



Home Affairs Committee

Oral evidence: [The work of the Metropolitan Police](#), HC 217

Tuesday 10 June 2014

Ordered by the House of Commons to be published on 10 June 2014

Written evidence from witnesses:

- [Metropolitan Police](#)

[Watch the meeting](#)

Members present: Keith Vaz (Chair), Ian Austin, Nicola Blackwood, Mr James Clappison, Michael Ellis, Paul Flynn, Dr Julian Huppert, Mark Reckless, Mr David Winnick.

Questions 1 - 120

Witness: **Craig Mackey QPM**, Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police, gave evidence.

Q1 Chair: This is part of the Committee’s continuing interest in the Metropolitan Police and policing issues. In particular this relates to evidence given to this Committee by Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe, the Commissioner, on 24 March. Deputy Commissioner, thank you for coming.

We are going to start specifically on the issues that were raised with this Committee as a result of the Ellison review and then move on to a couple of other areas, as members of the Committee might want to ask you about these issues. I want to start with the Commissioner’s evidence to us on 24 March when we—and I am sure you, because you were not part of the Met then, as I understand it—were told that a vast number of documents were shredded. I think the words were “a lorry-load of shredding”. The Ellison review talked about mass shredding that took place in 2003 and Mr Ellison also remarked that the chaotic state of the force’s records meant that any inquiries that he may have might be limited. What Sir Bernard said to this Committee was that when you shred documents it could either be malicious or you could be weeding out, getting rid of documents. Have you now discovered, as a result of what he told this Committee, why so many documents were shredded?

Craig Mackey: Thank you, Chair. It might help if I put some of the background to it. The “lorry-loads” quote, I believe you will find is a media word. “Mass shredding” are the words Mr Ellison uses. What we have done and the inquiries we have completed to date show that it is not 2003. It is 2001. You will probably remember from the Commissioner’s evidence he talked about recovery of a database called BORDSE. BORDSE was a database that was used to store intelligence during the years of what was called the Ghost Squad and Operation Othona. When we found that database we immediately made Mr Ellison aware.

As part of the inquiries we did to try to work out what that database was, what was the history from 2001, how did things go on there, we traced a member of staff who said during her time there in 2001 she shredded what is described as four bin bags of documents that were copies of intelligence reports that had already been put on to the BORDSE database. The process in the office that this member of staff worked in was that I would come out as an operational officer and I would get some intelligence in relation to, let us say, Craig Mackey as an individual. I would enter it on to the database and a copy of it would go in a file; so a paper copy and an electronic copy. It was the paper copies of intelligence documents that were weeded. We have interviewed—

Q2 Chair: Are you telling this Committee it was weeding and not malicious?

Craig Mackey: I have to be careful because there is still work ongoing, Chair.

Q3 Chair: But not ongoing in respect of the shredding in 2001?

Craig Mackey: Absolutely.

Chair: It has been shredded.

Craig Mackey: No, sorry, in terms of being able to show categorically, first, what happened and where that data is.

Q4 Chair: Sure. Is it still an ongoing review?

Craig Mackey: Absolutely.

Q5 Chair: Is this the same review that you have referred to in your letter to me of 2 June?

Craig Mackey: In relation to that work, yes. We have done a piece of work around that database. Remember one of the concerns that I know the Committee had and others had was, “Do you have the intelligence the Metropolitan Police Service collected during that period of 1994 to 1998 around Othona?” I can tell you there are 10,000 records on our current system that are—

Q6 Chair: There may have been shredding but you still have the records?

Craig Mackey: We have the records there, but what I cannot do for you yet, because that corrupted database is still being forensically examined, is I cannot produce to you and say, “There is the audit trail”.

Q7 Chair: Obviously it is important to get this right. You found the woman who did the shredding?

Craig Mackey: Yes.

Q8 Chair: You have tracked her down with the very best of forensic examination by the Metropolitan Police.

Craig Mackey: It was not difficult to track her down.

Chair: It was not difficult, okay, but it was difficult for—

Craig Mackey: I would be misleading you, Chair, if I said it was.

Q9 Chair: It was a bit difficult for Sir Bernard because he did not know when he came to see us.

Craig Mackey: In fairness to everyone at that point, the issue was discovered on 5 February. Mr Ellison published on 6 March, so we were going from a standing start.

Q10 Chair: You found her. You found the fact that you have these documents. There are 10,000 files, but it is on a corrupted database?

Craig Mackey: Sorry, I did not make myself clear there. The corrupted database is being examined. So the corrupted database we are now—

Q11 Chair: When you say “corrupted database”, is this a database that has gone wrong into an investigation on corruption? So we have a corrupted database concerning files about corruption in the Metropolitan Police?

Craig Mackey: In the 1990s I wish databases were as reliable as they are in 2014, but the 10,000 records are there now on our current system.

Q12 Chair: You are trying to extract them?

Craig Mackey: No, they are there now. We have those. In relation to the database, what we are trying to do is check there is nothing else on there.

Q13 Chair: It is just your use of the words “corrupted database”. For someone who is a dinosaur in these things, I would imagine something is wrong with this database. There is nothing wrong with the database?

Craig Mackey: No. I profess we are right at the limits of my technical experience on this.

Chair: Also mine.

Craig Mackey: There is a point, from what we know from a forensic examination of that database in 2007, when we stopped putting data on to that BORDSE database because we had new systems. It’s also absolutely clear that—

Q14 Chair: But you have the files?

Craig Mackey: We have the files.

Chair: It is on the database and someone—

Craig Mackey: It is on the current database.

Q15 Chair: Has Mr Ellison received them?

Craig Mackey: Mr Ellison knows what we have done and knows where we are. It is very hard to say, “Here are 10,000 intelligence records”, because they will relate from, let us say, a great big entry around Craig Mackey where we know all sorts of things to, “Craig Mackey was seen in a pub last night with X and it might be suspicious”.

Q16 Chair: Right. Who is running the review you initiated on 2 June and why do you have this review? You have said to me, “I have directed a review of MPS policy in relation to records management. This included assessment of the suitable authority levels for destruction”. As it is today, on today’s date at this time and place, 16.37 today, who has authority to order the shredding of documents that are held by the police?

Craig Mackey: If I may premise the question in a slightly different way. It is not about who has authority to shred them. We have a retention schedule. As a result of the management of police information, MoPI, codified in law through the Police Act through Parliament, we have set a date that nothing will be shredded or removed from our systems until 2018. Then below—

Q17 Chair: When did you set that?

Craig Mackey: When we agreed the MoPI, which would have been last reviewed in about 2010.

Q18 Chair: It is just that the Commissioner did not tell us this when he came to give evidence. He may not have known.

Craig Mackey: This is a level of detail. One of the things we have learnt from talking to many colleagues in both the public and private sector is that records management is something everyone is wrestling with.

Q19 Chair: Sure, but we have you. You are the right man. You know.

Craig Mackey: I would profess to have a degree of knowledge, but at the very extreme. This is a very specialised area.

Chair: As of today—

Craig Mackey: As of today that review is ongoing. It reports into me. We have brought a new Assistant Commissioner into the match.

Q20 Chair: Tell us the level of officer at the Metropolitan Police who can authorise the shredding of documents?

Craig Mackey: As I say, it is not about authorising the shredding. When they hit their disposal date you have to undertake something called “review, retain or dispose”.

Q21 Chair: Right, but what is the level? Is it Assistant Commissioner?

Craig Mackey: It happens to all documents. This will be members of staff and information teams and the rules and the law is quite strict. It is different for different bits of data. To give you an example—

Q22 Chair: Isn't that the confusing part, that there are documents that you hold, some of which may relate to police corruption? There is not a specific level. It does not come to you and you are at the top of the tree. It does not go to others. It is just done automatically by the officer who has to review it.

Craig Mackey: No, I would say that is not the case.

Q23 Chair: Tell us the case.

Craig Mackey: I think the confusion is much more around it is different for different pieces of information. Let us say personnel records. Absolutely clear, they stay for 100 years. The personnel record on me in the Met will be searchable should I ever reach the age of 100. That is there.

Q24 Chair: But corruption investigations like Tiberius and Othona and others?

Craig Mackey: Tiberius and Othona, to give you an idea, parts of those investigations will stay for 30 or 100 years. Other parts of those investigations could go within seven years.

Q25 Chair: You are telling this Committee that all the documents relating to Tiberius and Othona and Russell and all the other investigations that are ongoing are still held at the Metropolitan Police?

Craig Mackey: I cannot give you that categorical guarantee.

Q26 Chair: Where will they be then?

Craig Mackey: I can tell you what we have at the moment in relation to it. I think it is also important, and it comes to another fundamental point about what Othona and Tiberius are, that these are not investigations per se.

Q27 Chair: We understand that but just getting the records issues right, you cannot tell this Committee today that the documents relating to these very important inquiries, that concern this Committee and concern Mr Ellison and others, are all intact?

Craig Mackey: I can assure you that we have recovered in some cases 256 crates, in another case 3,000 crates, of information that relate to historic corruption inquiries. Is that everything? It will be a very brave person who sat before you and said that—

Q28 Chair: Right, but you can tell us the next stage, which is that they will not be destroyed?

Craig Mackey: The stuff we have absolutely will not be destroyed. It is there. It is far easier now with structured data, data that is kept on computers. You can search that and work through that. As I say, at this particular time I think the notion that corruption per se is a category we look at would be to mislead you. It is not. You have to look at the individual classification of information under there and you have to comply with it. I think, as I put in my letter, we have cases before the courts at the moment that may move some of those timescales and may move them to a shorter period.

Q29 Chair: Going on to the substance of this, how many police officers have been prosecuted as a result of Tiberius?

Craig Mackey: I don't know the exact figure. A range did appear before various courts in relation to both Tiberius and operations that came out of Operation Othona.

Q30 Chair: What worries the Committee I think, and certainly worries me, is this massive amount of documents concerning corruption in the Metropolitan Police. It is not a thin report with a few documents. You are talking about crate-loads of documents.

Craig Mackey: Yes.

Chair: What are we to conclude by this: that there are crate-loads of documents concerning corruption in the Metropolitan Police?

Craig Mackey: I would expect that when you look at that level of history. I think it is very important that we go back and look at Operation Othona. I know there has been a lot of talk about, "Has anyone read?", and I think there is a perception that there is a document that says that is Operation Othona. There is not.

Q31 Chair: No, but you sent this Committee a document and you have redacted so much information. As you see from here, all that is left is the title. If you can just bear with me a second, if you go on to other pages you will see that there are huge gaps. We do not say that you cannot redact but, having sent a document that virtually has nothing except footnotes on it, then to say to this Committee, "It is all confidential, you can't publish it", I don't think that the Committee is that impressed. If it had names then, of course, we would not publish it, but I have looked through this. There is absolutely nothing confidential in this. For example, on

one page there is “Detective Superintendent”, footnote 18 and that is it, so the Committee is probably minded to publish all this.

Craig Mackey: It is presented to you with that in mind.

Q32 Chair: No, you have asked us not to.

Craig Mackey: No, Chair, I am being—

Chair: Deputy Commissioner, you have asked us not to publish it, but I have looked through this and I have much more information about this inquiry from reading the website of a national newspaper than I have from what you have given us.

Craig Mackey: I can absolutely understand that and I was very clear in—

Q33 Chair: You would not mind us publishing it then?

Craig Mackey: By all means publish that redacted version. If the Committee—

Chair: There is no other version we have.

Craig Mackey: I was going to say if the Committee would like to see the fuller version and there is a way that can be done that is not in public, because there are very real risks and threats. Those parts that are redacted refer to organised crime groups that are, at this moment, probably attempting to infiltrate the police service.

Chair: Of course. We understand that perfectly.

Craig Mackey: I would be misleading people and I would be failing in my duty if I said, “I tell you what, just have a look”.

Q34 Chair: We understand that. Some of us have been around a while. We do get redacted documents, but we always ask whether we can publish and it seems to me that there is no reason why we should not publish these documents, so we will put it on the website tomorrow.

Craig Mackey: As you say, there are reports and I think there is quite a lot of information about Tiberius already in the public domain. But of the risk to operations and the one where there is the most potential threat and harm, that is the one that I am most worried about.

Chair: Of course.

Q35 Michael Ellis: Deputy Commissioner, can I move on from that and on to the Plebgate issue, as it is called? *The Guardian* newspaper a few days ago, in an eye-opening report, reported that a restricted letter from the head of security in the Prime Minister’s office was written to the Metropolitan Police’s diplomatic protection group in June 2011, which indicates that Cabinet Ministers had been obstructed from access to Downing Street. The

letter said, “I am writing formally to complain about the conduct of your officers who manage access into the rear of Downing Street at D11”—presumably that is an access point. “John Groves, the head of security and business continuity in Downing Street, wrote in a letter on 7 June 2011 to Inspector Ken Russell of the Met’s diplomatic protection group (DPG), ‘I cannot see any just reason why access was refused’.”

There appears, therefore, to be clear indications here that there was a concerted effort, over a period of months prior to the incident with Andrew Mitchell that became a cause célèbre, to disrupt Cabinet Ministers from entering Downing Street. This is a gravely serious matter. If you or I were obstructed by the police from entering the street where we work or live we would consider that a major infringement on our liberty, not consistent with a democratic society. To obstruct Ministers of the Crown, members of Her Majesty’s Cabinet, from entering their place of work and for it to be necessary for the head of security at No. 10 Downing Street to write to a police officer to complain about access being fettered in a way that they could see no reason for is wholly unsatisfactory, is it not?

Craig Mackey: In terms of it ends up in a letter to establish the ground rules for entry and exit, I would agree with you. Most of those things around entry and exit and security arrangements are resolved in normal day-to-day meetings and the sort of things we do. That security posture changes around places. That the requirements for particular points and locations changes is an absolute given, but it is clearly a disappointment if we reach the stage where people have to write to get things resolved.

Q36 Michael Ellis: The head of the Crown Prosecution Service appears to have said at one point, “No one may use the street unless authorised or directed by a police officer”. We do not live in a police state and Cabinet Ministers do not need authorisation from police constables as to whether they should enter a building to which, according to Downing Street, they ought to have unfettered access 24 hours a day as Cabinet Ministers because, for one reason, the Prime Minister may wish to see them. It is wholly unacceptable, is it not?

Craig Mackey: I think you have to remember there is a very different security regime and posture in place for Downing Street. It requires passes. I absolutely agree with you on the point about should you have access, but in accordance with whatever security posture, collectively, has been agreed for that particular location.

Q37 Michael Ellis: Yes, but I think we can assume that if the head of security at Downing Street is complaining then whatever protocols existed those years ago—

Craig Mackey: Did not work.

Michael Ellis: —had broken down.

Craig Mackey: No, I would agree with you.

Q38 Michael Ellis: This well predates the issue that has become known as Plebgate, but it has only just transpired that this was happening. As far as the disciplinary proceedings are concerned, are they now at an end?

Craig Mackey: The disciplinaries have concluded. Four officers have been dismissed, of which one was the officer who was sent to prison.

Q39 Michael Ellis: Four out of how many?

Craig Mackey: I think there was only one who was not dismissed in relation to that and there were others who were dealt with for more minor misconduct issues. Of those who faced gross misconduct, four were dismissed. We will publish—

Michael Ellis: One was sent to prison for 12 months.

Craig Mackey: Absolutely. At the end of this month we will publish the report in relation to that and, given the interest in this case, we are going to take the unusual step of publishing a summary of the chair's findings for each of those cases so people can see them.

Q40 Michael Ellis: Do you mean the disciplinary hearing?

Craig Mackey: Yes.

Q41 Michael Ellis: A summary of what the chair found that led to them dismissing, in disgrace, several police officers for gross misconduct.

Craig Mackey: Yes.

Michael Ellis: Yes, thank you.

Q42 Mark Reckless: Why only a summary of the chair's findings?

Craig Mackey: There will be things in there, for obvious reasons, that might refer to witnesses and those sorts of things. In an ideal world and one of the things on the back of the work around—

Q43 Mark Reckless: You could release it on a redacted basis like the document you gave the Committee.

Craig Mackey: A slightly different redacted basis in terms of that because the threat is slightly different, I would suggest. In an ideal world I am hoping, as we work with the IPCC and others, we can move to a position where hearings like that can be in public. We can't at the moment under the regulations, but it would be nice if we could end up there.

Q44 Mark Reckless: Have you any objection to the materials that to date have appeared in the public domain?

Craig Mackey: I do not think it is for me to object one way or the other. There is a variety of things that have appeared and various things about it. I absolutely understand the continuing interest in that particular case.

Q45 Mark Reckless: What costs are the Metropolitan Police involved in in preparing for these libel actions in respect of PC Rowlands?

Craig Mackey: I am not aware. We are not a party to it, other than the disclosure issue. Obviously we hold the documents and, through the civil court processes, there is a civil court disclosure.

Q46 Mark Reckless: There are costs to the public purse in dealing with all those disclosure matters?

Craig Mackey: Apart from that, but that will be for both of the libel actions.

Q47 Mark Reckless: Is it appropriate for someone simply to launch a legal action personally about something that related to their work?

Craig Mackey: In the nicest way, I think that is a matter for others at the moment. There is nothing to stop an individual remotely doing that.

Q48 Mark Reckless: You say it is a matter for others, but surely all PCs within the Metropolitan Police are ultimately under the direction and control of your boss, the Commissioner. They seem to be able to launch legal actions with respect to whether someone has said something disagreeing with them or whether they may have fallen on the premises of a petrol station while going to investigate a crime. Surely these are matters for the Commissioner who has direction and control of these people. If they go off and get a second job or something they need the permission of the Commissioner. Why can they just launch whatever legal action they like about their work without any come back?

Craig Mackey: In exactly the same way as most other people can in their walk of life. They can launch legal actions and they can take proceedings against their employer. Those same freedoms are available to police officers.

Q49 Mark Reckless: I am sure if, as a lawyer, I were to take legal action with respect to a client my employer would have something to say about it.

Craig Mackey: Your employer might, but there is a limit to—

Q50 Mark Reckless: But the Metropolitan Police does not?

Craig Mackey: There is a limit to the control you might desire of individuals that we can place on them. We cannot and it is entirely within an individual's current rights and arrangements. If they want to launch a legal action or consider one and can secure the funding to support it, they can do it.

Q51 Mark Reckless: Well, the reason they can secure funding to support it, Deputy Commissioner, is because the Police Federation are paying for it and public funds and facility money that is signed off by your organisation goes to support it. Why are the public paying for this?

Craig Mackey: The issue of which part of the Police Federation's funding is paying for legal actions is entirely an issue for the Police Federation.

Q52 Mark Reckless: Okay, but what about the facility time for Metropolitan Police officers involved in preparing Mr Rowland's legal action?

Craig Mackey: As you are aware, we are doing a review of facility time for the Federation at the moment, which is looking at their level of representation on the back of the national review and we are looking to make some substantial changes in terms of the work around the Police Federation.

Q53 Mark Reckless: I am glad to hear it. Finally from me, the Chair and I went to the Police Federation in Bournemouth. We were very grateful to be invited to hear the Home Secretary's speech. I understand that the Metropolitan Police Federation voted against the proposed reforms to the Police Federation. Do you have anything to say about that?

Craig Mackey: I had heard that. It is entirely for them what they vote for and what they do not vote for. As I have said, we have been very clear with the Federation, as the Commissioner has: it is time for the review and the work we are doing.

Q54 Mark Reckless: Why do you say it is only a matter for them?

Craig Mackey: Well, forgive me, we live in a democracy, don't we? If they want to vote for something they will vote for something.

Q55 Mark Reckless: But you, like us, will call upon them to reform?

Craig Mackey: We have done that.

Q56 Chair: We will come back to other issues in one second. Just on the end of Alice—the end of Alice. We don't know whether it is the end of Alice. I mean 30 seconds in Downing Street. Here you are, the Deputy Commissioner. You have masses of other things to do; so many police officers involved. I am sure that the Commissioner has told this Committee that he has apologised to Mr Mitchell but this has all been a complete mess, hasn't it? It could all have been handled so much differently.

Craig Mackey: It could have been dealt with completely differently. We absolutely recognise the legacy of it and the damage to the reputation of the Metropolitan Police Service and to individuals. It is one of those incidents—we have taken over 1,100 statements. It is a colossal investigation that has been looked at in considerable detail.

Q57 Chair: Indeed. Before we move on, just going back to what you said about Tiberius, I understand that the Tiberius report is 170 pages. Is that right?

Craig Mackey: There is a Tiberius report as in a summary document of Tiberius.

Q58 Chair: Right. So you have not given us the Tiberius report redacted; you have given us a summary? Just so we get this right, because we would not want anyone to say that we have been misled. You have a report called Tiberius, which is what we asked for. You have not sent us that. You have created a summary that you have sent us?

Craig Mackey: No.

Chair: No?

Craig Mackey: Chair, there are a number of reports in Tiberius and there are a number of spinoff reports in Tiberius. You will hear people talking about Operation Zloty.

Q59 Chair: Yes, we know Operation Zloty. We are aware of it.

Craig Mackey: There are four others at least.

Q60 Chair: What you have sent us is not—

Craig Mackey: Is the high-level Tiberius report.

Q61 Chair: There are other reports that you have not sent us?

Craig Mackey: There are other reports you can have access to.

Q62 Chair: Thank you for your offer and we will probably take it up in private. Would you write to us telling us how many officers, as a result of this massive amount of investigation—

Craig Mackey: By all means.

Chair: —have been prosecuted and been successfully prosecuted in respect of all this, because I think that you may wish to consult and get that information? But you are telling us that everything in paper form is on the database?

Craig Mackey: Yes, from what we know at the moment. As I said very early on, I want to make sure that forensic examination of the BORDSE database is complete.

Q63 Chair: How long do you think that will take?

Craig Mackey: It is with an independent consultant, so I would probably be guessing. If you are comfortable, Chair, I will put the projected timescale in that report to you.

Q64 Chair: Is this the same independently-led multi-disciplinary team that the Commissioner—

Craig Mackey: No.

Q65 Chair: This is another team?

Craig Mackey: To make sure that we gather that data off the database in a way that is forensically searchable and recoverable, it goes outside the Metropolitan Police.

Q66 Chair: Who is the consultant?

Craig Mackey: I cannot remember the name. I do not have it off here, but it is an independent consultant.

Q67 Chair: Have they taken all the stuff out of the Met?

Craig Mackey: They have taken the database.

Q68 Chair: They have a database that Mr Ellison does not have?

Craig Mackey: Mr Ellison had it back in February. They are doing it and they are doing the forensic—

Q69 Chair: Off-premises?

Craig Mackey: Off-premises.

Chair: They have taken it away?

Craig Mackey: Doing a full forensic recovery of what is on there.

Q70 Chair: They are what, computer experts?

Craig Mackey: Computer experts. We use them in court cases. They will give us—

Q71 Chair: Properly security checked?

Craig Mackey: Yes. They will give us a full read out of everything that is on there, when that database was altered, when the last entries were made on that database.

Q72 Chair: Yes. Do you know how many are involved in that process?

Craig Mackey: The specialists? No, I don't.

Chair: You will maybe write to us.

Craig Mackey: Yes.

Q73 Chair: They are different from the independently-led multi-disciplinary team that was brought in by the Commissioner?

Craig Mackey: Yes. As a result of—

Q74 Chair: How many are involved in that?

Craig Mackey: If I tell you what we have at the moment: we have an Assistant Commissioner, 28 members of staff—

Q75 Chair: Which Assistant Commissioner?

Craig Mackey: Martin Hewitt. He was a Deputy Assistant Commissioner, been recently posted to Assistant Commissioner, and we are due to announce fairly shortly that we have also taken on board, to assist us with this, a retired judge, His Honour Peter Jacobs. He has been asked by the Commissioner to chair the independent review committee.

Q76 Chair: That is that and then you have your own review going on, which is a review that you have directed into records management.

Craig Mackey: Into automation, yes.

Q77 Chair: Who is heading that?

Craig Mackey: It comes in through Martin Hewitt. It is all co-ordinated through Martin.

Q78 Chair: Martin Hewitt used to be the DAC for Crime Operations.

Craig Mackey: Yes.

Chair: He is presumably not doing any of that now.

Craig Mackey: He is not doing any of that.

Q79 Chair: Who is looking after Crime Operations?

Craig Mackey: DAC Steve Rodhouse.

Q80 Chair: Right, okay. There are quite a lot of people involved in all this?

Craig Mackey: There is a huge amount of work to do. If you look at the—

Q81 Chair: Can you tell us roughly how many police officers and staff are involved in this?

Craig Mackey: At the moment it is about 35 or 40. It will grow and it will probably double. If you look at the work—

Q82 Chair: Up to 70 people?

Craig Mackey: I can see it easily being that size.

Q83 Chair: That is a huge number of people, 10,000 documents, 3,000 crates, an independent consultant, your members of staff, an Assistant Commissioner, and nobody prosecuted.

Craig Mackey: But that is not the exam question.

Chair: But that is my question.

Craig Mackey: No, there are—

Q84 Chair: Has anyone been prosecuted as a result? That is my question to you.

Craig Mackey: There are a whole range of people being prosecuted based on the evidence that is in those crates.

Q85 Chair: How many?

Craig Mackey: I don't have the exact figures in front of me. I will give you them but if you—

Chair: Yes, because I think that is extremely important.

Craig Mackey: But if you look at everything, so look at the history from 1994 onwards, all of the corruption cases that the Met took were based on the work that was done by Operation Othona.

Q86 Chair: Are you now satisfied, because this sounds like a huge area for this Committee, that you have a grip of the issue of corruption in the Met?

Craig Mackey: Yes, current corruption. Current corruption looks very different to the stuff we are talking about here.

Q87 Chair: There is current corruption going on in the Met?

Craig Mackey: Yes. It is in every police force in the country.

Q88 Chair: Do you know how many people are involved? I know you cannot tell me the names.

Craig Mackey: At any one time we would have been between four to six live investigations around those sorts of issues.

Chair: Four to six?

Craig Mackey: Clearly they do not all finish in a month. On a monthly basis I look at all the high-risk investigations.

Q89 Chair: Four to six investigations involving roughly how many people?

Craig Mackey: It will depend on the circumstances of the case. It is very difficult to say. Corruption predominantly now is one on one. The thing that has changed quite dramatically from these issues we are talking about in the 1990s is that corruption now and the efforts to corrupt people are much more one to one and it will be based, usually, on some form of existing relationship. You will have known me perhaps through school. You will make an approach to me. I don't know you are corrupt but two back from you is someone that is.

Q90 Chair: You have been very helpful. Up to six of these investigations are ongoing. Is Detective Inspector Hurley's memo being properly investigated?

Craig Mackey: The 2012 report?

Chair: Yes.

Craig Mackey: The work is being done around that and is being looked at in terms of that. I think I provided you a reply in terms of you wanted to know who had seen it and where it had been.

Chair: Excellent. Let us move on to Mr Flynn and then we will conclude with some quick questions.

Q91 Paul Flynn: 27 years ago a private detective, Daniel Morgan, was very brutally murdered in a pub car park. There have been suggestions for many years that serving police officers were implicated in the crime and in the cover-up of the crime. His loved ones have been campaigning for the truth for 27 years. Is there any progress? Are they anywhere nearer the truth?

Craig Mackey: I hope, with the work of the independent panel that the Home Secretary and the Home Office have established, there will be an opportunity to have a clear look at what took place, what went on and understand that.

Q92 Paul Flynn: When can we look for a conclusion?

Craig Mackey: In the nicest way, sir, it is the Home Office's panel.

Q93 Paul Flynn: Mr James Patrick, a serving police officer, published information about how crime figures were being manipulated in the Met. The reaction of the Met to this police officer was to suspend him. He has now, I believe, left the police force and his crime was that he was caught in possession of the truth. Have you any comments on this of how this affects your police force and your standing in the public eye?

Craig Mackey: I can understand it if you present it in those ways. The circumstances and the facts of that case were slightly different but, given that there is a live employment tribunal, it is probably not sensible that I go into the issues that lie behind it in public.

Q94 Paul Flynn: But would you stand and say that the Met Police crime figures are the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth?

Craig Mackey: It would be a very brave person who did that on any set of public statistics. With 800,000 crimes and a system that is populated by people, there will always—

Q95 Paul Flynn: Yes, okay. Would you advise members of the public, when they are about to be interviewed by the police or members of the Police Federation, to take in a hidden tape-recorder to record the interview?

Craig Mackey: By all means if you want to. I would not do it and I would not—

Q96 Paul Flynn: If Andrew Mitchell had not done that his career would have been ruined because he was faced afterwards with identical testimony of three police officers that appears to be untrue.

Craig Mackey: Absolutely. We see individual cases where people—let us be clear. I think for all of us at the heart of being a police officer is that role of integrity and around what you do, what you say and truth. When you breach that, we are hard on people who do that.

Q97 Paul Flynn: The standing of the police at the moment seems to be that of the police force in a banana republic in South America. Can you remember any time when the reputation of the police has been at such a low ebb?

Craig Mackey: First of all, I don't necessarily agree with your contention because it is not supported by the figures. Public confidence is going up in London and, interestingly, from a recent BBC poll—you may well have seen the Commissioner in front of it—80% of Londoners trust the police. I think people make decisions about their public services, key ones like policing, on a different basis to that which you and I do. I think they make it based on their own personal experience of what they see, feel and impacts on them within a very short distance of where they live, where they work or where they go about their business. I think generalisations are hugely challenging. I can understand the attraction of—

Q98 Paul Flynn: Does it extend to the Mayor of London's Police and Crime Committee?

Craig Mackey: Does what extend?

Paul Flynn: Is the trust in there, do you think, the same as the trust in the rest of the Met?

Craig Mackey: Chair, I am not sure we survey whether the new arrangements for governance, MOPAC, police and crime commissioners outside London, secure confidence or otherwise.

Q99 Paul Flynn: One final question. I have a greatly respected constituent who served for 30 years in the Met and he tells me that the main reason there are problems in the Met is because the Met is full of people who are members of the fraternity the Freemasons. Are you a member of that fraternity and is he right that there are large numbers there who act against the interests of the public?

Craig Mackey: By their very nature, if they exist, they do not show themselves out to me. Let us put it that way. I am not a Freemason, never have been and I am not aware anyone has ever asked me to join either. Simply, an assertion like that is almost impossible to answer one way or the other.

Q100 Chair: Good. Well, you can only speak for yourself in these circumstances. Just a couple of quick questions if you could give quick answers, because I know you have other things to do. The head of counter-terrorism has been suspended from his work or is no longer at the Met.

Craig Mackey: He has been temporarily moved.

Q101 Chair: He has been moved. The reasons Richard Walton has been moved are what?

Craig Mackey: They relate to the referral of complaints matters or conduct matters that arise out of the Ellison review.

Q102 Chair: We were concerned when Cressida Dick was taken away from this position by the Commissioner. Of course, he has every right to rearrange his top team. Who is now covering counter-terrorism, which is obviously a very important issue?

Craig Mackey: Well, Cressida is still there. The swap between Cressida and Mark Rowley does not take place until the end of this month.

Q103 Chair: Where did Richard Walton fit in then?

Craig Mackey: Richard Walton was one below. I do not know if you have an organisation chart there. Maybe, Chair, it would be helpful if we shared the up-to-date one with the Committee.

Q104 Chair: Is Assistant Commissioner Byrne still there?

Craig Mackey: No, Assistant Commissioner Byrne is now the chief constable of Cheshire.

Q105 Chair: Is Chris Ellison still there?

Craig Mackey: Chris Ellison has retired.

Q106 Chair: Right, so there has been a change.

Craig Mackey: I am still there, Chair.

Q107 Chair: You are right at the top. We will come to you in a second. So that is Mr Walton. In respect of gangs, we have heard some very compelling evidence today from Sheldon Thomas and others. We have just opened our inquiry into gangs. We will obviously ask the Met to come and give evidence in a more formal way. This is formal evidence of a different nature. One of the points that he made directly relates to your portfolio, which I see here. You are in charge of diversity and citizens focus and you had, I think, Denise Milani there. Is she still there?

Craig Mackey: Yes.

Q108 Chair: Good. One of the points he makes was the importance of having more black officers in senior positions.

Craig Mackey: I would agree.

Q109 Chair: I am looking at your organisational chart. This is 2014. Apart from Pat Gallan, we have not made progress, have we?

Craig Mackey: It is a continual challenge for us. I am sure you heard the Commissioner when he was here previously and the work we are doing currently around recruitment. We are absolutely driving and pushing to get a Met that looks and feels like London. We are moving to a process fairly shortly where we are going to prioritise and take recruits only from the London area because we know the diversity is better when we get candidates only from London.

One of the challenges, quite frankly, we face at the moment around people coming into the organisation is the challenge that we are one of the few forces recruiting in any form in large numbers. Whether you live in Carlisle, Camborne or Camden, if you want to join the police, one of the few that is recruiting in those sorts of numbers is the Met. The reassuring thing is, as I think you know, we are one of the pilots for direct entry at superintendent. Along with the Commissioner I have done two sessions with groups from there. We had over 650 applicants for that. It is a much more diverse mix of people who truly reflect what London is, but it is a continuing challenge. I think, if you want a personal opinion, at some point we will have to look at the issue of whether the legislation is as permissive as it should be.

Q110 Chair: In respect of the number of dogs, there is a campaign about the fact that a lot of police dogs are being taken out of service. We, as a Committee, saw the excellent work being done by police dogs at Calais. What is your record in the Met in terms of the number of police dogs? Have you had a big decline?

Craig Mackey: No. The work around taskforce, we have combined a number of things because, among everything else we are doing, we are taking £600 million out of a £3.6 billion organisation. Some of that has been about looking at management ratios and management overheads. I do not have the exact figures to hand, but I can certainly provide them to you. We have not taken large numbers of dogs out nor horses.

Q111 Chair: When are you moving to Curtis Green?

Craig Mackey: Hopefully the first quarter of 2016.

Q112 Mark Reckless: Deputy Commissioner, do you think that policing would benefit if police officers, including senior police officers, were to stay in specific roles for rather longer than appears to be typical currently?

Craig Mackey: Yes, we should. That is probably the easy answer. I think there are a number of things that mitigate against that, but absolutely in terms of having people in roles. You will remember, for roles like mine, one of the things that was introduced—and, again, it was not asked for but was introduced—is we are all on fixed-term appointments. You are going to lose us at some point and the maximum we can have is five years. So there will be turnover and churn.

Q113 Mark Reckless: Unless you are reappointed as ACPO, for instance.

Craig Mackey: Yes.

Q114 Mark Reckless: Can I also ask you about ACPO? We had a Home Office Minister before the Committee recently who had said ACPO was on its last legs. Will you be sad to see Sir Hugh retire?

Craig Mackey: I do not think I would comment on individuals, but let us talk about what that model does. Do we need something central that allows forces to co-ordinate? Absolutely, because otherwise we will not deliver the Olympics. If you look at my own experience in Cumbria after the flooding and things, if I press a button and there is nothing connected to the end of it in terms of some sort of national co-ordination of infrastructure it might lower my blood pressure a bit but it is not going to do anything to help the people we are supposed to support. I am not going to get hung up on what we should call it, but we need something there that allows that co-ordination beyond the force level to meet those things that are a statutory requirement in the strategic policing requirement, otherwise we can't do it. I am part of the team at the moment working with other colleagues across the country to work out what that model will be.

Q115 Mark Reckless: Are you describing NPOC?

Craig Mackey: It is wider than NPOC. NPOC is the obvious example of it, but if you take it at the moment NPOC does not have a home. We have to find a home for it. If you assume the premise in your question is ACPO goes, what do you do with it?

Q116 Mark Reckless: The chair of the Chief Constables Council could do that on a part-time basis and his own force could be the lead force for the necessary security.

Craig Mackey: That is a big ask and I think if you—

Q117 Mark Reckless: But if they were offered it and they were prepared to take that on, would you object to that model?

Craig Mackey: I would not object to that model but, if I may, sir, put yourself in the position of the police and crime commissioner who is suddenly told, “You are going to get a part-time chief constable”. You might not be so happy. We have to have a realistic debate around what that model will look like, how it will work and what it will do.

Q118 Mark Reckless: Perhaps you might speak with the relevant police and crime commissioner and discern what their attitude is rather than making assumptions, but could I ask about the ACPO—

Craig Mackey: I think it is a safe assumption. I think a police and crime commissioner, certainly the ones I have worked with and met, appoint chief constables to be chief constable for their location and their area. I don’t think they do it and say, “By the way, you can do something else as well”, certainly not in my experience.

Q119 Mark Reckless: I am very interested in your hypothesis, Mr Mackey. I would be more convinced by it if you had spoken to the PCC who may be concerned. On ACPO TAM, can I ask about how that works with the Metropolitan Police and the lead role in terrorism? Is that the right model and do you think that can continue with the current structure, notwithstanding ACPO’s demise?

Craig Mackey: It can continue and there is a lot of work going on that Cressida and other colleagues on ACPO TAM are leading to put that on a statutory framework. There is a part of the Police Act, section 26, that allows agreements between both PCCs and forces to create a proper structure to allow that, because we need that. It goes back to that point about we absolutely need something. When we have a challenge or a problem is not the time to be trying to work out how it is governed. No, that model can work.

Q120 Chair: Very finally, do you wish you had stayed in Cumbria?

Craig Mackey: No, I am quite happy. I think I have one of the best jobs in policing. I have thought that in many roles I have had. I have been incredibly privileged. It was a huge and immense privilege to have been a chief constable. It is a very different role being the

Deputy Commissioner of the Met. It is a big in-tray, a big portfolio, but it is a great job and some fantastic people work for this organisation.

Chair: This Committee is very grateful to you for coming here and for giving evidence in such an open way. Thank you very much.

Craig Mackey: Thank you.