EMSOU works closely with the Serious and Organised Crime Agency and Her Majesty’s Revenue and Customs. The unit works more widely with other agencies as part of the Government Agencies Intelligence Network. Through this, the unit works with the Borders and Immigration Agency, Trading Standards, the Government Office for the East Midlands, the East Midlands Development Agency, Vehicle and Operators Service Agency, the Department of Work and Pensions, the Department for Rural Affairs and the Department of Trade and Industry.

Derbyshire police are leading work to establish a Counter-Terrorism Intelligence Unit. The costs of this will be met centrally so there is no financial burden on the region, but the creation of the unit impacts in another way. The skills needed in the unit are the same as those needed in other areas such as EMSOU and organisations like the Serious and Organised Crime Agency.

The East Midlands does not have any direct commitment to Olympic venues. However, the region will still have to play a part in supporting the Metropolitan Police Service and other agencies in ensuring that the London Olympics in 2012 are a success. To that end, police forces in the East Midlands region are fully engaged in the preparatory work that is being co-ordinated by chief constable Med Hughes, Chair of the
ACPO Olympic Preparation Committee. At this stage, quantifying the resources that will be required to support the Olympics is difficult. There is already an expectation on the police service that it is starting to build the Olympic factor into forward financial and resource planning. This will be an issue for some Police Authorities as their funding is focused primarily on the needs of their police area and any additional investment to support the Olympics will have to be the subject of discussion with central Government.

Immigration is a wider issue than just foreign nationals. The population in the East Midlands has grown by 4.1% whilst the national average for England is 2.7%. This growth is from a combination of factors with one element being migration. For example, Leicester city has seen a rapid and substantial increase in Somali residents. Lincolnshire is the fourth fastest growing area in England and has attracted a large number of migrants who work in the agricultural sector. Northamptonshire is seeing rapid growth as part of government plans to increase the size of Milton Keynes and increase housing in the surrounding area. There are tensions in certain areas of the region between new and existing communities.

Public involvement in local policing

Public involvement in local policing has been enhanced by the move to neighbourhood policing. All police forces and Authorities in the East Midlands consult the public routinely and regularly. The range of techniques for engaging the public is extensive and includes:

- Active Participation
  - Volunteers.
  - Special Constables.
  - Involving community in environmental audits.
  - Neighbourhood Watch.
  - Neighbourhood panels.
  - Public engagement cards.
  - Independent custody visitors.
  - Community placements for student police officers.

- Consultation and Communication
  - Joint Action Groups (JAGS).
  - Independent Advisory Groups (IAGS).
  - Public meetings including attendance at community group meetings.
  - Survey cards given out as required.
  - Ongoing survey of neighbourhoods including door to door surveys and electronic surveys.
  - Street briefings.
  - Feedback from public via website.
  - Making use of mobile police stations.
  - Utilising local amenities like shops and schools.
  - Surgeries.
  - Multi agency community forums.

The five case studies below illustrate the extent of community engagement across the East Midlands.

Case Study 1: In Lincolnshire, consultation takes place with all sections of the community through neighbourhood policing forums. Every six months this is integrated into neighbourhood policing profiles with part of the document looking to be made available to the public via the Internet. Information obtained informs activity, targets local priorities and is fed back through neighbourhood newsletters and subsequent neighbourhood policing forums. As well as using many of the techniques listed above, Lincolnshire police has a list of Key Individuals it uses to inform community impact assessments.

Case Study 2: There is a move within Leicestershire to look more at Restorative Approaches in Neighbourhoods (RAiN). This will involve more community engagement, and perhaps partner agencies. This is linked to Sir Ronnie Flanagan’s report and is about the unnecessary criminalisation of certain actions in order to meet perverse incentives of sanction detection rates.

Case Study 3: In Nottinghamshire, part of the “activation criteria” for each neighbourhood, requires that a representative section of the community is engaged with to identify and agree priorities. In order to do this a significant amount of guidance has been produced and circulated via the intranet and engagement techniques feature within the five-day Safer Neighbourhood Team training course.

Each neighbourhood has to have an engagement plan, which takes into account the demographics of the area. This engagement plan utilises the most effective style of engagements for the particular areas. The cycle of engagement varies between areas from six weeks in some of the urban areas to six months in some rural areas.
The public are also involved in agreeing priorities for areas in which most cases is done at a public meeting where priorities are voted upon. The time scale again varies between neighbourhoods. The force currently has approx 550 community identified priorities on its briefing and tasking system.

Case Study 4: Effective communication with the local community is key to the success of neighbourhood policing and to assist Safer Community Teams (SCTs) in keeping communities informed and engaged, Northamptonshire police have developed a guide to the minimum standards of communication. The neighbourhood policing project team consider the guide to be the best example of its kind, and it is being shared with other forces.

In Northamptonshire, SCTs use engagement cards to record community priorities when meeting members of the public. Each SCT collates the priorities from these interaction cards every 12 weeks and then they are taken to a neighbourhood panel. The neighbourhood panels are in different stages of development however ultimately the aim is for them to be as fully representative of the community as possible. The role of the neighbourhood panels will be to agree and set the three priority problems for the SCT and partners to work to resolve. If these priorities require a partnership approach then they are forwarded to the JAG for actions to be considered.

Northamptonshire Police Authority is currently setting up a process where individual Police Authority members will attend these community panels so that they can also oversee how SCTs are engaging with communities, and to be aware of local community concerns.

In Northamptonshire West Basic Command Unit, a Community Cohesion Unit has been established where officers are actively seeking and engaging with new and emerging communities. This Cohesion Unit also helps Safer Community Teams to build on these established links and to further develop relationships between the police and communities.

Case study 5: Neighbourhood policing in Derbyshire revolves around public involvement and working to priorities set by local communities. The force area is now divided into 103 individual neighbourhoods. Each neighbourhood team has set clear engagement plans specifically linked to their area. This identifies the best ways to communicate with the community concerned.

Through this process local priorities are set. These are confirmed at a main area meeting referred to as a panel or forum meetings. When the priorities have been set a clear course of action is then agreed. The priority can only be completed when re-presented to the meeting and agreed by the members, who represent the community concerned.

Each division now employs a specialist Safer Neighbourhood communications officer. Their role is purely to develop and maintain the best possible contact between police, partners and public.

Roles of and relationship between PCs and PCSOs: different ways in which police forces deploy staff

All five police forces in the East Midlands deploy PCSOs. There are many similarities in the way they do this. PCSOs are deployed as part of neighbourhood policing teams or units where they work alongside police officers. There are clear guidelines in each force about the role PCSOs should perform and the way they use their powers. They are not used as an emergency response resource. PCSOs contribute significantly interacting with the community and meeting public demand for visible policing. They receive high public acclaim and are responsible for positive public feedback, contributing to increased public satisfaction. More details of the way in which forces across the East Midlands deploy PCSOs are in Annex 1.

The role of PCSOs is developing—for example, there is a move to PCSOs attending crimes that previously were screened out. As PCSOs become more involved in the day-to-day investigative/victim care aspects of policing, this may create intelligence opportunities that will require warranted officer intervention. The PCSO role will improve satisfaction, but only if it is focused on matters of public concern and has sufficient back up from police officers to exploit any intelligence opportunities.

Operational relationships between PCs and PCSOs are generally good; there are however differences of opinion between the Police Federation and UNISON over “mission creep”.

Whilst there are many similarities in the way PCSOs are deployed by the five police forces in the East Midlands, nationally the lack of uniformity and mission creep across forces has led to a national stocktake. This is a timely review and should help answer the question posed around different deployments.

Use of technology to enable police officers to return to the beat

Police forces across the East Midlands are exploiting technology now and looking for further opportunities to do so. Examples include:

— Mobile data, offers the opportunity to reduce bureaucracy and to increase the time officers spend away from police stations. The five forces in the region are working together to submit a collaborative regional bid for funding from the National Policing Improvement Agency programme on mobile data. The Prime Minister announced £50 million in funding last September. Nottinghamshire and Leicestershire have well advanced plans for the rollout of mobile data terminals. The work they have put into this area has been used to help the other three forces in
the region develop their ideas on the use of this technology. This is a good example of working collaboratively. If the bid succeeds, all five forces will work together to implement mobile data. The solution will be tailored to individual force requirements and be based on tablet computers for vehicle use and hand held data terminals such as BlackBerrys for use by officers away from police stations.

— The use of real time tracking devices like Intelligent Deployment of Resources (iR3) and Automatic Vehicle Location System (AVLS) to achieve the most effective management and deployment of resources.

— Participation in the Home Office evaluation of body worn video devices. These offer the opportunity to secure evidence and reduce the need for written evidence where appropriate. They save time and have reduced complaints against officers.

— Expansion of Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) to provide better intelligence.

— Development of a search tool (GENIE) to enable a single search of all of a forces' data systems for names, addresses and other relevant information.

Whilst the use of IT / technology will allow officers more time on the frontline, a change in culture will be required for this to materialise fully.

**Definition of “front-line policing” (ie should it include work on case files and report preparation?)**

The frontline policing definition as it stands covers the “cradle to grave” aspects of any incident or investigation. This is positive from a police perspective as the full range of work that goes into any incident or investigation cannot be ignored. The public almost certainly do not understand the breadth of activity covered by the measure. They see it as a measure of visible policing. This begs the question what purpose does this measure serve? Additionally, gathering data for the measure adds to the bureaucracy facing police officers.

The current definition of frontline policing has been around for many years so it is perhaps timely to revisit it in light of the changing face of policing. Any change in definition needs to be carefully debated with practitioners as well as back office staff to ensure it reflects actuality. If the measure is changed it should be re-named as any changes will not allow for direct comparison with previous definitions.

**Police funding and the efficiency with which the various police forces deploy the financial resources available**

At a national level, the three-year funding settlement equates to a 2.7% increase for 2008–09 and a 2.8% increase for both 2009–10 and 2010–11 in police formula grant. The East Midlands average is slightly above 3% in each year. Whilst the region feels that the three-year funding settlement is a positive step, the benefit varies across the five police forces and serious financial issues remain.

The position when all central government grants are taken account of is worse (Table 1 below) than the headline formula grant implies with increases ranging from 2.2% for Northamptonshire Police Authority up to 2.9% for Nottinghamshire Police Authority.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| CHANGE IN GOVERNMENT GRANTS | £m |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | Derbys | Leics | Lincs | Northants | Notts | Total |
| 2007–08 grants | 119.31 | 128.56 | 71.07 | 81.30 | 149.11 | 549.35 |
| 2008–09 grants | 122.58 | 131.77 | 72.95 | 83.11 | 153.46 | 563.87 |
| % increase 08/09 | 2.7% | 2.5% | 2.6% | 2.2% | 2.9% | 2.6% |

One of the reasons for this is that specific grants have been frozen for several years. The result is a real terms reduction in the value of these grants.

The figures for Lincolnshire in Table 1 above exclude a £3.4 million special grant paid to the Authority in 07/08. Without this grant the Authority would not have been able to balance its budget and remain within Government targets for precept increases except through dramatically cutting policing services. The steps needed would have meant that the Authority could not have met its legal obligation to maintain an efficient and effective force. The Home Office grant was provided so that the Authority and police force could develop a plan for sustainable funding. This plan was submitted to the Home Office. As a consequence, total grants for 2008–09 are £1.52 million lower than in 2007–08. This is a reduction in funding of 2%. The Authority is considering a substantial precept increase as the only way to balance its budget in future years.
Unlike other classes of Authority where the floor reduces over the next three years, the floor for police remains at 2.5%. The impact on the East Midlands police authorities is shown in Table 2 below. The cumulative cost to the East Midlands Police Authorities is £57.2 million over the next three years.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOSS TO GRANT FLOORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£'000 Derbys Leics Lincs Northants Notts Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006–07 5.5 2.8 1.0 (0.8) 5.2 13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007–08 5.7 3.0 1.6 (0.6) 5.1 14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008–09 5.6 3.4 2.7 0.4 8.4 20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009–10 5.0 3.1 2.8 0.6 7.6 19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010–11 4.5 2.8 2.7 0.9 6.7 17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.3 15.1 10.8 0.5 33.0 85.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The forces feel strongly that the Government should move to a position where Authorities get the grant that the Government’s funding formula shows they need and that the Government should move swiftly to this position.

The region has a good track record on efficiency. From 05/06 to 07/08 forces in the region will have generated efficiencies in excess of £40 million. Despite this good track record on efficiency, the Police Authorities and forces in the East Midlands expect a budget gap in excess of £40 million over the period 07/08 to 10/11.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREDICTED BUDGET GAP IN THE EAST MIDLANDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£m 07/08 08/09 09/10 10/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmitigated budget gap 19 20.2 27.4 24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of reserves and one off grant (9.3) (5.3) (5.0) (4.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cashable savings (9.7) (4.8) (6.3) (5.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap 0 10.1 16.1 14.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Collaborative working is central to generating efficiencies to enable Authorities to balance budgets and to generate funding for improving protective services in the East Midlands. The region is at the forefront of collaborative working with a substantial programme of work. Key projects are set out in Table 4 below.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLABORATIVE PROJECTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency projects Protective service projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape Summarising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorities Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensics and Identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisoner Processing &amp; File Prep Workforce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modernisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand Management (was Control Rooms)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Management (was Shift Systems)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Force strength and resilience assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Policy and procedure alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whilst the collaboration programme will generate efficiencies, the likelihood is that these will meet only a proportion of the cost of enhancing protective services across the East Midlands.

The collaboration programme is managed centrally by a programme team costing £1 million annually. The team is funded jointly by the five police forces. The region has well defined governance structures for the programme. Chief constables and Police Authority chairs meet as the Collaboration Board that oversees the programme directly. The five police authorities have formed the East Midlands Police Authorities Joint
Committee. This Committee performs some of the functions of a police authority but in relation to regional work. Individual projects are led by chief officers—both police officers and police staff. A diagram of the Collaboration Programme Team structure is outlined below:

**Collaboration Programme Team Structure**

---

**EMSOU—an example of collaboration**

A key example of collaborative work relates to the East Midlands Special Operations Unit (EMSOU), which was established in late 2002. EMSOU initially covered Derbyshire, Leicestershire and Nottinghamshire. It now covers all five East Midlands police services and has expanded from 25 staff in 2003 to 120 and rising in 2007. Expansion was funded, in part, by ACPO from a Home Office grant of £20 million for improving police service capability on serious and organised crime.

One very welcome outcome from the funding settlement for the next three years, was the Home Office’s decision to continue to provide some financial support for the EMSOU and for Regional Intelligence Units. The Home Office will be providing a further £2/1.5/1 million to the EMSOU over the next three financial years: total central funding for EMSOU over the five years to 2010–11 will be just over £10.5 million. The ongoing cost of EMSOU will be around £8.5 million annually with the balance of funding coming from forces as officers/staff and cash. As Home Office funding diminishes, the cost to be met locally will rise and is a further pressure on budgets.

**Difficulties in recruitment and retention, covering not just numbers but quality of applicants/staff retained**

The picture across the five East Midlands police forces varies. Generally there is no problem recruiting police officers and the quality of applicants is good. On a positive note, the region is achieving and, in some cases, exceeding its targets for the recruitment of female officers. Parts of the region are also meeting or exceeding targets for the recruitment of black and minority ethnic officers. However, there are concerns about overall recruitment in the future because of the impact of decisions on pay and changes to pensions and conditions.

Turnover is another matter. The region has seen increasing numbers of officers leaving as people concentrate on quality of life. Northamptonshire have experienced significant retention issues during the last two years. The areas of specialism that have been particularly hard hit are accredited investigators and firearms officers. Both specialisms have seen a drain of numbers to the Met and City of London. Northamptonshire have also suffered significant losses at the rank of Sergeant. This critical supervisory rank has also proved difficult to recruit to.

Leicestershire are experiencing difficulty in getting sufficient firearms officers to meet the growing demands. The force has seen a reduced number of officers applying and a reduced number being successful. Add to that the pay situation and the fact that carrying of firearms is a voluntary role; the force can see potential challenges ahead.

On the police staff front, the situation is more problematic. Nottinghamshire report difficulties in recruitment and retention, covering not just numbers but quality of applicants/staff required. Northamptonshire are concerned about becoming a training ground for other organisations. Trained police
staff, such as analysts and investigators, are drawn away by higher salaries and better career prospects. Lincolnshire Police’s main concern is over the recruitment of PCSOs. This is a combination of salary (affordability) and the geography of Lincolnshire. Another emerging theme is the difficulty of getting staff to fill professional roles such as human resources and accountancy. Again, geography plays a part but so does salary, with a reduced pool of appropriately professionally qualified people responding to adverts.

Derbyshire are reporting problems with a diminishing pool of available candidates in an increasingly competitive market. This is compounded by the need for attracting recruits with additional skills such as languages. They also face challenges in retention due to increasing national and regional initiatives. The force is experiencing difficulty in effecting medical retirements due to significant cost implications.

Whilst workforce modernisation offers many opportunities, inevitably, it can be unsettling for officers and staff alike. One risk which needs managing is that the skills needed in posts that have been workforce modernised are being acquired through the appointment of former officers. In the short term these individuals are likely to represent the best pool of talent for the roles but this will be a shrinking pool.

Annex 1

DERBYSHIRE CONSTABULARY

PCSOs have a specific role within Safer Neighbourhood Teams. Deployment to incidents and daily tasking should take into account the limited powers, training and equipment provided to PCSOs. They should not be deployed to incidents where there is a potential for serious confrontation and as a result should not be deployed on patrol with police officers or special constables on reactive duties. It is important that if a situation arises that the PCSO does not have the power, training or equipment to deal with, such as a violent disorder, the PCSO withdraws, observes and reports, instigating a response from a police officer.

The primary role of a PCSO is to provide a highly visible reassuring presence within the Neighbourhoods of Derbyshire, working as part of a Safer Neighbourhood Team to support the problem solving initiatives developed by the team.

It is important to recognise that PCSOs are not a replacement for warranted officers and should not be used for tasks normally undertaken by a police officer.

While PCSOs have a key role to play in the reduction of crime, PCSOs should not be used to investigate crime (other than house-to-house as above) and should not be used to take witness statements.

In order to provide an increased visible presence within our neighbourhoods, it is important that PCSOs are not deployed in plain clothes and are not requested to perform:

- Routine clerical duties.
- Transport duties.
- Prisoner escorts.
- Enquiry office cover.
- Custody duties.
- Football match duties.

PCSO should spend the majority of their time conducting directed high visibility foot or cycle patrol. They should be tasked each tour of duty in line with the current priorities for their neighbourhood. It will be necessary for some PCSOs to use a motor vehicle to get from their station to their neighbourhood. This should be done only in line with the PCSO driving procedure. (ie They have undertaken and passed the appropriate assessment following approval from their Inspector. In addition the use of the vehicle is restricted to travel to/from their neighbourhood and it is not within reasonable walking/cycling distance and is not reachable by other suitable methods).

PCSOs will patrol on their own. A dynamic risk assessment should be made when the situation dictates to ensure that PCSOs do not attend or become involved in incidents for which their powers, training and equipment are not sufficient.

To tackle specific neighbourhood priorities an officer of at least the rank of Sergeant can authorise a PCSO to patrol with another team member where a dynamic risk assessment dictates this as the appropriate method to combat the issue. For example, if a specific neighbourhood priority is a large group of youths causing a nuisance outside a local shop. It may be more appropriate at the identified times for a PCSO to patrol the area with a neighbourhood constable to ensure safety and enable the priority to be tackled more effectively.

The above restrictions are subject to waiver if it is necessary to save life or serious injury, to assist a police officer or member of the public in an emergency, or in the event of a major operational incident such as a train crash or terrorist incident.
Leicestershire Constabulary

Leicestershire have adopted all the mandatory powers for PCSOs except arrest, which they oppose on the grounds that it changes the role of the PCSO. Leicestershire have also just surveyed all of their existing PCSOs to get a view on what they think of their role; what needs changing; how they fit in.

Leicestershire operate a Neighbourhood Policing Improvement Unit which includes a PCSO senior lead and a neighbourhood policing officer senior lead working together, alongside special constables and volunteers. Each neighbourhood has dedicated PCs and PCSOs who are overseen by a neighbourhood policing Sergeant.

PCSOs take part in high visibility patrols; provide support to incident; provide support to crimes and work as part of a local support team which deals with low level crimes like vandalism and damage by making follow up enquiries in their beat area.

The role of PCSOs however, perhaps doesn’t go wide enough, as many of our other extended police family such as Local Support Team Officers (front enquiry officers) are actively involved in supporting frontline policing as part of a change of their historical role. Indeed, PCSOs frequently cover for the LSTOs as this is first point of contact business.

A guide to deployment has been produced and circulated, in an effort to prevent PCSOs being used as replacements for a diminishing police officer workforce, rather than the visible additionality they were originally intended to provide.

Lincolnshire Police

Lincolnshire Police has a deployment policy. The team set up in Lincolnshire police is that each team is led by a community beat manager (a PC) with a team of PCSOs, volunteers and partner agency staff. In some cases community beat managers direct the activity of neighbourhood policing teams but PCSOs are line managed by neighbourhood Sergeants.

Northamptonshire Police

PCSOs are encouraged to do all that a PC does within the range of their powers.

Northamptonshire are moving towards PCs focusing more on the specific use of their powers and PCSOs performing most or all of the public engagement and problem solving. All PCSOs are deployed to a dedicated neighbourhood.

They work in Safer Community Teams that are made up of a Sergeant, PCs, PCSOs, special constables and community wardens. The Sergeant has a supervisory role for the team. PCSOs are not a response resource and they undertake duties like high visibility patrols, schools liaison and dealing with low-level crime amongst other tasks.

Nottinghamshire Police

Nottinghamshire police has 217 identified neighbourhoods. Each neighbourhood has a Safer Neighbourhood Team made up of beat manager constables, PCSOs, special constables and local authority wardens / community protection officers. One size does not fit all and teams are made up of varying sizes based on need.

Beat managers have a responsibility on a daily basis to task PCSOs while Sergeants maintain the responsibility to sign off appraisals and deal with welfare issues.

The role of staff within the teams are clearly defined within the demand management resource deployment guide which includes extracts from the Safer Neighbourhood strategy.

APPENDIX 22

Memorandum submitted by the Association of Chief Police Officers of England, Wales and Northern Ireland

Context

On many measures policing in the UK has never been more successful. We are all experiencing the lowest risk of being a victim of crime for over 25 years. Against this reality the police service is bringing record numbers of people to justice and our prisons are full with those who pose the greatest harm to neighbourhoods. Strategically we have seen the development of ACPO led capabilities designed to counter the evolving contemporary threats from terrorism and organised crime. So what is broken that we are trying to fix? The service is grappling with an expanding, yet imprecise, mission. Call volumes to forces show no
signs of abating and the ACPO led renaissance of local policing across the UK has unleashed further demand. We are now in a very different place than we were 40 years ago when a measured dispassionate Royal Commission undertook a root and branch review of the police service. The results have delivered decades of stability and the governance settlement has also endured keeping to a very large extent, politics out of policing by reinforcing the local accountabilities of chief officers and police authorities.

However as the context has shifted the Royal Commission settlement has looked increasingly in need of review. We are living in a period of unprecedented upheaval which has challenged notions of individuality, neighbourhood, community and nation. We have yet fully to appreciate the impacts of the information age on our society and the rapid development of technologies intended to protect identity also carry the potentials to infringe on our liberties. These challenges are perhaps of greater concern in a country without a written constitution which most developed democracies enjoy. Beyond our localities we have to take into account changes across the globe; mass movements of capital and people, failed and failing states, turbulence in regions which directly impacts our economy, attachment to corrosive ideologies and climate change. And all these energies represented in real time through the internet.

The Flanagan Interim Review78 quotes Peel’s Principles for Policing. They have stood the test of time since 1829. The purpose of the Police is sufficiently captured in those principles. ACPO contends that society has changed so dramatically that, whilst the purpose of policing is unchanged, the challenges to that purpose have created the need for a current review of policing.

Policing, until the 1960’s was a locally structured and funded service which, for the most part addressed local crime and disorder. Peel’s Principles were as relevant to the small Borough or City Police Force as they were to the Policing of the Metropolis. Police Officers were members of a relatively static and familiar community who, on behalf of the community, upheld laws including local by-laws, and ensured the standards of behaviour that the community expected in the public domain.

Until the 1960’s, the local Police Force would deal with most things that the world could throw at it although the Metropolitan Police would be called upon to deal with homicides in the provinces where investigative expertise was not available. This was the time of uniform patrol, a so called deterrent to crime and disorder, principally because it was an effective means of deployment whilst waiting for any incident to arise that required police attendance.

The local Watch Committee monitored Police effectiveness and there was an annual inspection which ensured that the Police were reasonably up to date with practices and procedures. The principal accountability was to the local community who, if they had concerns, could raise those concerns with the local Watch Committee.

Things started to change in society in the 1960’s. Communities became mobile with the greater availability of transport. Communities became more transient and diverse. The 1960’s and 70’s saw the growth of individual freedoms and the challenge to authority and norms of behaviour.

The response to this changed environment was the Royal Commission in 1962 and its recommendations. (Appendix A). The consequences of the Commission included the merging of City and Borough Police Forces which, by 1974, created the patchwork of 43 Forces in England and Wales that is familiar today. It also heralded new accountabilities to Police Authorities. It also triggered ideas about how policing might become more efficient in responding to the changing nature of society. On the grounds of greater efficiency, the 1970’s saw the emergence of a more mobile Police Force, equipped with radios so that they could respond more quickly to calls from the public. That focus on efficiency has been a hallmark of policing development for the last 30 years. Attending and dealing with incidents has become the predominant focus and, as the number of incidents has grown79 the police focus has become one of reacting to the incident efficiently rather than resolving the underlying problem of which the incident is a symptom. Some manifestations of this efficiency focus include centralised control rooms, incident based command and control IT systems and the auditing of incident responses in terms of time taken and appropriate submission of reports.

This drive to be more efficient was exacerbated by the 1980’s focus on economy and efficiency around ‘modernised’ organisational systems and procedures. New public managerialism and ‘policing by objectives’, performance against which was judged by input and output measures of activity became the norm. Home Office Circular 114/198380 (Appendix B) was a seminal text that influenced the thoughts and actions of Police leaders for a decade or more.

The influence of the Audit Commission on economy, efficiency and effectiveness, particularly the focus on ‘value for money’ was self evident in the sale of many rural police stations and police houses, with Forces centralising their resources in the larger towns and cities. This coincided with a recognition by police forces that to be good and attractive employers they could no longer rely on former quasi militaristic models of leadership. For example, many officers had been told where to live, often living in “tied” housing in the area in which they worked. Over a very short period this became untenable with a majority of officers wanting to take advantage of home ownership in an area of their choice rather than being told where to live.

78 Interim Report of HMIC on Review of Policing Sir Ronnie Flanagan
79 For example, in West Yorkshire Police the number of incidents for last year was 2.5 million
80 Home Office Circular 114/83 Economy Efficiency and Effectiveness in the Police Service
The response style of policing in the 1990’s was becoming detached from the communities that it served. The Police became more and more focussed on incident response so that prioritisation drove the service to more mobile units and more squads to deal with particular types of incident. Local foot patrols became more scarce and “community policing” was seen by many Police Leaders and commentators to have become a residual, and token, presence in the community. Those seeking to judge Police performance continued to search for metrics that would indicate the level of effectiveness of individual Police Forces. The things that were easily measured thus assumed a priority, resulting in volume crime reduction and detection becoming paramount in recent years. The Central Government Public Service Agreement (PSA) targets have brought that focus into sharp relief. Other priority targets around offences brought to justice are a further reinforcement of the Government’s focus on volume crime. A positive outcome has been a reduction of volume crime and yet the public do not feel safer nor do they feel, in general, better served by the Police Service.

Police leaders have responded to this emerging paradox by restructuring their Police Force to enable a better connection between the Police and the local communities they served. This is called “Neighbourhood Policing” (a term which is intended to distinguish this commitment from the discredited and tokenistic “community policing” of the 1970’s and 80’s). The Government has responded positively to this ACPO led shift in emphasis.

That said, the 1998 Crime and Disorder Act might have been expected to have more impact than it has achieved to date. The thrust of the Act was to present policing as a predominantly local activity and an activity that ought to be managed in partnership rather than by the Police alone. It envisaged Local Authorities and other partners sharing the burden of reducing and detersing crime and disorder. The impact of the Crime and Disorder Act has been diluted by two major factors. Firstly, this approach is long-term in focus and nature, but Central Government has not relented on the 1980’s and 90’s focus on performance indicators which can be measured in the short-term. Secondly, however, the threats facing the country from terrorism and serious and organised crime have created a divergence of focus and a widening of the challenge to a single tier Police Service.

In 2008 the Police Service in England and Wales can be characterised as having a mission that is wider than ever before and having a lack of shared clarity amongst stakeholders about what is expected of it in relation to the breadth of the challenge.

The Police Service remains structured as though it has to meet a local requirement with some of the 43 Police Forces being very small indeed. It is still very much measured, despite the promised advent of APACS on its ability to reduce and detect volume crime. Most Forces are trying to become more familiar, accessible and accountable at a local level, but are wrestling with the need, also, to simply deal with the amount of incidents that are reported to them. Despite some notable progress by some individual Forces the Service as a whole has yet to find an appropriate answer to the serious and organised crime threat. The recent additional Home Office support in this regard is welcomed but there is still much to be done.

The introduction of PCSO’s at the Neighbourhood level has been welcomed in an effort to increase the capability and capacity of Police resources dedicated to tackling local issues such as anti social behaviour. However, there remains a need to win widespread public support for and understanding of their role. They are a key feature of a neighbourhood management approach and their value is in being a member of a dedicated Neighbourhood Policing Team, not performing ancillary tasks or patrol functions beyond their remit. They are depicted in some press as a hollow substitute for “real” policing, whereas they actually perform a different role to police officers and have the unique ability to remain visible and familiar to a local community whilst police officer colleagues respond to the wider spectrum of demands.

In response to these competing demands, some Forces have changed structures, reconfigured their organisation, demarcated roles to deal with frontline, support and non operational functions, in the drive to be more efficient and effective. Furthermore, the business of recording things has become, for the Police, a much more bureaucratic process taking officer time that was probably never envisaged in the creation of new systems. For example, crime recording and stop and account are two examples covered in the Flanagan Review. This highlights the needless drain of unnecessary bureaucracy and the requirement that Flanagan demands to free up space so that officers and staff can concentrate on the parts of their jobs that are important to the public they serve.

81 Within its five year strategic vision for policing, criminal justice and community safety, the Government set out a number of objectives and Public Service Agreements (PSA’s). PSA1 fell under Objective One “People are and feel more secure in their homes and daily lives”. PSA1 is “To Reduce Crime by 15% and further in high crime areas by 2007–08” (as measured by the British Crime Survey). The latest British Crime Survey Results (12 months to September 2007) indicate that BCS Crimes have fallen by 13% Nationally. (Compared to 2002–03).
82 Nationally, Total Recorded Crime has fallen by 9.7% when comparing 2006–07 with 2003–04 (ie three years ago) Nationally, Total Recorded Crime has fallen by 13.3% when comparing the latest 12 months to September 2007 with 2003–04
83 Feedback by North Yorkshire to ACPO Consultation on Home Affairs Select Committee Future of Policing in 21st Century. Also, Edwards and Skidmore 2005 and Duffy et al 2008
85 APACS—Assessments of Police And Community Safety (from April 2009)
86 Feedback by South Wales Police, Staffordshire Police and Norfolk Constabulary to ACPO Consultation on Home Office Green Paper and Home Affairs Select Committee Future of Policing in 21st Century
One of the consequences of all these changes has been the effect on the Service’s capacity and capability to deal with the threat posed by more serious and organised criminality\(^88\). However, the Service is now much better positioned to counter the terrorist threat given the new structures and new resources created in this area in the last two years\(^89\).

Against this current context of policing, it is little wonder that there are reviews and calls for reform.

This position paper, published by the Association of Chief Police Officers\(^90\) acknowledges the Flanagan Review\(^91\); the Government’s proposals for a Green Paper on the Future of Policing; the Home Affairs Select Committee which will take evidence on a similar theme; and the proposals emerging from other political parties about the purpose and role of policing. The Police Service is, undoubtedly, at a crossroads. The context sketched out above helps to explain why. What follows is a professional view from the Chief Police Officers who have experienced the changes to policing in recent times and who have a view on the issues that need to be addressed in creating a Service for the future that can better meet public and political expectations.

The following chapters deal with the dilemmas which, ACPO believe, lie at the heart of the current debate about policing:

- Chapter 2—The need to get more local.
- Chapter 3—The need to manage the serious as well as volume threats.
- Chapter 4—The need to reconcile local priorities with a central performance management regime.

**CHAPTER ONE**

**A local focus**

Policing has, traditionally, been a local service and has become stretched, in recent years because of (a) more serious and cross border issues and (b) in the drive for efficiency the Service has been perceived as being more detached from the local communities that it serves (despite it being increasingly funded by local people through council tax). ACPO’s position is an unswerving commitment to addressing the need for a locally visible, accessible, responsive and above all, a familiar policing style. There is universal commitment, within the Service to the aims of neighbourhood policing.

Neighbourhood Policing is a deployment arrangement which has, at its heart, a new commitment to Citizen Focus. ACPO\(^92\) is developing a broader Citizen Focus Plan that will seek to create a momentum towards better meeting the expectations of people at a local level\(^93\).

Neighbourhood policing may look different in different parts of the country. There may be differences within different parts of a single Force. The needs of the community will be different; the risks and threats faced by the community will be different; and the geographical footprint will be different. There are some features of neighbourhood policing that ACPO consider to be common.

These are contained in “Professionalising the Business of Neighbourhood Policing”\(^94\). The fundamental principles are:

- Accessibility.
- Influence.
- Intervention.

There are different Neighbourhood Policing Team models. One of the more common is that of a named Sergeant or Inspector being responsible for building relationships, responding to problems and addressing crime and disorder trainers within defined geographical areas. The individual Sergeant or Inspector is accountable to the local community. He or she has a team of Officers, PCSO’s, Special Constables and volunteers commensurate with the risks and requirements in the area. A neighbourhood team should, as far as possible, have some relationship with political boundaries. In some areas the Ward is the appropriate template, in others a district or sub-district would be more appropriate. The team will establish relationships with Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships and with other agencies such as the Local Authority to provide a coterminous service to the community.

---

\(^88\) Feedback by Gloucestershire and also Sussex Police to ACPO Consultation on Home Office Green Paper and Home Affairs Select Committee Future of Policing in 21st Century

\(^89\) Estimated to be £500 million

\(^90\) The Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) is an independent, professionally led strategic body. In the public interest and, in equal and active partnership with Government and the Association of Police Authorities, ACPO leads and coordinates the direction and development of the police service in England, Wales and Northern Ireland. In times of national need ACPO, on behalf of all chief officers, coordinates the strategic policing response.

\(^91\) Review of Policing HMIC Sir Ronnie Flanagan 2008

\(^92\) CC Julie Spence. Citizen Focus Business Area.

\(^93\) Realising Britain’s Potential: Future Strategic Challenges for Britain Cabinet Office. Feb. 2008

\(^94\) Professionalising the Business of Neighbourhood Policing ACPO 2006
ACPO recommends a commitment to neighbourhood policing. There are core principles of neighbourhood policing that we would wish to see established and any Government policies should take account of these features:

- Other agencies also to be held to account for delivery of outcomes. APACS will help but needs to be further developed and adopted across Government. ACPO continues to have concerns that APACS may simply replace PPAF as a performance management tool for the Police.

- Other local strategic partnerships such as the Criminal Justice System have a key role in improving local service delivery and re-assurance. ACPO supports the further integration of criminal justice services in order to provide a common purpose and objectives. ACPO recommends pilots of integrated Police and CPS prosecution teams and processes.

ACPO recommends pilots of integrated Police and CPS prosecution teams and processes.

- ACPO believes that the processes in the Magistrates’ Court should be proportionate to the cases that they are dealing with. ACPO supports the Streamlined Process as an extension of the work to reduce bureaucracy in Magistrates Courts (Criminal Justice Simple Speedy Summary [CJSSS] project). It recommends that the law on Disclosure as it applies in the Magistrates’ Court needs to be reviewed to ensure greater proportionality.

- ACPO supports the principles of Virtual Courts as an efficient and fair way to manage cases in the Magistrates’ Court. It represents one part of the “collaborative space” agenda, which aims to use technology to improve processes across Criminal Justice Agencies.

- Government’s future plans are to reserve Prison for the most violent and dangerous offenders. ACPO reject that as the starting point for dealing with prolific and persistent offenders, but there is a recognition that volume crime offenders such as burglars and vehicle thieves may well stay in the community where they will be punished locally. The control of offenders on community punishments will be through Probation supervision, electronic tagging and curfew etc. and effective operational neighbourhood management. Therefore, the Service has an important role in an integrated approach to offender management by working in partnership with other agencies. This will require risk managing and supervision of offenders in communities as well as reassuring these communities that they are safe.

- Furthermore, the types of offending behaviour that are prevalent in local communities are not effectively dealt with through current summary processes.

ACPO recommends the extension of Community Justice Courts and the further streamlining of summary justice (Simple Speedy Summary Justice Initiative).

ACPO supports the use of fixed penalty and other immediate sanction/disposals as a means of dealing with local offending of a non serious nature. ACPO would welcome any further involvement of the local community in determining sanctions for offending behaviour which affects communities.

- PCSO’s are a positive contribution to the work force mix that is required to deliver effective local policing. ACPO’s position is that the funding for PCSO’s should be part of the mainstream and Chief Constables should be given the discretion for deployment of PCSO’s and sworn officers.

The Government has provided ring fence funding for 2008–09, but future funding is uncertain after this time. There has been a recent review on PCSO powers to ensure clarity and consistency on issues such as recruitment, selection and training, how these are exercised. The important issue is that there is accountability to Chief Constables. In addition, clarity and consistency is required on issues such as recruitment, selection and training, career development and how they are supervised.

ACPO recommends that PCSO’s should be employed by mainstream, not discretionary funding.

- Government has funded a number of different warden and guardian schemes through different departments. ACPO’s position is that any patrolling function funded by central Government should support a neighbourhood approach under the control and direction of the Chief Constable.

95 Feedback by North Yorkshire Police to ACPO Consultation Home Affairs Select Committee Future of Policing in 21st Century
96 Feedback by North Yorkshire Police, Norfolk Constabulary and Northamptonshire Police to ACPO Consultation on Home Office Green Paper and Home Affairs Select Committee Future of Policing in 21st Century
97 Feedback by ACPO Criminal Justice Area. Also Cleveland Police response to ACPO Consultation on Home Affairs Select Committee Future of Policing in 21st Century
98 Feedback by Derbyshire Constabulary to ACPO Consultation on Home Affairs Select Committee Future of Policing in 21st Century
99 Feedback by Norfolk Constabulary to ACPO Consultation on Home Affairs Select Committee Future of Policing in 21st Century
100 Feedback by North Yorkshire Police and Northamptonshire Police to ACPO Consultation on Home Affairs Select Committee Future of Policing in 21st Century
101 NPIA Neighbourhood Policing Programme
ACPO recommends that the development of other patrolling functions, supported by central or local funding, should support the neighbourhood policing approach of the Police Force concerned.

- ACPO understand the desire for local accountability and priority setting at the neighbourhood level\(^\text{102}\). It is, however, seen as additional to, and not in the place of, the Police Authority accountability at a Force level. CDRPs and local strategic partnerships provide the basis for a more local determination of priorities and also for the joining up of public services. ACPO consider the LSP should be responsible for making adequate provision for neighbourhood accountability which may or may not involve local councillors and local citizens. APCEO would also like to see the LSP develop the capability to genuinely reduce crime and vulnerability, as well as proper offender management. This will be reinforced by the Audit Commission’s Comprehensive Area Assessments (CAA) to produce a sustainable community safety strategy.\(^\text{104}\) The CAA vision sets out four areas which may provide a framework worthy of development:
  - Relevant to the quality of life of local people.
  - Area and outcome focused.
  - Constructive and forward looking.
  - Joint and participative.

ACPO recommends the Local Strategic Partnership as the model for local multi-agency priority setting (see further in Chapter 3).

- ACPO strongly supports the legitimacy which comes from the democratically elected representatives at local and national level. However, ACPO has strong concerns regarding the proposals to have accountability vested in an elected “sheriff” or to see the Service “brigaded” as a local authority service under the local authority chief executive\(^\text{105}\). This resistance arises from the determination that the service should remain apolitical as well as the operational requirement to move significant numbers of resources to police the harm or risk at a Force, Regional or National level. Any elected person or body could only arise in a political context and the accountability to the local authority would leave policing to the whim of elected representatives of political parties.

ACPO recommends the rejection of the notion of an elected Commissioner or “Sheriff”. We do not recommend the municipalisation of the Service.

- Within LSP’s ACPO would like to see a greater commitment to collaborative agreements where all the strategic partners understand the threat, risk and harm in their locality eg guns and crime, alcohol, emerging violence\(^\text{106}\) and the emerging threat from drugs and other organised crime.

- ACPO consider that local policing needs to take more account of citizen values and expectations. ACPO would be sympathetic to a performance management regime that allowed the local element of policing to be driven more by this local accountability. It is not something that the Police Service alone can establish. It needs Government’s will.

The above points, taken as a whole, would create an environment for neighbourhood management approach, recommended as the future policing environment by the Flanagan Review. The Police Service, in such an environment, would be engaged, in partnership, in building social capacity as well as law enforcement\(^\text{107}\). The measurement of police effectiveness would have to reflect this transition. ACPO considers the current performance regime to be unduly weighted towards targets for crime and bringing offenders to justice. The qualitative aspects of the service are often overlooked or overwritten. This narrow focus on quantitative targets extends to some of the current proposals around APACS targets for serious and organised crime and even counter terrorism. These types of offending just simply do not lend themselves to quantitative metrics.

ACPO considers that to ensure the cultural transition to providing a qualitative service in partnership there is a training requirement for officers and staff that provide this local service. The Service needs to address the gap between the perceptions and reality of crime and community safety.\(^\text{108}\) Recent customer service surveys\(^\text{109}\) show this disparity. However, the Police Service still holds the public’s trust and if this focus is elevated by Government we believe we can address this perception-reality gap. A key reason why this reassurance gap exists is that the public are sceptical about crime reporting and statistics. The “Smith Review”\(^\text{110}\), which was commissioned by the Home Office, recognised this dilemma and made several recommendations that ACPO feel would go a long way to addressing this reassurance gap. (Appendix D)

ACPO recommends that Government implements the recommendations of the Smith Review.

---

\(^{102}\) Feedback by Northamptonshire Police to ACPO Consultation on Home Affairs Select Committee Future of Policing in 21st Century

\(^{104}\) Feedback by South Wales and also Cleveland Police to ACPO Consultation on Home Office Green Paper and Home Affairs Select Committee Future of Policing in 21st Century

\(^{105}\) Conservative Party—Policing for the People


\(^{107}\) CC Matt Baggott (Leicestershire)

\(^{108}\) Feedback by Derbyshire Constabulary to ACPO Consultation on Home Affairs Select Committee Future of Policing in 21st Century

\(^{109}\) Ipos MORI 2008

Furthermore our contact management processes need to be reviewed in relation to the Varney Transformational Government Agenda which identifies the opportunities to deliver better public services through joining up service provision across the public sector, and by engaging more directly with users in the design and delivery of services. In addition, there needs to be more personal contact and face to face accountability in all public sector services. The Service stands ready to play its part.

If a coherent strategy can be supported by Government Policy around the above proposals, the Police Service will be better placed to meet the local expectations for policing. It would address the gap that currently exists between perceptions and reality of crime and community safety.

The Police Service, in adopting this local focus, would understand the different needs of a diverse and dynamic population. The needs of new communities and transient communities would be better met by a Police Service delivering against this local template. The Police Service would be in a better position to build feedback to ACPO Consultation on Home Affairs Select Committee Future of Policing in 21st Century.

The HMIC Report, “Closing the Gap”, revealed, in 2005 the extent of the gap in the adequate provision of capability and capacity to deal with serious threats to the public and national security. Since the publication of that report, ACPO acknowledges the very positive developments in relation to counter terrorism. The emerging structure of Counter Terrorism Units (CTU’s) Counter Terrorism Intelligence Units (CTIU’s) is an ACPO venture for collaboration at a National level. This is alongside a Metropolitan Police Service Counter Terrorism command, which has created a National capability and capacity and an enhanced partnership with other security agencies to meet the current threat. ACPO knows that the features of this arrangement that have enabled the counter terrorism gap to be addressed include: (1) new resources; and (2) a structure that is built on the existing foundation of the Police Service. ACPO believes that these two principles are necessary features in addressing other gaps around the protective services. For example, the gap in our ability to tackle serious and organised crime is assessed as a need to tackle 400 organised crime groups which have amassed £440 million of criminal wealth and which incurs a social and economic cost of between £20 billion to £40 billion per year. ACPO asserts that there remains a sizeable gap cannot be addressed by restructuring current assets alone, nor can it be addressed by creating some agency apart from the Police Service.

The Government response to the recommendations of the HMIC Report “Closing the Gap” was to propose the merger of Police Forces in order to ensure a strategic response and efficient and effective brigading of assets in order to address level 2 threats. The intention of this policy was to ensure that local policing could continue to be developed and volume crime addressed whilst, at the same time, addressing the level 2 threats in a more joined up and strategic fashion. The position of ACPO in relation to this proposal remains positively, though not unanimously, in favour of strategic merger of Police Forces in the future. If the Government is to move forward with this agenda, it needs to do so in co-operation with Forces, seeking to support in practical terms those who would benefit from mergers.

Since the HMIC Report, it is the contention of ACPO that there has been an increasing threat in serious crime and threats to safety and security. The responses to gangs and guns and to knife crime are cases in point. The work of ACPO in mapping organised crime has identified significant numbers of criminal groups committing serious crime across the country, involved in such offences as human trafficking and other international criminality; e-crime; fraud and exploitation.

There are some strategic responses to this widening gap as follows:

- Guns and Gangs Task Force led by ACPO.

111 “Service Transformation: a Better Service For Citizens and Businesses, a Better Deal for Taxpayers” Sir David Varney
112 Closing the Gap. HMIC Report 2005
113 ACPO TAM 2003
115 Home Secretary, Charles Clarke—speech to Chiefs and Chairs 19 September 2005
117 Realising Britain’s Potential: Future Strategic Challenges for Britain Cabinet Office. Feb. 2008 (p13)
118 Letter to T McNulty MP from Sir Ian Blair. 31/12/07. “Police Reform Green Paper” Also, CC Brain of Gloucestershire
— Development of the Office for Security and Counter Terrorism who have developed a revised strategy and delivery plan which embraces counter terrorist policing.

— Operations Reflex and Pentameter which tackle organised immigration and human trafficking, child exploitation and online protection centre supporting the Police Service.

— Furthermore ACPO has developed a comprehensive set of protective service standards\(^\text{120}\) that all Forces are required to meet. A gap analysis is being undertaken at this time within Forces and some Regions and Improvement Plans developed to close any gaps in capability and capacity.

Protective Services Demonstrator Sites to work collaboratively in closing the capability and capacity gap.

— ACPO support and development of Regional Intelligence Units and the ACPO approach to tackling Level 2 crime.

ACPO believe that planning for the policing of the Olympic Games will further highlight the difficulties that exist within the current structure and financing of Police Forces will reveal barriers to an effective National response to large scale events such as this. In addition, the Service needs to develop a capability and capacity to meet extraordinary demands which go beyond the normal requirements of the 43 Forces. The ACPO position is that the serious threats and risks faced by society have had insufficient attention and are unlikely to be met within current resource levels and structure. Fundamentally, whilst ACPO accepts the political reality of the CSR proposals, there are not enough resources invested in policing in England and Wales to meet both the local ambitions described in the previous chapter and the extent of serious risks faced by the public and the nation.\(^\text{121}\) This is reflected in the recommendations by Sir Ronnie Flanagan\(^\text{122}\) to top slice funding for better protective services. However, what is needed is additional investment in serious and organised crime and protective services and for this investment to be allocated by an appropriate formula which targets the areas of greatest need.

ACPO recommends that more resources are directed to address this protective service gap.

Some of the gaps in provision could be better addressed, though not entirely closed, by a more strategic response. This can be seen in the use of a lead force for economic crime, including fraud\(^\text{123}\). Barriers to this strategic response are a performance regime that is predominantly focused on volume crime (it is noted that APACS intend to address the serious as well).

Governance and funding streams are locally focused in 43 Police Force areas. Given the nature of some threats, it is not clear who is accountable for addressing the threat. Except where a crime has a direct impact on a locality, there is no overarching accountability for prioritisation and direction of investigations. The recent achievements in counter terrorism can be seen in the context of supplementing the local governance and funding streams with central co-ordination and allocation. The Home Office should also clarify governance with NCJB and work with the Ministry of Justice on the reduction of re-offending\(^\text{124}\).

The Serious and Organised Crime Agency (SOCA) is nearly two years old. The Police Service formerly had a Regional Crime Squad capability which in 1998 was merged into the National Crime Squad to work alongside the previously created (1992) National Criminal Intelligence Service. These two entities migrated into the Serious and Organised Crime Agency in April 2006.

There had already been a steady migration of NCS activity towards level 3 since their creation in 1998 and the very distinct SOCA priorities specifically mitigate against their involvement in the level 2 arena. This has, undoubtedly, widened the gap in the ability of the Police Service to tackle level 2 and level 3 crime. It is accepted by ACPO that SOCA has overarching responsibilities for addressing National and International threats beyond level 2 and level 3. An example of this growing gap is the hi-tech crime capability which used to be readily available to the Police Service and is now more distant because of this capability remaining with SOCA\(^\text{125}\). However, ACPO is developing a Memorandum of Understanding with SOCA to identify how these two organisations can better work together as well as developing a joint narrative of serious and organised crime to draw up proposals for the future. This may include a requirement for further resources but the use of those resources, eg to create further structures or to resource improved inter-force working through a “task to finish” approach, has yet to be finalised.

ACPO recommends that a closer alignment of SOCA’s priorities with the Police Service should be pursued. Alternatively, ACPO propose the development of a level 2 regional intelligence network and national capability which goes beyond producing intelligence. This would be created as an intermediate capacity and capability and linked directly with the Police Service. Options for the structure of this capability can be further considered.

---

\(^{120}\) ACPO Threshold Standards for Protective Services December 2007

\(^{121}\) Feedback by South Wales, Gloucestershire Police, ACPO Finance Committee to ACPO Consultation on Home Office Green Paper and Home Affairs Select Committee Future of Policing in 21st Century

\(^{122}\) Review of Policing (Recommendation 5) Sir Ronnie Flanagan

\(^{123}\) Feedback by City of London to ACPO Consultation on Home Affairs Select Committee Future of Policing in 21st Century

\(^{124}\) Feedback by Surrey Police to ACPO Consultation on Home Affairs Select Committee Future of Policing in 21st Century

\(^{125}\) Feedback by Sir Paul Scott-Lee, West Midlands Police, to ACPO Green Paper
Co-ordination of intelligence needs to be reviewed in the wake of the migration of NCIS. The National Intelligence Model remains the appropriate model for the management and deployment of intelligence. The ACPO position is that the local ie Force wide co-ordination of intelligence is fit for purpose.\textsuperscript{126} The Regional Intelligence Model and the Regional Counter Terrorism Intelligence Units provide the means for sharing cross-border intelligence.

In the case of serious and organised crime, however, there is a gap in National tasking and co-ordination. ACPO has already embarked upon a review of tasking and co-ordination at the Regional level and the intelligence links with National organisations\textsuperscript{127}.

ACPO recommends that the findings of the ACPO review informs and defines future tasking and co-ordination arrangements at both a Regional and National level.

The freedom of movement across European borders, and the increased global communications networks, makes our borders more vulnerable to breach by criminals and terrorists. ACPO’s position is that whilst control over borders is important, it needs to be balanced with an increase in security, which is appropriately funded and resourced.

The agency ought to inform Police Intelligence systems and the agency ought to be capable of being tasked around the interdiction of criminal movement across borders. This is being progressed by ACPO Crime Business Area\textsuperscript{128}.

ACPO recommends the establishment of a border capability that involves the Police Service as well as immigration and revenue and customs and balances the twin requirements of security and control.

The investigation of crimes being committed by organised crime groups often relies upon overt surveillance (eg CCTV and ANPR) and covert surveillance (technical monitoring of vehicles) overseen by a regulatory body. ACPO understand the need to maintain the trust and confidence of the public and Parliament in relation to its use of such methods.

ACPO has already given evidence to the Select Committee on the Constitution, House of Lords\textsuperscript{129} and will present again to the House of Commons on 18th March 2008. ACPO sets out the view that:

\begin{itemize}
  \item The reported descent into an Orwellian “Big Brother society” is more myth than reality. However, ACPO recognise that there remain concerns over privacy and freedom of speech.
  \item The development of widespread CCTV coverage is the result of a positive partnership between citizen and the State, rather than a degradation of the relationship between the two.
  \item Survey data indicates that citizens are very happy to support the development of surveillance and data acquisition mechanisms to achieve a balance between privacy and safety.
  \item The Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 (RIPA) has been an effective piece of legislation, but its implementation has placed an excessive bureaucratic burden on public authorities in relation to surveillance, in contrast to a much less regulated private sector.
  \item Technological advances have blurred the line between “surveillance” and “data collection”. This is one of many reasons why it is now time to re-visit the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000.
\end{itemize}

ACPO recommends that the checks and balances that currently regulate the use of such investigative procedures are sufficient and could be better explained to the public by an independent authority.

ACPO recommends that bulk data derived by technological means and held by other Government departments should be available to assist Police enquiries.

A point of real issue here is the Department of Transport capturing ANPR data that is not available to the Police.

In relation to the supply and criminal use of controlled drugs, ACPO support the creation and deployment of multi-agency drugs intervention programmes at a local level.

ACPO recommends the further development of drugs testing and assessment of prolific and persistent offenders. ACPO further recommends restrictions on bail for offenders assessed as likely to re-offend prolifically because of drug addiction. The treatment of offenders who comply with treatment interventions should continue to be part of the spectrum of responses\textsuperscript{130}.

Legislation has created the means for Police and other agencies to seize cash and assets from serious and organised criminals. The Police Service regard this asset focus as a means of deterring criminals and punishing them where it often hurts the most. The continued development of an asset recovery approach will contribute through taking the profit out of crime. These seized assets are predicted to increase in value. There is an opportunity for a virtuous cycle of further investing in addressing the Serious and Organised Crime gap by using seized and forfeited criminal assets to build that capability. At the moment the Police Service receives too small a proportion of seized assets (the majority goes to HM Treasury).

\textsuperscript{126} ACPO Crime Business Area. Intelligence Portfolio- Programme of Work. February 2008
\textsuperscript{127} Review of Regional Intelligence Units. (Terms of Reference) ACPO 4 February 2008
\textsuperscript{128} ACPO Crime Business Area. Cabinet Paper—9 January 2008
\textsuperscript{129} Association of Chief Police Officers. Crime Business Area. ACPO Submission to the Select Committee on the Constitution. House of Lords
\textsuperscript{130} Feedback by ACPO Drugs Committee to ACPO Consultation on Home Office Green Paper.
ACPO recommends that the proceeds of crime that are seized or ordered for forfeiture should be channelled into supporting the police capacity and capability to tackle such criminals. The current division of assets seized from criminals does not create the appropriate benefit to growing the police capability to counter the threat.

Further clarity is required around the role of the police and other agencies in preparing for and responding to critical and major incidents and civil emergencies. Budget pressures on responder agencies is affecting investment in this area, with Police Forces expected to fill the gap\(^{131}\).

ACPO recommends greater accountability for Local Authorities and other responder agencies around critical and major incidents and civil emergencies, or greater investment in the policing capability to meet this increasing burden.

\section*{Chapter Three

Central v Local

The tripartite arrangement for the governance and leadership of the Police Service in England and Wales is a balanced one that is established in statute. The parties to this arrangement reflect some profound and constitutional anchor points in British policing. The Home Secretary is responsible to Parliament and to the citizen for national security and community safety. The Home Secretary has powers to compel the Police Service to act in certain ways, powers to hold the Chief Constable or the Chair of the Police Authority to account. ACPO recognises that the Home Secretary has a role to play in directing national leadership and coherence around matters of organisational efficiency such as IT procurement for example.

The Chief Constable has independence from political control and has several points of accountability and scrutiny of his or her actions. (Appendix C) Traditionally, each Police Force has been subject to regular inspection by Her Majesty’s Inspector of Constabulary, a regulator independent of Government. However, ACPO recognises that there are too many bodies undertaking regulation and inspection of the Police Service, which leads to increased costs and bureaucracy.

The Police Authority is a local body representing the public of the area covered by the Police Force. The Police Authority is one of the manifestations of a local policing service. Its principle duties are\(^{132}\):

\begin{itemize}
  \item To consult with the public in the area covered by the Police Force about policing matters.
  \item To agree with the Chief Constable a strategic plan and priorities for the policing of that area.
  \item To appoint a Chief Constable/Commissioner for the area and other Senior Officers.
  \item To hold a Chief Constable to account for the actions of his or her Force, and to hold a Chief Constable to account for performance against the local policing plan.
  \item To raise a budget and to decide upon the local level of precept to maintain an efficient and effective Police Force in the area. The Policing Plan will take account of the budget available to Police the area.
\end{itemize}

This skeletal description of the roles of the three parties to the leadership and governance of policing in each of the 43 areas is not intended to be a comprehensive account, but rather one that positions the three elements in relationship to each other.

Changes to policy and legislation in recent years have influenced and skewed the dynamic that is involved in the relationship of these three parties. There are a number of new developments that create a drift towards the centre. These include:

\begin{itemize}
  \item National Policing Board chaired by the Home Secretary to determine Service strategy and Sub-Boards to oversee subordinate strategies.
  \item A statutory responsibility to meet the requirements of the National Policing Plan.
  \item Public Service Agreements and Key Performance Indicators which must be addressed.
  \item A statistically based and comparative Police Performance Assessment Framework (PPAF). This is due to give way to Assessments of Police and Community Safety (APACS).
  \item Interventions of a Police Standards Unit that have created a culture of compliance.
  \item Performance management of Chief Constables and performance related pay. Performance appraisal must take account of compliance with national targets.
  \item Fixed term appointments for Chief Constables which has significantly increased turnover in Police Leadership.
  \item Ring-fenced funding of initiatives, eg PCSO’s etc.
  \item Ministerial oversight of some specific initiatives, eg street crime, where a number of Forces were expected to comply with centrally directed tactics.
\end{itemize}

\(^{131}\) Feedback by Gloucestershire Police to ACPO Consultation on Home Affairs Select Committee Future of Policing in 21st Century.

\(^{132}\) Roles of a Police Authority—APA Internet Site
The situation, therefore, is that Chief Officers and Police Authorities are looking to the centre for the identification of priorities and for performance management. Forces and Authorities are, of course, seeking to reflect local priorities within their plans, but it is central targets that are irresistible and, therefore, overwhelm the local focus. The Chief Officer controls and PDR’s in conjunction with a plethora of targets have focused people to become more parochial. Therefore, ACPO propose model contracts and PDR’s which properly describe and rebalance national and local accountabilities for Chief Officers.

ACPO recommends that central priorities and targets take account of the need for flexibility around local priority setting.

ACPO recommends model contracts and PDR’s which properly describe and rebalance national and local accountabilities for Chief Officers.

It is clear that the priorities for local communities are often not a matter for the police alone. This is reflected in the current arrangements for partnership agreements involving other agencies at the local level. For example, Local Area Agreements determined by Local Strategic Partnerships and Annual Plans of CDRPs are ways in which Local Community Safety priorities find a voice and an accountability structure. ACPO recognises the ongoing development of APACS and of Comprehensive Area Assessments.

ACPO recommends that more focus be given to the means of holding such partnerships to account for the mutual provision of service against local priorities.

These arrangements should take into account “place-shaping” as identified by the Lyons Inquiry. This recommends that there should be a place focussed approach to deliver prosperous and cohesive communities. Government, regional partners and local authorities need to work together to provide a mechanism by which competing interests and risks are balanced. In addition, there needs to be collaborative working on economic development and a better balance between national and local priorities to drive improvements in local areas.

Central government should set some key priorities and monitor performance against these priorities. Central government should recognise, however, that this cannot be a description of the whole of the policing provision. There should be a requirement for Forces to set plans for meeting local priorities in conjunction with other local partners. Central government could rely upon public confidence and satisfaction become the metrics which bridge the central and local dimensions.

ACPO recognises the danger in having a purely local focus. Some commentators talk as if addressing the local gap in provision would resolve the whole policing mission. ACPO accepts that the provision of a local policing service, which addresses the priorities of the local community, is a principal and necessary role of the Police Service, but not the only one. There are some continental policing models which have a tiered structure for policing delivery which create unhelpful separation between the local concerns and serious criminality. A central tenet of ACPO is that the Service must be capable of tasking and co-ordinating activity from the National to the Local and from the Local to the National.

We have the National Intelligence Model (NIM) which provides a vehicle for this comprehensive prioritisation. NIM enables information to move freely between local level community intelligence and developed intelligence to trigger covert investigations. It is because of this connectivity that the Service must not be ‘balkanised’ into separate structures for neighbourhood policing; cross border policing activity; and National Security. All will be better addressed from the same starting point. The mechanisms for funding, Governance and accountability need to be recognised, however, that the whole spectrum of policing activity needs to be given due priority in parallel. To move to a heavily localised structure without recognising the broad mission is to skew the overall business in an unhelpful way.

ACPO recommends that the Police Service should remain a single integrated Service which is charged, funded and equipped to meet the broad requirements of policing.

The way the Service is configured and deployed to meet the terrorist threat represents a template for achieving this connectivity throughout the Service. CTU’s and CTIU’s have been established in hubs and regions so that there is a capability to tackle the threats from terrorism. There is a realisation in the Service, however, that CTU’s and CTIU’s must retain an operational connection with local policing.

The Police Authority remains an appropriate means of determining a standard level of local funding and the priorities for the Police Force. Their oversight at Force level is recognised. The accountability and performance management that is required at a more local level needs to supplement the work of the Police Authority.

ACPO recommends that, at the Force level, a Police Authority is appropriate for setting priorities and holding the Chief Constable to account for the Forcewide functions.

133 Feedback by Norfolk Constabulary to ACPO Consultation on Home Office Green Paper
135 Eg Policy Exchange Think Tank. Fitting the Bill Local Policing for the 21st Century 2007
136 Feedback by Northamptonshire Police to ACPO Consultation on Home Office Green Paper
One issue which adds to funding pressures is that of rigid capping, where a 5% maximum precept increase for all is set without taking into account the fact that some Forces start with precept levels that are double those of other forces. Therefore, any future capping guidance will need to allow greater flexibility for Forces/Authorities with below average precepts. It should also take into account the fact that “gearing” of Police Authority/Force precepts is greater than for local authorities (at least double) therefore a 5% for all has a greater impact on Police budgets.

ACPO recommends that council tax capping guidance should allow greater flexibility to Police Forces and Police Authorities which have below the average precept levels.

The Local Strategic Partnership might involve local citizens as part of a more local accountability. ACPO recognise that this is not a separate and additional Police accountability, but rather an accountability of what local public sector partners are doing or not doing to meet the needs of the citizen around community safety. Senior Police officers should be engaged in the Local Area Agreement process, linked to the LSP, which should effectively reflect local priorities and concerns. In addition decisions on policing should be made as close as possible to the people who are affected by them.

ACPO recommends that local accountability against local plans should be additional to the Police Authority structure and should be multi agency in approach.

There is a need to encourage partnerships to put money into policing if there is a need to tackle a local issue and which meets the common good.

ACPO recommends that Local Strategic Partnerships should have the facility to raise and deploy funds at a more local level, particularly for partnership activity aimed at meeting very local priorities. The Police Authority would ensure that the whole policing area is receiving a standard level of policing service.

ACPO acknowledges that this may raise some concerns, however, the important point is that additional funds are made available for the very local dimension of policing.

Alongside this recommendation there is an opportunity to provide additional resources at a local level from housing developers which, if legislation were more prescriptive, would require them to invest in local infrastructure when growing the size of a community. In addition, increased powers to charge would enable Forces to recover all of the consequential costs from profit making festivals and sporting events and not just the on-site policing costs as at present. This would assist Force budgets and thereby release funds.

ACPO recommends the extension of Town and Country Planning regulations to encompass the impact on police services.

ACPO recommends Forces be given increased powers to charge major event organisers.

There are opportunities for joint funding of initiatives, for example, through CDRP’s, LSP’s and Government Office. Also, at a regional level, Forces can work collaboratively to attract EU Funding. These funding streams need to be focused on the long term and not distract or divert resources towards short term results at the expense of long term plans and priorities.

At a local level, there have been many short term initiatives funded by the Home Office, Forces and partners. However, this has skewed activity away from longer term problems as Forces and BCU’s have sometimes become too focused on short term initiatives which attracted funding. Therefore, there needs to be a longer term view and a prioritisation of what is important. Consequently, the move to local financing should be encouraged, but this must come with a release of central controls on ring-fenced budgets.

However, ACPO does not recommend BCU Commanders have separate budgets as a share of the Force resources. Budgets ought to be devolved to them by Chief Constables and Police Authorities.

ACPO recommends that budgets for local policing arrangements should be directed through local Police Authorities and Chief Constables. There should be no direct grant funding to BCU level.

More serious crime is that which is beyond what a Force could effectively tackle, is dealt with through Regional Tasking and Co-ordination. However, regional governance structures are in their infancy and rely upon Memoranda of Understanding between Forces to overcome legal, human resource, IT, and financial issues and processes which are not compatible with such working. Likewise, while there are Regional Government Offices, these are separate from Police regional and national activity and it may be appropriate to review their role as they relate to policing arrangements. This accountability gap is partly addressed by recent legislation which requires Police Authorities to look beyond their own boundaries and seek collaborative opportunities.

ACPO support the current work on national collaboration around some non strategic areas. However, this requires pump prime funding and the Government is encouraged to make it available. Collaboration should be on the basis of the pursuit of genuinely improved processes and outcomes, while investment in partnership activities should be on the basis of a demonstrable financial benefit.

\(^{137}\) Feedback by Surrey Police to ACPO Consultation on Home Office Green Paper and Home Affairs Select Committee Future of Policing in 21st Century.

\(^{138}\) Feedback by Sussex Police to ACPO Consultation on Home Office Green Paper and Home Affairs Select Committee Future of Policing in 21st Century.

\(^{139}\) Section 106 Town and Country Planning Act 1990

\(^{140}\) Feedback by Gloucestershire Police to ACPO Consultation on Home Affairs Select Committee Future of Policing in 21st Century.

\(^{141}\) Feedback by Northamptonshire Police to ACPO Consultation on Home Office Green Paper

\(^{142}\) A national programme on shared services. CC Bernard Hogan-Howe.
Not everything is best delivered by individual Forces working in isolation or in a collaborative effort. For the Service to effectively and efficiently deliver local policing, respond to incidents and ensure that protective services have sufficient capability and capacity, there is the need for standardisation and connectedness between business processes and IT. Technology is linked to bureaucracy and the increasing differentiation of systems leads to increased bureaucratic processes to feed and manage them.

ACPO recommends that NPIA devise a plan to migrate from local IT databases to National IT databases and this should be done at a Service-wide level rather than expecting all Forces to sign up to a common plan.

National standards could be used to support national processes, for example the ACPO Threshold Standards on Protective Services. These standards could provide a national benchmark on Service delivery. However, it is important not to interpret or implement standards as extra performance indicators. Instead they could assist Forces in providing a consistent approach to service delivery.

ACPO recognises that any standards that are imposed on the Service should be properly costed beforehand to ensure their affordability within the spectrum of activity required of each Force.

In addition, it is recognised that there are many different terms and conditions of employment within the Service. It would be beneficial to have standard terms and conditions of employment, including the development of a national pay and reward strategy, to help remove barriers to employee mobility and deployment. This would improve national capability and capacity, particularly in light of the challenges the Service will face in the future.

ACPO recommends that Staff Terms and Conditions of employment be developed at a national level to improve Service capability and flexibility.

The most important asset the police service has is its staff. In order for the police service to meet the challenges of the future the Service needs to develop the required skills for 21st Century Policing. This will require proper investment in training and development and appropriate levels of funding to build capability and capacity through the NPIA. This work needs to link with the Workforce Modernisation Programme being developed by NPIA and the HMIC recommendation for a 10 year workforce plan to match skills and aptitudes to roles and tasks.145

In summary, the central controls need to be strategically applied to those aspects of a multi-Force Service to ensure capability where necessary and effectiveness against national threats. There is also a place for the Centre to describe how the Service may undertake some functions in a more efficient fashion.

However, the local nature of policing is constrained by the current centralist focus and levers. Government need to trust the Service to work, with local partners, in meeting local priorities and make room in the performance management framework for this local difference. An additional local accountability could be created around the Local Strategic Partnership.

CHAPTER FOUR

Recommendations

Chapter 1

1. ACPO recommends a commitment to neighbourhood policing. There are core principles of neighbourhood policing that we would wish to see established and any Government policies should take account of these features. (Features listed in Chapter 1).

2. ACPO recommends the extension of Community Justice Courts and the further streamlining of summary justice (Simple Speedy Summary Justice Initiative).

3. ACPO recommends that PCSO’s should be employed by mainstream, not discretionary funding.

4. ACPO recommends that the development of other patrolling functions, supported by central or local funding, should support the neighbourhood policing approach of the Police Force concerned.

5. ACPO recommends the Local Strategic Partnership as the model for local multi-agency priority setting (see further in Chapter 3).

6. ACPO recommends the rejection of the notion of an elected Commissioner or “Sheriff”. We do not recommend the municipalisation of the Service.

7. ACPO recommends that Government implements the recommendations of the Smith Review.

143 Recommendations 10 and 11 Review of Policing. HMIC Sir Ronnie Flanagan.
144 Feedback by Suffolk Constabulary to ACPO Consultation on Home Office Green Paper and Home Affairs Select Committee Future of Policing in 21st Century.
Chapter 2

8. ACPO recommends that more resources are directed to address this protective service gap.

9. ACPO recommends that a closer alignment of SOCA’s priorities with the Police Service should be pursued. Alternatively, ACPO propose that a capability be created as an intermediate capacity and linked directly with the Police Service. Options for the structure of this capability can be further considered.

10. ACPO recommends that the findings of the ACPO review inform and define future tasking and co-ordination arrangements, particularly at a national level.

11. ACPO recommends the establishment of a border capability that involves the Police Service as well as immigration and revenue and customs and balances the twin requirements of security and control.

12. ACPO recommends that the checks and balances that currently regulate the use of such investigative procedures are sufficient and should be better explained to the public by an independent authority.

13. ACPO recommends that bulk data derived by technological means and held by other Government departments should be available to assist Police inquiries.

14. ACPO recommends the further development of drugs testing and assessment of prolific and persistent offenders. ACPO further recommends restrictions on bail for offenders assessed as likely to re-offend prolifically because of drug addiction. The treatment of offenders who comply with treatment interventions should continue to be part of the spectrum of responses.

15. ACPO recommends that the proceeds of crime that are seized or ordered for forfeiture should be channelled into supporting the police capacity and capability to tackle such criminals. The current division of assets seized from criminals does not create the appropriate benefit to growing the police capability to counter the threat.

16. ACPO recommends greater accountability for Local Authorities and other responder agencies around critical and major incidents and civil emergencies, or greater investment in the policing capability to meet this increasing burden.

Chapter 3

17. ACPO recommends that central priorities and targets take account of the need for flexibility around local priority setting.

18. ACPO recommends model contracts and PDR’s which properly describe and re balance national and local accountabilities for Chief Officers.

19. ACPO recommends that more focus be given to the means of holding such partnerships to account for the mutual provision of service against local priorities.

20. ACPO recommends that the Police Service should remain a single integrated Service which is charged, funded and equipped to meet the broad requirements of policing.

21. ACPO recommends that, at the Force level, a Police Authority is appropriate for setting priorities and holding the Chief Constable to account for the Force wide functions.

22. ACPO recommends that council tax capping guidance should allow greater flexibility to Police Forces and Police Authorities which have below the average precept levels.

23. ACPO recommends that local accountability against local plans should be additional to the Police Authority structure and should be multi agency in approach.

24. ACPO recommends that Local Strategic Partnerships should have the facility to precept at a more local level, particularly for partnership activity aimed at meeting very local priorities. The Police Authority would ensure that the whole policing area is receiving a standard level of policing service.

25. ACPO recommends the extension of Town and Country Planning regulations to encompass the impact on police services.

26. ACPO recommends Forces be given increased powers to charge major event organisers.

27. ACPO recommends that budgets for local policing arrangements should be directed through local Police Authorities and Chief Constables. There should be no direct grant funding to BCU level.

28. ACPO recommends that NPIA devise a plan to migrate from local IT databases to National IT databases and this should be done at a Service-wide level rather than expecting all Forces to sign up to a common plan.

29. ACPO recommends that Staff Terms and Conditions of employment be developed at a national level to improve Service capability and flexibility.

Feedback by ACPO Drugs Committee to ACPO Consultation on Home Office Green Paper.
Introduction

The Royal Academy of Engineering is pleased to contribute to the Home Affairs Select Committee inquiry on “Policing in the 21st Century”. This response has been compiled using contributions from key Fellows of the Academy. Whilst we recognise that the inquiry covers a wide range of matters, we have restricted our attention to the issues concerning the use of technology to enable police officers to return to the beat. Supplementary evidence can be provided if required.

Our response covers the following:

2. The police radio system “Airwave”.
3. Mobile data technology and advanced communication technologies.
4. Networked systems for operational coordination.
5. Digital information storage.
6. Conclusions.

1. Science and IT in the Home Office

1.1 In the Home Office there is a lack of integration between Science and IT (in relation to policing). The Police IT Organisation (PITO) is now part of the National Policing Improvement Agency (NPIA), which is a non-departmental public body. There is a disparity between science in the NPIA and the Home Office, partly due to separate budgets. There is also insufficient clarity and understanding of the major differences between the supply of computers and administrative networks, and the use of advanced communications and IT. Consequently there is an overall lack of coordination, policy and strategy for advanced systems in policing.

1.2 The Home Office has a programme of research into future technologies which utilises the facilities of the Home Office Scientific Development Branch (HOSDB). There are many useful technologies being developed and maintained, including body armour, fingerprint detection and sensors. However science, technology and engineering in the Home Office are under-funded and the NPIA has recently suffered budget cuts. More funding and resources are needed to improve research into technologies for policing.

2. The police radio system “Airwave”

2.1 Radio technology expenditure has been dominated by the Airwave system, provided by BT and Motorola. This is based on Terrestrial Trunked Radio (TETRA) digital technology, which replaced analogue systems. This platform is capable of supporting text and video formats but is primarily used for secure voice communications, and has been fairly successful. However, the amount of voice traffic is now reaching the limits of the current system’s spectrum resources in some areas (particularly in London). This suggests that the Airwave system will be inadequate for the future needs of the police forces, particularly in densely populated areas where information needs are likely to exceed the TETRA network’s capacity.

2.2 Airwave has limited (narrow) bandwidth and data capability. Existing equipment is capable of carrying more traffic but additional spectrum is required. Rather than use another band it would be easier and less expensive to expand the band assigned to Airwave to the full range. In the UK, military users occupy the part of the band not assigned to Airwave, so this expansion would need to be managed carefully. Spectrum-based solutions are unavoidable because officers on the beat have to be mobile.

2.3 While it is a relatively simple solution, expanding the Airwave band may still not be sufficient to cope with future policing needs. As the requirements for data transmission increase, bandwidth needs will also increase. A wireless broadband technology system will be necessary to cope with this, such as Worldwide Interoperability for Microwave Access (WiMAX). The high capacity technology may be used on a local or temporary basis, as required. Terminal devices with appropriate graphical and textual interfaces will be vital.

2.4 The TETRA-based Airwave system could also be improved using the compatible TETRA Enhanced Data Service (TEDS).
3. Mobile data technology and advanced communication technologies

3.1 Better mobile data and communication technologies will reduce time spent at stations, enabling officers to spend more time on the beat.

3.2 The efficiency of information gathering could be improved in various ways. Information gathering using multiple choice options could speed the entry of information into records, with automated analysis for simpler aspects of reporting. More complex information could be recorded by dictation, with officers simply correcting the automatically generated transcription.

3.3 Transmission of good quality images would improve the knowledge and capability of officers away from the station. There is increasing interest in using video services for policing. Communication of high-quality visual information can have a significantly positive impact on cooperative action in a variety of situations (eg suspect identification). However, the spectrum issues already mentioned will restrict the volume of visual information that can be transmitted. Also, higher data rate channels may be required for the high resolution images that would be needed for evidential purposes.

4. Networked systems for operational coordination

4.1 A significant revolution would occur if the military concepts of Network Centric Operations (NCO) were properly applied to policing. The fundamental concept of NCO is based on situational awareness. The aim would be to deter or defeat criminals by achieving and maintaining “information superiority” through the robust networking of well informed officers, ie communicating precise information accurately to officers who have the capability to examine and act upon the data rapidly. NCO increases connections between officers, vehicles and control centres, leading to more rapid responses, accuracy and personal protection of officers.

4.2 An essential enabler of NCO would be a local encrypted network with broadband capability and mesh technology. This would increase coverage, reliability and secure connections between officers, vehicles, stations and control centres. However these requirements cannot be provided by Airwave.

4.3 Examples of NCO enabling technologies could include:

- Intelligent CCTV and analytical software (eg Aralia Systems software) to allow control centres to identify disturbances immediately.
- Transponders in vehicles and carried by officers to signal their locations to command local posts.
- Facial recognition using high resolution police camera technology.
- Deployable sensors with wireless access and links to emergency services (eg for chemical release emergencies).

4.4 Network-centric operations require an information system able to give controllers the right data at the right time. This would require changes to network architecture. This architecture would link data streams and analysis from many sources, including legacy systems. Existing systems must be integrated into the architecture without change. The result would be rapid development of integrated operations for police controllers, transforming policing. The networked police officer will be able to access data sources, call for rapid assistance and communicate instantly with control centres and stations. Emergency co-ordination and response will be significantly improved, particularly if there is integration with the other emergency services (eg fire and ambulance).

4.5 National standards and interfaces (including technical and information standards) will be essential to allow systems and technologies to evolve in the future.

5. Digital information storage

5.1 Digital storage technologies would allow officers to be personally equipped with significant repositories of information before going on the beat, although this would only be suitable for low confidentiality non-sensitive information. Digital storage could also be used for information collection during operations. This would minimise the need for paper based systems and provide a richer and more accurate source of intelligence and reports. Data would be secured and time stamped to ensure evidential quality.

5.2 Where information from officers on the beat could not be relayed back reliably in real time, temporary storage on a personal device would be possible using appropriate short-range, high-speed wireless interfaces.

5.3 Non-sensitive information suitable for digital storage could include community briefings, mapping and hazard identification (potentially using Global Positioning Systems (GPS) to enhance information).
6. Conclusions

6.1 There should be better integration of science in the Home Office (ie the HOSDB) and the NPIA’s police IT functions.

6.2 To meet the needs of the police in the 21st century it is necessary to create products rather than invent new technologies, (although research into emerging technologies is still vital). The spectrum needed to deliver certain information services is not currently available, and this is a severely limiting factor.

6.3 The overheads and cost of transition to new systems can be significant, especially as individual police forces represent relatively small operations. In addition, many police forces operate in an autonomous manner. Implementing solutions on a force by force basis risks fragmentation, which would be a barrier to integration across police forces and wider emergency services. In addition, a fragmented approach may not attract the attention of the global technology companies who would implement new complex programmes. Therefore effective management of transitions will be as critical as the technology itself to secure ultimate benefits. Technologies should be introduced as part of a wider re-engineering of operational processes, particularly information systems.
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APPENDIX 24

Memorandum submitted by the former Mayor of London, Ken Livingstone

1. Summary and Recommendations

1.1 The Mayor welcomes the opportunity to respond to the Home Affairs Committee inquiry into Policing in the 21st century.

1.2 This submission examines policing (particularly focusing on the London region) and the need to manage risk. It draws upon Sir Ronnie Flanagan’s Report and raises issues relevant for debate on Police Reform in the Green Paper this spring.

1.3 This submission also examines models of policing which are, on the face of it, conflicting, on the one hand community driven reactive policing and on the other centrally driven pro-active policing. It brings these models together to suggest an approach which is both community orientated and evidence led; and which manages risk with appropriate and accountable control.

1.4 The submission suggests a more co-ordinated approach particularly across London drawing on the tenets of “Policing by Consent”. It makes a number of recommendations to bring about a cultural shift in policing for the 21st Century, which is underpinned by a structure of accountability that ensures good governance and active citizenship.

1.5 The Mayor’s key recommendations are as follows:

Priority Setting

— A more coordinated approach across neighbourhoods and regions to ensure responsive and accountable policing for the 21st Century.
— Reform should include the Mayor of London undertaking the MPA’s executive functions and the London Assembly undertaking the MPA’s scrutiny functions.
— The City of London Police and the British Transport Police in London should be incorporated into the Metropolitan Police.
— That the Londonwide Community Safety Partnership participates in the strategic assessment process, supported by the GLA.
— That Equalities Impact Assessments continue to be applied to the structure and functions of the MPS.

Community Concerns

— The Mayor stresses the importance of integrating the GLA as part of briefing on security issues in the lead up to and during the Olympics, to ensure strategic regional coordination and a partnership approach to community safety.
— Continued transparency when dealing with stop and searches.
— The Mayor recommends that the Press Complaints Commission (PCC) should be invited to issue guidance on the use of accurate terminology and sensitivity in reporting on anti-terrorism issues.
— The Mayor recommends the use of s44 of the Terrorism Act should be kept under review in terms of its effectiveness in preventing terrorist attacks, and the impact it has on reassurance of key communities.

Public involvement
— The Mayor recommends good practice from Safer Neighbourhood Panels, Community Police Consultative Groups, and community participants should be utilised in wider training.

PCSOs
— The Mayor believes that any changes to the make up of Safer Neighbourhood teams should only be made with careful consideration of staff and public confidence, and taking account of public accessibility to front-line police officers.

Use of technology
— The Mayor broadly agrees with Sir Ronnie Flanagan’s recommendations on using technology to speed up stop and account whilst retaining the ability to monitor disproportionality
— The Mayor recommends full evaluations of the use, impact and cost of “Tazers” and “Mosquitos”. This should cover any health risks, when usage of these is appropriate, and any effects on public and police confidence.

Front-line policing
— The Mayor broadly agrees with proposals to streamline processes, provided this does not lose valuable evidence and information, and does not prejudice the right to a fair trial.

Funding and available resources
— The Mayor believes that the current damping arrangements must be maintained as no detailed evidence or rationale has been presented to justify the potentially significant shifts in resources that would otherwise occur.
— The Mayor recommends that the MPS ensures that a significantly larger percentage of its allocation of recovered assets be targeted at investment in a wide range of sustainable community and voluntary sector crime reduction partnership initiatives. The GLA will assist in the co-ordination and distribution of these assets.

Recruitment and retention
— The Mayor recommends that Equalities Impact Assessments continue to be applied to the structure and functions of the MPS.

2. Introduction

2.1 The Mayor recognises the achievements of the police service in implementing an ongoing major reform programme. During this process, performance has improved. Crime figures have fallen for the fifth year in a row in London and are now at the lowest level for nine years. This trend of falling crime in the capital coincides with increases in numbers of uniformed officers from 25,430 in 2000 to 35,256 this year.\(^4\)

2.2 These successes do not always translate into public perception. In addition, crime and victimisation have disproportionate impacts on some communities. Crime remains a major concern for the public and therefore also of major importance to the Mayor.

\(^4\) MPS Workforce data Dec 2007. Figures include PCSOs
3. SCANNING THE GROUND, SETTING THE SCENE, RAISING THE QUESTIONS

3.1 The Mayor agrees with Sir Ronnie Flanagan that co-ordination between the police and other partners is vital, so as to sustain and co-ordinate efforts to address the problem of crime. This co-ordination is particularly important for London, which accounts for 17% of recorded crime and has particularly complex governance arrangements.

3.2 At a neighborhood level the successful roll out of Safer Neighborhood teams represents a significant achievement. Ongoing and effective community support is vital to their continuing delivery and to building public confidence.

3.3 Improved confidence brings increased expectations. London currently enjoys very high rates of public confidence in its policing. However, many Londoners still suffer disproportionate impacts from crimes including fear and harm from drug markets and gun violence.

3.4 The policing services at regional and national level address the harm of more serious organised crime. The police family act proactively in relation to perceived risks, putting effort and resources into strategies to “target” offenders that appear to present a sufficient level of threat or nuisance. However further consideration is needed of the correct proportionality between risk and control, in the context of increasing demands, and taking account of issues of sustainability and accountability.

3.5 The Mayor believes that further co-ordinated efforts across police services, as well as across multi-agency partnerships, would increase benefit. Co-ordination is key to correct identification of problems and in formulating the most effective responses, particularly in disrupting networks of criminals operating illicit markets in drugs, arms and people. However, this co-ordination must incorporate accountability.

3.6 There is evidence to suggest that perceptions of community harms may not always match evidenced threats. At first glance this could suggest that a targeted approach to policing ie “intelligence led policing” (ILP) conflicts with reactive responses to individual crimes flagged up by communities through “neighbourhood” policing.

3.7 Therefore the Mayor suggests a more coordinated approach across neighbourhoods and regions to ensure responsive and accountable policing.

4. CO-ORDINATION AND TRI-PARTITE ACCOUNTABILITY

4.1 The Mayor agrees with Sir Ronnie Flanagan’s Report that “policing is a public service and one that can only be effectively carried out with the support and consent of the public”149. Sir Ronnie asks whether the current balance of accountability and priority setting between the Home Office, Police Authorities and Chief Constables is appropriate. It is a common view that the balance of tripartite accountability has shifted excessively towards central Government, for example the Serious Organised Crime Agency (SOCA) was created with direct accountability to the Home Office.

4.2 Police authorities provide a degree of local accountability; in London, we have the Metropolitan Police Authority (MPA). The Flanagan Report suggests that police authorities would benefit from a higher profile. Moreover, the report explores the options for structural accountability. One of the suggested options for change is the introduction of directly elected elements into policing. The elected individual would be directly accountable to the electorate and would have the power to hire/fire Chief Constables. They would hold performance of the force to account, and set targets and policing plans. They would still be subject to National Performance Assessment through measurement, priority setting and the activities of an Inspectorate. Consideration in the Flanagan Report is given to whether this role should be given to the Mayor in London.150

4.3 The Mayor recognises the need for a robust and successful tripartite relationship between government, police and communities and believes that reform is required which simplifies the currently over-complex governance and force structures in London. This reform should include the Mayor undertaking the MPA’s executive functions, the Assembly undertaking the MPA’s scrutiny functions. The Mayor also believes that the City of London Police and the British Transport Police in London should be incorporated into the Metropolitan Police.

4.4 The Mayor further suggests there is a need to ensure greater coherence between police accountability and wider accountability structures. In the case of London the committee should examine the relationships between the Government Office for London and the GLA in supporting the work of Local Strategic Partnerships, Local Criminal Justice Boards and Local Crime and Disorder Partnerships. Greater public accountability requires clear and transparent processes rather than the currently confused and over-complex landscape.

150 The Review of Policing by Sir Ronnie Flanagan, pp 89.
5. Bridging the Gap in Policing by Consent: Neighbourhood and Regional Level

5.1 The Safer Neighbourhoods initiative and the expansion of PCSO and Special Constable activity exemplify the recent shift to more community based policing.

5.2 Total Notifiable Offences (TNO’s) have been falling steadily. Between June 2004 and September 2007 TNO’s fell 16%. With the introduction of Safer Neighbourhood teams in April 2004 there does appear to be a positive association with reducing crime levels. We also note that confidence in policing in London rose from 53% in July–Sept 2006, to 58% for October–December 2007. These findings suggest that Safer Neighbourhoods policing is providing community reassurance and helping to bridge the gap between falling crime and fear of crime, whilst also having an impact on crime levels.

5.3 From reports produced by Iquanta (Home Office) comparing the MPS with its most similar forces, the MPS is leading the field in confidence in local policing with a gap of 5% to the nearest comparable force (Merseyside). This finding reinforces the positive impact that local Safer Neighbourhood teams have had in London. A more detailed analysis can be found in Appendix 1.

5.4 The Mayor believes one of the main features of sustainability and improvement is ensuring community support for policing. In the Mayor’s view, community support is earned through responsiveness and trust, and through professional and appropriate police interactions with the public.

5.5 Recommendations have been made for accountability through the Mayor at the London Regional level. At a local level we recognise the impact that some Safer Neighbourhood Panels and Community Police Consultative Groups (CPCG’s) have had on involving local people to help encourage cultural change in the police. The Mayor recommends good practice from Safer Neighbourhood Panels, Community Police Consultative Groups, and community participants should be utilised in wider training. For example, Lambeth CPCG is recognised by a recent stop and search evaluation by the London School of Economics as a model of good practice in stop and search monitoring.

5.6 The demand for a cultural shift away from inequitable and unfair policing practices (particularly in the case of stop and search) has been detailed in the Stephen Lawrence Report and policy documents from the Mayor of London. Recommendations from the Mayor which enhance transparency when dealing with stop and searches include proposals to:
   — Continue to compile and publish data on proportionality in stop and searches.
   — To monitor and publish data on repeat searches.
   — To reduce searches not requiring reasonable grounds.
   — To create access to Standard Operating Procedures (SOP’s) for stop searches.
   — Develop and engagement strategy for s44 and s60 stops and search powers.
   — Demonstrate the proficiency and of training for staff at all ranks in the exercise of stop and search powers.
   — Ensure search are linked to crime pattern and analysis and planned operations.

5.7 The Mayor is aware of the resources the police have to meet these expectations. The Mayor proposes that the above recommendations should be fully taken up and resourced through efficiency savings made by the use of technology.

5.8 The Mayor is aware of the proposals for stop and account and the estimated efficiency savings these could bring. The Mayor broadly agrees with Sir Ronnie Flanagan’s recommendation on the use of technology to speed up stop and account and the monitoring of disproportionality through technology, but considers further consultation is vital.

5.9 By linking searches to intelligence including crime pattern analysis, the strengths of local reactive policing and intelligence led policing can be combined.

5.10 Sir Ronnie Flanagan’s report raises the importance of criminological knowledge. Recent reports from crime policy experts identify developments that may assist greater integration of police intelligence processes with wider community perspectives. This includes the growing practice of police commanders inviting representatives of other agencies to become members of Strategic Tasking and Coordinating Groups. Efforts are also being made in some areas to link up National Intelligence Model processes (the production of Strategic Assessments) with those of Community Safety Partnerships.

5.11 The Mayor proposes that the London wide Community Safety Partnership participate in Strategic Assessment, supported by the GLA as a way of reducing the apparent tension in policing between, on the one hand, the trend towards strategic planning based on analysis of crime patterns and intelligence and, on the other, the current emphasis on responding to community fears and demands for more attention to “anti-social behaviour” or individual offences.

---

151 Maguire, Mike and John, Tim (2006) “Intelligence Led Policing, Managerialism and Community Engagement: Competing Priorities and the Role of the National Intelligence Model in the UK”, Policing and Society, 16:1, 67–85
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6. Concerns and Proportionate Responses

Terrorism

6.1 The Mayor is committed to tackling terrorism and is acutely aware of the fact there remains a serious and sustained threat from international terrorism to the UK and in particular London.

6.2 The Mayor recognises the rationale behind s44 of the Terrorism Act 2000 as part of a strategic approach to address the risk and whilst the Mayor believes that it is important that police officers have the use of this power in order that they can prevent and deter terrorist activity, it is important to monitor its impact on community confidence.

6.3 Very few arrests for terrorism offences have occurred as a result of s44 stops & searches in London. Out of a combined total of 16,206 s44 stops & searches carried out during 2001–02 and 2002–03, only 13 arrests were terrorist related.\(^ {152}\) BAME community groups in London have indicated that the use of these powers is having an increasing corrosive effect on community confidence that undermines policing by consent in the fight against terrorism.

6.4 Throughout the prolonged period of “heightened alert”, we need to remember that new terrorism remains a high consequence, and low-probability risk. With this in mind the Mayor recommends the use of s44 of the Terrorism Act should be kept under review in terms of its effectiveness to prevent terrorist attacks and the impact it has on reassurance. The review should probe the usefulness of information gathered by such interactions as compared with reduced confidence by some communities and the potential loss of valuable community support in anti radicalisation strategies.

6.5 Whilst the Mayor recognises that media interest in counter-terrorism is valid, he believes this must be balanced by fair, accurate and sensitive reporting. The Mayor recommends that the Press Complaints Commission (PCC) should be invited to issue guidance on the use of accurate terminology and sensitivity in reporting on anti-terrorism issues.

Olympics

6.7 With regard to the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games the Mayor has a full team assisting with planning and preparation which includes as one of its functions paying due regard and consideration the community safety aspects of the games. Hosting the 2012 Games will require a significant security effort. Policing will be an essential element of this.

6.8 The Olympic Security Directorate, led by the Security Coordinator for the Games, Assistant Commissioner Tariq Ghaffur of the Metropolitan Police plans to deliver a safe, secure and resilient Games. In addition to providing effective and proportionate security, one of the key objectives of plans for Games security is to ensure community confidence and satisfaction with the security approach for the Games. The Mayor stresses the importance of the GLA being briefed on security issues in the lead up to and during the Olympics and recommends that the GLA be party to Tasking and Co-ordination relevant to a partnership approach in ensuring community safety.

6.9 It is envisaged that there will be high visibility of policing during the Olympic Games as this provides significant reassurance as well as providing sign-posting for the public, and information for more specialist policing units. It is likely that PCSOs will play a significant part in visible patrolling.

7. The Role of the PCSO

7.1 PCSOs were introduced to London on 11 September 2002 through the Police Reform Act 2002. PCSOs are posted to the 630 Safer Neighbourhood teams across London and also deployed in the MPS Transport OCU, Royal Parks, airport security and central London security patrols. Local authorities, housing providers and businesses have also invested in additional PCSOs. PCSOs are a uniformed presence and help the MPS to increase public satisfaction levels. They contribute to the performance of Safer Neighbourhood teams in terms of visibility, intelligence gathering, community consultation and accountability.

7.2 The diversity of the PCSO workforce has helped achieve the MPS’ vision to create a service that reflects the population of London—a large number of PCSOs are female or from black and ethnic minority groups which helps to build trust and confidence with the variety of communities in London.

7.3 Given the current success of Safer Neighbourhood teams any suggestions with regard to greater flexibility and the interchangability of Neighbourhood Officers and PCSO’s should be considered carefully. The Mayor believes that any changes to the make up of Safer Neighbourhood teams should only be made with careful consideration of staff and public confidence, and taking account of public accessibility to frontline police officers.

8. FRONT-LINE POLICING

8.1 The use of technology in disenabling suspects or dispersing groups through the use of Tazer and Mosquitoes is yet to be given a full and frank debate despite the potential risks involved in deploying these methods.

8.2 The Mayor recommends full evaluations of the use, impact and cost of “Tazers” and “Mosquitos”. This should cover any health risks, when usage of these is appropriate, and any effects on public and police confidence.

8.3 With respect to front-line police work the Mayor agrees with Sir Ronnie Flanagan that front line police officers should not spend a disproportionate amount of time undertaking paperwork. However he also believes it is important that good evidence is captured and recorded. The Mayor broadly agrees with Office for Criminal Justice Reform (OCJR) Guidance for a streamlined process in as far as the practice does not lose valuable evidence and information and it does not prejudice the right to a fair trial. The Mayor recognises the potential benefits of this approach to enable further deployment of front line staff.

9. DEPLOYMENT OF FINANCIAL RESOURCES

9.1 We know from the last full formula review in 2005 the difficulty of achieving a formula that reflects all of London’s unique needs alongside those of forces elsewhere in the country. The Mayor did not support the changes made to the police formula in the last review and therefore strongly opposed any proposal to reduce the level of the grant floor over time as has now been proposed in the Flanagan Report. It was clear then that London’s needs are not well reflected in these formulae which are a best fit for all authorities and do not fully capture London’s unique circumstances.

9.2 If needs based grant is to remain a key element of the grant system it is necessary for a fundamental review of this formula during the coming spending review period and therefore there is no case for removing damping protection before 2011–12. Indeed the Mayor was pleased that the floor has been set a constant 2.5% across the next three financial years as he had called for as part of the consultation that took place on changes to damping in the autumn of 2007. This is particularly important since the overall increase in resources is lower than in the last settlement.

9.3 The GLA remains at the grant floor over the next settlement period and we do not believe the revised formula reflects the level of need in London for day-to-day policing.

9.4 The Mayor believes that the current damping arrangements must be maintained in the absence of a better formula as no detailed evidence or rationale has been presented to justify the potentially significant shifts in resources that would otherwise occur. The Flanagan report suggests the changes in grant that would occur would only be significant for those authorities that would otherwise lose more than 5% of grant. However, although the GLA grant would only remain approximately frozen in cash terms if the formula was introduced without damping, this represents some £44 million in 2008–09 and accounts for around 30% of the entire cost of damping in the settlement. The loss of this grant would have a devastating impact on policing in the capital so it is an extremely naïve view to suggest that damping could and should be removed whilst the current formula is in place.

10. POTENTIAL INCOME FROM SEIZED ASSETS

10.1 The Mayor is aware that a significant proportion of the recovered criminal assets received by the MPS are put back into further financial investigation. Whilst this may contribute to reducing crime some recovered assets should be re-invested into the Capital’s communities that suffer most harm from serious crime.

10.2 In 2006–07, the Home Office allocated just over £10 million of recovered assets to the MPS. Of that figure, only 5% (ie £500k) has been made available to support community and voluntary agencies spread over a three-year period and represents a relatively small proportion of the MPS annual allocation to community and voluntary groups of 1.7%.

10.3 In order to deny serious organised criminals opportunities in the form of victims and criminal markets across the Capital, the Mayor recommends that the MPS must ensure that a significantly larger percentage of its allocation of recovered assets be targeted at investments in a wide range of sustainable community and voluntary sector crime reduction partnership initiatives. The GLA Community Safety Team will assist in the co-ordination and distribution of these assets.

10.4 These initiatives should prioritise and reflect the needs of London’s diverse communities who are affected by crime. In so doing such public incentivisation engagement activity could result in the positive outcome of increasing community participation in the identification and recovery of criminal assets.
11. Recruitment and Retention

11.1 For a decade from 1991–2001, the number of uniformed MPS officers was in continual decline, with the number of police falling by in excess of 10%. At the end of 2000–01 the number of police officers was 25,430. Recent figures (December 2007) show there are 31,119 police officers and 4,107 Police Community Support Officers. Combined this represents close to a 10,000 increase in uniformed officers (up to 35,226); a 39% increase since the GLA was established.

11.2 This is a result of funding from the Mayor and Government. We now have more police in London than at any other time in history, including dedicated community policing teams in all 620 neighbourhoods, and 21 new Safer Transport Teams in outer boroughs.

11.3 It is essential to recognise that the police service is one of the most publicly visible services in British society and, as such, help to set the tone for how our society is viewed and for how those within society view themselves. As a consequence, it is therefore imperative that the police reflect the communities that they serve. Government (central and regional) can help to set the tone for the police in that respect and it is worth noting that, since the GLA came into being and backed by financial investment together with clear guidance, the number of BAME police officers in London has more than doubled both in terms of actual numbers and in percentage terms from less than 4% of the officer numbers in 2001 to more than 8% in 2008. Women officers have now increased to 21%.

11.4 The strong message for the need to increase the extent to which the police “looked like London” was diligently taken up by the MPS so that, when a new arm of the policing family was introduced (ie. PCSOs) and the opportunity to begin recruitment from a clean sheet was presented, the efforts have resulted in over 31% of PCSOs being BAME and 34% being women.

11.5 One of the key messages for successful policing in the 21st century must be a service that reflects and properly caters for the communities it serves in order to work towards diversity targets set by the MPS for recruitment and retention.

11.6 The Race Equality Scheme Working Group [RESWG] oversees the implementation of the MPS Race Equality Scheme, and ensures that the necessary arrangements are in place to meets it’s statutory obligations under the Race Relations [Amendment] Act 2000. The membership of the Group includes MPA and MPS officers, and representation from the Equalities and Human Rights Commission and the GLA.

11.7 The Mayor recommends that Equalities Impact Assessments continue to be applied to the structure and functions of the MPS.

Annex

SAFER NEIGHBOURHOODS AND PUBLIC ATTITUDES

The MPS Public Attitude Survey collects information for the key high-level performance outcomes of the Safer Neighbourhoods Programme. These include confidence in local police, perceptions of personal safety, worry about anti-social behaviour and the extent to which local police are thought to both understand and
deal with local issues of concern. In the second quarter of 2006–07 (July to Sept) confidence in local police was recorded at 53%. In the intervening months this figure rose to 58% for the second quarter of 2007–08 and remains at this level for the third quarter 2007–08 (Oct to Dec).

Over the last 18 months there has been a steady high percentage of Londoners who feel safe when walking in their local area during the day (96%). The numbers feeling safe after dark are at a lower level but have remained stable over the last 12 months (73%). Over the last 18 months there has been an increase in worry about anti-social behaviour (from 34% to 41%). There is evidence that worry about ASB is driven by Londoners’ concern about “young people hanging around” and concern about drug using/selling. There is also evidence that Londoners say that police are increasingly dealing with matters of concern to the community. This indicator drives public confidence. Since 2006 the extent to which local police are thought to both understand and deal with local community issues has improved. Initial figures of 55% and 59% respectively have increased to figures in 2008 of around 63% (for both).
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ABOUT LIBERTY

Liberty (The National Council for Civil Liberties) is one of the UK’s leading civil liberties and human rights organisations. Liberty works to promote human rights and protect civil liberties through a combination of test case litigation, lobbying, campaigning and research.

LIBERTY POLICY

Liberty provides policy responses to Government consultations on all issues which have implications for human rights and civil liberties. We also submit evidence to Select Committees, Inquiries and other policy fora, and undertake independent, funded research.

INTRODUCTION

1. There can be no doubt about the vital and challenging public service performed by the police in maintaining law and order; preventing, detecting and investigating crime; and protecting national security. Liberty has long had an interest in policing, not only because new police powers and practices can, on occasion, interfere with human rights and civil liberties; but also because without effective policing the state could not fulfil its obligations to protect human rights.

2. In this submission we focus on just a few of the many important issues raised by the Home Affairs Committee’s inquiry into policing in the 21st century.

— First, we discuss the important and often misunderstood relationship between effective policing and human rights.

— Secondly we consider the important constitutional boundaries between the police, the Executive, the courts and Parliament and the way these have become increasingly blurred.

— Thirdly, we comment on the legislative trend towards broad discretionary police powers and the challenges this can pose not only in human rights terms but also for front line policing.

— Fourthly, we consider the dangers associated with the practice of off-the-record press briefings regarding ongoing policing operations.

— Finally, we make a few observations about the threats and opportunities posed by technological advancements for policing and human rights.

HUMAN RIGHTS AND POLICING

3. For over a year, stories in some parts of the UK press have given the erroneous impression that human rights have hindered the effectiveness of police operations and led to controversial operational decisions. These stories have suggested that human rights laws have tied the hands of the police, stopping them taking the actions necessary to make society safer. One of the best-known examples was the story in June 2006 that a suspected car thief, who bombarded police with bricks and tiles during a rooftop siege, was given a Kentucky Fried Chicken takeaway meal by officers to ensure his “well-being and human rights”.153 There may have been a number of operational reasons for the Gloucestershire police’s decision to give the man a KFC meal but it was certainly not the man’s human rights that required them to do so. The story represents either a gross misunderstanding of human rights law or a cynical attempt to use human rights as a scapegoat.

153 Cf “KFC meal ‘ensures siege man’s rights’”, Telegraph, 8 June 2006
for a controversial operational decision. As the Department for Constitutional Affairs’ Review of the Implementation of the Human Rights Act concluded: “Decisions of the UK courts under the Human Rights Act have had no significant impact on criminal law, or on the Government’s ability to fight crime.”

4. Far from making the public less safe; public protection is a key part of the post-War human rights framework. The police play an invaluable role in maintaining law and order; preventing criminality; detecting and investigating crime; and protecting national security. Indeed, in performing these important functions, the police are helping the state to meet its obligation to protect human rights. Article 2 of the Human Rights Act 1998 (right to life), for example, expressly requires the UK “to take appropriate steps to safeguard the lives of those in their jurisdiction”. The primary requirement here is to pass effective criminal legislation to deter violations of the right to life and to put in place machinery to enforce that law and to ensure that justice is provided where life is taken. In addition, the right to life has been interpreted as requiring states to “take preventative operational measures to protect an individual whose life is at risk from the criminal acts of another individual.” The police clearly play a key role in performing these obligations.

5. Human rights are, however, also about placing appropriate limits on the state’s powers to restrict the rights of individuals. For example, restrictions on the right to protest (usually enforced by police) affect the right to free speech and assembly and should, therefore, be defined in law, pursue a legitimate aim and any restrictions must be proportionate. In Whitehall and Westminster these key tests of legality, legitimate aim and proportionality have rightly played an important role in debates on police powers and criminal justice. They provide a set of standards against which policy-makers are able to scrutinise new proposals and the operation of existing laws. These standards are also key to the way the police exercise their powers on the front line. Failure to act compatibly with these human rights standards could place police officers in breach of section 6 of the Human Rights Act and could also lead to evidence gathered by the police being found to be inadmissible by the court in criminal proceedings.

6. Compliance with human rights standards is, however, about much more than staying on the right side of the law. Human rights standards can also play a vital role in effective policing, maintaining public confidence in the police and can assist the maintenance of good community relations:

— Human rights laws require the state to undertake a prompt, independent investigation into the, thankfully extremely rare, situations when police operations result in a loss of life or when police are alleged to have ill-treated members of the public. Not only does this ensure justice to victims, it also helps to maintain public confidence in the police. Public confidence in the Metropolitan police would, for example, have been less damaged by the tragic shooting of Jean Charles de Menezes if the IPCC’s inquiry into the facts surrounding the killing had been published promptly, if an inquest had been held promptly and if, to the extent possible, police guidance on the use of lethal force had been scrutinised publicly.

— The requirement to secure people’s rights without discrimination on the basis of a person’s race or religion militates against the unfair targeting of particular racial groups for stop and search. Coercive police practices which have a disproportionate impact on one racial or religious group have a seriously detrimental impact on race relations and on important police efforts to engage certain communities in their work.

— When policing protest, due regard to the requirements of legality, legitimate aim and proportionality would reduce the risk of the police being seen as over-bearing and would make it easier for them to maintain the important appearance of independence from the bodies targeted by the protest. Criticisms of the police handling of striking miners during the 1980s have, for example, had a lasting and damaging impact on how the police are perceived in some communities.


7. Over recent years the paradigmatic relationship between Parliament, the Government, the police and the courts has become blurred. It is increasingly difficult to argue that Parliament is responsible for making and defining new criminal laws and police powers; that an independent police force ensures compliance with the criminal laws and investigates suspected violations; and that people thought to have violated criminal laws are prosecuted and, if found guilty, punished by independent courts. As we explain below, Liberty believes this paradigm to be a key feature of the British constitution, vital to maintaining the rule of law and to the effectiveness of independent policing in the UK.

---
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Parliament’s weakening supremacy over criminal justice laws

8. As parliamentarians you will be all too aware of how the detail of new laws is increasingly left to secondary legislation or codes of practice which receive limited, if any, effective parliamentary oversight. Indeed, the Government has itself started to acknowledge this trend. It is not, however, just the increasingly powerful Executive which has threatened Parliament’s supremacy over criminal justice law. Consider, for example, the increasing use of civil orders, obtained from the courts on the application of the Executive or other public bodies, breach of which is a criminal offence. The Anti-Social Behaviour Order or ASBO is, perhaps, the best-known example though other examples are sadly mushrooming (control orders, parenting orders, serious crime prevention orders and the proposed violent offender order). These orders make it a criminal offence for the person subject to the order to do things which others can do without any fear of legal sanction. For this reason the Council of Europe Commissioner for Human Rights has described ASBOs as “personalised penal codes”. Parliament, of course, plays no role in creating or defining these personalised criminal laws. It is, to say the least, hard to reconcile this with one of the key principles of the rule of law that “No man is above the law and everyone, regardless of rank, is subject to the ordinary laws of the land.”

9. In Liberty’s view, this new breed of civil orders can undermine fair trial standards, give rise to a grave risk of arbitrary, discriminatory and unjust treatment and has the potential to undermine public confidence in and respect for the criminal justice system. It also creates novel challenges for policing. First, members of the public increasingly expect the police to take strong action to prevent what they perceive to be anti-social behaviour. However, this requires difficult value-judgments by the police given the vague nature of the legal definition of “anti-social behaviour” and the wide range of behaviour it would cover—at its lowest, the statutory definition encompasses behaviour “likely to cause harassment, alarm and distress”. Policing compliance with ASBOs also poses significant challenges for police. It is no longer enough for the police to spot behaviour defined in law as criminal (such as shop-lifting or graffiti). In addition, police must now be able to identify individuals that are subject to ASBOs and know what restrictions or obligations their ASBO has imposed. Only then can they decide whether the person is committing a criminal offence. Communities, themselves, are increasingly expected to provide the additional vigilance necessary to police compliance with ASBOs.

10. As we discuss below, another worrying trend has been the increasing willingness of Parliament to agree to broad discretionary police powers. This legislative approach to police powers is not necessarily in the best interests of the police or of effective policing.

Politicalisation of the police

11. The political independence of the police is as important in a democracy as the political independence of the courts. Political parties come in and out of power but those responsible for delivering public services, like the police, remain in post regardless of the ebb and flow of political opinion. It is, therefore, vital that the police maintain their political independence. If the police become too closely associated with any one political party it is inevitable that faith in the police will be damaged. The police must win the trust of us all, not just people of a particular political persuasion. In recent years some key figures in the police have acted in a way that threatens this vital political independence. For example, Liberty expressed concerns about Sir Ian Blair’s public support for ID cards during the 2005 election campaign at a time when Labour was the only political party which supported the introduction of ID cards. The way the Labour government brought senior Metropolitan police officers into Parliament in 2005 to lobby Labour backbench MP’s to support 90 days pre-charge detention was also controversial. As it is now, the issue of pre-charge detention limits was a divisive political issue with all other political parties opposing the Government’s 90 day proposal. It is, of course, appropriate for the police to communicate with Government about the powers they feel they need to do their job—indeed, given their experience, one would expect the Government to consult them on such matters. On the occasions cited above, however, Liberty believes that the police strayed into the realms of political lobbying.
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12. It is not only the police that have been seen to blur the distinction between traditional competencies; politicians have also increasingly interfered in operational policing matters. One way in which Central Government has exerted control over policing has been the imposition of police performance indicators or targets which affect how police forces use their resources. Central allocation of resources is, in fact, directly related to the meeting of crime reduction targets. In 2007, this “target-driven culture” led to severe criticism by the Police Federation of England and Wales. The Federation complained that targets had distorted police priorities by requiring police to focus on easily measurable results, diverting attention from serious crime and local needs. The Federation published a dossier of “ludicrous” cases it claims were the result of Home Office targets, including the story of “a child in Kent who was arrested after removing a slice of cucumber from a sandwich and throwing it at another youngster”.172 As we discuss below, when these politically-driven targets are combined with broad discretionary powers, the implications for human rights can be severe. Liberty also has concerns about the lack of transparency and accountability in the setting of these targets.

13. Central Government has also increased its powers to censure “underperforming” Chief Constables. The Police Reform Act 2002 created powers for the Home Secretary to call for a Chief Police Officer’s suspension (earlier plans to allow the Home Secretary a direct power to sack having been abandoned). The Police and Justice Act 2006 increased the powers for the Home Secretary to intervene in “failing police forces”, giving her the power to intervene on her own initiative, without the objective assessment of HMIC; enabling her to give remedial directions directly to a chief police officer, rather than to the police authority; and enabling her to give remedial directions to a police authority where she believes the police authority itself to be failing.173 Increasing politicians’ power to interfere in operational policing further undermines the current arrangements for local police accountability. It contributes to the progressive erosion of the traditional checks and balances which, until recently, afforded important protection for the independence of British policing from inappropriate political interference. It also widens the scope for pressure to be placed upon the police to use the broad discretionary powers that they are increasingly given in a way which will meet a political agenda rather than the wider needs of policing in a particular community and context.

The police and the delivery of justice

14. The criminal justice system continues to move away from the paradigm that the police investigate suspected breaches of the criminal law, the CPS prosecute suspects and the courts determine guilt and impose punishments. The police are increasingly being given powers to impose punishments on the public without the involvement of the courts and, in some cases, without even CPS involvement. Perhaps the best-known example of this has been the use of fixed penalty notices or on-the-spot fines. In the early years of the 21st Century these have imposed more serious penalties174 been used for a growing range of offences175 and a growing range of bodies (not just the police) have been given the power to issue them.176 Another example of summary justice powers given to the police in recent years is the power under the Police and Justice Act 2006 for the police to impose punitive conditions on cautions.177 The Magistrates’ Association said of this power that “contrary to the principles of justice for prosecutors and police to be able to impose punishment without the involvement of the judiciary. A democratic legal system ensures that an independent tribunal—the judiciary—should sentence and impose punishment, thus preventing bias from prosecutorial authorities.”178

15. The Government is proud of this direction in the criminal justice system. In July 2006, for example, the Department for Constitutional Affairs published a paper entitled “Delivering Simple, Speedy, Summary Justice”.179 While Liberty appreciates the desire to remove delays in the criminal justice system, powers designed to achieve this should not be at the expense of justice. The move towards summary justice is not only of concern from the perspective of the rights of the suspects. Fair trial safeguards, and the involvement of the independent court in the delivery of punishment, are also in the wider public interest and the interests of victims of crime. The rigours of a criminal trial, in which the prosecution is required to establish guilt beyond reasonable doubt and the defendant has the opportunity to argue their innocence, help to ensure

172 Cf “Police condemn ‘target culture’”, BBC, 15 May 2007
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that the right person is convicted. Furthermore, hearing criminal cases and handing down punishments in open court, demonstrates that justice is being done and that the state will not accept criminal behaviour, providing a public warning against offending.

16. There is also a risk that this rush towards summary justice could damage public perceptions of the police. In particular, it is likely to result in an inconsistent approach by different police officers, especially where complicated judgments are necessary in determining whether a fixed penalty notice, for example, is appropriate. Where ascertaining guilt is a simple black and white matter (ie did this person drop a cigarette butt?) the risks are perhaps minimal. By contrast, where a police officer has to determine whether to issue a penalty notice for disorder the judgments are far more open to differing interpretations given that the definition of relevant behaviour can be as vague as whether the person's behaviour is "likely to cause harassment, alarm or distress".180

Increasing the Discretionary Powers of the Police

17. While the use of discretion has always been an obvious and necessary part of day to day police work, legislation in recent years has seen the Government move away from setting clear parameters to policing powers. The types of powers given to the police in recent years have become increasingly discretion based. Examples of this legislative tendency abound. On 1 January 2006, for example, there was a small but significant shift in the nature of British policing. All criminal offences became arrestable. That power, created by the Serious Organised Crime and Police Act 2005, has meant that police officers can place people under arrest for minor offences such as dropping litter. Until that point many minor offences, generally those not punishable by a custodial sentence, were "non-arrestable". Other examples include the powers under Section 44 of the Terrorism Act 2000 to stop and search people without reasonable suspicion.

18. The Labour Party Document of April 2005, "Tackling Crime, Forwards not Back", is instructive in stating: "We asked the police what powers they wanted and made sure they got them". By creating broad discretionary powers, the Government has removed any excuse the police might otherwise have for failing to meet centrally-decided targets. The Government repeatedly resists attempts within Parliament to place statutory parameters and limitations on new police powers, arguing that this would unnecessarily tie the hands of the police. Government ministers defend this approach by arguing that the police can be trusted to exercise their powers in a proportionate manner and, indeed, that they have a legal obligation to do so under the Human Rights Act.

19. Broadly defined discretionary powers are not, however, a boon for police. In fact they place a massive burden on individual officers. The justification for making all offences arrestable under SOCPA, for example, was simplicity "[The] basis of arrest remains diverse—it is not always straightforward or clear to police officers or members of the public when and if the power of arrest exists for offences at the lower end of seriousness". However, making all offences arrestable places a far more onerous, and somewhat impractical, duty upon an officer. Before an arrest is made he or she will have to decide whether it is "necessary" to arrest. In human rights terms this means that every time a police officer has to make a decision on arrest they will effectively be required to make a determination as to whether it would be proportionate to arrest under Article 5 (the right to liberty) and Article 8 (the right to privacy) of the Human Rights Act 1998. If Parliament defined more clearly when it would and would not be appropriate to arrest a suspect, the police officer would have clearer parameters within which to make on-the-spot decisions. By refusing to make these determinations Parliament and the Executive are absolving themselves of responsibility to lay down clear indicators of what powers the police can legitimately use.

20. The Government is sending out a complicated message to the police. On the one hand there is a need to improve performance, reduce crime and increase detection. In order to do this the police have been given all the powers and discretion they want. Meanwhile, they remain under an obligation not to misuse these powers. However, if there is pressure to get results then it can only be expected that the police will use them. Sometimes the coercion is tangible. In May 2005, for example, it emerged that Police Officers in Manchester could lose their jobs if they failed to meet targets of at least four arrests a month.181 Even without such blatant pressure, it is hardly reasonable to expect a young inexperienced police officer given wide powers of stop, search, arrest and detention not to use the powers they have to their limits. This is clear from the way in which sections 43 and 44 of the Terrorism Act 2000 (TA) have been used. For years the entire metropolitan area of London was on a rolling authority, allowing section 44 searches without reasonable suspicion. Further, police did not limit searches under section 44 to the terrorism context. Powers have been used against anti-war protestors, anti arms fair protestors and, in 2005, were used to detain Walter Wolfgang, the 82 year old who was thrown out of the Labour party conference.

21. The consequences of this understandable temptation for the police to use the powers they are given to the broadest extent possible might be to undermine the relationship that exists between public and police.

---
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In essence, we give up a degree of individual freedom in return for protection against, and investigation of, acts of criminality. At the heart of this social contract is an acceptance that powers to restrict our freedom will be proportionate and used only when necessary. Undermining this relationship, particularly in the current climate, may well prove to be neither in the interests of the public nor the police. The example of section 44 is instructive here. In July 2004, while giving evidence to the Home Affairs Committee, the Metropolitan Police Authority said of Section 44 of the Terrorism Act 2000:

“Section 44 powers do not appear to have proved an effective weapon against terrorism and may be used for other purposes... It has increased the level of distrust of our police. It has created deeper racial and ethnic tensions against the police. It has trampled on the basic human rights of too many Londoners. It has cut off valuable sources of community information and intelligence. It has exacerbated community divisions and weakened social cohesion”.

POLICE AND THE PRESS

22. There seems to have been a worrying increase in the practice of off-the-record press briefings during on-going police operations in recent years. In some cases briefings appear to have been given during attempts to arrest terror suspects. It is perhaps an inevitable consequence of 24 hour rolling-news reporting that media appetite for information has grown. This is especially the case for terrorism where pre-emptive and continuous “breaking news” reporting is understandably highly prized. While mystery still surrounds the precise source of these off-the-record briefings in individual cases it is clear that the practice seriously compromises the administration of justice by potentially prejudicing future prosecutions and compromising police investigations. Protocols are required to ensure that briefings given to the media by the police and Home Office are attributable, accurate and appropriately timed.

23. Inaccurate reporting can damage the reputation of suspects who may later be released without charge and, in the process, seriously undermines essential police and community relationships. Over the last few years, off-the-record briefings in several anti-terror operations have led to suspects being named, false evidence being reported, and inaccurate links and circumstances being identified by the media. An example of this was the media reporting of the alleged Ricin plot in 2003. While jurors are asked to put media reports out of their mind for the purpose of deciding a case inaccurate media speculation poses a severe risk of bias that could significantly compromise any trial. Liberty is also concerned about the impact of off-the-record briefings on community relations and the subsequent flow of information to the police. The level of media attention surrounding the terror arrests in Birmingham in 2007, for example, angered the wider community.

24. Off-the-record press briefings also have the very practical effect of interfering with ongoing police investigations, possibly even increasing the chances of suspects evading arrest. Once the media have been tipped off about the potential location of a terror-related arrest, the press inevitably arrive in the area for “breaking news” reporting. The arrival of numerous TV crews, journalists and equipment potentially provides prior warning to suspects, or those known to them, that the police may be on their way. Deputy Assistant Commissioner Peter Clarke of the Metropolitan Police said of the anti-terror operation in Birmingham in January 2007:

“on the morning of the arrests, almost before the detainees had arrived at the police stations to which they were being taken for questioning, it was clear that key details of the investigation and the evidence had been leaked. This damaged the interview strategy of the investigators and undoubtedly raised community tensions.”

TECHNOLOGY: THE SURVEILLANCE STATE AND IMPROVED EFFICIENCY

25. Technological advancements can pose both great opportunities and great challenges for policing and can have serious human rights implications. A detailed assessment of this wide-ranging and complex issue is, of course, well beyond the scope of this submission and well beyond Liberty’s expertise. However, we hope the following observations are of use to the Committee.

26. Surveillance like CCTV has become more affordable, more widespread and more complex. While surveillance technologies like these can, of course, help the police to perform their functions, there are risks. For example, the regulatory regime for CCTV cameras has not managed to keep up with new technology.

---

182 There have been conflicting reports about the source of these briefings with dual claims that the leaks originate from the police themselves or from sources within the Home Office.
183 Media reporting on this case contained numerous details on the alleged plot, including: that the gang would smear Ricin poison on the door handles of cars and shops in North London; the report that Ricin poison had been found at a North London address; and that the main suspect had links to Al Qaeda. After 23 arrests, it was eventually established that no Ricin had been found and only one of those arrested was convicted (for the murder of a policeman killed during the arrests) with all other arrestees released.
184 BBC, “Terror chief warns of media leaks”, 24 April 2007
The Data Protection Act fails to provide an effective enforcement tool. Compliance with more detailed guidance, such as that issued by the Information Commissioner’s Office, remains unenforceable and is largely dependent on proactive and responsible attitudes from individual local authorities and police authorities. Without effective regulation of surveillance technologies there is a real risk that CCTV cameras will be placed inappropriately, that video footage will be of dubious quality and that it will be used unsuitably.

27. In recent years technological developments have made it much easier and cheaper to collect, share and process large amounts of personal information. Again there is no doubt that this can be of use to the police. Recent high-profile stories about loss of personal information have, however, demonstrated one of the associated risks. The more personal information that is collected in one place and shared, the greater the risk that the information will find its way into the wrong hands and the more serious the consequences. The reputational cost and cost to personal privacy can be severe. It is also now arguable that technological developments, particularly in relation to the scale of automated data processing (data matching and data mining) are outstripping the DPA. There has been little determination of how data mining might be DPA-compliant. However, it is likely that stringent safeguards including the proper anonymisation of raw data, and the time-limited and targeted use of data-matching practices would need to be in place before compliance with the current legal “framework” is possible.

28. Technological developments also have the potential to make police work more efficient. An example can be found in the recent suggestions that the lengthy forms currently completed by police after stop and account could, in future, be replaced by recording stop and searches on hand held “Blackberry” devices or using “airwaves”. This would significantly reduce the time taken to record the basic information about the encounter necessary to ensure both accountability for the individual encounter and institutional accountability for any disproportionality in the race of those stopped by the police.185

29. Of course it is not only the police that have greater access to new technologies. The police have often commented on how their job as investigators is made more difficult as a result of the quantity of, often encrypted, information stored on the computers they seize. This is a major plank of the Government’s arguments that the police should be allowed to detain terror suspects for longer than 28 days. We do not doubt that new technologies increase the amount of information the police could use as the basis of charge. In a liberal democracy it does not, however, follow that the pre-charge detention limit should be continually ratcheted-up so that the police have enough time to trawl through all of the materials that could potentially yield evidence. If this were the sole basis for a decision on the appropriate detention period, it would be almost inevitable that future technological advances would lead to detention for even longer than 42 days—the sky is the limit in terms of material the police could sift through to look for evidence of guilt. Given the serious implications of lengthy pre-charge for the individuals affected, for our democratic principles and for the longer-term battle for hearts and minds lengthy pre-charge detention must, however, be resisted. Instead, other ways of helping the police with the difficult job of investigating terrorism must be pursued. In Liberty’s view post-charge questioning, with appropriate safeguards, and intercept evidence could greatly assist police investigations. Technology may itself make it quicker and easier for the police to trawl through and decrypt large quantities of information.

APPENDIX 26

Memorandum submitted by Iain Gordon, Ex-Metropolitan Police Detective Inspector

MUNICIPAL POLICING

It is clear that vast numbers of the public do not feel represented by the judicial system in this country and certainly not by the forces of law and order. There is a very tangible feeling, not just of being disenfranchised, but of real hopelessness and despair at the failure of these organisations to perform their very basic roles.

It is the Government’s duty to protect its citizens mainly through a civilian body of peace officers (police), the criminal courts and the prisons. There have been numerous high profile cases recently which indicate strongly that these systems are failing lamentably. The public continually express their considerable dissatisfaction with this parlous state of affairs through their elected representatives and the media.

The fact that nothing changes, the slaughter on our streets goes on unabated and there is a massive amount of real fear experienced by the public, particularly the young and vulnerable, is nothing short of a national disgrace.

185 The requirement to record stop and accounts was an important development introduced following the recommendations of the Macpherson report into the police investigation of the Stephen Lawrence case in the 1990s.
One of the most worrying factors is the lack of cohesion between Government, who make the laws, and the judiciary who enforce them. It is absolutely right that the judiciary should be totally independent of government but the fact that they are at loggerheads, so often, is incongruous and deeply frustrating for a public who constantly see natural justice being denied. There is now a very real suspicion that the whole thing is a legal conspiracy. After all, lawyers draw up the legislation. Parliament, which is awash with lawyers, passes the laws and another set of lawyers, firstly the Crown Prosecution Service then the Judges, interpret and sit in judgement on them. Juries of the people play a very small part in this process despite their distorted portrayal as the bastions of justice.

This situation needs to be addressed as a matter of urgency in order to eradicate the fast growing public feeling that we, the law abiding majority, are not involved in, or even taken into consideration during the legal processes. We have become mere cannon fodder for the legal profession.

The police are in the front line of all this and are feeling more and more beleaguered. When questioned about their reasons for joining, most of the ordinary ranks dismiss the pay as fairly immaterial and quote a genuine desire to make a difference and help the public. It is no secret that most of them are palpably aware that they are failing miserably to achieve their aims through major faults in the system. Individual officers have put their heads above the parapet, some at the expense of their jobs to articulate that, as have the Police Federation and the Superintendents’ Association. Meanwhile the ivory tower dwellers in Government and senior police ranks adopt the stance that they know best and let the devil take the hindmost.

Police Authorities are supposed to be the public’s conduit to the police and are allegedly in place to ensure, on our behalf, that police forces are efficient and effective. They are in fact an enormous white elephant having presided over the almost total removal of a uniformed attested police presence on the streets.

It has been suggested, quite rightly in my view, that these ineffective and top heavy authorities should be abolished and replaced with an elected police chief or sheriff. The problem with the current proposition is that if those elected officers are county or force based the public’s needs, which differ from one side of a county or force area to another, will not be met.

Thus, the most sensible solution is to operate on a borough basis, paying special attention to local requirements. Each borough would have its own municipal force headed by an elected police chief for a period of say three years. Initially that might seem like stepping back in time. However there need not be any fears about the sort of corruption that used to exist in the old borough police forces due to modern methods of supervision. Additionally, albeit unwittingly, the government will have in place the ideal majority members of such a force in the shape of Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) who should have their own minimal rank structure, initially headed by retired main stream officers.

Another great benefit of such a force would be that the current main stream “services,” as they like to call themselves, can maintain their existing structures and primary reactive work, responding to more serious crime, whilst allowing the municipal police to exclusively, and without abstractions or interference, deal with the everyday nuisances which blight peoples’ lives like litter, graffiti, dogs mess, loud music and more importantly anti-social behaviour. This would also have the effect of bringing, what seems to be an ad hoc mishmash of Council officials, wardens and parking attendants under one umbrella. Budgets are naturally all important these days but, in essence, after training and a change of legislation to empower the local officers in a limited way, the additional overall cost would not be prohibitive.

One of the concerns may be a risk of the overlap of police activities which will inevitably occur from time to time. However, with the proper procedures in place these can be minimised. The system works well on the continent where, even in the small towns and villages, the police are ubiquitous without being overtly aggressive or intrusive. The public see exactly what they are getting for their rates and more importantly have a say in how they are spent.

It is absolutely certain that there is a general perception in this country that we have a class of people, including Judges, Chief Constables, Ministers and the like who are so detached from the reality of life on the streets that they do not understand or even really care about the problems that ordinary people encounter everyday on the streets. That should be deeply worrying for the establishment and it flies in the face of our whole way of life and history. This needs to be addressed radically and urgently. According to Magna Carta no one should be denied right or justice. Currently the law abiding public are being deprived of both.
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Memorandum submitted by Paul Carne

WEDDELL MURDER CASE

Comments and thoughts of Paul Carne, son of Mrs Traute Maxfield, and brother of Sandra Weddell.

CASE SUMMARY

This relates to the case of Garry Weddell who murdered his wife Sandra at their home using a cable tie, and attempted to stage it as a suicide. He was subsequently charged by Bedfordshire Police with her murder. He appeared before Judge Bevan on three occasions who eventually granted bail, with £200,000 surety provided by his barrister brother Geoffrey Weddell.

Breached bail and appeared before magistrates and was released.

While on bail Weddell took up clay pigeon shooting lessons with the knowledge of his brother. Weddell, then murdered his mother in law using a shot gun stolen from a shooting club in Markyate. Weddell then killed himself with the same weapon.

FOR CONSIDERATION

Innocent until Proven Guilty.

Consideration of bail for Violent Offences.

Evidence in Support of Bail.

Position & Privilege Balanced Judgement.

Court Proceedings.

Granting of Bail.

Improved Surety Rules.

Bail Conditions.

un Club Operation.

Role of Police.

Fair and Equal.

INNOCENT UNTIL PROVEN GUILTY

Changes in science and technology have produced vast improvements in the quality of police forensic evidence. The direct result of this means when police have made a charge it is more likely to be the case. The world is a changed place since the Bail Act of 1976; the general increase in lawlessness would perhaps suggest that a person on suspicion of an offence today is less likely to be innocent.

From past cases we should know that to consider a person as being innocent is not always the case. Where the evidence is of good strength and particularly where violence has been involved the safer position of assuming guilty should be adopted, for the safety of others.

CONSIDERATION OF BAIL FOR VIOLENT OFFENCES

Where there is an application for bail, the possibility of bail must be considered in relation to the offence. Defendants who have allegedly committed violent acts should be less likely to receive bail, and more so those who have committed murder, than those who have damaged property or have caused other material loss.

Where there is strong evidence, and the police and the CPS oppose bail, then bail should not to be considered an option at all, regardless of the defendant’s position and standing in the community. In
investigating a case the police will have built up a far greater understanding of the character of the defendant and the surrounding issues, more so than any Judge could possibly do within the brief period of court.

One who has committed an offence is no better than one is from a less privileged position in society. A murderer who is wealthy and respected, is no better than a murderer from an under privileged position.

Where there is evidence of good strength, bail should be refused, regardless of the defendant’s position and standing in the community.

It is in the defences interest to belittle the prosecution case, with unfounded and ill thought out and illogical arguments, deception and even lies, which given the limited time available in court, cannot be thought through properly.

Weddell, used the restricted time element, and “play it as we go” approach to eliminate the opportunity for careful thinking and evaluation. In Weddell’s case, the CPS did not have a copy of the psychiatric report, which had only been completed just before court.

The requirement to give bail goes against police evidence, and presents the Judge a difficult task in refusing bail.

EVIDENCE IN SUPPORT OF BAIL

Reports submitted to the court need to be worthy of being submitted, simply bearing the name of a well-known person doesn’t necessarily make a report worthy. The psychiatric assessment in the Weddell case was not worthy of being presented in court.

The Judge Bevan, did not accept the quality of evidence regarding the suicide note. As he was not satisfied that the printer attached to the family computer had been used to print the fake suicide note, though the police removed the printer from the house. Instead he was more than willing to accept a half-truth report from someone who claims to be able to predict how a person will behave in the future.

In the Weddell case, the psychiatric assessments should not have been considered as being adequate for the purpose of making an informed judgement. It is simply not possible to judge a persons character, and certainly not any future actions based on a few hours of observation, and without taking into account the knowledge and concerns of others.

The psychiatrist was not familiar with all aspects of Weddell’s personality. It is likely that the psychiatrist was biased, after all he was paid by the defendant for the report. He would have been instructed as to what was required.

In fact the psychiatrist actually used Garry Weddell’s own words in his report as an explanation for the stolen co-axial cable.

Judge Bevan should not have taken the word of the psychiatrist, based on what he had heard. In fact Judge Bevan was lied to, and misled by Weddell in court. Judge Bevan was aware of this as it raised a concern in his mind, but decided to press on regardless.

POSITION & PRIVILEGE

Wealth and position should not be taken into account when considering bail, where violent offences are concerned. Geoffrey Weddell exercised his position and his wealth in order to win bail for his brother Garry Weddell. Judge Bevan, placed his trust in Geoffrey Weddell as being of the same “club”.

BALANCED JUDGEMENT

Proper and balanced judgements can only be made by a court, once there have been equal opportunities for defence and prosecution to present.

There was no opportunity for the Crown prosecution to present their own psychiatric assessment, after the defence presented their psychiatric assessment, funded and probably biased in favour of the defences.

There is no limit to the defence, as to who, and the number of reports that could be obtained, until a report in favour of the defence was obtained.

COURT PROCEEDINGS

Judge Bevan failed to conduct the hearing process logically.

His mindset at the out set was a willingness to grant bail.

He did not allow the CPS to advance details of the prosecution evidence at the first hearing. Instead he allowed this information to be presented by the defence.

He was unwilling to devote time to hearing the prosecution evidence, and only heard the crown evidence in full at the last hearing, yet indicated that he had been thinking about the facts for a long time.
Did not attached proper weight to Crown evidence. He accepted a rushed and ill produced psychiatric report.

Consideration of further offences was considered in only 50 words. He was in two minds as to whether to grant bail or not.

**Granting of Bail**

Once bail has been granted, a person is basically allowed to go free with certain restrictions. The Judge in granting bail, must satisfy himself that the person is safe to be released. If there is any doubt, then the person should not be released.

It is unreasonable to expect the Police to run round monitoring people, because they might be a threat, as perceived by witnesses and others. If the Police raised concerns about a particular person based on their investigation of the case, then these concerns should take precedence over any ruling a Judge would make. The Judge is more concerned with human rights than with safety of the public.

Unfortunately, these concerns cannot always be evidenced, through previous character history. Though there will be statements and beliefs to that effect taken from witnesses, but who is to say they are wrong. Why believe a lone psychiatrist having had a very limit time to make a judgement.

**Improved Surety Rules**

The granting of bail, in addition of a surety, must also require the immediate notification to Police of any information which may be pertinent to the case in order to help properly police the defendant. In the Weddell case, the relevant information would have been declaring the clay pigeon shooting lessons, and informing police whenever Weddell failed to return home for the night.

Unless there are real penalties, family members, relatives or those who have an interest in the defendant, cannot be expected to properly police the defendant.

Geoffrey Weddell was secure in offering £200,000 as surety. The weakness of the law, meant that he would probably never be made to pay, as there no onus on him to declare certain information to the police. The only point mentioned by Judge Bevan was the instance of buying travel tickets.

Geoffrey Weddell’s real intentions were always to protect his brother, any disclosure by Geoffrey would most likely have placed Weddell back in custody, he didn’t want this, at any cost. It is quite possible that Weddell had not returned home on previous occasions. On the occasion after Weddell had shot himself, Geoffrey Weddell made a weak excuse for himself by saying he went to bed early, which he apparently rarely does. Again the following day, he failed to notify police of Garry’s absence.

Geoffrey Weddell turned a blind eye to Garry Weddell’s activities. It won’t have taken much thinking for a barrister to realise that there could be a risk of further offences if his brother was having clay pigeon shooting lessons.

**Bail Conditions**

The Bail conditions should be in keeping with the seriousness of the offence, and not with the defendants standing and position in society. Weddell bail conditions were completely out of scale compared with others involved in far less serious offences.

Greater consideration must be given as to how defendants are to be policed when on bail. Simply dumping this issue in the lap of the Police not acceptable.

Judge Bevan after saying he was of mind to give bail as long as the conditions were stringent enough, then only made a punitive requirement for only registering twice a week and remaining outside of Bedfordshire.

**Gun Club Operation**

Police should have increased powers for stipulating how gun clubs operate, and particularly with respect to control of people accessing firearms.

The identity and address of a person wishing to use a firearm under any circumstances must be positively established. This should be by means of a passport, photo driving licence, and with a police check being made to ensure the person is suitable for such an activity.
ROLE OF THE POLICE

The Police have limited resources; they should be fully supported by the courts in their efforts in bring offenders to trial. Hours and hours will have been spent investigating a case. By releasing an offender on bail is simply devaluing the efforts of the Police, and placing the onus on them to police defendants on bail.

Having a limited resource, means it will not be possible to properly police the defendant.

FAIR AND EQUAL

It is hoped that all would agree something has gone wrong with the Weddell case, and that some changes are required.

This is a world of compromise. Even with the best of intentions we fall short of our theoretical goals, this is the failing of human nature. Even with the best systems in place, if human judgements are required decisions will always be biased in some way.

A lack of accountability, trust of human judgement, lack of resources, absence of absolute truth, personal agenda’s, political correctness, lies, all add up to a flawed system.

15 April 2008

APPENDIX 28

Memorandum submitted by the British Transport Police

The initial Home Affairs Committee Press Notice (18.01.08) stated the Committee will “examine progress made with the programme of police reform initiated by the Government in 2001” and that the primary focus of the inquiry “will be on how expectations of the police force have changed and the resources the police have to meet these expectations”.

Additionally a letter recently received (dated 11.03.08) listed a variety of themes relating to policing in 21st century and these are highlighted below in bold. Commentary under each heading gives a brief steer in relation to the police reform/BTP. A possible angle for BTP evidence could be experience of Police Reform from a non-Home Office force perspective.

1. THREAT OF GUN AND KNIFE CRIME

BTP is conducting a national campaign to tackle knife crime on the railways. This entails the use of walk-through metal detectors, similar to those at airports. These detectors are fully portable and can be used anywhere at anytime. The use of Operation Shield has been extremely successful with 81,000 people passing through the scanners on the London Underground Area alone (figures up to January 2008). This resulted in 8,626 being stopped and searched and 764 arrests, with 45% of these arrests specifically related to the recovery of weapons being. The Operation has had huge success in England, Scotland and Wales. The arches were funded by the Home Office.

2. ALCOHOL RELATED CRIME

In the last 12 months BTP recorded 4,843 crimes involving alcohol (just over 93 per week) on the rail and underground networks.

Over recent years the rail environment has seen rapid change, BTP is finding itself not only having to police the unique environment of the railways, but additionally having to police locations not dissimilar to many city centres with bars, clubs and shopping malls being developed at many major stations. The 24 hour economy is a growth industry on the rail network. For example, there are impending major developments at Birmingham New Street, London Bridge, Battersea, Cardiff and Stratford to name but a few. In Leeds for example, this has resulted in an increase in serious crimes such as violent and sexual assaults recorded under BTP’s jurisdiction, albeit they have occurred in and around a number of nightclubs and bars located in arches away from the actual rail station. This has had an impact on Force resources. BTP would welcome involvement in any initiatives aimed at reducing alcohol related crime.

While BTP is the primary enforcement agency in relation to criminal offences relating to licensed premises on the railways, under the Licensing Act 2003, the BTP must go via the local Home Office force in matters relating to the granting, rejection etc of licences for premises on the railways. The Act refers to “The Chief Officer of police for the police area (or each police area) in which the premises are situated”. In England and Wales there are 43 Home Office forces and numerous more Licensing Authorities (ie district councils, county councils, London Boroughs, Welsh Boroughs). This creates the anomaly whereby a Home Office force can approve an application for the sale of alcohol at a premises located on BTP’s jurisdiction, but would not be accountable for any recorded offences (alcohol related or otherwise) committed on the rail network as a result of the granting of the application.
BTP is currently awaiting confirmation from the Ministry of Justice in relation to the granting of powers for BTP officers to issue fixed penalty notices for two Railway Byelaw offences—one of these being for Byelaw 3—"intoxication" (the other being "disorderly behaviour"). If these powers are granted they will be an excellent opportunity for BTP to further tackle alcohol related anti-social behaviour across the rail network in England and Wales.

3. TERRORISM

The railways will always be a prime target for terrorist activities. To combat terrorism on the railway, BTP regularly exchanges information and shares lessons with international law enforcement agencies. As a result, it is well equipped in prevention measures and enforcement, and has developed unmatched professionalism and expertise. Specialisation is critical when it comes to bomb detection. BTP has established a graded response approach for the assessment of unattended items and bomb threats. The success of BTP’s approach is unrivalled by any other organisation in the world.

In England, Wales and Scotland, BTP has been at the forefront of forces in the use of stop search powers under s44 of the Terrorism Act 2000. BTP has had positive feedback from members of the public, rail users and rail staff in relation to the way that BTP officers carry out the searches. The percentage of complaints arising from such actions is tiny in relation to the number of searches actually carried out (approximately 30,000 per year).

The use of s44 is only one of many tools operated by BTP officers. Behavioural Assessment Screening System (B.A.S.S.) training is one of the more recent initiatives being rolled out not only in BTP but also to rail staff. BASS is a system whereby officers are trained to identify suspects through indicators such as behaviours, body language, expressions and signs of deception, amongst other things which may indicate involvement in terrorism or other criminality.

4. THE ROLE OF PCSOS

In relation to the police reform agenda the extension to the policing family (namely Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) and the Accreditation Scheme) has been perfectly suited to the rail environment. PCSOs are the eyes and ears of the Force, patrolling trains, stations and platforms providing reassurance to the travelling public. PCSOs have selected police powers and additionally BTP has elected that its PCSOs carry handcuffs. This has been well received by the 254 PCSOs BTP currently employs. The main function of BTP PCSOs is high visibility patrolling, often at main line stations, allowing warranted officers to travel to more remote stations and/or investigate crime. Unlike Home Office forces, BTP did not/do not receive ring fenced funding specifically for recruiting PCSOs (either from the Home Office or the DfT). However, with the introduction of PCSOs being so successful within the rail environment, a number of train operating companies are funding their own dedicated PCSOs over and above their normal police service agreement charges.

BTP also operates a Railway Safety Accreditation Scheme, which under the Police Reform Act 2002 means BTP is empowered to accredit individuals within organisations with minor police powers to deal with anti-social behaviour, nuisance offences and minor disorder. The scheme enables the train operating companies, Network Rail and BTP to work together to improve safety on the trains. A number of train operating companies have taken advantage of the Scheme.

BTP has developed a Neighbourhood Policing (NP) model tailored to the needs of the railway community and the wider community where appropriate. It entails the provision of locally based officers and staff in a clearly defined geographic area, based upon station infrastructure, who work with partners and the community to: improve relationships with BTP stakeholders and community; solve local problems by locally driven interventions by relevant parties and stakeholders; reducing crime and the fear of crime; the provision of visible dedicated locally accountable resources with defined geographic responsibility; intelligence led targeting of issues that matter most to the community; bringing offenders to justice and raising the profile and awareness of BTP.

BTP has adopted NP across the entirety of the London Underground Area and has 10 NP teams located in specific geographic areas across England, Scotland and Wales. They have been so successful, receiving much praise from train operators and in driving down crime, that BTP is seeking to add at least another 12 teams across the country by funding half from the Force budget agreed by BTPA, and the other half by matched funding found from the identification of cashable efficiencies through BTP’s new “FrontLine First Programme”.
5. FUNDING ISSUES

BTP receives revenue funding directly from train and freight operating companies, Network Rail and TfL. Capital funding comes directly from the DfT. Occasionally, some funding may come from the Home Office (for example Operation Shield, Airwave, etc).

Given the role that BTP plays in counter terrorism on the national rail network, the train operators have questioned whether private sector money should be used to police what is a national issue for society and they, BTP and the BTPA, have made approaches to the DfT regarding specific funding for counter terrorism measures. (That said, BTP has found it difficult to quantify specifically what proportion of budget is dedicated solely to CT work beyond the running costs of the Counter Terrorism Support Unit).

Another major drain on BTP resourcing is policing major events and not least football policing. During the football season every geographic Area of the Force is impacted and is called upon to provide resources to police football almost seven days a week. Some Home Office forces are keen to examine the possibility of charging organisers of profit making events for the cost of policing the event outside of the stadium/venue. BTP would not be adverse to such an initiative given the drain this type of policing has on the everyday work of preventing and detecting crime on the railways.

6. RETENTION AND RECRUITMENT OF OFFICERS

Wherever possible BTP actively seeks parity in terms and conditions for officers with Home Office forces, and on the whole does not experience problems recruiting trainee police officers and retaining police officers generally. However, where BTP seeks to recruit specialist and/or experienced senior officers from Home Office forces, it experiences real difficulties as there is no parity in relation to the pension scheme operated by the Home Office and the railways pension scheme. It is a hindrance to BTP’s ability to be competitive in the recruitment market place. For example, a recent recruitment campaign to employ two Detective Chief Inspectors elicited 39 expressions of interest from officers employed in other forces, however when they became aware of the disparity in the pension schemes 26 withdrew from the process.

While this has been a major problem for a number of years, the BTPA and BTP have made representations to the Home Office, DfT and others in relation to this problem and some progress has been made in recent months with a solution being actively worked upon.

7. TARGETS AND BUREAUCRACY

In relation to national policing targets, wherever possible BTP attempts to mirror Home Office forces, adopting national targets for Quality of Service, Offenders Brought to Justice, Persistent Young Offenders, sickness absence etc. (This will continue following the imminent introduction of the new Assessment of Policing and Community Safety (APACs) performance regime).

With a transient rather than geographic population, comparisons per “1,000 population” or similar are not possible for BTP which formally sits outside of the Home Office PPAF performance regime (and the soon to be implemented APACs regime). As the specialist national force for the railways BTP is unique with no “most similar forces” for BTP’s performance to be compared with across a multitude of targets. Additionally there are many national targets which are simply not relevant to BTP eg roads policing, burglary and domestic violence. Instead, in conjunction with key stakeholders BTP devises railway specific targets for example for dealing with fatalities, route crime and cable theft.

In relation to performance management at force level, a recent inspection of BTP by HMIC noted BTP’s “innovative work in planning and target setting that takes account of BTP’s national perspective, stakeholder and partner input and the requirement for corporacy and consistency with latitude and flexibility to accommodate local needs.” For 2007–08 BTP implemented a new system for setting targets which comprised three distinct tiers: common targets for corporate objectives eg fatalities; common objectives with local targets to take account of a range of performance in different BTP Areas eg staff assaults and local objectives with local targets eg different sets of problems at railway stations. This resulted in 101 different targets set in the Annual Policing Plan (of which at the time of writing, over 90% are likely to be achieved). This approach to local objective setting has been heartily welcomed by the rail industry and passenger groups and as a result a more streamlined, two-tier system has been implemented for 2008–09 with greater emphasis on local target setting.

Additionally the train and freight operating companies and Network Rail attend monthly local “Joint Tasking and Co-ordinating” meetings with BTP, using the National Intelligence Model to help examine local problems and the deployment of resources to tackle them. This involves joint operations with BTP officers, PCSOs, Specials and industry accredited security staff, rail staff and revenue protection officers. It can also entail train operators bidding via business cases for BTP resources to run their own local operations where their own local intelligence has identified issues which have not necessarily appeared on BTP’s radar. This joint problem solving process, linked with the successes of BTP style NP, has been warmly welcomed by the rail industry and proved successful in reducing crime on the rail network.
In relation to bureaucracy BTP is no different from Home Office forces in that it suffers from many of the same problems—double keying of information as IT systems do not talk to each other, form filling etc and it supports the findings of the Flanagan Report and looks forward to the implementation of recommendations.

BTP is one of the forces at the forefront of implementing the use of mobile data via hand held computers or PDA’s. (A bid for an additional 800 devices is currently with the Home Office). They have been trialled on the London Underground Area and are to be rolled out across the country. The ability to access numerous computerised systems from the hand held computer has reduced bureaucracy and saved officer time. Given the geographic dispersal of BTP’s limited resources across the country and the long distances that officers can travel away from their home stations on a normal shift (compared to Home Office force officers), it is anticipated that introduction of PDAs beyond the London Underground Area, will provide more savings in officer time.

BTP’s FrontLine First Programme, as referred to above, is seeking to identify cashable efficiency savings to implement, at least, six new NP teams across the country. All key business processes will be examined in detail, best practise will be adopted from the Workforce Modernisation pilots and the rail industry to ensure that every effort is made to reduce bureaucracy.

8. THE USE OF TECHNOLOGY

BTP as a member of “policing UK” uses many Home Office force national policing systems and applications to conduct day-to-day business (eg PNC, VIPER, NAFIS, ANPR, Lantern, Airwave, NSPIS Command and Control, NSPIS HR etc).

Funding for new technology can be a very real issue for BTP (and other non-Home Office police forces). When the National Policing Improvement Agency (NPIA) is developing a new system for policing UK, it appears that sometimes BTP is included in the specification (and central funding) and other times it is not. A prime example is the impending implementation of the Police National Database (PND) which is intended to provide police with a “21st century tool for combating 21st century crime improving their ability to protect children and our communities”. The PND will ultimately be a one-stop shop for national policing information as well as external information sources that impact on policing. It is expected to replace the PNC and IMPACT Nominal Index as well as facilitate key links with other central information systems. PND is an initiative for Home Office forces and BTP is not a Home Office force. Failure to gain access to the system would mean that BTP would not be a credible police force—it would have no method of recording intelligence and court cases and convictions could be impacted. BTP is currently progressing the necessary compliance framework to ensure that it gains access to PND and has active participation in the Joint Operations Authority (JOA) lobbying for membership and access.

BTP’s work with PDAs has been mentioned above and was also referred to in the Interim Report of the Flanagan Review.
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Memorandum submitted by the British Beer and Pub Association

LICENSED PREMISES (OPENING HOURS)

Source unless otherwise stated: DCMS Stats Bulletin Nov 07

— Total number of premises licences in England & Wales as of March 07: 161,283 (only 50,580 of these are pubs).
— Total number of 24 hour licences in force as of March 07: 5,112.

Percentages:

— Only 3.2% of all licences are 24 hour, many of which are not used. Only two pubs in the United Kingdom open reasonably regularly on a 24 hour basis and they are both in Blandford Forum.
— Of premises with a 24 hour licence, pubs, bars and nightclubs make up 8.9%; o-trade 17.8% and hotels 65%.
— 60% of pub, bars and restaurants stop selling alcohol by 11pm and on average closing times have increased by only 21 minutes. Source: DCMS Evaluation of the Licensing Act March 08.
A report commissioned by the DoH funded Alcohol Education Research Council concluded that “there has been little change in noise levels, alcohol related violence/fights, drinking driving (and) alcohol related crime” since the Licensing Act 2003 was introduced. Source: Licensing Act evaluation for AERC by Middlesex Uni April 08.

Early signs are that overall crime levels are in fact down—during the six month period after the change in licensing laws, a survey of 30 police forces shows a one per cent fall in recorded incidents involving violence and criminal damage.


**PUB CLOSURES/FALLING BEER SALES**

1,409 pubs closed during 2007, the closure rate is seven times faster than in 2006. This equates to 27 closures a week or four a day. (Source: CGA for BBPA)

On-trade beer sales fell by 4.5% in 2007. The general trend shows off trade sales about static with the on-trade in decline (Source: BBPA)

Pub closures are struggling with the effects of regulation, eg the smoking ban, and increased alcohol taxation. Overall business costs are soaring (eg energy, food and employment) whilst at the same time beer sales and machine income are declining. Most pubs have extended their food offerings and cater for different customers throughout the day.

**ALCOHOL CONSUMPTION**

There has been a change in social habits—people are pre-loading at home before going to the pub, or even straight to a club. 14% of people usually have a drink before they go out. This rises to 37% for 18–24 year olds Source: YouGov.

Pub customers now often choose to drink locally in suburban areas. There are fewer night clubs.

Consumption among younger people is down (although younger people are drinking less those who do are drinking more).

2000–06 Source: ONS

Young men: 37% drop

Young women: 29% drop

---

**APPENDIX 30**

Memorandum submitted by Musgrave Retail Partners GB

**MUSGRAVE**

Musgrave is partner to entrepreneurial food retailers and foodservice professionals. In Great Britain we partner more than 2,000 independent Budgens and Londis retailers.

**THE MUSGRAVE WAY OF WORKING**

We are proud of our record of supporting independent retailers and we are committed to our values of long–term stable relationships, not being greedy, honesty, working hard and achievement. Our approach is to equip the entrepreneurial retailers associated with our brands with the sales, marketing, IT, finance and logistical expertise that come with the most advanced retail business practice. We also leverage our scale to help them compete with multiples on quality and price and work with local suppliers to satisfy growing demand for locally sourced products. This way of working with our retail partners allows local, family run businesses to meet the needs and demands of their customers.

Throughout recent years, as more out-of-town superstores have developed and high streets have been abandoned by many of the major multiples, Budgens and Londis retailers have continued to open stores serving the local community and to offer their customers the opportunity to purchase excellent quality, well-priced, foods within the convenience of their local neighbourhood.
BUDGENS AND LONDIS

There are currently Budgens stores in over 25 counties in England, all of which are independently owned and operated. With stores ranging from 2,000 square feet to 10,000 square feet, we believe these independent retailers can offer their customers a range and service that meets their specific location and lifestyle requirements and contributes to the vibrancy of local communities.

There are over 2,200 Londis stores throughout the country, all of which are run as family businesses and entrepreneurial enterprises. They stock a wide range of products sourced from local suppliers, offering great service and a warm and welcoming atmosphere that provides a genuine alternative place to shop for daily top-up needs.

SERVING THE COMMUNITY

Serving the community goes to the heart of how we operate. Our network of retailers plays a valuable social and economic role in their local environments.

We were an active supporter of Nick Hurd MP’s Sustainable Communities Bill which since passing onto the statute book has given local communities increased power to drive forward government policy and consequently tackle local economic, social and environmental issues. When the Bill became an Act of Law in November 2007, we were extremely proud to host a parliamentary reception to celebrate the Bill’s success and the important contribution it will make in allowing local communities to prosper.

COMMUNITY BASED PROGRAMMES

Musgrave Retail Partners GB and its retailers also support local communities by becoming actively involved in community-based sponsorship and charity support. We are currently involved in a number of programmes across Great Britain, such as partnerships with children’s charities, such as Kids in Action and support for national cancer organisations, such as CLIC Sargent.

The Budgens store in Broadway, Worcestershire, provides a good example of community involvement. The store sponsors the local St Mary’s Primary School by providing the school football kit and packed lunches for school trips, as well as wine for the Parent Teacher Association events. The store also provides a range of other community services, including cleaning the town square, sponsoring a local newsletter and supporting the neighbouring museum.

Budgens and Londis stores are always looking for new ways to service local people. The Budgens store in Virginia Quay, for instance, engaged with the community prior to opening and, following feedback from the public, elected to open a dry cleaning service on site. Following the closure of the post office in Enfield High Street, the newly opened Budgens chose to include a replacement post office within its premises for the benefit of local shoppers. Jonathan James, the owner of two Budgens stores in Cambridgeshire, has a police station integrated into one of his stores, runs driver safety courses from the garage of his stores and provides a weekly car servicing facility for elderly or disabled drivers.

In Mabe in Cornwall, Steve Nisbet’s Londis store delivers not only newspapers but also groceries for its elderly or disabled customers. It also watches out for them—if they do not see a customer for a couple of days, someone from the shop will go round to their home to make sure they are well. Steve also raises money for charity: through Charity Challenge, the adventure travel company, he has donated over £5,000 to cancer research through sponsored treks around the world.

Another Londis store in Cornwall, in the town of Torpoint, has raised funds for various charities through having collection boxes in the store and getting its staff to take part in events such as sponsored swims and walks. It also provides sponsorship for local groups, such as the training kit for the local under-11 football team, financial assistance for local choirs and, together with HMS Raleigh, it helped redecorate the children’s ward of the local hospital in Plymouth.

LOCAL FOOD SOURCING

We endeavour to support local communities through our commitment to using local suppliers wherever possible and continue to be the major sponsor of British Food Fortnight. We work closely with a number of regional bodies to introduce more local suppliers into stores, including Kentish Fare, Tastes of Anglia, the Linc Pork Scheme, Tastes of Sussex and East Midlands Fine Food.

Additionally, Budgens own-label fresh meat is 100% British and we continue to work with the award winning delicatessen Newitt’s. It is also our policy to always source British poultry and eggs as well as fruit and vegetables when they are in season.

We regard local sourcing as essential in developing a relationship with the local community. It keeps money circulating locally, boosting the local economy, and the retailers are seen to be actively supporting community producers.
TAKING CARE OF THE ENVIRONMENT

We are committed to playing a leadership role in tackling sustainability challenges by managing and minimising any negative impacts of our business. Because our retailer partners operate in the heart of local communities, local people’s need for long journeys associated with out-of-town shopping is greatly reduced and because, whenever possible, we work with local suppliers, the carbon footprint of our products is minimised.

We have a number of other environmental initiatives underway, including using bio-diesel in the vehicles operating from our Thamesmead distribution centre. We are fully involved with the government funded WRAP (the Waste and Resources Action Programme) and wholeheartedly support its objective to help businesses become more efficient in their use of materials and to recycle more often. Through this programme, we aim to minimise the need for landfills, reduce our carbon emission and improve our impact on the environment.

AWARDS

The outstanding work of Budgens and Londis retailers has been recognised through a number of awards. Some of the most recent ones are detailed below:

Checkout Convenience Awards May 2007
— Best Fresh and Chilled Convenience Retailer: Budgens.

The Grocer Gold Awards June 2007
— Best Consumer Initiative: Musgrave Retail Partners GB.

Federation of Small Business Awards 2007 (Somerset)
— Terry and Melanie Philpott, Londis, Castle Cary.

Convenience Store Top Shop Awards 2007
— Best use of technology: Dee Sedani, Londis, Etwall.

Retail Industry Awards 2007
— Independent community retailer of the year: Mark Richardson, Budgens, Newent.
— Independent environmental retailer of the year: Terry and Melanie Philpott, Londis, Castle Cary.

Asian Trader Awards 2007
— Customer care: Dee Sedani, Londis, Etwall.
— Newcomer of the year: Charlie Singh, Londis, Chasetown.
— Spirit of the community: Nita Shah, Londis, Hermitage.
— Asian Trader of the year: Andy Patel and Hitesh Patel, Budgens, Virginia Quay.

Independent Achievers Academy Awards 2007
— Best staff development: Sunder and Pam Sandher, Londis, Leamington Spa.
— Best merchandising in store: Ramesh and Nim Shinagdia, Londis, Southwater.
— Best shop presentation and best in-store theatre: Terry and Melanie Philpott, Londis, Castle Cary.
— Best store layout, Ben and Ragini Patel, Londis, Minster.
— Best layout and presentation: Andy Patel and Hitesh Patel, Budgens, Virginia Quay.
Countryside Alliance—Best Rural Retailer Awards 2007 (East of England)
— Penny and Andrew Sunnaway, Londis, Otley.

Wiseman neighbourhood Awards 2007
— Gold award and commitment to local sourcing: Nigeel and Joanne Owen, Londis, Malpas.
— Heritage award for community commitment: Michael and Kay Taylor, Londis, Gedney Hill.
— Gold award: Brian and Jane Bradford, Londis, Starcross.
— Forecourt of the year and SGF emerging star: Gordon Strang, Londis, Scone.
— Heritage award for community commitment: Mike Howe, Londis, Clyst St Mary.
— Commitment to local sourcing: Malcom and Sue Bodell, Londis, Bow.
— Staff excellence and excellence in milk merchandising: Derrick Cooke, Londis, Malvern.

March 2008
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Memorandum submitted by Group 4 Securicor

1. INTRODUCTION

During the evidence session on 10 June 2008, there were a number of questions about Electronic Monitoring. I have therefore provided an explanation of Electronic Monitoring and also Satellite Tracking. A specific question was asked about the number of tagging breaches experienced by G4S. I have answered this question on page 6 of this document.

There were also questions about the advantages of outsourcing both Police Custody Suites and Police Services in general. I have also expanded upon this area for you in this response.

2. ELECTRONIC MONITORING

2.1 Background

Electronic Monitoring (EM) is a cost effective monitoring, tracking and compliance solution for subjects at home or in the community using a variety of proven technologies and applications.

G4S has three of the five contracts with the Ministry of Justice to provide EM services for offenders, both adult and juvenile, at various stages of the criminal justice system. The EM service is predominantly used to monitor a curfew. The three contract areas are:
— North East and North West.
— East Midlands, Yorkshire and Humberside.
— South East and South West.

We have dedicated Customer Liaison Officers who interact on a daily basis with agencies, including police forces, to provide compliance and other information about specific subjects.

We have recently seconded staff to West Yorkshire Police and Lancashire Police. G4S “EM experts” are now embedded within the Offender Management Unit in both of these Police areas—in doing so, G4S are playing a key role in a Police led multi-agency approach to managing high risk offenders (PPOs) under a pilot system known as Integrated Offender Management. Benefits include:
— Improved communications via faster two-way information sharing and speedier interventions by criminal justice agencies to help reduce risk / re-offending.
— Improved service access and efficiencies through the co-location of G4S and the Police has, as well as closer agency relationships delivered a “real time” intelligence picture.
— The opportunity for our customers to realise the full potential of Electronic Monitoring and the intelligence it provides and consequently to identify where it can be used more effectively.
2.2 When is it used?

Electronic Monitoring is used as an alternative sentencing option, either as a condition of bail, as a requirement of a community sentence, or where a prisoner has been released early on Home Detention Curfew (HDC), or is subject to release on licence.

2.3 The equipment

2.3.1 How does it work?

The equipment consists of a tag and a monitoring unit and is based on a Radio Frequency technology. The tag is fitted to the subject’s ankle and the monitoring unit is located in the home or other place of curfew. The tag acts as a transmitter and sends signals to our Control Centre.

2.3.2 Is the equipment reliable?

The technology used in tagging has been proven to be robust and reliable. All equipment has been thoroughly tested and is constantly updated to take advantage of the latest technology. Tamper mechanisms mean that the offender cannot remove the tag or move the monitoring unit without this being reported to the Control Centre.

All of our equipment has passed Ministry of Justice, Home Office and internal testing requirements and meets Ministry of Justice specifications. It is subject to quality checks before installation and is maintained during visits. Our Monitoring Software checks equipment reliability and diagnostic messages include monitor moves, tampering with the tag, low battery or power loss. If we receive an alert for any of these incidents, we immediately schedule a visit to the subject to identify the cause.

2.3.3 When do we install the equipment?

Once we receive notification from a Court or Prison we will visit that evening to install the equipment. Our monitoring officers will visit the address given within the curfew hours. The subject must be present for the installation to be completed. Once our monitoring officers have confirmation of the subject’s identity they will then fit the Personal Identification Device (PID) or tag around the subject’s ankle. The monitoring unit will then be located within the property and the range set to cover the whole house. This does not include the garden.

2.4 Breach Information

2.4.1 Who is responsible for breach action?

The responsibility for enforcement action depends on the sentence that has been imposed, although we are required in each case to inform the relevant body that the subject has not complied with the curfew.

In the case of Home Detention Curfews (or other prison releases) where someone has been released early from prison, any breaches are reported to the Post Release Section (PRS), a department within the Ministry of Justice. PRS will then decide what action, if any, to take.

A curfew may be imposed as part of a set of community requirements such as unpaid work. In this case the subject’s Offender Manager, who can be the subject’s Probation Officer or Youth Offending Team (YOT) Worker, is responsible for breach action. All breaches are reported to the Offender Manager who will decide what action to take. Should the curfew stand alone as a single requirement, then it is G4S who will take the matter back to Court. The same responsibilities will apply to the application of enforcement action, such as formal warnings, or violations which fall short of breach.

In bail cases we report all time violations to the police and it is they who take action and return a subject to court.

2.4.2 What constitutes a breach?

— One or more Curfew violations whose length amounts to an entire curfew period.
— A second tamper violation, or any removal of equipment fitted to the subject, or damage causing the non-functioning of any part of the equipment.
— One or more Curfew violations whose total length amounts to an accumulated period of two hours, where the subject has already received a formal written warning for one or more previous Curfew violations.

2.4.3 Breach Rates

In my evidence to the Committee on 10 June, I stated that 95% of G4S curfews were successfully completed. This is an average figure for the year which covers all sentence types, including bail, community sentences and release from prison. It refers to those people who completed their order without revocation before the due date, but does not include those who were subject to enforcement action, which was not concluded before the order had finished.

In respect of community sentences only, during the period March 2007 to April 2008 we monitored 29,149 subjects on curfew. 76% of these (22,197) completed their curfew either without the need for any court enforcement action or action was taken but subsequently withdrawn or the subject was found not guilty. A further 6.5% (1,899) completed with proven breaches where the court decided that the order should continue. Overall 2,818 (9.6%) were revoked, either before or following completion of the order.

2.5 Satellite (GPS) tracking

G4S currently provide GPS tracking services in the USA under life-time sex offender tracking arrangements and are currently tracking approximately 2,000 cases.

Satellite tracking can be used as a way of providing intensive supervision of dangerous offenders and can supplement or even replace police manpower-based supervision and monitoring in the community. It can also provide potentially critical intelligence to help with crime investigation. A technique known as “crime correlation” can be used to identify or rule out suspects.

G4S was one of the providers under the England and Wales pilots (2004–06). A number of criminals were convicted successfully on the basis of GPS tracking evidence provided to Police by G4S.

3. The Wider Technical Capability of Electronic Monitoring

There are a number of ways in which Electronic Monitoring can assist the Police in carrying out their role. The main areas we have identified are listed below.

3.1 Bail Management and Reporting

Bail Management encompasses various tasks, some of which can be missed due to higher priority incidents. Our involvement in this area could include:

— Use of tagging on bail to reduce the volume of police checks and provide increased intelligence via PDA data capture.
— Remote checking via voice verification technology including bail and drug treatment attendance.

3.2 Managing Offenders

3.2.1 Prolific/Persistent Offenders

Police tasks include home interviews and compliance monitoring by visit/phone. There is an opportunity to increase the use of Electronic Monitoring (including satellite tracking) to reduce police monitoring resource and increase intelligence.

3.2.2 Registered sex offenders/MAPPA

We could conduct statutory checks, using Voice Verification and/or satellite tracking or use monitoring functions in support of the strategy to manage behaviour of violent/dangerous offenders.

3.2.3 Electronic Monitoring Data

The G4S monitoring systems record and capture vast amounts of data which can be potentially useful to the police and other agencies. G4S already provide ad hoc intelligence requested by Police on a daily basis to help with investigations into crime. This is done by contacting our national control centre in Manchester. In addition, a summary of all violations by MAPPA and PPO subjects is issued to all Police Force intelligence units on a weekly basis. Examples of the data we capture are as follows:
Every single movement into and out of a curfew address is captured and recorded by our systems while a subject is being monitored. This provides patterns of behaviour and movements to and from home on a continual 24 hour basis. We have been able to assist in confirming a subject’s whereabouts to include or eliminate them from Police enquiries on other crimes.

The presence of individuals on tag in a curfew location, other than the individual who lives there, is also recorded. This provides patterns of association between offenders and can assist the Police in their enquiries.

Relationships can be established between monitored offender behaviour and risks of non-compliance. This can be used to inform quicker and/or better decision making about intervention and offender management.

Prior to visiting an individual’s address, G4S can inform Police whether or not a monitored subject is present.

4. POLICE SUPPORT SERVICES

We offer a range of services which aim to release police officers to front-line duties, all of which are summarized below. The rationale for these services is that:

- Police officers are spending 43% of their time in the police station—processing prisoners, preparing prosecutions and other paperwork are the main reasons’ (Diary of a Police Officer—conducted in seven Forces—November 2001).

- As few as three uniformed police officers are available to patrol the streets, respond to 999 calls and tackle night-time disorder in some towns and city areas’. officers’ (Unpublished research in 15 forces by Mike Chatterton, Manchester University, reported in Daily Telegraph 13 February, 2007).

4.1 Custody Suites

G4S manages the Custody Suites for the following Police Forces:

- South Wales Police
- Lancashire Constabulary
- Staffordshire Police
- Gloucestershire Constabulary
- Norfolk Constabulary

All custody and detention officers are required to undergo eight weeks of rigorous training, including two weeks of “on the job” monitoring training, enabling them to experience first hand the duties required of them.

Services include:

- Drug testing, finger printing, FME or Nurse Examiners, interpreters and DNA collection.
- Correlation, control and storage of evidence secured, including courier delivery of evidence.
- Transport and logistics including point of arrest and delivery to custody suites and inter-custody suite transfers.
- Scene of crime protection.
- Full electronic ID service.
- Extensive training, dedicated client management and a programme of regular performance reviews.

The benefits to the Police are:

- Increased police presence with officers returning to front-line duties.
- Improved budgeting for the Police, with transfer of financial risks.
- Increased productivity, giving better value for money and improved use of overall resources.
- Faster turnaround of detainee processing.
- Closer management and supervision of detainees, reducing the frequency and opportunity for high risk situations to develop.

We regularly measure service satisfaction through distribution of questionnaires, and the most recent survey elicited the following responses:

- 88% positively stated that the custody suite service had significantly improved.
- 72% believed that the staff numbers employed at the time of the survey were adequate.
- 96% felt that the helpfulness of the custody and detention officers was excellent.
— 98% said that the overall welfare of the detainees was good.
— 92% said that adherence to operating procedures was good.
— 96% stated that the overall custody suite service was good.
— 96% believed that co-operation shown to police officers was good.
— 86% rated the service of G4S Justice Services as good or better.

Case Study—South Wales Police

Key facts
— In the first full year of the contract to March 2005, G4S were able to increase the number of detainees processed by 20% on the previous year.
— Since G4S took over duties there has been a 25% increase in efficiency in the day to day running of South Wales Police’s Custody Suite function. This has contributed a total net saving of circa £1.2 million per annum on staffing costs alone.

4.2 G4S Police Recruit

G4S Police Recruit is a specialist recruitment business dedicated to providing policing consultancy and staffing solutions, principally to UK Police Forces but increasingly also to local and central government, regulatory bodies and the private sector.

At this time we are providing staffing solutions to most of the UK’s Police Forces. The services allow clients to:
— Add capacity/ capability into teams, allowing a dynamic response and offering a “surge capability”.
— Have the flexibility of staffing required to meet unforeseen or fluctuating demands on a temporary contractual or permanent basis.
— Utilise modern staffing solutions that maximise performance whilst maintaining best value.
— Source specialist skills not easily accessible.
— Manage resourcing budgets more effectively.
— We maintain a unique database of over 12,000 skilled individuals with up to 200 new candidates being added each month.

5. The Future

Through our broad range of expertise we have been able to offer a cheaper service, with improvements in service standards. Our staff are highly trained to carry out the duties required of them, and this has resulted in commendations from the Chief Constables of the forces that we support.

Outsourcing of Custody Suites is only a fraction of the opportunities that outsourcing could provide to the Police. The Workforce Modernisation Programme (WFM) has highlighted that the omni-competent Police Officer is not the most efficient or effective use of resources for the 21st century and many of the “non core” elements of police work could be outsourced. The WFM programme is only in its early days but it has shown that new optimal workforces can be created using different mixes of staff and new business processes. A more flexible approach would ensure that events such as a major crime enquiry will not lead to a collapse in service provision elsewhere in the policing model.

From a G4S perspective, we successfully provide wholly outsourced prisons on behalf of the Ministry of Justice and can envisage how this might seamlessly be applied to the Police Service. Some examples of services that might be effectively outsourced are detailed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Police Services</th>
<th>Entire Custody Operations</th>
<th>Fleet Management</th>
<th>Estate Management</th>
<th>Call Centres</th>
<th>Finance and HR</th>
<th>IT</th>
<th>Temporary Staffing</th>
<th>Training and Consultancy</th>
<th>Drug Testing</th>
<th>Forensic Support</th>
<th>Property Management</th>
<th>Evidence Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Specialist Support  |  CCTV Evidence Collection  
|---------------------|----------------------------
|                     | ANPR/Mobile Custody Suites 
| Major Crime Support | Scene Guarding/Search  
|                     | House to House teams      
|                     | Investigators              
| Contingent Workforces | Short term volume tasks eg Stewarding 

20 June 2008
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Supplementary memorandum submitted by Research In Motion

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION RE BLACKBERRY SOLUTION FOR UK POLICE FORCES

1. APPLICATIONS AVAILABLE ON THE BLACKBERRY

Major deployments of the BlackBerry solution have been made across North Wales, West Yorkshire, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire police forces. To date, BlackBerry deployments are the most advanced in UK policing providing a high proportion of frontline officers with secure, mobile access to the:

- Police National Computer (PNC) (incl firearms licences & the Schengen Visas databases).
- NICHE Records Management System (RMS).
- Warrants database.
- Electoral Roll.
- Command and control.
- Case and custody records.
- Intelligence briefings.
- DVLA database.
- Crime Tasking.
- PNLDB (Police National Legal Database).

2. BLACKBERRY DEVICES CURRENTLY BEING USED BY UK POLICE FORCES

Each individual police force selects which BlackBerry model best suits their needs. They are free to choose from our entire product range, including the “Curve” shown to the Committee on the 10th of June. In addition to email, text and instant messaging, and web browsing, the “Curve” features a camera, a multi-media player, and an expandable memory. Like all of the BlackBerry devices, the “Curve” provides access to each of the above applications.

3. INFORMATION ON THE COST TO DEPLOY THE BLACKBERRY SOLUTION TO AN INDIVIDUAL OFFICER AND COST TO DEPLOY TO ALL OFFICERS

The cost ranges from £0.80 per day per officer, based on figures from Thames Valley Police. This is their total cost and includes all internal and external IT, operator costs and training. There are no hidden costs. Keith Gough, Mobile Information Project Manager at Thames Valley Police, can provide additional information on these figures.

We believe it would cost between £41.7 million–£52.2 million to provide all 143,000 UK police officers with a BlackBerry device based on the multiplication of 143,000 by our estimated costs.

4. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON THE DEPLOYMENT OF BLACKBERRY DEVICES TO THE FBI

In April 2008, the FBI purchased 19,500 BlackBerry smartphones for use by 56 of its field offices. The devices allow agents to access the Sensitive But Unclassified (SBU) Mobility Program for the first time from handheld devices. SBU information includes the no-fly list, missing and kidnapped persons, and crime alerts. Our carrier partner on this project, Verizon, is also conducting in-person training with agents.
5. **Stop and Search Form Functionality on the BlackBerry**

A police officer can complete a stop and search form on the BlackBerry smartphone. Merseyside Police is one of the forces that have successfully deployed this application which allows an officer to complete the stop and search form whilst on the beat with the information simultaneously being input into the Police National Computer.

6. **Return on Investment (ROI)**

In 2007 RIM commissioned Ipsos Reid to conduct an ROI study on BlackBerry deployments. One of the report’s conclusions is that the average BlackBerry user converts 60 minutes of downtime into productive time every day. We have included a copy of the report.

---
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Supplementary memorandum submitted by the National Policing Improvement Agency (NPIA)

**Summary**

1. This Memorandum, which supplements the Memorandum submitted in February 2008, provides further information about the work of the National Policing Improvement Agency (NPIA) in the area of leadership and progression, particularly our work to improve performance in the retention and progression of a more diverse workforce.

2. The police service today faces a number of challenges which are complex and diverse. Ensuring that the Service has the leadership skills and capability to respond effectively to these challenges is a key requirement now and for the future. The NPIA is committed to ensuring that the police service of the 21st century truly reflects the diverse communities we serve.

**Leadership Strategy**

3. The NPIA has developed a Leadership Strategy on behalf of the police service. The aim of the Strategy is to build and develop more effective leadership across policing in England and Wales. The Strategy sets out the development plan for the next three years. Key deliverables are:

   - An agreed national standard for development in the three areas of professional policing skills, executive policing skills and business policing skills.
   - Design of all national leadership development products to provide an incremental and accredited development programme for current and future police leadership, which supports continuous professional development.
   - The development of a national talent management system which identifies talent and ensures that there is an effective talent pipeline to the most critical and senior of posts—ensuring there is the right mix of skills.

The Strategy has been developed following extensive consultation and research across the service.

**Supporting the Service on Retention and Progression**

4. The NPIA is committed to maximising the potential of all police officers and staff, especially those from under represented groups. We want to ensure that officers and staff not only have the opportunity to progress within the police service, but feel supported in doing so by the changes being made in our practices and procedures.

5. We have introduced independent input to our policy and decision making. Two of the post Stephen Lawrence groups set up as successors to the Stephen Lawrence Steering group look specifically at “Retention and Progression of Officers and Staff” and “Trust and Confidence” issues. These groups are chaired by independent members who are working with us to help ensure race equality issues are taken into account in the development of policies and guidance.

6. A critical component of the Leadership Strategy is the police service’s ability to attract and develop highly talented individuals who will be the police leaders of the future. A wide range of initiatives have been put in place to increase leadership capacity at all levels of the service, for example:

   - The High Potential Development (HPD) scheme is a national leadership development scheme for the police service. The scheme, which has been revised and re-launched, aims to attract a cadre of individuals who will undertake a very focussed and structured programme which equips them with the skills to be the future police leaders. Over the last year we have taken specific action to
encourage minority ethnic officers to apply for the HPD scheme including an integrated marketing campaign with marketing materials, PR, advertising and posters aimed specifically at officers and the graduate community from minority ethnic backgrounds.

— We have been working with the National Black Police Association (NBPA) to promote the HPD scheme and encourage minority ethnic officers applying for the scheme to contact the NBPA for support and advice.

— The National Senior Careers Advisory Service (NSCAS) is a career leadership and development service specifically designed to support ACPO and senior officers and staff operating at Superintendent level. The primary goal of NSCAS is to enhance leadership capacity and capability to ensure that there is a sufficiently large pool of officers and staff able to meet the growing leadership challenges at the top of the service.

— The Positive Action Leadership Programme is a four day learning and development course available for any police officer or police staff member from an under-represented group in the service. The programme is carefully designed to provide a highly impactful and motivating leadership experience for the individual. The intended outcome of the programme is to encourage personnel from under-represented groups in the police service not only to stay, but also to expand their career aspirations, applying for lateral development and/or promotion opportunities when they arise.

— We are actively engaging with groups such as British Association of Women Policing to attract candidates to future roles.

— We regularly exhibit at recruitment events and university careers fairs.

7. We recognise however that more could be done to support and develop the future leaders of the police service, including those from a BME background. The revised HPD Scheme is both professional and comprehensive to enable the police service to identify and develop that small group of exceptionally talented officers and staff with the potential to advance to senior leadership positions within the police service. To run alongside this new scheme, a framework will be drawn up that can be used by the much wider group of individuals within the service who wish to explore their leadership potential in a structured way. We will be working with the staff associations including the NBPA on the development of these new arrangements to ensure that they provide equality of opportunity to all.

8. ACPO has set up a BME Progression Group to inform future training and development initiatives amongst BME officers and staff within the Service. The primary objective of the group is to improve the representation of BME officers and staff across the service and the group’s membership, made up of Superintendents and police staff equivalents, is drawn from across the service. NPIA are involved in a number of initiatives to help the group work towards achieving its overarching objective, including the organisation of and participation in a national conference for group members being held in September this year.

9. NPIA, in collaboration with ACPO, has set up a BME Senior Staff Network. The purpose of the network is to identify critical success factors for senior BME police officer and police staff progression to Chief Officer level.

RECENT STATISTICS

10. Due to positive action initiatives put in place by NPIA during 2007, 12 female and three BME candidates attended the Senior Police National Assessment Centre (Senior PNAC) selection process in September 2007. Six of the female candidates were successful and two of the BME candidates were successful. These are the highest success rates and numbers for both female and BME candidates attending the Senior PNAC process since its introduction in 2003. All of these officers successfully completed the Strategic Command Course in February 2008 and were added to the pool of officers eligible to apply for Assistant Chief Constable posts.

11. So far in 2008, and for the first time in any given year three BME Chief Superintendents have been successful in appointment to the rank of Commander / Assistant Chief Constable.

12. In May and June 2008, NPIA organised four regional Open Day events targeted at officers and senior managers interested in applying to attend the Senior PNAC and Senior Staff selection processes in 2008. events were a joint collaboration across NPIA Business Units that provided information about Senior PNAC process, National Senior Careers Advisory Service (NSCAS) and the Strategic Command Course. A total of 195 delegates attended the Open Days of which five were BME officers who had plans to apply for Senior PNAC in the future.

13. Based on information derived from existing monitoring systems, four BME Superintendents / Chief Superintendents who are currently working with the NPIA Development Advisors are applying to attend the Senior PNAC selection process in September 2008.
14. NPIA co-ordinated a recent positive action initiative targeted at under-represented groups at Superintendent rank and senior staff that attracted 31 female and five BME candidates who attended the NSCAS Level II Assessment Centre selection process in February 2008. All of these applicants were successful and as a matter of priority are now being allocated an individual NPIA Development Advisor.

Chief Constable Peter Neyroud QPM
NPIA Chief Executive
June 2008

APPENDIX 34

Memorandum submitted by the Local Government Association

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION WORK ON MIGRATION STATISTICS AND THE CENSUS OF POPULATION

The Local Government Association (LGA) has been active over a number of fronts in pressing for improvements to migration statistics and in preparations for the 2011 Census of Population. This note briefly summarises past actions and then outlines the current work programme.

Migration Statistics

In October 2007 and January 2008 LGA convened two conferences on migration, in which data issues figured prominently. We also commissioned a report from the Institute of Community Cohesion entitled “Estimating the scale and impacts of migration at the local level” which informed submissions to the House of Lords Economic Affairs committee inquiry on the economic impacts of migration and the Treasury select committee inquiry on “Counting the Population”. In the latter we argued that current statistics on migration, and particularly short-term migration, were inadequate for planning service delivery and compromised funding formulae used to distribute central government grant to local authorities. The Treasury committee report strongly presses the second argument in particular.

Our current activities include:

— Building the local government sector relationship with the Office for National Statistics (ONS) concerning migration and population statistics. We hosted a seminar involving ONS and sector technical and strategy experts during May (which is envisaged as the first in a series of such meetings) and sit on both the Government Migration Statistics Improvement Board (which is chaired by the National Statistician) and two of the working groups that support this Board.

— Leading in the preparation of a resource guide to help councils estimate and plan services for their local populations. The guide will set out how—and how far—official sources, including government administrative records such as school registers and national insurance registration can be used as a diagnostic to better understand local populations and population change. The guide will also identify innovative practice by authorities using their own data or exploiting local sources; and explore how far private and voluntary sector sources might illuminate local issues. We will commission work on the guide in time for publication in the autumn. Crucial to this will be to ensure that government departments are willing to co-operate in sharing and making available the necessary data.

— Work to encourage government to bring together relevant official sources on migration in a single place (mirroring ONS’ initiative concerning national-level migration reporting); and to press for improvements in administrative sources which could illuminate local migration experience.

— A second phase in our research into the impacts of migration on local services, and in particular the costs associated with these impacts. This research is being carried out by the Institute of Community Cohesion, the National Foundation for Education Research and CIPFA, and is due to report in the autumn.

The Census of Population

Local authorities, and LGA, have a history of involvement in the planning and execution of the census. We are engaged in planning for the 2011 Census through the Central-Local Information Partnership (CLIP) group of technical experts, and through direct contact (for example, successfully lobbying for a fourth page on the census form to ensure that questions of value to local government can be included). We are also strengthening the necessary machinery to ensure that ONS are clear how census can best serve local government sector requirements.

Our overarching strategy is to ensure that the Census achieves the best possible coverage of the population.

23 June 2008
1. Migration into Cambridgeshire

Recent A8 migration into Cambridgeshire continues to impact heavily on police and other services with evidence indicating that the pace of migration continues. For example, the Worker Registration Scheme data for Peterborough shows a similar number of registrations this quarter as for the same quarter last year. New Link sees around 20% of the new arrivals coming to Peterborough each year. In 2007–08, there were 1,483 new clients registering with New Link, which is up from 874 in 2006–07. In addition, they have expanded the range of languages spoken in-house to 20, with the recent addition of native Czech/Slovak and Lithuanian speakers. The Czech/Slovak community now represent their largest group of clients. Some of the following examples also illustrate some of the impacts.

While church congregations have been dwindling around the country, one city Church is struggling to cope with ever-increasing numbers. Now St Peter and All Souls Church in Peterborough is hoping a £1 million extension will help to accommodate its growing flock. The Catholic Church in Geneva Street was originally built in 1896 to house a congregation of 250 but more than 100 years on and the popular Grade 2 listed building is struggling to find room for its parishioners. In 2003 its congregation stood at 740. By 2005 it had risen to 886 soaring to 1,308 in 2006 because of mass migration with the numbers in 2007 at 1,645.

Pupils from 39 different countries were enrolled in Peterborough schools between September 2006 and January 2008. The overwhelming majority came from Poland, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Portugal and Lithuania, but others have travelled to Peterborough from countries including Afghanistan and Madagascar. Fulbridge Primary school, in New England, Peterborough, has seen the number of Eastern European children jump from two to almost 100 in the last two years—the school population is 680.

In Cambridgeshire schools over 90 languages are spoken, the majority in Cambridge City. However, Fenland schools have experienced a rapid rise in the numbers of English as additional language (EAL) learners. Language data from the Annual School Census 2006 indicates that Fenland schools had a total of 260 children and young people with EAL: 167 in primary and 93 in special and secondary schools. By 2008 data indicates that the number in primary schools has risen to 350 and in special and secondary schools to around 160.

2. Language Services

There are in excess of over 100 languages in Cambridgeshire and it is this “super-diversity” to which the police are exposed that poses additional everyday challenges.

A heavy demand continues to be placed on the language services provided by the police. For example, between January 2007 and December 2007, qualified freelance interpreters were used 2,076 times for face to face interpreting. High though these figures are they actually under-represent interactions because they reflect the number of assignments, not the number of people provided with an interpreting service. So, for example during one assignment an interpreter can often assist with communication between a number of different people—this often happens with detained people in the Custody Office.

It is these face to face interactions which comprise the biggest part of the language services budget. Although savings of 33% were made in 2007–08, the budget is still more than double that in 2002–03. The continued demand is reflected in the language line calls which have risen from 1,427 in 2002–03 to 4,339 in 2006–07 and 4,476 in 2007–08. In 2007–08 this represents an average of 373 calls per month.

The savings in this area are neither the result of a reduction in the quality of service nor demand. They are due to the appointment of an Interpreting Services Manager who conducted a root and branch review of interpreting services, which promoted the use of local interpreters, a new claims procedure and the use of 29 Multi-Lingual Support Officers (MSOs). The MSOs are able to assist in the numerous everyday interactions where language and understanding can become a barrier. Their appointment was a bold and innovative step and Cambridgeshire are leading the field in their use. Likewise, the Constabulary is cooperating with a local educational establishment to pioneer a training course in “Police Interpreting”.

---

186 The A8 states are Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia or Slovenia.
187 The County of Cambridgeshire includes the Unitary Authority area of Peterborough. All references to Cambridgeshire in this briefing note include Peterborough unless otherwise stated.
188 January to March 2007 saw 805 registrations and January to March 2008 saw 775 registrations.
189 New Link is a pioneering centre integrating new arrivals into the Peterborough settled community. New Link delivers a range of services including bi-lingual information and advice, and employment and enterprise support.
189 Language line calls cost £0.80 per minute.
189 MSOs are not qualified interpreters, they are employed by Cambridgeshire Constabulary on casual workers contracts to provide interpreting and translation services for non evidential purposes as and when required.
It is important to recognise that only around 50% of the language services provided by the police relate to foreign nationals as offenders. The other 50% are for other reasons eg foreign nationals as victims, witnesses and for other operational reasons. Pressure on the force control room and the police service centre is increasing as they often receive phone calls from members of the public who do not speak English and therefore language line interpreting services are required as a matter of urgency.

However, it does not matter whether the police are dealing with offenders, victims or witnesses. It takes two to three times as long when interacting with someone who does not have English as their first language and where the encounter has to be conducted through an interpreter. In this respect pressure on policing continues to increase.

3. Custody Impacts

The graphs below give an indication of the historical impact of migration and new communities on custody. In 2002 there were on average three non UK nationals in custody per day. This went up to an average of 13 per day in 2006. The figure now stands at 10 non UK nationals in custody per day. This can also have a “knock on” effect in the Custody Office by slowing the whole day to day business process down for other detainees as well. These increases in custody figures are partly a reflection of the increasing number of migrants in the County. In addition to this there is a complex inter-play of other factors which have seen a disproportionality of Eastern European nationals in certain offender categories. Where we have identified those issues, such as driving with excess alcohol, engagement activity has been undertaken with the aim of reducing it.

A further consideration when looking at the changing profile of custody detainees is the time a detainee actually spends in the custody suite. For those detainees of a non UK nationality this can be significantly higher than for those of a UK nationality. Whilst a contributory factor to an extended stay in custody is most frequently the availability of interpreters to allow the investigation process to continue, there are occasions where an individual has been detained for immigration purposes but the UK Border Agency have not been able to ‘house’ the detainee prior to deportation. As a result, there are additional costs borne by the Constabulary in providing food, phone calls, supervision etc, as well as a potential loss of custody facilities.

The Hertfordshire Alcohol Problem Advisory Service (HAPAS) who provide drink drive rehabilitation courses for those convicted of excess alcohol also note an increase in Eastern European nationals who attend the course. HAPAS do not keep nationality statistics but do describe the increase of Eastern Europeans as “significant” and have employed a Polish interpreter to assist with the delivery of the course. In Lincolnshire, they have such a large number of Polish nationals that they have employed a Polish speaking trainer who delivers their course.

Non-UK detainees 2002 -2007

![Graph showing % Non-UK detainees in Forcewide for 2002 to 2007]

194 Previously called the Border & Immigration Agency.
195 HAPAS is an independent agency promoting the prevention of alcohol misuse and concerned with helping those harmed directly or indirectly by alcohol throughout Hertfordshire, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire. PC Barrios participates in the drink drive rehabilitation course.
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5. Translated Material

A great deal of engagement work has been undertaken by the police and their partners in an attempt to address some of the cultural issues which can contribute to the commission of criminal offences. One of our successes has been the production of A Newcomer’s guide to policing and the law in Cambridgeshire. This provides a basic guide to the law and some of the “do’s” and “don’ts”. It has been translated into 17 languages, used by other police forces and is a hugely sought after document by our partners who distribute it to migrants. An evaluation has confirmed its worth. Penalty Notices for Disorder (PNDs) have also been translated into nine different languages for staff to use.

The Roads Policing Unit (RPU)—has used translation services to translate the Vehicle Seizure notice into four languages—Polish, Lithuanian, Portuguese and Kurdish (Sorani). These notices are still very much in use by RPU Officers when seizing vehicles.

We do not keep statistics on vehicle seizures as such, but a snapshot has been obtained from a local garage who deals with all uninsured vehicle seizures in the Peterborough area. Over the last week, 20 vehicles have been seized. Of those at least eight (possibly 10) were owned by Eastern Europeans.

6. Road Traffic Offences

The Constabulary’s Casualty Reduction Officer and Neighbourhood Policing Teams continue to engage with migrant workers at various locations throughout the County and provide information and law inputs in relation to drink drive and vehicle offences, such as no insurance.

Warrants issued by the Magistrates Court for minor road traffic offences are another indicator of disproportionality. For example, a recent review of warrants for the three Basic Command Units (BCUs) in Cambridgeshire revealed that Peterborough had 213 outstanding warrants where the person was of no fixed abode compared to 86 and 97 for the other two BCUs. Of the 213 warrants, 84% were from the Eastern European community. In order to reduce this, a protocol was introduced which involves officers making additional enquiries to substantiate that person’s identity.

---

196 The guide provides information on such issues as: reporting crime; how to contact the police; help for victims and witnesses; personal safety; acceptable behaviour; alcohol and drugs; drinking and driving; and domestic violence.

197 Vehicles seized under Section 165A-C RTA 1988 for being uninsured or driven by an unlicensed driver.

198 This does not purport to be a representative sample and is merely intended to give a flavour of what is still happening.

199 The most common offence is that of failing to produce driving documents when required to do so.
Immigration has also bought an “international” dimension to criminality within Cambridgeshire. A good illustration of this is the proliferation of cannabis “farms” in Cambridgeshire and particularly Peterborough. From November 2006 to May 2008, 49 cannabis “farms” were raided in Cambridgeshire—34 of these “farms” were in Peterborough. Across the region Cambridgeshire has seen the highest number of Vietnamese cannabis “farms”. The majority of “gardeners” were Vietnamese, many illegal immigrants. This has raised questions about the extent to which they are victims of trafficking debt bondage or exploitation in a world of organised criminals. Many of those detained admitted that they were in debt to the traffickers who had bought them into the UK. However, they did not necessarily see themselves as having been trafficked. Whilst there is clear evidence that many of these people entered the United Kingdom illegally, there are significant intelligence gaps around how they were recruited and brought to Cambridgeshire. What is clear though is that human trafficking and forced labour are present within our county. Further work in this area will be conducted in liaison with United Kingdom Human Trafficking Centre (UKHTC) and the Serious and Organised Crime Agency (SOCA).

Honour Based Violence and Hate Crime

There have been cases of Honour Based Violence (HBV) in Cambridgeshire where the police have had to meet the cost of the victim’s accommodation. This has arisen when an investigation is underway and where the victim has no recourse to public funds. This victim care can last for six months to a year. Cambridgeshire Police are committed to tackling this type of crime and in June 2008 launched an HBV reporting line—only the second of its kind in the country. Potential victims will have direct telephone contact to on-call female police officers who will take initial management of the situation. The clear implication for the police is that the number of these sensitive and complex cases will increase. Since the line opened three weeks ago, there have been 12 calls from possible victims, 10 of which have resulted in active enquires commencing—including one from an East European man involved in a forced marriage situation. Many other calls have been received which have resulted in advice and guidance being given.

In order to maximise the reporting of Hate Crime via third party means Cambridgeshire operates the Open Out. Since January 2008 Peterborough also use the Stop Hate UK telephone reporting line.

Honour Based Violence is defined as: “a crime or incident, which has or may have been committed to protect or defend the honour of the family and/or community”.

Previous Convictions of Non-UK European Citizens

In recognition of the high numbers of European migrants in the County, Cambridgeshire Police have become the first force nationally to be able to obtain previous conviction histories for all non-UK European citizens who come into custody or are under investigation for a criminal offence. An agreement with the United Kingdom Central Authority allows checks to be made in relation to all non-UK EU nationals that come into custody. This is excellent for the administration of justice as up until now offenders have been dealt with by the courts with no knowledge of previous convictions recorded in their home country. However, the requirements of the process increases both officer time when dealing with that person and also impacts on the time of other staff involved in the administration of the scheme.

This lack of access to the offending history of foreign nationals also has implications for officer safety. For example, in May 2008 Cambridgeshire Roads Policing Officers arrested a Polish male who made off from the scene of a road traffic accident after driving with excess alcohol. Initially he gave the officers an incorrect name, but finally revealed his real name. A check on the Police National Computer disclosed that he had been disqualified from driving by a British Court. When this became known the man became violent,
fighting with four officers and assaulting two of them. A subsequent check on his previous convictions from Poland (which were not on his British record) revealed he had convictions for homicide and other offences of violence. These Polish convictions will now be transferred onto his British criminal record.

10. OPERATION RADUIM—HUMAN TRAFFICKING FOR SEXUAL EXPLOITATION

Operation Radium, now part of the national Operation Pentameter Two, was launched in Cambridgeshire last August to investigate human trafficking for the purposes of sexual exploitation. So far in Cambridgeshire, 41 people have been arrested since the start of a massive operation. Over the last 10 months officers rescued 12 victims of the industry including nine adults and three children.

At least 85% of the women working as prostitutes come from Eastern Europe, China, Thailand and Brazil and are lured to Britain with false promises of legitimate work. Some were sold for up to £5,000 to pimps and brothel-keepers. The women were set quotas of the number of men they must have sex with each week, under the threat of violence. Five people have so far been charged in connection with two cases of trafficking and 23 people have been dealt with by the UK Border Agency. Four other people are also currently on bail.

11. CALL HANDLING

No statistics exist which reflect the nationality of callers to the police. However, police staff have noted a rise in the number of calls from those whose first language is not English. For all those answering calls, it is difficult to determine when little of no English is spoken. A recent example illustrates the point:

An operator took a call from an Eastern European who was using the outside phone at Bridge Street police station, because the Enquiry Office was closed. He repeatedly phoned the Switchboard only saying “Help” and then putting the phone down. The Switchboard Operator asked for an Officer to be dispatched to ascertain the problem. It transpired it was not a police matter but a problem between the caller and his Gangmaster regarding his accommodation.

12. OPERATION TOLERANCE—WORKER EXPLOITATION

Operation Tolerance is the name of a multi-agency initiative which will investigate trafficking for forced labour and worker exploitation in the Eastern Region of England. Cambridgeshire Constabulary is taking part in some preparatory activity which is led by the Gangmasters Licensing Authority (GLA) and supported by Lincolnshire and Norfolk police and also the United Kingdom Human Trafficking Centre. This initiative seeks to raise awareness of the issues around exploitation and trafficking and also to develop intelligence in these areas. There are clear indications that trafficking for labour and worker exploitation is occurring in the county and has become a feature of Cambridgeshire’s changing crime profile.

13. ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES

Engagement with the community is central to Neighbourhood Policing. As communities become more diverse it is important that officers have the language, faith, cultural skills and knowledge to enable them to interact effectively. In addition to core neighbourhood duties of providing visible presence and reassurance, Neighbourhood Policing Teams (NPTs) will engage with new arrivals and other minority communities as well as providing support and reassurance to victims of Hate Crime. There are an immense number of creative engagement activities being undertaken by NPTs in factories, packing plants and other places of employment, community centres, and other agencies’ premises and out in the neighbourhoods.

New communities require a “new” response. The police Community Cohesion Unit at Peterborough was established as a direct result of the needs and challenges the changing ethnic profile of the community presented. Key members of the team are the multi-lingual Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs). They are drawn from the community they help support and in addition to their linguistic skill they have been forging links with economic migrants in the City. This has been so successful that Slovaks, Czechs and Poles are now approaching them to report worker exploitation and appropriation of wages. Only a couple of weeks ago as a result of information given to one PCSO, police were able to “rescue” a young Slovakian male who was working in conditions of virtual slavery. The PCSOs have also been able to make significant inroads into strengthening links with young Muslim females.

The cultural dynamics in Peterborough has resulted in five staff being devoted to Safer Schools Partnerships work. This work is essential to the promotion of cohesion, but removes five staff from the “frontline”. Due to the issues in one of the schools in the Fenland area a similar Safer Schools Partnership is also being considered.

269 Key points of call handling contact are the Switchboard, the Force Control Room and the Police Service Centre.
14. Knife Crime

Knife crime\textsuperscript{210} is an area in which the Constabulary has had considerable success. In 2005–06 there were some significant knife crime and knife culture challenges in Cambridgeshire. Whilst these issues did centre on Peterborough they also affected other areas, such as Wisbech. The murders of Alvydas Galubickas\textsuperscript{211} in Wisbech in November 2005 and of Zelia Harrison\textsuperscript{212} in Peterborough in January 2006 both with knives raised the profile of knife crime within the county. Crime analysis for Peterborough revealed that during the two month period between 25 December 2005 and 25 February 2006 there were 85 knife crime incidents reported to the police. Intelligence suggested the involvement of all communities in the carrying and using of knives, but victim and offender analysis identified a potentially disproportionate representation of new communities. For example, there were a number of incidents involving Iraqi Kurds as offenders.

The Constabulary responded in partnership with a series of interventions which tied in with the National Knife Amnesty,\textsuperscript{213} but went beyond the scope of that initiative. They centred on prevention, education and communities. For example, there were a number of incidents involving Iraqi Kurds as offenders. Such as

\begin{itemize}
  \item Alvydas Galubickas was stabbed to death following a revenge attack by fellow Lithuanians Gintautas Leinartas and Ruslanas Ignatenka, both of whom were sentenced to life imprisonment for murder in September 2006.
  \item Zelia Harrison was a Sex Worker who carried a knife for her own protection, but Afghan Wakil Sahebzadeh used it to kill her. In May 2006 he was sentenced to life imprisonment for her murder.
\end{itemize}

The area of this case study is a popular destination for Eastern European migrants within Cambridgeshire. Proportional to the population, twice as many migrants have registered to work here as elsewhere. Eastern Europeans form the largest proportion of the population born abroad and represent up to 25% of the local working population. There is evidence that migrant workers and their dependants are settling in the community, which is putting other services such as education under greater strain.

For example, there is racial tension within one of the local schools. There has been racially motivated verbal and physical abuse (where foreign pupils are pushed out of the way in corridors and food is thrown at them). Many of these incidents are going unreported. There have also been acts of violence directed towards foreign pupils, including stone-throwing and fights. It has been noted there is a culture of “baiting” foreign students into a fight, so that a verbal/physical confrontation can be instigated. One such attack on a Lithuanian was witnessed by large numbers of pupils. The offender admitted the attack was racially motivated. There is also the perception from some that the children of migrants are getting “preferential” treatment due to extra support in relation to language issues. The school are working closely with the police who are offering support in managing and challenging unacceptable behaviour while providing reassurance on the school site.

Migrant workers also occupy public spaces in fairly large numbers—sometimes to drink, but often just to talk. Many migrants are feeling isolated from the settled community with few opportunities for meaningful interaction to promote integration. The attitudes and perceptions of some sections of the English population are becoming problematic and hostile. There have been instances of damage to foreign registered vehicles and negativity toward migrants expressed in public. Much crime against migrants is going unreported. All this serves to reinforce migrants’ feelings of isolation and victimisation. An example of how this can manifest itself occurred on 15 June 2008. A violent disorder took place between migrants and the settled English community involving 10–12 persons and in which a baseball bat and other weapons were used. The police arrested four people, three of them migrants. Enquiries are on-going in relation to this offence but it has raised tension levels in the community. A meeting of agencies at Chief Executive level recently took place to discuss these issues and work out a way forward.

\textsuperscript{210} A knife crime is one where an offender was either unlawfully in possession of a knife or bladed article or had used a knife or bladed article to threaten or injure another person.

\textsuperscript{211} Alvydas Galubickas was stabbed to death following a revenge attack by fellow Lithuanians Gintautas Leinartas and Ruslanas Ignatenka, both of whom were sentenced to life imprisonment for murder in September 2006.

\textsuperscript{212} Zelia Harrison was a Sex Worker who carried a knife for her own protection, but Afghan Wakil Sahebzadeh used it to kill her. In May 2006 he was sentenced to life imprisonment for her murder.

\textsuperscript{213} The National Knife Amnesty ran from 17 May 2006 until the 30 June 2006.

\textsuperscript{214} For example, education and awareness inputs in schools, factories, farms and other places of employment. Translated material explaining the law in relation to knives was also distributed in five languages. The use of hand held metal detectors in certain pubs and clubs for reassurance and deterrence.

\textsuperscript{215} Such as knife awareness training in schools.

\textsuperscript{216} This case study has been depersonalised, but the events described are real and on-going.
16. Policing Impacts: Everyday Examples

What follows are a few everyday routine examples of how migration is impacting on the service delivery of the police:

— A Police Inspector in Wisbech who recently reviewed the detention of a Latvian national who spoke no English took over an hour on a task that would normally take 10 minutes. In this instance the Inspector had to locate a translator, explain the process to them and once that had been completed actually conduct the review. This issue with detained persons, languages and translators is repeated countless times throughout the County on a daily basis.

— A recent case involving a cannabis “factory” in a rural area of South Cambridgeshire again highlights the language issue. Three Vietnamese nationals were arrested so not only were there the obvious issues in time delays and expense in arranging interpreters for interview, but all of the offenders’ phones were examined. When the examination reports came back all of the text messages were in Vietnamese. This in turn meant extra expense in getting the text messages translated.

— A record is kept by police in Peterborough of persons given a direction to leave217 an area when their presence is likely to cause or contribute to the occurrence of alcohol-related crime and disorder. Of those persons so required to leave 42% are Eastern European.

— Some Eastern European nationals engaged in anti-social behaviour in Wisbech and dispersed under Section 30218 indicated to Officers they did not have a bed available and had no space in their accommodation to sit, drink and chat. This not only indicates a drinking culture, but also accommodation and tenancy issues which may be linked to exploitative landlords.

— A Lithuanian migrant raped by two of her fellow nationals in Peterborough was found temporary accommodation with another Lithuanian family. She did not stay with them because she felt she had brought “shame” on them by involving the police. She was then found living destitute under canvas along with other Lithuanians in a similar predicament. The police tried to find temporary accommodation, but ended up paying for accommodation over the weekend in question because no other agency could assist.

— Migrant workers from a local fruit packing plant in East Cambridgeshire were paid in cash at the end of their periods of employment. To collect their cash they were taken by bus to a local bank before returning home (normally two to three days after end of contract). The average payment was about £4,000 per employee. Cash handout periods lasted for about 1½ hours. Ten employees at a time were allowed to collect their wages. Groups of young men would stand outside the bank counting it out of brown envelopes. The numbers of workers steadily increased and so did the amounts of cash. There were a huge number of risks associated with this practice. A great deal of police time and effort was expended in both ensuring the activity itself was monitored and that a longer term solution to it was found. From this season the company have agreed to pay by electronic bank transfer.

— A report was received by the police from English as an Additional Language (EAL) teacher, that many of the young migrant worker men she taught tended to, “... remain culturally isolated, to speed, drink-drive and expect to avoid being charged with traffic offences”. As a consequence an engagement activity at the packing plant was arranged by the Neighbourhood Policing Team which dealt with drink drive and other cultural and community safety issues.

— Eleven males from Afghanistan were detained after they were found hidden in the rear of a truck in Fordham, East Cambridgeshire, which had travelled from Belgium via Felixstowe. They were detained under the Immigration Act 1971 by the Neighbourhood Policing Team (NPT) and taken into custody at Ely Police Station. Three Immigration Service Officers were dispatched from Norfolk to assist. The language issues had to be overcome while these detainees were looked after, fed and processed. The NPT was totally committed to this task at the expense of their normal duties. Two of the males turned out to be young persons and social services became involved. Emergency accommodation was found for them in Peterborough and Fenland to which they were taken by the police. The remaining nine males were taken to Oakington Detention Centre by the police and the Immigration Service. The net result was that five police officers were committed for nearly ten hours (one officer worked a seventeen hour day) and thus not able to perform their normal community duties.

July 2008

APPENDIX 36

Memorandum submitted by British Chambers of Commerce

ABOUT THE BRITISH CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE

1.1 The British Chambers of Commerce (BCC) welcomes the chance to respond to the Home Affairs Select Committee’s call for evidence into Policing in the 21st Century. The BCC is the national voice of local business; a national network of quality-accredited Chambers of Commerce, uniquely positioned at the heart of every business community in the UK. The BCC represents over 100,000 businesses of all sizes across all sectors of the economy that together employ over 5 million people.

SUMMARY

2.1 The BCC is concerned that business crime is rising at a disturbing rate. Since 2004 the total cost of crime against business has risen from £10.5 billion to £12.6 billion.219 The Home Office has previously estimated the total cost of crime in Britain each year is £59.9 billion, which would suggest that business crime accounts for a substantial share of the total cost of crime. Crime against business is a problem that is not only affecting many companies’ ability to do business but is also blighting the communities in which they are situated. 80% of businesses indicated that crime against business is a problem to their local area.

BRITISH CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE RESPONSE

What should the public expect of the police; how could Chief Constables determine their priorities more effectively and what is the role of the Home Office in setting priorities?

3.1 The BCC believes that the business community and crimes against business are not properly prioritised in the fight against crime. The Home Office has recently reduced its business crime unit to a single person which sends out a signal to the business community that central Government perceives crimes against business as a minimal issue. This goes against current evidence which suggests crimes against business are in fact on the rise. Our recent survey found that crimes against business now cost British business £12.6 billion per annum, a rise of 20% over four years.

3.2 The BCC believes that there must be key performance indicators related to crimes against business so that police forces can be judged against them. Due to the lack of any real statistics on crimes against business many police forces do not see tackling crimes against business as a priority. This has led to a reduction in confidence of the police from the business community. 56% of businesses are not confident that the police understand the issues that are most important to them while 68% do not feel confident that the police are dealing with issues that are most important to their business.

What is the effect of heightened concerns about terrorism, immigration, gun and knife crime, identity fraud; the growth in cyber-crime; the Olympics?

3.3 The BCC’s recent crime survey reported the rising concern of cyber crime. New and fast changing tactics have resulted in over a third of businesses reporting phishing attacks while 11% have experienced credit card fraud. As a result 74% of businesses have called for the creation of a central/national body to deal with e-crime.

What should be the role of public involvement in local policing?

3.4 The BCC believes that businesses, at the heart of their local communities and as providers of jobs, are fundamental to the development and sustainability of their local areas. Community policing programmes should take account of the role business plays in the community. Employment helps reduce criminal activity and anti-social behaviour. Police priorities should help protect and maintain business in communities as part of crime reduction programmes.

3.5 It is vital that the business community is represented on local partnerships. Current awareness of Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRP)s at only 27% is very low and of those businesses that knew of their local CDRPs only 38% felt they were effective. 59% of all businesses reported that they should be given a greater role in local crime partnerships and evidence shows that where the local chamber or business representative organisation has been involved crime is often reduced.

3.6 The BCC believes that each police force should have a police officer whose role should include business liaison.

219 The Invisible Crime: A Business Crime Survey April 2008—a survey of over 4000 of our own business members which formed the Business Crime Survey Report, which has been submitted with this memorandum as evidence.
How can the roles of and relationship between Police Constables (PCs) and Police Community Safety Officers (PCSOs) achieve better policing?

3.7 The BCC believes that PCSOs play a vital role in their local community. However, awareness of local PCSOs among businesses is currently fairly low at only 32%. Yet where contact has been made nearly half of businesses believed they had impacted on perceptions of safety in the local area.

Would you support the use of technology to enable police officers to return to the beat?

3.8 The BCC would support measures that allow police officers to spend more time policing rather than completing paperwork.

APPENDIX 37

Memorandum submitted by Staffordshire Police

— Thank Chairman for the opportunity to present a Staffordshire Police perspective.

— The aim for Staffordshire Police is to create the highest levels of trust and confidence within our communities and we will do that by putting the public and the individual citizen at the heart of all that we do.

— Our operational priorities are to keep reducing crime, deliver cutting edge protective services and exceptional levels of customer service.

— To achieve all of this the Chief Constable, Chris Sims, has recognised that our staff need the best tools, more discretion and the maximum amount of time possible dedicated to a service for victims and witnesses.

— Today we would like to showcase four examples of how we are helping our staff build trust and confidence.

— Chief Superintendent Michael Harrison will speak about our development of an electronic file building product and how we have linked this to a significant development within the Criminal Justice world which is called “Streamlined Process”.

— Inspector Emma Griffiths will speak about another product delivered exclusively within Staffordshire to provide telephone call evidence direct to the investigating officers from our control room systems.

— Mr Ian De Soyza will outline the most recent developments for the use of mobile hand held computer devices for operational staff across Staffordshire.

— Firstly, however, I will take a couple of minute to explain to the Committee the work we are doing on crime recording and developing a culture of professional judgement for our officers and staff.

— Sir Ronnie Flanagan, in his recent Review of Policing, highlighted crime recording as being one of the main areas where processes in the service have become overly bureaucratic and our officers had become to risk averse. Sir Ronnie tasked four Forces, including Staffordshire, to trial new technology and new ways of working.

— I think the service now accepts that we had, over a period of years, arrived at a one size fits all service for crime recording with little attention to what the public needed or expected.

— The police service records somewhere between 5 and 6 million crimes a year. This has been a growth industry in recent years and the service now records more and more calls for service as formal crimes since 1998. 29 new Home Office crime classifications have been introduced resulting in 750,000 new offences being recorded in 2005–06 alone. The cost of recording and handling common assaults alone nationally has been estimated at £91 million per year.

— The real damage, however, comes from the artificial constraints placed upon officers when trying to resolve this enormous number of crimes. The service has been forced to show improved sanction detections out of a growing number of incidents described as crimes. As a result we have appeared inflexible and clumsy in our seemingly rigid use of criminal justice sanctions against what the public sees as a varied basket of minor incidents and misdemeanours.
Under the National Crime Recording standards the requirement for incidents to be classified in accordance with strict definitions of offences has led to countless examples of crime reports where the complainant, the offender and the police did not truly believe that a criminal offence had been committed. The examples included:

- Children being cautioned for public order offences where members of the public are offended by their playing.
- Children being cautioned for throwing snowballs in a road.
- Children being cautioned for seemingly serious firearms offences when they had in fact been playing with paint ball guns in local woods.

As well as criminalising more people, particularly the young, the police service has moved further and further away from the public’s need for flexible solutions and has driven our offices to become more and more disillusioned with the bureaucracy.

Staffordshire Police, as one of the four pilot Forces, is now working with communities to draw a distinction between “serious crime” and “local crimes and incidents”.

Serious crimes account for about 30% of all crimes recorded. These will continue to be robustly investigated and recorded. An increased emphasis on quality investigations for these offences should mean that we can detect even more than before and provide a top level service for victims and witnesses who will need to be supported through the criminal justice system.

Local crimes account for the remaining 70% of issues handled by the police. The four pilot Forces are now recording these crimes in a much more concise way—in fact we are striving to record the bulk of these matters on a single page. This short crime report format can be captured on our command and control systems, removing the need for any double keying on to our crime system and almost eliminating the need for officers to be involved in the computer input process.

Our officers have also been freed up from the requirement to maximise sanction detections for local crime. Officers can agree a whole range of formal and informal disposals with complainants which are recorded succinctly on our systems as community resolutions. Officers are primarily judged on the levels of satisfaction reported by the people they are serving. Our community teams are then on hand to engage with the wider community on neighbourhood management and problem solving to stop things happening in the first place.

This programme of work started on the 02.06.08 and is being formally evaluated by the National Policing Improvement Agency. We think the benefits for reduced bureaucracy, public satisfaction and staff morale are going to be significant. We think that for the estimated 100,000 crimes that Staffordshire Police record in a year we may be able to save up to 40,000 hours of officer time in the recording process alone with, as yet, unquantified savings in the removal of the need to take unproductive witness statements and time spent in custody suites. We anticipate being able to report back fully to Sir Ronnie and to the Home Secretary in January 2009. By way of examples today, however, I can distribute an example of the short crime report to compare with the old Staffordshire format and a copy of a letter from one of our local Parish Councils who comment on their perceptions of the benefits of our staff using their common sense and professional judgement in dealing with minor crimes.

**STREAMLINED PROCESS**

(Appendix B—Streamlined Process—Police Report Example)

Presented by Chief Superintendent Michael Harrison

- Proportionate file preparation and service of advance information to the point of first hearing.
- Reduced bureaucracy/a stop in the over engineering of files.
- Court reduced churning/CPS sensitive to victims and witnesses.
- Carter Reforms.
- Proactive case management at first hearing.

Performance:

- 78% of guilty plea cases dealt with at the first hearing.
- 48% Reduction in the requirement to obtain statements.
- 15% Reduction in the tasking of officers.
- MG Compiler2.
Staffordshire Police MG Compiler

Helping nationally to cut Bureaucracy for operational officers

Concept: One of the constant complaints by officers is the amount of paperwork and the repetition of data regarding the Prosecution forms or “MG forms” such as “Name” “Rank” “Collar Number”, Defendant(s) Name Date of Birth etc.

All of this information is required on every form and dependant upon case file complexity can be up to 20 pages per Defendant. Cases dealing with four defendants can have over 80 separate pages.

MG forms are nationally formatted, maintained on an editable database and in most cases have to be completed by hand.

James Bromley, Divisional IT Officer for Trent Valley Division of Staffordshire Police, embarked upon a project to create an electronic version of the MG forms thus removing constant repetition for operational officers which was called MG Compiler.

MG Compiler: With the success of the original MG Compiler and efficiency savings made, Staffordshire Police was asked by the Home Office to be one of the seven forces to take part in the piloting of the new “Streamlined Process” of prosecution file completion.

James Bromley was asked to produce a new electronic version for streamlined process, which has been completed and is called MG Compiler2 which at present is on trial within Chase Division of Staffordshire Police.

The Streamlined process is expected to further reduce bureaucracy for frontline officers, by simplifying the file content the MG Compiler2 adds further time savings for officers.

The program is based on Microsoft Excel and is designed to use Excel spreadsheets to replicate the current set of “MG” forms.

The system has 37 facsimile MG spreadsheets which replicate the national forms required. The system can produce any prosecution file type, for up to four Defendants.

The Streamlined Process is based around the Police Report case summary MG5 form, which for Staffordshire Police has removed over five pages of forms.

This new form is fundamental to the MG Compiler2.

Case officers only need to complete their personal details once and a customised template is created for them.

Using the “Defendant” tabs and completing the key information such as Defendant(s), Name, date of birth etc. will automatically populate the relevant part of the forms saving valuable time for officers.

By using the MG Compiler2, it removes over 400 field replications which the case officers would normally spend valuable time completing by hand.

The program is further enhanced by giving the end-user dropdown menu selections and includes spelling and grammar check functionality within parts of the forms.

Benefits: The following benefits of using the system have been noted:

— The original MG Compiler has anecdotal evidence which confirmed time savings of at least 30 minutes per defendant, per case file.
— Built in methods of contacting the injured parties to update on case progress.
— MG Compiler2 can be used on virtually any computer, laptop, PDA or Blackberry.
— Can already be accessed on any computer within Staffordshire Police.
— Creates an entire case file which can be readily emailed as an attachment to interested parties eg CPS, other case officers for handover.
— The MG Compiler is easy to use for people with basic IT skills having been designed for the novice and expert computer user.
— Can be used as a training aid, officers learn which files are required.
— Can be quickly edited to suit any changes to the national Manual Guidance forms.
— Produces a professional case file output with grammar and spelling corrected.
— Improves accuracy and streamlines the entire MG file building process by producing the exact forms for the file type.
— Contents meet the exact requirements of the Criminal Justice Support Unit and Crown Prosecution Service as well as M.O.G. protocols.
— Can be tailored and customised to create bespoke forms.
— Is designed to incorporate “Statutory Charging” for CPS.
— Officers work on the actual forms so they are recognisable.
— This has been tested and designed in conjunction with Police officers and Support staff to ensure user friendliness and is fully endorsed in its usage by Staffordshire Police file handling department (Criminal Justice Support Unit).
— Case file templates may be created for common occurrences ie drink driving, public order, etc.

Costs: We have copyrighted the Compiler and have been happy to share our innovations with others who seek solutions for operational staff.

The cost to interested parties is free however any customising to match Force/Constabulary systems may incur fees.

Forces that have purchased the original system so far are as follows:
— Norfolk Constabulary.
— Sussex Police.
— Cumbria Police.
— City Of London.
— Lincolnshire Police.

A number of other forces have also expressed interest.

STAFFORDSHIRE POLICE WEBPLAYER999

Supporting vulnerable victims by reducing bureaucracy through technology

Concept: The WEBPlay999 voice recording system is based at Staffordshire police Headquarters and centrally records all incoming and outgoing telephone calls to the Force.

Staffordshire Police has developed this system so the 999 calls can now be listened to and downloaded from any computer across the force as soon as the call is made.

This enables officers to use the call as evidence on initial interviews with defendants and during disclosure to both Prosecution and defence solicitors, therefore helping us to secure prosecutions and support our most vulnerable victims whilst reducing bureaucracy within the criminal justice system.

After consultation the concept and process has been embraced by all sectors of the criminal justice system, which includes both the Courts and CPS within Staffordshire.

The Webplayer999 recordings can be either forwarded to case officers or interested parties via email or downloaded on to a CD which can be played our dedicated custody interview disclosure suites.

Since the launch of WEBPlayer999, some 20 forces have visited Staffordshire Police Including the Metropolitan Police Force and City of London.

Costs: There are no costs involved to Webplayer999 as it was already a force system, it purely required a change in force policy and operational procedure

Benefits: The benefits of using this facility are as follows:
— WEBplayer999, allows us to access and immediately play the initial call made to Staffordshire police. It can then be copied onto disc and be played to the defendant on interview. This would normal take four to six weeks which would necessitate the defendant to be placed on police bail.
— It supports the force’s objectives of reducing crime and protecting people.
— WEBplayer999 can be accessed through any computer within the Force.
— It provides corroborative evidence in order to help support the victim’s allegation, reassuring them to continue with their complaint and in the effectiveness of the police.
— It is strong and compelling evidence which helps officers present a persuasive and imp active case to the CPS, defence and ultimately the court, therefore enabling charging decisions and prosecutions to be made swifter, preventing opportunities for the victims to withdraw their complaint.
— WEBPlayer999 has been introduced at no cost to Staffordshire police but has cumulative time savings throughout the criminal justice system.
— It can be sent to and played by the case officer via email, this has proven to be useful in engaging officers in domestic violence cases and more effectively than the printed text from command and control output.
— Our domestic violence team are able to make more informed risk assessments therefore protecting our most vulnerable victims.
### APPENDIX A

#### SHORT CRIME REPORT

Staffordshire Police  
Local Crime Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Crime Reference Number</th>
<th>Date Code</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Date Committed Between/At</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**OFFENCE TYPE**  
- Domestic: YIN  
- Localised: YIN

**Location Type**  
- Public Place: Licensed  
- Public Place: Non-Licensed  
- Non-Public Place

**Relationship to Offender**  
- Family  
- Friend  
- Colleague  
- Stranger

**Scene of Crime**  
- Room/Flat/House Number/Name

---

### Home Affairs Committee: Evidence  
Ev 295
APPENDIX B
STREAMLINED PROCESS—EXAMPLE OF A POLICE REPORT

DIRECTOR’S GUIDANCE STREAMLINED PROCESS
POLICE REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defendant 1.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>STREAMLINE</th>
<th>File</th>
<th>Anticipated Plea</th>
<th>Adult</th>
<th>status?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defendant 2.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Anticipated Plea</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>status?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defendant 3.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Anticipated Plea</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Youth?</td>
<td>status?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defendant 4.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Anticipated Plea</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Youth?</td>
<td>status?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. KEY EVIDENCE. “Key evidence” is any evidence which taken together establishes all the points which need to be proved. The summary should be set out in chronological order so that it tells the story of the offence (not the investigation) and covers each of the ‘points to prove’. It should be made clear which witness (provide name & status e.g. key eye witness, victim) can provide the evidence summarised. Witnesses who give the same evidence or deal with procedure (charge, interview etc.) should be listed in Section 3 below. State value of property stolen or damaged and what recovered.

2. DEFENDANT INTERVIEW. Identify the interviewing officer. Set out any explanation the defendant gave as to how the offence happened, include any mitigation and remorse put forward. If CCTV is ‘Key’, record the defendant’s response/reaction if it was shown in interview. Summarise the explanation of the defendant aloud at the conclusion of the interview and note that here. State if no comment made in interview or prepared statement handed over and obtain a copy. Note any special warnings given.
RESTRICTED (when Complete)

DIRECTOR’S GUIDANCE STREAMLINED PROCESS
POLICE REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervewing Officer</th>
<th>Others present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>URN 21</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. NON KEY EVIDENCE. List the witnesses not summarised in section 1 and state what they contribute eg. additional eye witness, arresting officer, present at arrest but dealing with passenger/member of public, charging officer, officer seized CCTV.

4. VISUAL EVIDENCE. If any, state if 'key' and give a brief summary of what it shows. If no visual evidence or if not key, give reasons.
Following attendance at your seminar held in Monmouth on 16 June 2008 I make the following comments for your attention/consideration.

Consideration of the underlying reasons for Crime should have a priority prior to additional penalties being imposed.

At present the increases in crime appear to be outstripping the Police man hours, and Prison places, available. Perhaps if the reasons, Lack of facilities, Poor housing etc. were tackled first in an attempt to encourage social stability in the Family unit and education and sporting facilities were made more widely available at the same time this might reduce crime and be a less costly way forward.

Hand held computers having the capability of having their contents, or copies thereof, being used in court as evidence. This would assist in reducing duplication of reports and increase the amount of time police officers were available to investigate crime/be available on the streets.

A reduction, by design, of reporting requirements and legislation in the time Police Officers are required to spend “on station”.

These then are my, somewhat restricted thoughts on the subject of Policing in the 21st Century. I would however plead that when making your considerations your committee perhaps “thinks outside the box” and produces some radical proposals for the well being of all sectors of this Country in which we live.

---

**APPENDIX 39**

**Supplementary memorandum submitted by the Local Government Association**

I am writing to express the Local Government Association’s concerns about proposals in the Policing Green Paper to reform the membership of police authorities through the introduction of directly-elected crime and policing representatives.

The rationale for the introduction of crime and policing representatives is that the public feel that they have little or no influence over decisions made about policing. Whilst the LGA does not dispute this claim, and supports increasing the public accountability of the police, we feel that the new structures contained within the Green Paper will decrease such scrutiny and undermine the principle behind the changes.
Key to this concern is that the proposed new structure of police authorities will, by reducing the number of councillors who sit on police authorities, undermine partnership working between the police and local authorities. I am sure you will agree that partnership working is vital to addressing crime and has been central to the reduction in crime that we have witnessed over the last decade. It is more than likely that directly-elected crime and policing representatives will have differing policy aims from local authorities, and potentially the police, making the agreement of joint objectives more difficult.

The LGA also believes that the proposal to place crime and policing representatives in charge of Community Safety Funds could divert financial and other resources away from complex policing matters towards their own electoral priorities, which may be based on populist messages. Furthermore, partnership working will be threatened by the increased possibility that electoral objectives become the principle drive behind policing on a local level—with the potential for the police to be seen to be enforcing a political agenda.

Councillors are already elected locally to represent the community as advocates on crime and community safety issues. The LGA does not believe that setting up parallel structures with a conflicting and competing mandate will aid the police in working with partners to reduce crime, nor will it increase the representation of local residents in decisions on policing. Instead police accountability should be improved by extending to council executive members (including leaders) the responsibilities proposed for directly-elected mayors, and by councillors continuing to form a significant part of police authorities. This would strengthen the partnership working which is so vital to crime reduction and allow for the communities to utilise strong relationships with councils to input into decision making on policing issues.

October 2008

APPENDIX 40

Memorandum submitted by the Thames Valley Police on Recruitment and Retention

The figures which Chief Constable Sara Thornton gave clearly reflected the current situation. However, whilst the impact of growth in the South East was referred to, there was insufficient time to elaborate on the key significance of this growth.

The South East Regional Plan to 2026 proposed some 640,000 new homes in the region and the creation of 1 job per house. In Thames Valley alone, 209,000 (minimum) new homes are proposed.

Our current indications are that this growth will require 540 additional officers and 700 staff to maintain current ratios of policing to population. We are already, here in Thames Valley, one of the lowest ratio of officers to population in the UK. Clearly, the impact of this growth is going to put a significant additional strain on recruitment and retention over the next few years and is clearly an issue which I feel the Committee needs to be aware of in its deliberations, particularly when looking forward to policing in the new Century.

This growth will also put significant financial strain on policing in Thames Valley and across the South East. For example, in Thames Valley alone we currently estimate a requirement for £90 million of additional capital investment to provide the necessary facilities to police the growth. As you may be aware, there is no support from government towards these costs.

As a consequence, we are anxious to ensure access to “planning gain” and the proposed Community Infrastructure Levy to support policing and community safety. We are pursuing this rigorously with Home Office and DCLG and any support your Committee could give in furthering this would be most welcome.

At the Reading session, there was also the mention of the “floors and ceilings” in the revenue funding formula. This is also crucial to the future provision of safe communities as we are predicting an additional annual revenue requirement of £50 million to meet the increased needs arising from growth.

April 2008