

London Borough of Hackney
Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission
Municipal Year 2021/22
Date of meeting Tuesday, 22 June 2021

Minutes of the proceedings of
the Living in Hackney Scrutiny
Commission held at
Hackney Town Hall, Mare
Street, London, E8 1EA

Chair	Cllr Sharon Patrick
Councillors in Attendance:	Cllr Penny Wrout, Cllr M Can Ozsen, Cllr Ian Rathbone, Cllr Ajay Chauhan, Cllr Anthony McMahon, Cllr Soraya Adejare
Apologies:	Cllr Clare Joseph
Officers in Attendance	Maurice Mason, Community Safety Partnership Manager
Other People in Attendance	Cllr Susan Fajana – Thomas (Cabinet Member for Community Safety LBH), Natasha Plummer (Head of Engagement MOPAC), Jo White (Reviews Manager MOPAC), Sal Naseem (Regional Director London IOPC), Emma Pearce (Oversight Lead IOPC), Detective Superintendent Marcus Barnett (Borough Commander Central East BCU), Commander Jane Connors (London lead for Violence and Stop/Search, MET HQ)
Members of the Public	None
Officer Contact:	Tracey Anderson ☎ 0208 356 3312 ✉ tracey.anderson@hackney.gov.uk

Councillor Sharon Patrick in the Chair

1. Election of Chair and Vice Chair

- 1.1. Following the nomination and seconding of Cllr Patrick as Chair. Cllr Patrick was duly elected Chair of the Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission.
- 1.2. Following the nomination and seconding of Cllr Adejare as Vice-Chair. Cllr Adejare was duly elected Vice-Chair of the Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission.

2 Apologies for Absence

- 2.1 Apologies for absence from Cllr Clare Joseph.
- 2.2 Virtual attendance from the following Councillors on the Commission.

- Cllr Anthony McMahon
- Cllr Soraya Adejare.

3 Urgent Items/ Order of Business

3.1 There are no urgent items, and the order of business was as set out in the agenda.

4 Declaration of Interest Hackney Library Services

4.1 None.

5 Trust and Confidence and Inclusive Policing

5.1 The Chair outlined the reasons for this session.

5.2 Following the Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission meeting in November 2020 the key themes that emerged for follow up were:

1. MPS complaint system
2. Accountability of police officers for behaviour and appropriate use of police tools.
3. No set monitoring targets for stop and search and outcome success rates.
4. Reducing the disproportionality among ethnic minority groups being stopped and searched.
5. Representation of Hackney's diverse community in MPS / MOPAC community engagement and scrutiny structures.

5.3 Invited guest to the meeting were:

- Metropolitan Police Service (Head Quarters & Borough Commander for Hackney),
- Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC)
- Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC).

5.4 To continue their work looking at building trust and confidence and inclusive policing.

5.5 The Chair informed the meeting questions were sent to the IOPC, MPS and MOPAC for a response in advance of this meeting. The meeting was split into 3 sessions.

Session 1 IOPC

5.6 The IOPC provided a written response to the questions submitted. The meeting moved straight into the questions and answer session for this segment of the meeting.

Session 2 MOPAC

5.7 The Chair introduced the item and asked the Head of Engagement from MOPAC to cover the questions sent in advance and respond to the queries raised in the previous session related to stop and search, handcuffing and progress on the Mayor's Action Plan for Crime and Policing in London.

- 5.7.1 The session commenced with a presentation from the Head of Engagement from MOPAC outlining their response to questions sent in advance. (Questions were noted in the agenda).
- 5.7.2 The main points from the presentation are outlined below. MOPAC is led by the Mayor of London Sadiq Khan. The Mayor of London is the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) for London. The police and crime commissioner for London sets the budget and the strategic direction for the Metropolitan Police Service (MET/MPS). The PCC is responsible for overseeing the work and holding the MET Commissioner to account for delivery. During the mayoral term a police and crime plan is produced, and this sets out the strategic direction.
- 5.7.3 The officer highlighted at the last meeting MOPAC advised they would do a series of workshops over the summer looking at trusts and confidence, particularly within black communities. MOPAC spoke to over 400 people in this programme of work organisations within the black communities and from black communities.
- 5.7.4 MOPAC explained they have focused on black communities because of the significant concerns this community has raised and the gaps in their level of trust and confidence in policing compared to other communities. Notwithstanding, confidence across all communities has fallen more recent years.
- 5.7.5 From the work carried over the summer MOPAC has published an action plan for transparency, accountability and trust in policing. This was published in November 2020. This report is organised across 4 themes and has 40 actions in the plan. The majority of which are now in progress.
- 5.7.6 A full update on all the actions across the plan was published in February 2021. A further update is due early July 2021.
- 5.7.7 The 4 themes across the plans focus on the areas that relate to the discussion at the meeting.

A) better use of police powers – looking at how the police use their policing tools (handcuffing, tasers, use of force and stop and search). MOPAC recognise there is some disproportionate impact on some communities but also that it is of concern to the public and has a key impact on the trust and confidence measures.

B) how they work together with black communities to make them safer and how they engage with the MET and MOPAC about the work that they do and policing in their area.

C) how the service represents and understands black communities. This is relevant in relation to how they recruit police officers, black police officers to the service and increase the numbers. MOPAC explained the MPS have stated their ambitions in relation to this. They will also be considering how police officers are equipped, trained and education to be able to operate in the many diverse communities they serve.

D) how MOPAC hold the police to account for their operations.

5.7.8 MOPAC advised in response to the questions sent in advance they would speak about their community engagement activity, data transparency and accountability.

Community engagement

5.7.9 In the action plan MOPAC have made a commitment to overhaul their community engagement structures. This is currently being reviewed. This involves mapping some of the activity that already exist, and now MOPAC is working towards establishing a new community engagement framework.

5.7.10 This work will involve communities across London, in Hackney, the Safe Neighbourhood Boards (SNB), the community monitoring groups, all other existing groups and the wider community.

5.7.11 MOPAC is aware that the monitoring groups that are currently in place e.g. stop and search and SNBs have been in place for a significant periods of time and they acknowledged they are not well known or as representative as they would like them to be. These groups are not as well positioned to be talking about the good work they may be doing in their various areas. MOPAC explained the groups were set up under the previous administration. However, in relation to how the groups are structured and bringing new people on board. MOPAC have provide them with upfront investment and spent time setting them up. MOPAC has provided a broad framework in which they are expected to operate, a model terms of reference and a set of expectations round engagement and what they should be working on.

5.7.12 MOPAC has become aware that the groups need more ongoing support for the work they would like them to do. Over the years some of the work has been delivered through MOPAC and local authorities but the financial pressures in recent years and the ongoing capacity needed to support them has become more critical.

5.7.13 Within the current framework MOPAC are advising groups to become more diverse and have encouraged them to think about how to be more inclusive. However, MOPAC do not have a direct role in recruiting people to these groups.

5.7.14 MOPAC explained they would expect them to have a natural understanding of their local communities. One of the questions MOPAC Head of Engagement is asking is “what are the barriers to people are being involved in those mechanisms and are they still fit for purpose”. MOPAC is currently doing this work with communities because they want to understand peoples lived experiences and expertise in those spaces so they can build something that will work for communities on the ground.

5.7.15 The next phase of their work on the action plan aims to resolve these issues and the key aim is to make sure the groups are more diverse and representative. MOPAC will consider how they can enable this.

5.7.16 MOPAC have scheduled a meeting in July to talk to communities about this.

Data transparency

- 5.7.17 This is an important element of the work that they do. There is a lot of data already in the public domain, but this data is not necessarily as visible to everyone as they would like it to be. It was highlighted that people do not necessarily know the data is available and MOPAC is planning to do some work to promote the data and make it more accessible.
- 5.7.18 As part of the action plan MOPAC have produced the new race equality data dashboard. This brings together into one place a range of data to help better understand disproportionality across all the data sets. This covers data from the public attitude survey (covering different levels of trust and confidence) through to use of force and stop and search data.
- 5.7.19 Although this data already existed MOPAC will be pulling it together in one place so that people can see it through the disproportionality lens. This was published at the end of February 2021 and a further update to that data will be in the next quarter.
- 5.7.20 In relation to the question about the public attitude survey about how they use the survey and how they get people to respond to the survey; linked to promotion etc. The MOPAC officer explained the survey uses a representative sampling technique. People are identified and approached and asked to respond to the survey by an independent organisation. Therefore, it is not an advertised opportunity. However, one of the things MOPAC have tried to do to is increase representation and amplify some of the voices heard. The aim is to boost the number of black respondents within the sample. This will be increased to 1000 people in a quarter.
- 5.7.21 The Head of Engagement explained MOPAC want to understand and identify the different experiences within the community.

Accountability

- 5.7.22 MOPAC exercise their oversight function in a number of ways such as how they publish and monitor various data sets, holding the Police Commissioner and her senior team to account through their formal oversight meetings and 121 meetings.
- 5.7.23 They have a regular oversight board which reviews the data sets etc. the Deputy Mayor of London for Policing and Crime at MOPAC is the responsible officer holding the MET Commissioner to account. The data transparency around this is important because it enables both MOPAC and the public to see the data and interrogate it. In addition to this MOPAC's work with communities to enable communities to scrutinise key aspects of policing e.g. stop and search and police custody through custody visitors. Helps MOPAC and the MPS understand how communities are experiencing policing on the ground.
- 5.7.24 MOPAC's monitoring of this is to consider this question 'is the outcome expected from policy being experienced on the frontline or is something else being experienced'.
- 5.7.25 The officer pointed out this is not always understood from quantitative data, the qualitative data from people's voices is also really important.

- 5.7.26 MOPAC explained they have regular oversight meetings and regular oversight boards where they review regular data sets and the MPS business plan. The Deputy Mayor of London for Policing and Crime holds the MPS Commissioner to account and has a dialogue about the data set. Drawing attention to where things are going in the wrong direction. The Deputy Mayor of London for Policing and Crime will aim to get underneath what the issues are applying the right leverage and inquisition to make the right things happen.
- 5.7.27 In addition, the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime has regular meetings and dialogue with the senior leadership team.
- 5.7.28 MOPAC have a whole range of data sets they can see and use to monitor the MPS performance and review the areas being identified as particular concerns. The officer pointed out through some of the police tools MOPAC understood that trust and confidence was going down and they were looking at this area.
- 5.7.29 MOPAC is aware the issues and concern for black communities and how much their confidence and trust in the police has decreased.
- 5.7.30 MOPAC were looking at extensive amounts of data. This includes stop and search, hate crime, trust and confidence, domestic and sexual violence, police officer numbers and abstractions – the number of police officers taken away from their local community beats. All this data is being tracked by MOPAC and they are publishing the data so the public can scrutinise the MPS and ask questions of the MPA and MOPAC, testing the work they are doing in that space.

Session 3 MPS (local Borough Command Unit and MPS Headquarters)

- 5.8 The MPS provided a written response to the questions submitted. The meeting moved straight into the questions and answer session for this session.
- 5.9 **Q&A session IOPC**
- (i) **Members asked for the reason why a large proportion of complaints or appeals were not upheld by the IOPC?**

In response the Regional Director for London from the IOPC explained the figures sent over were from 1st February 2020 to 1st May 2021. The officer confirmed 32% of the appeals sent to the IOPC concerning the MET were upheld. This figure is an improvement. The officer explained in 2013-14 they were upholding over 50% of the appeals sent through to the IOPC. Over the years the MPS has improved, and that figure has gradually reduced. Therefore, the figure provided in the written response signifies the best performance to date of the MPS.

The officer pointed out there needs to be some recognition for this improvement, but the officer did acknowledge if looking at the figure 32% of appeals (a third sent to them) in isolation with no context does not look great. However, this is demonstrating an improving picture of performance compared to historical performance.

- (ii) **The Chair commented the Commission's initial assumption was that the low upheld figure represented poor performance, but this was incorrect. The Chair asked the officer to confirm if the IOPC has not upheld an**

appeal or review it was because the MPS have not operated poorly or that there is no evidence of misconduct.

In response the Regional Director for London from the IOPC explained two-thirds of the complaint appeals they review are in favour of the Police Service. But in a third of the complaints, they review they are upholding in favour of the complainant. In the past this figure was half of the complaints. Therefore, in summary it is an improving picture.

The Oversight Lead and Oversight Liaison officer from the IOPC added that in relation to the figures outlined in the written report. The officer highlighted when the IOPC considers an appeal there are several grounds they can uphold an appeal on. This could mean a police officer was at fault; there was not enough information provided to the complainant; they could disagree with the finding but record the same outcome or they could have asked for a reinvestigation. Therefore, the reason for upholding a case can be different and individual to the case.

The Central East BCU Borough Commander added the other important point about the improving picture was also down to the significant hard work of the MPS. Having 32% upheld and 68% not upheld in his view demonstrated that there were big elements where police officers were not found to be operating incorrectly.

- (iii) Members asked the IOPC what learning, or areas of improvement have they taken away from cases that are not upheld and how does the IOPC regulate and share the learning with the MPS?**

In response the Regional Director for London from the IOPC explained he did not have that information at the meeting. However, the officer explained the IOPC produce an annual report on police complaints statistics. This report is published and provides a breakdown. This is not just for the MET but covers the 43 police forces in England and Wales. This report will outline the areas that complaints are upheld, not upheld, the type of complaints and the breakdown by ethnicity. This information was not available at the meeting and this information would not be available for the current financial year. This would be published next year. The officer pointed out this information is in the public domain, and a link could be sent to the Commission.

In response to the query about learning. The IOPC have powers to make learning recommendation to help improve policing practice. They do this through independent investigations and appeals. This can depend on the individual cases and the circumstance of that individual matter. To give an idea of the volume of work the IOPC carries out in this area. The officer highlighted since they were created in 2018 there has been over 400 learning recommendations made by the IOPC and each one is a particular opportunity to improve policing practice in that area.

- (iv) Members asked if it is possible for the IOPC to have a role in helping to establish the standard for accountability of police officers to reassure the public there are robust systems and processes in place; to root out inappropriate behaviour, manage unconscious bias and address poor standards for police officer conduct.**

In response the Regional Director for London from the IOPC informed the Commission their role in the system is to help the MPS ensure police officers are held accountable for their actions, lessons are learnt and also to ensure guardianship of the police complaints system. In essence they are there to ensure the public have confidence in the police service. In terms of establishing the standards there are national standards in place that all police officers must abide by. There is the code of ethics that all police officers must adhere to. There are the professional standards. When the IOPC investigate matters they make sure the police officer has adhered to the relevant standard, operating procedures and policies. They do refer to the code of ethics and professional standards. However, the IOPC do not establish the standards but ensure the codes of ethics and professional standards that are in place are followed.

- (v) Members commented this discussion was taking place because of the lack of trust and confidence in the police by the local community. Members queried if the IOPC could do more to establish trust and confidence in the police. Members asked about the IOPC's role as the independent regulator. Not just in building trust in confidence in the police but trust and confidence in the IOPC too. Members pointed out previous evidence given to the Commission from the community highlighted that people do not want to go to the IOPC because**
 - a) they do not think they are independent enough and.**
 - b) that they don't see the work carried out by the IOPC as representing them.**

The Member commented after reviewing the IOPC website they noted information about the types of cases referenced in the meeting and recommendations they have made about police working practices. Members found this information to be very helpful but did not think it was accessible enough to the public.

- (vi) Members commented trust and confidence issues are not unique to Hackney but it's a London wide issue and possibility across other parts of the UK.**
- (vii) Members asked how they would help the public understand how the IOPC, MPS and MOPAC work together to build trust and confidence and asked for better communication and reassurance to the public that demonstrates the MPS does have robust processes in place to hold police officers to account. Members suggested the MPS identify the type of information that could be made available in the public domain. Members asked the IOPC to explain how they see their role in making this happen.**

In response the Regional Director for London from the IOPC replied the IOPC recognise the challenge in building confidence in the IOPC as an organisation due to the issues from their predecessor. In reference to the IOPC building trust with the community. The IOPC recruited a dedicated stakeholder engagement team a couple of years ago. The IOPC believe it was important to go out into the community engage with them, listen to what they have to say and build awareness of the IOPC. This the reason why the IOPC attended the

scrutiny commission meeting last year and again today. The officer pointed out the IOPC has done a number of community engagements. Over the last year they have attended 50+ meetings across London engaged with different groups - not just bodies like the scrutiny commission but young people, charities, youth groups - all with the intention of building awareness of the IOPC. Through these types of conversations, the IOPC can establish relationships and try to close the gap that exists in trust and confidence. Although it's acknowledged reversing the public perception will not be a quick fix because people and communities will judge you based on what you do, not what you say.

In reference to the IOPC being held accountable for the work that they do and the actions they take. This was why it is important for the IOPC to attend the scrutiny meeting to talk about the work they have done and their work on stop and search. The IOPC will continue to work this way nationally and they are committed to working like this in London.

The IOPC recognise there is that gap in trust and confidence both nationally and at regional level. The officer pointed out it is important to highlight there is an accountable system in place and the IOPC is part of the system. If people are unhappy, they can voice their concerns through the complaints system. Like any service it can only improve if they understand when things have gone wrong and can have the opportunity to put things right. Therefore, it's important to build awareness of the system and work together with the other bodies. All three organisations do work separately and jointly on occasions to present to communities. They have done a joint piece of work to explain their different roles in the system.

For the IOPC they deal with the most serious complaints. However, the majority of complaints go to the MPS to respond to first.

The IOPC see it is important for them to work together to explain the system and point out that they are an independent body to review cases when things go wrong.

There is a lot of miss conception and confusion about their role. But the responsibility is on the IOPC and the Regional Director for London to make sure they do this myth busting to give clarity, reduce the mis conceptions and close the gap that existing in relation to trust and confidence.

- (viii) Members referred to the IOPC website and pointed out it was a bit unclear about the difference between appeals and reviews. Members commented that they did not think many people know they can go to the IOPC for a review and suggested the IOPC does more publicity about this.**
- (ix) Members acknowledged the information provided from the IOPC about trust and confidence, working with the public and building community engagement. Members asked if the IOPC would be willing to work more closely with Hackney Council officers and MOPAC to promote to stakeholders or participate in public meetings.**
- (x) Members referred to the 32% upheld and 68% not upheld and asked if this data was broken down by ethnicity for each category?**

- (xi) Members explained they were interested in the ethnic profile of the public who have had their appeals upheld or not upheld against the MPS.**

In response the Regional Director for London from the IOPC confirmed this information was not available at this stage.

- (xii) In response Members commented this information is quite important because the Commission's work started with stop and search looking at the disproportionality between different ethnic groups. Members added that having the ethnic breakdown for this data was critical and would really be useful for the Commission to see.**

- (xiii) Members commented given the lack of trust among people who have taken out grievances against the MPS for the way they have been treated. The public may view the low upheld figure with scepticisms, and this is unlikely to inspire confidence in the MPS. Members asked the IOPC how they can reverse this view?**

In response the Regional Director for London from the IOPC explained this data was note the only metric by which the IOPC can be measured for success.

With the appeals and the work of the IOPC Oversight Team with the MPS there has been an improving picture. In terms of confidence in the IOPC as an organisation, it's about taking the opportunities to build awareness about their work to close the gaps. Particularly around learning. There are several facets to their work, and they do independent investigations which is the accountability aspect. These are important and they attract a lot of publicity.

With regards to the learning side of their work from systematic reviews to prevent issues repeating. The Regional Director referred to the IOPC's work on stop and search and the 11 learning recommendations made and pointed out this was an opportunity to improve trust and confidence in the IOPC as an organisation. This is to show they will focus on the areas of concern highlighted by communities in London, and they will do something about it.

The IOPC have used the levers available to them and the Regional Director pointed out the MPS accepted all 11 recommendations. Now they are in the phase of implementation. Therefore, the view is confidence in the IOPC should be measured more broadly than just one metric.

- (xiv) Members asked for clarity to confirm if the IOPC had an individual role and systematic role?**

- (xv) Members commented trust and confidence is important and the role of the IOPC is important too. Members pointed out the recently published public inquiry report concluded the MPS had institutional corruption. The reference to institutional corruption was not in relation to the MPS working with criminals but rather that the MPS was not good at examining itself, being transparent and honest with itself and the people they serve.**

- (xvi) Members queried if the IOPC's systematic reviews of the MPS should have highlight this rather than a public inquiry.**

(xvii) Members asked about the lessons learnt from the public inquiry and the role of the IOPC in getting the MPS to be more candid. To view itself and its procedures more critically.

In response the Regional Director for London from the IOPC informed the Commission the public inquiry had a very specific role. The IOPC's role is set out in law. The officer explained the IOPC review referrals that come in from individual police forces. These will be deaths or serious injuries following police contact, conduct matters and complaints.

The IOPC will consider them and decide whether to undertake an independent investigation. Other cases go back to the individual police force for their consideration. The IOPC also looks at appeals against complaints. This inquiry had a very different remit, so it is important not to conflate the role of the IOPC with the role of the inquiry.

In relation to systemic learnings, the IOPC will look at their independent investigations holistically to detect connections. This helps them to identify if there are gaps or shortfalls in procedures / policies the IOPC will make learning recommendations to close those gaps.

The Regional Director confirmed the IOPC have a role. However, following publication of the report it will be for the MPS, MOPAC and Hampshire police to review the report and consider if any referrals need to be made to the IOPC.

The IOPC has stated publicly that in tandem they will review the report to consider if there are any conduct matters arising and if necessary, call those matters in. But initially it will be the individual police forces and MOPAC to consider the report.

(xviii) Members enquired if the IOPC was concerned that the findings of the report would reflect negatively on the IOPC and if this would make the work of the IOPC more difficult in relation to winning trust and confidence because the concerns had not been raised by the IOPC previously.

In response the Regional Director for London from the IOPC disagreed with the view expressed about the reflection of the report's findings on the IOPC. The Regional Director pointed out no criticism was directed towards the IOPC in the report. The criticism is related to the MPS and reiterated there is a process underway for the MPS and MOPAC to consider if they need to make referrals to the IOPC.

In reference to the term watchdog there are other bodies that operate in the system such as the inspectorate, HMIC, FRS who have been commissioned by the Home Secretary to do a review into the MPS following the report.

(xix) Members commented about the learning, transparency and accountability for many communities. Members pointed out there is a lack of trust in any complaints commission although they acknowledged the IOPC was the latest reincarnation of this body. Members highlighted Cynthia Jarrett, Mark Dugan and Hackney's Rushan Charles and many more have felt let down by the complaints processes. Member's wanted assurance that what the IOPC take forward is reflective of community's needs.

Particularly in respect of stop and search. Members commented although the processes in place may not address people's complaints in full because it's considered normal policing. People's experiences may feel far from it. Members highlighted in terms of the learn recommendation made by the IOPC and the recommendations being sent to the MPS. The public would like to see them implemented in full. It is recognised there are no quick fixes, but Members were of the view changes need to happen fairly quickly to assure the public there is a system in place that the public can have confidence in and that their needs will be fully met through a referral to the IOPC.

In response the Regional Director for London from the IOPC replied in identifying the changes the community will see the IOPC will use the levers and powers it has to make recommendations. The Regional Director pointed out the MPS have accepted the recommendations, so the next challenge is in making a difference in the areas they have identified and for communities to see that change. The officer also suggested MOPAC responds to the questions too because the MPS is accountable to MOPAC for implementation. MOPAC have the ability to scrutinise the MPS about their daily operations and implementation of the recommendations and the delivery of change in more detail.

5.10 MOPAC Q&A

- (i) **Members thanked the officer for the presentation and expressed they were pleased MOPAC recognised the disproportionate treatment of black citizens across London. But were disappointed the Police Commissioner for London did not acknowledge this or recognised the problem. However, Members pointed out it has been 40 years since Scarman and 20 years since the McPherson reports. Members highlighted the changes have not been significant enough for many people across many demographics to feel there has been changes. In reference to the Mayor's action plan for policing and crime Members commented they could see the intentions of MOPAC in relation to implementation of the action plan but noted there had been no specific outcomes readily available for people to see.**

- (ii) **Members asked for clarity on how changes to public experiences will manifest in the coming years. For example, could MOPAC see more police officers etc. Members commented although the policies and names of police officers had changed over the years the outcomes had remained the same. Members wanted to understand the outcomes MOPAC expected to see because of the Mayor's Action Plan for Policing and Crime.**

The Head of Engagement from MOPAC advised the Mayor of London had clarified the 2 outcomes they are aiming to achieve through their work in the action plan. The Head of Engagement from MOPAC pointed out the action plan is not the only work they are doing there is other work to address this too. The officer pointed out there is a whole range of work that MOPAC and the MPS is doing.

The two key measures for the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime are:

- 1) improving trust and confidence

- 2) reducing disproportionality.

These 2 will be the litmus test to demonstrate whether their work is making a change.

The third area they would like to understand is the community experience. The officer pointed out the service has changed since the Scarman report, and many things are different. But acknowledged when they speak to people their experiences of the service and perception did not demonstrate anything had changed. The third area the officer expected to see change is how the public feel about the service, how they perceive it and their experiences. This would be in addition to the changes they may see in the data.

MOPAC acknowledged there have been other plans and previous reports. However, the key difference about this plan is:

- 1) they were creating an action plan and not making recommendations. These are actions and things they are going to do and the MPS are going to be held to accountable for doing. This will be implemented within the Police and Crime Plan and will be part of their statutory delivery.
- 2) The other area that was different was the way they developed the plan.

MOPAC created an action plan not recommendations, so this work is part of the service's statutory delivery. This is different because MOPAC are putting themselves up to be held accountable for delivery as well as the MPS. MOPAC did this work very deliberately with communities and involved them from the very beginning in devising, sense checking and getting their feedback on the solutions. In contrast historically they would tell the public the solutions. Most importantly MOPAC is finding out what the community would like to see addressed.

This has given MOPAC and the MPS real clarity about what communities care about. The Head of Engagement from MOPAC advised opening themselves up and having a committed to keeping communities involved in the conversations (whilst working with them to develop things) gives opportunities to the public to hold MOPAC to account.

MOPAC informed the Commission they received feedback from the community and partners expressing their concerns about the statement released from the MPS. The Head of Engagement from MOPAC wanted to reassure the Commission that this was one of the top priorities for the Mayor of London. The officer confirmed the MPs has orientated its resources towards getting this done and there was a commitment behind this work.

- (iii) **Members queried the connection between communities and police officers who are custodians of their community safety. Members commented this has slowly dissolved. Members asked if this has been as a result of the ways the MPS is organised across London having regional and some centralised functions e.g. The TSG and tactical support units. Members pointed out the impact of this is one week they are responding to situation in Hackney and another day they may be responding to situations in Croydon, Bromley or other area of the capital. Notwithstanding other institutional and organisational challenges. Members understand the rationale for this working practice but urged**

MOPAC to review this decision and the impact it was having on community relations.

- (iv) **Members asked if the Mayor of London had an action in the plan to review or reverse some of these decisions and re-establish community relations between police officers and the communities they serve.**

The Head of Engagement from MOPAC confirmed this is a point they hear raised a number of times.

The way the service operates is not mandated by MOPAC. The Police Commissioner has operational discretion to organise the resources as the leader sees fit.

In regard to the regional work MOPAC has encouraged the MPS to recognise the need for BCU Commanders to have good local connections across their area. The MOPAC officer felt the Central East BCU had good local connections.

In relation to local resourcing and dedicated ward officers out on the frontline. The Head of Engagement explained when the Mayor of London was elected in the first term, he put additional officers into the MPS. There was also a commitment to limit the number of abstractions from frontline areas. Making reference to the additional uplift in police officer numbers (big recruitment in London) and the additional funding from Government. This gave them the opportunity to boost local numbers. There is work underway to identify how to get more local officers into the local areas. This would mean not relying on officers from big task groups or the TSG but drawing more on local delivery teams too.

Around TSG and other tactical teams that can come in and work in other boroughs. This is challenging. But there is work within the MPS that thinks about how TSGs are briefed when they go into local areas. The Head of Engagement informed she is aware the TSG in Haringey go and speak to the local team before they deploy. This is to understand the local context for the reasons outlined by Members of the Commission.

The Head of Engagement from MOPAC informed the Commission the TSG do a lot of community engagement working with young people and outreach work. The officer pointed out the TSG recognise that distance and are trying to address this.

- (v) **Members referred to MOPAC's commitment and reporting back on the action plan. Members asked after all the consultations and outreach to the black and working-class communities what difference MOPAC (the community) would expect to see in the next 6-9months in relation to handcuffing, stop and search and disproportionality following their community engagement work.**

The Head of Engagement from MOPAC informed the Commission MOPAC will be tracking trust and confidence and disproportionality. It is not anticipated the measures would have moved much during the period stated. At the top level this will take much longer to be noticeable in the data. However MOPAC hope

through the local surveys carried and ways of working with the community there might be some under the line changes in the way the local relationships operate and how people feel about them.

The officer highlighted the MPS is increasing their engagement work within the local community and MOPAC will be doing work around the action to keep the conversations active with local communities. The MOPAC officer would like to see that people will begin to feel differently about the nature of the relationship. However, the officer pointed out although this is not easy to measure, if people are unhappy, they will vocalise it. If this starts to improve then they will be travelling in the right direction, even if it cannot be measured in the actual data.

In terms of the community engagement work and outcome in the next 6-9 months. By the next financial year they would have developed their new community engagement framework and implement it. It is anticipated that they will focus on areas like stop and search and where they know there are issues around trust and confidence because they are the most critical. They want to enable people to hold the police to account more effectively and also feel confident that there are various levels of scrutiny particularly around stop and search.

- (vi) Members still raised concern about the profile of MOPAC in relation to their community engagement and commented many people have never heard of MOPAC. Members asked how MOPAC carried out consultation, engagement and would report back to people?**
- (vii) Members also asked for MOPAC's views about Ward Panels. Member pointed out in Hackney Ward panels are quite active and commented the police make the effort to report back to the community.**
- (viii) Member referred to the previous Borough Commander taking steps to bring in outside training for the police to understand how to deal with difficult customers and queried if this was still ongoing?**

The Head of Engagement from MOPAC agreed MOPAC does have a low profile with the public. There is a lack of understanding of who the Mayor's Office for Police and Crime are and their role. The officer agreed the public know who the Mayor of London is but not MOPAC.

The work of MOPAC is carried out through a number of mechanisms. Across City Hall they have several stakeholder groups and networks they work with. This includes their commissioned service providers and existing community engagement structures. MOPAC also works with other voluntary sector organisations to network out to other organisations.

MOPAC acknowledged they do not reach everybody, but they have their annual programme of surveys (victim satisfaction and public attitudes) which surveys a representative sample of Londoners. This is to ensure they get a representative view in the data. Through this engagement MOPAC also try to work with networked organisations. Resource wise they are a small team of staff, so they have to work through networks. There is more they can do, and they try to work through partners to amplify messages.

In relation to consultation and engagement this is an ongoing process, and they will continue to bring new people into the conversations.

MOPAC is also looking at their wider communications around the action plan and in general. MOPAC is looking at the different channels they can use to interact with more people e.g. young people and use digital channels to interact with groups that will not read the Mayor's press releases or attend these meetings like these. MOPAC's objectives are to go out to the public to reach audiences where are rather than expecting them to come to them. MOPAC is doing some analysis to look at the gaps and identifying who they should be talking to, to then target their communications towards them.

In terms of Ward Panels, the Head of Engagement for MOPAC was pleased to hear they are active and that the MPS support them well. The officer explained they are part of the wider engagement landscape and MOPAC will be looking at these mechanisms too. The officer explained across London ward panels vary in their effectiveness and how representative they are. MOPAC highlighted they suffer from some of the same problems as their other engagement mechanisms. MOPAC talked about working with the MPS to think about how they would address this too.

- (ix) Members highlighted that MOPAC had increased their engagement efforts with the community and asked if the budget for community engagement had increased in line with the extra community engagement work.**

The Head of Engagement from MOPAC confirmed the budget had not increased. However, the officer explained as they revisit the frameworks, they will have to look at the budgets. The officer pointed out currently the budgets is allocated Safer Neighbourhoods Boards and used to run the meeting structure as well as invest in local projects. In the future this may not be the model and the local projects piece may disappear and it might focus on more engagement activity. Therefore, this could mean some of the funding may be reallocated. The officer acknowledges there will need to be further thinking about how they used the funding to ensure there is sufficient support for the groups on an ongoing basis. This may require more budget, but these decisions will be made when the structures become clearer.

5.11 MPS Q&A

- (i) Members referred to the Account Group (a local youth group) and noted they were quite a challenging group towards the police and about the work of the police. Members commented they had learned the MPS had reviewed their monitoring groups locally and noted the range of groups they were currently working with were not set up to specifically to challenge police activity. Members wanted to understand out of the all the groups the local MPS was working with, who was set up specifically to monitor police activity?**

The Borough Commander for the BCU Central East informed the Commission the MPS was still working with the Account Group. They met with them, the Mayor of Hackney and Cabinet Member for Community safety recently along with members of the TSG.

The Borough Commander for the BCU Central East also pointed out they are working with Hackney Voyage, and they provide advocacy and scrutiny. Particularly around terms of reference and grievances around Section 60s. The MPS has their own community monitoring groups e.g., police encounter scrutiny group, they have an innovation hub working through the MOPAC action plan. The local MPS has held 3 sessions with 30 young people in each session from different schools and communities in Hackney. The sessions have covered talking about policing, the context and how they establish solutions to policing and improve engagement.

The Borough Commander also pointed out the MPS work with the local authority and the scrutiny commission. The BCU view these groups as holding the police to account. Alongside the independent advisory group, safer neighbourhood board, IOPC and various other monitoring groups that look closely at police activity. Part of this structure has included setting up a Police Encounter Panel to look at body worn camera footage and the way the police operate.

The Borough Commander outlined a number of groups and organisation they are working with across the borough to develop a comprehensive engagement plan. It was also pointed out this includes their youth engagement plan where the MPS works across 20 priority schools and colleges. The Borough Commander highlighted the MPS has over 200 police cadets. Working with their youth engagement officers.

(ii) Member enquired about the response the MPS has received from these groups in relation to trust and confidence and how the MPS is using the information provided?

The Borough Commander for the BCU Central East advised in the last 6 months they have seen some positive improvements in the work around trust and confidence. They also have the satisfaction survey, and this has shown improvements in that area.

The Borough Commander advised through all the conversations the local MPS has had with young people and groups they noted overall 80% of Londoners support and trust the MPS.

The Borough Commander advised they are aware of the concerns and focus on improving their policing response particular in relation to trust and confidence, stop and search, section 60s and use of force. The Borough Commander is of the view the MPS is starting to see real improvements. The Borough Commander highlighted for stop and search they are averaging 28% positive outcome rates. This is significantly higher than it has been previously. There is more focus around their use of Section 60, messaging and training about culture. The local MP is working with members of the black community linked to Rushan Charles's family to understand the community tensions.

The Borough Commander of Central East BCU was of the view they have a way to go but this is an improving picture. Their community engagement has been improving trust and confidence.

- (iii) Members referred to the reviews the local MPS informed they would carry out to look at body worn camera footage and stop and search. Members asked if the reviews have been completed. Members also enquired about the outcomes and the recruitment of members of the community to participate in the MPS review groups.**

The Borough Commander for Central East BCU replied they reviewed approximately 800 stop and search footage. The Commission was informed the MPS have reported on the headline finding around stop and search, use of force, handcuffing, body worn video to their learning and development teams and identified officers that were particularly adept at stop and search.

The Borough Commander for Central East BCU expressed in reference to the comments about local TSG officers he disagreed with the views about the TSG, a view he highlighted he had recently expressed in a conversation with the Account Group. The Borough Commander informed the Commission the TSG have the highest positive stop and search outcome rates in London and fewer complaints. In his view there was a misconception about the TSG performance.

The Borough Commander pointed out there are several resources that come into the borough.

Highlighting when the TSG come into Tower Hamlets and Hackney, they are very well briefed and the TSG is brilliantly led. In his view they do a great job supporting London and keeping London safe. This is the same for the violent crimes task force, transport policing and firearms command and specialist crimes.

The Borough Commander from Central East BCU confirmed the stop and search review was complete and the local BCU has a monitoring group looking at stop and search. They are in the process of setting up the Police Encounter Panel. This will be an independent process looking at body worn video footage or incidents that are shown in the media.

The Borough Commander highlighted that there are times that only a very small snapshot is shown in the media to the public. Therefore, a full reflection of the encounter is not taken into context. There has been a significant amount of work carried out in MPS and they are starting to see improvements around the way and use of stop and search, use of force, training and cultural awareness. The local MPS is working very closely with the local authority and other community groups in the area of cultural awareness.

- (iv) Members asked the MPS to explain what change they would expect to see in 6-9 months. Members acknowledged there has been community engagement work training and reviews but explained they wanted clarity on the changes the MPS are anticipating seeing.**
- (v) Members wanted to know the difference the public will see particularly in regard to diversity of the way the MPS carry out their stop and search police activity. Members commented young black males represent a high proportion of the people stopped and searched. Members wanted to know when a better reflection of proportionality would be seen in the data?**

- (vi) Members asked about the recruitment the MPS carried out for the review group from the community and who was in the group from the community?**
- (vii) Although Members acknowledged change takes time. Members commented it is important for the public to see changes and there is an increasing desire to see change.**

The Borough Commander for Central East BCU explained overall he hoped to see less violence on the streets in Hackney. The Borough Commander pointed out currently in violent crimes young black men were subjected to serious levels of violence.

The MPS hopes to see far less victims on the streets, a reduction in violence, a reduction in weapons being used in violence and firearms. Notwithstanding this will mean a continued use of all their legal powers in a proportionate and balanced way.

The Borough Commander highlighted this will be alongside an improving picture around training and awareness of the communities (cultural awareness) to gain a greater understanding of their experiences.

The MPS acknowledged there is low confidence in the black communities, but they are working on this. The Borough Commander hoped to see an improvement in trust and confidence and an improving engagement picture with the public wanting to work with the MPS. The Borough Commander also hoped to see Members of the scrutiny commission and other influential community leaders coming out for a ride along with local police officers to see how the police operate on the frontline to understand the daily challenges they encounter on the streets to keep people safe. The Borough Commander pointed out they are complex and there are many challenges.

The Borough Commander acknowledged the MPS is a big organisation but was of the view the MPS is not an institutionally corrupt organisation or institutional racist but agreed they do have areas they need to improve. The Borough Commander added if there are these types of behaviours or activities, they would be rooted out.

The Borough Commander expects the scrutiny commission and the wider community to see a continuing improving picture around trust and confidence and a reduction in crime.

- (viii) Members referred to the monitoring groups looking at the body camera footage and commented it was a good initiative. Members noted there was a recent consultation by the MPS that was seeking the view of young people and reached out to people in the community to forward this to young people. Members asked how many consultation responses the MPS received from young people and how the MPS had taken their views into account when they were framing the terms of reference for the monitoring group who will be looking at the body worn camera footage?**
- (ix) In connection with the MPS review of the body worn camera footage Members also asked if the MPS had identified a police officer that was not**

successfully delivering their body worn camera footage i.e., regularly have technical problems with their body worn camera. How would this information be shared and used?

- (x) Members referred to dispersal zone applications and commented they have noticed that in the last couple of months there have been regular applications for dispersal zones. Particularly in the Dalston Gillette Square area, almost a constant dispersal zone. Members acknowledge the area has experienced problems and a murder recent but queried if there was a connection between stop and search and the regular use of dispersal zones? Members asked if a dispersal zone made it easier for a police officer to carry out a stop and search?**
- (xi) Members queried if the dispersal zone was a short-term measure to use in extreme cases?**

In response the Borough Commander for Central East BCU informed he could not give detailed information about the consultation with young people or the outcome. This could be reported back. The Borough Commander explained the aim of the consultation was to ask young people about their views on how a Police Encounter Panel can operate and inform who will have access to them.

The Borough Commander explained people can sign up to receive inclusion notices and the Panel will have a strong term of reference. However, it is not unusual for members of the young community to be reluctant to sign up to the strict terms of reference and inclusion notices.

The Borough Commander for Central East BCU was confident that Commander Roper - the Scotland Yard lead for this area of work – would be focused on the young people of London in this work.

In reference to identification of police officers that are not using body worn cameras as required. If they are not carrying out a stop and search as required, justifying the grounds for a stop and search appropriately and the encounter does not meet the professionalism standards expected. The MPS has robust process that enabled them to review police officers' pattern of behaviour and establish the learning and training development needs or if it's a discipline issue. This is shared and implemented across the BCU and London as required. The Borough Commander highlighted although the details are not widely published or made known there are a number of accountability, transparency and openness channels through their local professional standards that will look at the findings for accountability of their actions and how they are operating.

In reference to dispersal zone applications. The purple zone has been an ongoing area of concern for the partnership and there have been many meetings regarding this. There has been successful outcome in designing out crime by the use of CCTV to support businesses in the community. There is a street drinking community and there has been some anti-social behaviour (ASB). In response they have put dispersal zones in place. This is used in Hackney and across London to keep volumes of crowds down and reduce anti-social behaviour (ASB).

In response to dispersal zone applications and stop and search. The Borough Commander explained they do not make it easier or enable police officer to carry out a stop and search. Police officers still need to show a proportionate lawful and balanced use of stop and search. A police officer still has to (this is the same for Section 60s) justify their legal action for using a stop and search. The Borough Commander stated it is a myth in thinking that police officers can dispense with the rules because this is in place.

In response the Community Safety Manager from LBH added in relation to Gillette Square and the use of a Section 35 under the Anti-Social Behaviour Act 2014. The officer concurred it does not facilitate stop and search. But pointed out the use of a Section 60s would facilitate a stop and search, but this tool has not been used recently within the borough of Hackney.

The officer highlighted the LBH Community Safety had campaigned for a Section 35 to be put in place in Gillette Square. This is in response to various types of crime that have been carried out there including the recent murder. The Community Safety Manager advised the business owners in that location will testify to issues and the perceptions of the problems they see in that location. It was pointed out the Council has an action plan in place, and this aims to treat the causes. The officer highlighted the second area with a Section 35 dispersal orders in place is the nighttime economy.

The Community Safety Manager advised the community safety team fully supported the two dispersal orders and reiterated they did not facilitate stop and search.

- (xii) Members referred to accountability and engagement with partners. Members asked in reference to the accountability of police officers who have high rates of non-actionable footage for stop and search. Members encouraged this data to be shared with the groups the MPS had selected to scrutinise their processes. Members commented they hoped the Council would have some involvement in this process too.**
- (xiii) In terms of dispelling the narrative that stop and search is not disproportionate despite the numbers decreasing. Members commented the perception within the community is that stop and search is not reducing although the MPS data indicates otherwise. Members highlighted that minority communities hold the view the middle classes are seen taking drugs and selling it but not put under the same kind of searching tactics as minority communities. Members urged for the data to be shared amongst the groups scrutinising and asked the MPS how this will be taken forward?**
- (xiv) Members asked about the MPS process that would identify if an officer is implementing the police tool disproportionately and the tangible outcomes demonstrating the approaches taken locally or London wide are as a result of changes being embedded in the processes of the MPS.**

In response the Borough Commander for Central East BCU advised the MPS will share a range of data with the various monitor groups. In relation to the processes to manage a police officer who is identified as not performing as expected. If there is a training need or something more serious they would be

subject to formal process and the MPS would share the detail to explain the findings, action taken and how they will improve.

The Borough Commander reiterated they want as many people as possible from the community to walk with them to see their work and get an understanding of the collective challenges faced in trying to create cohesion and a safe environment for their communities. The Borough Commander expressed this is not just a challenge for the police but a whole community challenge.

The Borough Commander for Central East BCU offered to take Members of the Commission out on a ride along with police officers to see their daily operations. The Borough Commander was of the view this would be a rich and enlightening experience for the scrutiny commission.

The Borough Commander confirmed they will be sharing the data with the people included in the monitoring and scrutiny process.

(xv) Members enquired if the MPS scrutiny process identified patterns of behaviours, what would be the procedure?

The Borough Commander for Central East BCU explained this would depend on the findings. Overall, the outcomes found are expected to lead to improving trusts and confidence in terms of less resented stop and searches, less use of force where not necessary and increased positive outcome rates. Where a police officer may not be putting their body worn camera on, not sufficiently justifying the grounds for their stop and search or there is a training need, they will get trained and developed. If it is more serious and a misconduct issue (not in line with the code of conduct, ethics, or the law) this will be managed through the formal performance processes. This could mean reflective practice, misconduct illustrated through formal processes like written warnings, gross misconduct etc. The Borough Commander highlighted as noted by the IOPC there are a range of measures that can be used, and these are open for the public to see and to understand. In addition, members of the public can make a complaint if they feel this is necessary.

(xvi) Members asked a follow up in response to the Borough Commanders comments. Pointing out it is not always obvious to the public or made known to the public how issues with police officers are managed. Members asked the MPS to confirm how any concerns related to a police officer not operating correctly whilst using their discretion would be identified?

In response the Borough Commander for Central East BCU explained although a police officer has the use of discretion they still need to use their powers within the context of the incident and the law. This is their responsibility as a Constable of the Crown. When a police officer decides to stop and search a person it is the police officer's responsibility to justify their actions.

If the officer offence is a minor issue such as not switching the camera on, camera battery has run out of charge, not filling out the paperwork correctly or something else not in order. If this is a one-off incident the police officer may be spoken to and told areas of improvement. If it's a police officer that keeps

coming to notice, there may be a training issue. The training can be in depth or one to one or repeating officer safety training. But if in the stop and search the police officer has been aggressive, displayed in appropriate use of language or in appropriate use of force which cannot be justified. An investigation is carried out. This would be a possible misconduct where a formal investigation will take place. This can be by local investigators, central investigators from police complaints, discipline prospective or by the IOPC. The Borough Commander explained there is a huge range of complexities that are involved in policing and the MPS are led by the intelligence and police officers must use their curiosity and professional judgement.

The Borough Commander highlighted there is a range of activities they can undertake to bring the police officer up to standard but if they are completely not suitable for the organisation or policing that is the very end of the spectrum with the IOPC or serious misconduct processes.

- (xvii) Members queried how the MPS or local Borough Commander communicates with the public in relation to a perceived police officer misconduct. Members wanted to understand the MPS communication strategy for building trust and confidence that gives the public assurance that police officers are disciplined or retrained if they are deemed to be not acting professionally.**

The Borough Commander for Central East BCU reiterated the local MPS is doing a huge amount of work led by their local officer working with the council and the Community Safety Partnership for Hackney. Covering a wide range of community engagement which includes the MPS SNB, IAGs and other monitoring groups. The Borough Commander highlighted the MPS has invested in work to improve their communication. There is also the wider MPS work. In addition, there is work to support local policing through MOPAC community engagement. The Borough Commander pointed out linked to the IOPC and other channels the MPS is describing and explaining the work they are doing. This work is not seen as an easy quick win. But over the medium to long term they will start to see sustained long term improvements.

The Borough Commander made a commitment that his local MPS team will provide a consistent strong focus working with the Community Safety Partnership (CSP) to improve the streets of Hackney. The Borough Commander commended the work of his officers, and the local CSP viewing it as a strong partnership with a wide range of diverse in-depth activities undertaken.

- (xviii) Members asked if the data shows how many teenagers are being stopped and searched and queried how many were not arrested or had not committed any crime?**
- (xix) Members asked the MPS if they have informed the public, it is compulsory for police officers to use their body worn camera and that there a recording?**
- (xx) Members reiterated the ask for all the information on stop and search to be shared with partners?**

The Borough Commander for Central East BCU advised the body worn camera is absolute and it is the same across London. No police officer should be out on the streets without a body worn camera operating. Occasional they may experience technological failure; a button has not been pressed or a battery has failed. Their current reporting shows 98% compliance from police officers, thus approximately 2% short across London from 100% compliance of body worn cameras capturing every stop and search and encounter with police officers in London.

The Borough Commander highlighted where they can scrutinise and hold to account, they are seeing improvements and the public are aware. The MPS had recently through various mediums explained about stop and search and the body worn camera usage and the supervision rates. Every month they take approximately 400 weapons off the streets in London. The MPS see the scrutiny commission as part of the positive work they talk about related to community cohesion and the collective work to bring safety to the streets of Hackney.

In reference to the data about young people. The Borough Commander was unable to provide these figures at the meeting. The Borough Commander did highlight that in the last 6 months they have stopped approximately 600 – 850 people a month in Hackney. The average positive outcome rate is approximately 28%. The Borough Commander informed unfortunately they do need to stop young people as young as 12 years old that have zombie knives and drugs on their persons. That are committing serious acts of violence or involved in serious acts of violence. The Borough Commander explained it is not uncommon for young people to be carrying big knives and sometimes firearms and quantities of drugs. Therefore, the Borough Commander will continue to direct his police officers to use stop and search in a proportionate and lawful way to keep people safe.

(xxi) Members commented they were encouraged to hear about the positive work of the MPS. Members asked how many misconduct issues have been picked through reviews of body worn footage?

In response the BCU Borough Commander advised in November 2021 they will do another month of scrutiny looking at every single stop and search that has happened on the street. This activity is labour intensive. This is in addition to the work already carried out to make improvements through police officer safety training and learning and development with the community.

If there is a complaint about the conduct of a police officer this is managed through formal processes. Currently the MPS do not publish data revealing the outcome of the process.

The Borough Commander advised the MPS could speak to the IOPC and MOPAC about the publication of data. The Borough Commander reminded the Commission the local MPS has monitoring groups with community representatives on them.

(xxii) Members commented the MOPAC officer referred to transparency and the use of data being increasingly important. Members urged the MPS to take the initiative and not wait for different bodies to insist on its

publication. Members were of the view this would be a proactive way of increasing trust and confidence with the community and show the community the MPS is taking their concerns seriously.

- (xxiii) Members commented it was good to know that the use of the footage from body worn cameras could be used to root out bad behaviour.**
- (xxiv) Members highlighted the MPS can have a negative attitude towards members of the public who film the police whilst conducting their duties. Members asked the Borough Commander for his view on this.**

In response to the comments about encouraging the publication of the data the Borough Commander from Central East BCU advised he will have a conversation with colleagues to establish whether this is being considered.

In response to the comments about the MPS being negative towards being filmed by the public. The Borough Commander explained that sometimes police officers are under extreme provocation and might react in a way they would not be expect to behaviour. When this happens the MPS will address it. The Borough Commander highlighted most of the time police officers are incredibly restrained, and he does not see bad attitude very often. But where he does see bad attitude the police officer would be removed from frontline duty and reprimanded. The Borough Commander has no objections to members of the public filming and added they have a right to do this. The Borough Commander pointed out where he does have concern is when police officers are being filmed whilst under extreme provocation and being subjected to violence, with members of the public standing by and filming police officers being assaulted on the streets. This is not acceptable or expected behaviour from the community. A balance needed.

- (xxv) The Chair concurred and expressed the scrutiny commission did not condone anyone being subjected to abuse or being filmed whilst being assaulted. The Chair acknowledged many police officers do try to do their job to the best of their abilities and are public servants.**
- (xxvi) The Chair advised whilst the scrutiny commission's work programme was still being drafted the Commission would like to keep this under review and may revisit it before the end of the municipal year. The Chair explained the Commission was keen to hear about the improvements and outcomes from the work discussed at the meeting by the MPS and MOPAC.**
- (xxvii) The Chair expressed a desire to take up the offer of a ride along with police officers in Hackney to see them undertaking their duties.**

The BCU Borough Commander commented it would be an invaluable experience for members of scrutiny to go out with police officers to ride along and see them at work within the local community.

The Community Safety Manager from London Borough of Hackney offered to facilitate this visit.

ACTION	Overview and Scrutiny Officer to liaise with the MPS and LBH Community Safety Manager about facilitating a ride along for Members of the Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission.
---------------	---

6 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

- 6.1 The minutes of the previous meeting in the agenda for approval were the 9th March 2021.
- 6.2 The minutes of the previous meetings were agreed.

RESOLVED:	Minutes were approved
------------------	-----------------------

7 Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission- 2020/2021 Work Programme

- 7.1 The Chair informed the Commission the work programme was still being drafted. At the next commission meeting the scrutiny commission would review the draft work programme for the municipal year.
- 7.2 The highlighted the following items were being considered for the work programmes.
- 7.3 A review of the council's work to achieve its commitment to net zero carbon emissions. The Chair highlighted this topic area was also being covered by the Skills Economy and Growth Scrutiny Commission and the Scrutiny Panel. Each scrutiny commission would be looking at different areas of the council's commitments.
- 7.4 LiH scrutiny commission would focus on reviewing the councils work on its buildings, solar energy, how the council builds and its retrofitting of buildings. In addition, this may include how the council can encourage the private sector to be greener.
- 7.5 There will also be a one-off joint scrutiny session with children and young people scrutiny commission to look at housing for care leavers. It is proposed to combine this session with looking at the Council's housing company to see if this vehicle can be used to help provide care leavers with sustainable housing for the future.
- 7.6 At the next meeting on 14th July 2021 a full programme will be drafted for the scrutiny commission membership to consider.

8 Any Other Business

8.1 None.

Duration of the meeting: 7.00 - 9.35 pm