

2020 VISION: PUBLIC SAFETY IN A GLOBAL CITY

1) INTRODUCTION

Good evening, ladies and gentleman. Welcome to the Royal Society of the Arts.

The Borough of Westminster is a fitting place to talk about public safety in our global city.

It has beautiful, historic buildings dating back to the 18th century, like this one, symbols of the wealth and trading power of one of the world's great capitals.

It's also busy, the heart of government, home to must-see locations for tourists, shoppers, theatregoersand criminals.

Just across the Strand is Charing Cross Police Station. Some of you will have seen it on the way here. It's another beautiful old building - the original hospital in fact - solid, traditional, authoritative, perhaps even a bit austere and unwelcoming. I can't think why we chose it.

In fact, you wouldn't even know it was a police station unless you were by the entrance. But you'd certainly notice if 500 or so police officers weren't based there.

If you come and go tonight blissfully unaware of all that activity going on just a few hundred yards from you, feeling safe and secure, able to walk without feeling threatened, you'll have experienced what's great about London, and if I can be so bold, what's great about the Met.

That feeling is what we want everyone in this city to experience, wherever they live, whatever community they're from.

But of course not everyone shares our desire. Criminals, terrorists - they want to disrupt our peace for their own gain.

It's our job to handle the threats they pose, to protect the public and keep them safe in this great, global city of ours.

Key themes

Right now, people are questioning whether we can still do that in these tough financial times.

I'm always being asked – how is policing going to cope with the even tighter budgets that we expect after the next election, whoever wins?

By my own officers & by the media, and the people who hold me accountable. And it's a question we're asking ourselves as we prepare for a new phase of change.

It's not my style to endlessly analyse or theorise. I'm direct, straightforward and at times, I'm told, brutally honest. I like people who bring me solutions, not people who bring me problems.

Policing is about catching criminals and protecting people. It's not equipped to solve society's ills, nor should it try. Whenever we do, we lose focus and forget our key responsibility to keep people safe.

But I've been persuaded to set out some of my views more publicly and explain why I am so passionate about transforming the British Policing model.

I've been persuaded because I think policing is at a crossroads, because of a financial challenge we did not choose. How we respond to that challenge is absolutely up to us. It is our choice. No one else could or should make it for us.

We could choose despair, because we'll have less money, fewer officers and because the public expect more of us, year-in, year-out.

Or we can choose hope and optimism, and believe, as I do, that we can transform policing to meet those challenges, and yes, get even better at doing our job. We can choose to transform by building on our strengths, strengths the world sometimes sees more clearly than we do in the UK.

If you had any doubt, if my officers had any doubt, then let's be clear – the Met is a 'can-do' organisation, and I am a 'can-do' leader. A smaller Met can still make London safer.

But our success – because that's what it will be – will not happen without some radical changes, and a model of policing that will look different to what it is today.

Because as we make our choices, to transform and succeed, so we will ask the public and their leaders to make some choices too, about what they want from their police, and understand the consequences of that.

I'm going to be clear tonight about the growing threats we face, in countering terrorism, tackling cyber-criminality, and protecting the vulnerable – and the increasing help we need as a result from the public and our partners to tackle crimes that offer a lower risk to public safety. Whilst I speak as Commissioner of the Met, I know my colleagues across the country are battling with similar challenges, without all the resources that we can bring to bear.

I will spell out how I believe policing needs to change to do this; to embrace digital policing, redefine the emergency services and map out new areas for collaboration, to develop our skills and modernise both the office of Constable and our patchwork quilt of police forces to be fit for purpose for the 21st century.

And I'll talk about how we support that change by the professionalisation of policing and crime prevention.

To my leaders I say, no one follows a pessimist. I firmly believe the Met will be better in 2020: transformed, yes, smaller, yes, doing all the same things in the same way, no.

Reducing budgets can make life harder. But they can also focus your mind on the choices you need to make, on what you want to be really good at.

2) BUILDING ON SUCCESS

I'm a strong believer in what I call Total Policing, using all the powers we have, all the levers we can access, all the skills and capabilities of our people in a total war on crime; using all our compassion and humanity to offer total care for victims; and maintaining high ethical standards through Total Professionalism.

I want to share my vision for Total Policing with you tonight, because I hope you'll agree, it includes us all; those of us who wear uniforms, and those who live, work or run businesses in this great global city.

The great strength of British policing is that it remains true to the principle set out by Sir Robert Peel two centuries ago. The police are the public and the public the police.

We police with consent. It is often quoted, but what does it mean? Well, for me, it means that in London 32,000 police cannot impose their will on 8.6 million.

We gain our legitimacy from the law, but more importantly from the public's belief that the role we carry out is essential. And that provided we do it within the law, and above all reasonably, then we will have their support.

The best evidence that this is true must be our ability to patrol our most rural or urban spaces unarmed. The British police are one of a handful of unarmed police services around the world. And even now, despite the fact that we've been disrupting terrorists intent on attacking our officers, I wouldn't want to see that change. I'm sure you don't either.

The British model of policing is envied around the world, make no mistake about it. And New Scotland Yard continues to set the standard for detectives, for investigators, for forensics and for counter-terrorist policing.

My job is to make sure that continues, and to secure the support of the public for the changes we need to make to transform our organisation to cope with the new threats that face us.

So we have commissioned the Royal Society of Arts to help us with that task, to reach out to some of our partners and identify the key themes and issues on which we can base the safety of our citizens as this city grows and changes over the next 5 years and more.

I'm very grateful to the RSA for hosting us tonight and for working with us to set out a 2020 Vision for Public Safety in a Global City.

We've already demonstrated that we can transform under pressure.

And we didn't even start until the last Olympians had left London after the most successful and secure Games that people had ever seen.

Yet we're already well on course to save nearly 600 million pounds by 2016.

We've built our strength back up to 32,000 officers, with the strong support of the Mayor and his team; the only force, in fact, to maintain the number of police it has in this period.

And whilst we've done that, recorded crime in London has fallen, and we've made a series of important interventions to achieve our goal to be the best crime-fighters by any measure.

On gangs

We've rebuilt our Trident team to become a gang-fighting force the criminals fear. They've locked up thousands of the worst offenders, taking out the people responsible for much of the serious violence in London.

We've halved the number of shootings & reduced stabbings by a third. Murder is on a downward trend, with 95% detected.

On neighbourhoods

We've put more officers into neighbourhoods, but with a clear and unwavering focus on bringing down the crimes that blight people's lives.

Burglary, theft, anti-social behaviour – all reduced.

On stop and search

We've changed our approach to stop and search, significantly reducing the frequency with which it's used, but increasing the number of people we arrest.

On response & our service to victims

We've got better at answering the public's calls – 999 and 101. We get there faster too.

And we've concentrated on improving our service to victims of crime, offering them a visit from officers if they want one. So satisfaction with our service has risen and is still on the up.

We've seen more people come forward with the confidence to report rape or sexual abuse.

And we're better at caring for those in our custody.

Getting the best from technology

We've embraced new technology, using Automatic Number Plate Recognition as a key weapon in tracking criminals.

We have officers queuing up to use body-worn video, to have a visual record of their contact with the public; a source of valuable evidence where the truth is in dispute and an opportunity to build public trust in our integrity.

And we're on our way to giving our officers digital access to all the information they need, wherever, whenever.

Being totally professional

As a service, we have risen to the challenges to our integrity

We've shone a light on our past, exposing the story of undercover policing, and saying sorry where we should.

We've committed to be more transparent, so we've invited the BBC into film us for a major documentary which you'll see later this year.

We've been intolerant of poor behaviour, and yes, we've sacked people who don't live up to our values and standards.

We've embraced the College of Policing's new Code of Ethics, and worked with the Mayor to shine an ethical spotlight on some of our biggest dilemmas.

And yes, we've done all this whilst saving hundreds of millions of pounds, and giving the tax-payer better value for money

So when I say I'm proud of my people; that our 50,000 are a match for anyone's.

You know why.

3) THE TRANSFORMATION TO COME

If you ask any of my team, you'll know I'm never happy, however good we may be.

There is more transformation to come and more to improve.

My aim is simple.

How can we be the best that we can possibly be?

That's what drives me, and it always will.

One of my first bosses gave me some feedback when I was a young Sergeant.

'You're challenging, he said. Sometimes that can be in a good way - you won't accept that things have to be done the way they always have. But it's a two-edged sword. Sometimes it can cut, wound'.

I know that's part of my style. I don't think I could change it. In fact, I don't want to.

But I valued the feedback - a gift.

I've recognised that trait in others, winners who we've asked to come and talk to our officers.

We had a series of events for leaders in the Met last summer to which we invited some great characters to share their experiences.

As we were waiting for one event to begin, I asked one officer what he was expecting.

Well, he said, I hear there are some great motivational speakers ... and you.

Feedback - as I said - a gift.

You may have some gifts too that you'd like to shower on the Met during the 2020 work.

Don't hold back.

But don't expect the Met I lead to approach the next 5 years with anything other than confidence that we can be even better, that London can be made safer.

Changing London

Our great, exciting city is changing fast.

London now has 8.6 million people, the highest population ever recorded.

Growing at a hundred thousand a year, this will be a city of 9 million people in 2020.

A young city, with some of the fastest growing Boroughs bucking the national trend of an aging population as they get even younger

More schools needed, more demand for public services, including ours.

44% of Londoners are currently from black or ethnic minorities.

New communities, new cultures, new languages

Alongside communities who've been here for decades, and with whom we have sometimes had difficult relationships.

But the population wouldn't be growing if people didn't think this wasn't a safe place to live and work, as well as a prosperous city.

A city where you can walk about safely, by day or by night

Where the public is at the heart of the Met, informing everything we do, and holding us to account

Responding to new threats

We've won many battles in the war on crime: tackling gangs, taking on armed criminals, reducing burglary and theft.

And I'm confident we will hit the target the Mayor has given us to reduce key crimes by 20%.

But money attracts criminals - it's the dark side of being a successful city.

So we need to sustain the fight, keep shifting the point of attack, disrupting the criminals, anticipating, staying agile.

Some people talk as if the downward trend in crime we've seen since the 90's is just an inevitable consequence of social change, better technology, better living standards, better design.

I'm afraid I don't buy that.

Our interventions do make a difference. The fall in shootings and stabbings we've seen wouldn't have happened without our Trident gangs command

And our response isn't always captured by the conventional ways we record crime.

Our most important activity is often pre-emptive – targeting criminals before they strike – or preventative – trying to head off the risks.

Because criminality moves on; it evolves.

It's agile. It's digital. It's global.

Here are our key concerns;

- First, the terrorism threat is growing, especially from lone actors, and it's having a significant impact on communities, as we've seen over the last few months.
- Then we have online fraud and cyber crime;
- Sexual abuse of the vulnerable, children and adults, some of which may be new, some of which is because people have more confidence to report;
- And the challenges presented by international migration of criminals;

We will need to reorganise ourselves so that we can put more officers and staff into the teams who go into battle on our behalf.

They are our cutting edge, specialist frontline units, who take on the toughest criminals and the most sensitive crimes.

We cannot simply retreat in austerity. We must have scope to invest in the capability to face these new threats.

And we need to spell out, like the military has, that we can't promise to tackle everything the world throws up within a shrinking budget.

If we try to fight on all fronts, we'll fail on some.

If we're not clear what's beyond our reach, how can others take responsibility?

If we overstretch our people, they'll break.

We must focus on those areas where the risks are greatest, and where we have the powers, and the expertise to succeed.

Countering terrorism

Take counter-terrorism - we're working at an intensity we've not seen before, whilst our society, frankly, is struggling to understand what motivates 15 year olds to choose radicalisation, and who is best placed to prevent it.

It's a very different challenge to trying to disrupt terrorist plots, and it takes place in children's bedrooms and on their mobiles, where the police can't go or shouldn't go.

We are fortunate; if that's the word, to have a history of fighting terror and to have capabilities that other countries still seek.

We have a model that brings our resources together in regional hubs to deliver more effectively for the public. It allows us to strengthen our specialist expertise whilst maintaining the link with neighbourhood officers, who are our front line in counter-terrorism.

It works. It ain't broken. It doesn't need fixing. Moving counter-terrorism out of policing would be a huge risk, cost money, and break the link with local accountability just at the point that we most need support from our communities...

...Because we ask for and are given strong community support. That's why I don't think any modern, developed city is better placed than London to resist the threat. But we're seeking new ways to help us connect with the young to combat radicalisation and incitement to violence.

That doesn't happen without a lot of resources and a 24/7 commitment from fantastic officers and staff, and our partners in the security services.

It also requires the Met to have a global reach. We are increasing the number of liaison officers we have deployed across the world, working with law enforcement colleagues to tackle threats at their source.

We support others when they're attacked, offering our expertise in some of the advanced forensic work that helps identify victims and suspects.

The relationships we build constitute another line of defence, and build our own knowledge of the changing threats.

Terrorism is globalised like so much else, and the techniques and tricks that first emerge elsewhere can be exported to the UK if we ever let down our guard.

The fight against cyber-crime

I set up our cyber-crime unit, Falcon, to help us get to grips with the risks from cyber criminality, and get a clearer picture of the threat to our economy, and to your pockets.

There's no doubt in my mind that that the full extent is masked by the willingness of financial services companies to absorb the cost of fraud and pay out to the public. That means online crimes simply don't get reported or investigated, although the customer always picks up the bill in the end.

Coupled with this, is the unwillingness of big businesses to report when they've been hacked or defrauded, presumably for fear of the reputational consequences. Instead, they're all spending tens of millions in isolation, trying to keep up their drawbridges.

It's inefficient and a huge cost to the individual companies.

It threatens London's reputation as a good place to do business, where the rule of law is upheld.

Protecting the vulnerable

Ask the public what they most want us to be and they often come back and say – protective.

There's no question that society is putting ever greater value on protecting those who are vulnerable; to child sexual exploitation & abuse, grooming, rape, human trafficking, female genital mutilation, domestic violence.

And no question that increasing public confidence is leading to more reporting of these crimes, a demand we must meet.

Much of it is historic, where the investigative challenge is daunting and labour-intensive.

As law enforcers, we have a big role to play, identifying those at risk, catching predators.

And I am just as committed to improvement here as I am in tackling gang members and robbers. That's why I commissioned, with the Director of Public Prosecutions, Alison Saunders, a report from Dame Elish Angiolini into how we handle rape.

I'm sure there will be some uncomfortable messages about where we still haven't got it right, but I hope people realise we're listening and continuing to learn.

It also demonstrates how we can't protect the vulnerable alone. By the time we're involved, someone's been hurt or is at serious risk.

The key interventions, to protect children, drug-abusers, partners at risk of violence, are often made by other agencies.

Very little of the work we do here shows up in any crime figures. And some of it shouldn't even be left to law enforcement.

Mental health – a case study

You can see this clearly in the area of mental health.

It's now a huge challenge for policing in London and across the UK, with about 40% of the calls to which we respond involving someone with a mental health issue.

Anyone who's worked with us closely will understand why I said a couple of years ago that dealing with mentally-ill people was core business for the Met, and we needed to increase our skill and capability to meet the challenge.

We've become the frontline for mental health services, and this is not acceptable either to the general public, those with mental ill health or to me.

We have responded to the challenge, and we invest a lot of your money as taxpayers in doing so. When people are in our custody, we check them every 15 minutes.

But most of the people with whom we come into contact should be getting medical care, not a visit from a police officer.

As you'd expect, we've had some dialogue with the NHS about this. We don't think they should be asking police officers to move their patients for them. They've got the better training to do that, not our officers. So we've stopped it.

And we push very hard to ensure that when medical care is needed, that comes from medics not police officers. If not, the public are more at risk, the patients are more at risk and so are the officers.

There's still more to do, and we need a wider debate about the social responsibility for reducing the incidence of poor mental health as well as caring for people who shouldn't be relying on the police to stop them from harming themselves or others.

It epitomises one of the key strategic responses we need to meet all those transformation challenges outlined within a tough financial climate.

4) THE FINANCIAL CHALLENGE

Any of you who work in the public sector will know that the next five years are going to be tougher than the last five.

So just as important as transforming our policing services will be continuing to transform our efficiency.

We are committed to getting the full value from every pound of tax-payer's money we spend.

That's how we'll save our first 600 million pounds by next year without cutting police officers.

It's for political leaders to decide how much money we get in the new Parliament.

But we're currently expecting to make up to a further 800 million pound savings by 2020 – that'll be 1.4 billion in total.

Now if you want some idea of what 800 million means for us, it's equivalent to the cost of about 16,000 police officers, half our current strength.

Rest assured, the last thing I want to see in London is fewer officers, as we've already demonstrated with the way we've made savings so far. But we won't be able to get all the way there without some reduction. .

Of course, we'll make our arguments to protect our budget where we can.

We don't think our current funding from the Home Office fully recognises the challenges of policing our capital.

Last year, we took the equivalent of 405 police officers every day out of local policing to manage public protests and events.

We support the right of protest and we work hard week-in, week-out to make sure it happens peacefully.

But we don't think Londoners should subsidise it from their own policing resources.

Cutting costs

The commitment I offer in return to tax-payers is to cut our costs to compare with the best in the private sector.

In our first phase of change we have focused on 3 areas; fewer buildings, fewer support and headquarters staff and fewer senior officers or managers. In each area, we can do even better to give value for money to the tax-payer.

How? Well, take our estate. We have made the Met more responsive to the needs of the public – faster to pick up the phone in an emergency, quicker to get there, ready to visit any victim of crime.

Investing in these areas has meant we can manage with fewer police stations, and we firmly believe the public want us to come to them, particularly with more sensitive crimes.

We make accessing a police officer even easier, and if we get that right, a visit to a police station in 2020 should be the exception.

We'll need many fewer buildings and invest in our money in officers instead.

We've reduced our office staff already by 3 and half thousand, and we'll need to go further in future.

We must provide support services to our officers as efficiently as the market can. That may involve the market delivering those services, it may not. But it should always be our benchmark for value and quality.

Some roles may leave London & create jobs elsewhere in the UK.

We will continue to focus our resource on frontline policing, both officers and the investigative and crime-fighting tools they need.

That may lead to a rethink about whether community support officers - who are staff rather than warranted police officers - offer the best value to the public and the taxpayer.

We currently have around 1800. They do a valuable job and are integral to our current approach to neighbourhood policing. But we have to decide whether a warranted officer with powers of arrest is a better use of our limited resources.

We've reduced by a third the number of senior officers in the Met – that's from Commander to Commissioner, and we will keep looking for further savings that allow us to put our money into frontline officers.

5) OUR APPROACH

Let's be clear though, cutting costs alone will not be enough.

We have to change the model of how we police London and the UK.

And we have to do that that as crime gets ever more digital, more global and more complex.

Whilst a growing population increases demand and public expectations rise.

Faced with that, I know some in policing are downcast.

I'm not.

But only if we make radical changes in London and to policing across England and Wales.

To invest in our specialist frontline units, we must get our supply lines and support structures working even more efficiently.

There are three key areas on which we will focus;

Firstly, we must invest in digital technology to work smarter and be more productive

Second, we must develop our amazing people to have the right skills for 2020, to be even more innovative and agile, and to look and feel like our diverse, global city.

Thirdly, we must be more collaborative within policing & with partners to support each other more effectively and efficiently.

Using technology to work smarter and be more productive

I am very clear that our future success will be built on how we embrace technology and that's why I have committed the Met to be the first truly digital police force.

At the core of this is our mobility strategy, equipping our officers with the right digital devices to access all the information they need wherever they are; gathering imagery and video to enhance the evidence we use to pursue our investigations.

This is about working smarter, and removing the obstacles that confront our officers and stop them getting the job done as quickly and efficiently as they would like. They already display extraordinary commitment, passion and courage. This is what we, their leaders, can offer in return.

We've been running a trial in Hammersmith for the past few months, equipping our officers with tablets and giving them access to secure policing systems whilst they're out on the road.

The results are impressive. It's saving officers at least an hour each day. Add that up, and it's a lot of extra officer time.

And at the moment, we're only focusing on one part of the law enforcement process. Our vision is to use digital to connect the criminal justice system from the very first report of a crime through to a court appearance, an end-to end service.

Better for the public; better for officers and for the courts; more efficient for the taxpayer.

But that's not enough. We also need to make it easier for the public to report crime, to follow the progress of their case and be less reliant on updates from our officers. We may need to flex our both our crime recording and our criminal justice processes to allow the public to play their part more effectively.

If we do, I firmly believe we can offer the public a better service at the same time as we free up our officers to be more productive.

And because we have been slow in the past to reap the benefits of digital technology and smarter ways of working, the potential productivity gains are significant. We

believe we can generate up to a 15% increase in productivity by 2020, perhaps enough to compensate for the inevitable reduction in police officers.

Developing our people

In the modern world of digital policing, it's capability that counts.

Forensic skills, IT skills, expertise in social media and communications data.

It's not just about how many people you've got, it what's your people can do.

So we need to balance our investment in digital with an investment in our fantastic officers and police staff to develop all the new skills required to combat 21st century crime.

And we must do this whilst progressing the commitment I have made to build a Met that looks and feels like the Londoners we serve.

Tomorrow I shall be attending a passing-out parade at Hendon for the group of officers that will take us – more or less - to the 32,000 number we've been targeting for 3 years.

I'm delighted that nearly 20% of them will be from minorities. But overall, it's still the case that after all that recruitment the Met still only has 11 and a half per cent of our officers from minority backgrounds.

That's why I continue to push for a change in legislation to give us some of the help they've had to become more representative in Northern Ireland and the United States

Limiting our recruitment to Londoners has made a difference, but when you see how fast London is changing, it's not enough.

Not only do I want more minority officers, I also want more of the people with digital skills.

I would be in favour of opening up a new direct entry route to bring in people at a senior level with specific digital skills who can help us take on the cyber-criminals.

This imperative to transform is why I want the next government to keep open the options for voluntary and compulsory exit for officers. The military has had to do it to transform rapidly to meet new threats, and I believe we will need all options available to us as well.

We'll also need increasing flexibility on pay to recognise the cost of living in London, and the need to attract people with the right digital skills.

Finally, we need to think hard about the Office of Constable and how we modernise that to meet the needs of 21st century policing. For those not familiar with it, this is the principle that each and every officer – whatever their rank – is an independent legal official, not an agent of their force, or the government. They are all personally

accountable for the exercise of our coercive powers. They cannot be ordered to arrest someone, not even by me.

I support this principle.

But as servants of the Crown, our relationship with our officers is governed by Police Regulations, not employment contracts.

In my view, these Regulations are increasingly unhelpful and stand in the way of the transformation policing urgently requires.

Firstly, they add in costs by requiring us to follow long and often anachronistic procedures. For example, every officer involved in a gross misconduct case – out of which they might be sacked and lose the Office of Constable – has the right to a QC.

That leads individual forces to do the same to achieve equality of arms, and the net result is lengthy and expensive disciplinary processes.

Secondly, it's clear that policing needs to change its employment practices to adapt to the digital world. We can't adapt when we're locked in a system that doesn't give us the flexibility to change we need. Rank and hierarchy are less and less meaningful when even your most junior Constables are empowered by digital technology.

I'll support my officers to the hilt, make no mistake about that. But I'm worried that these self-imposed constraints will get in the way of the changes we need. Unless we can quickly find that flexibility, we may need to find a different model.

Collaborating to success

And that leads us on to the third area on which we think we should focus, and the particular reason why we've asked the RSA to help us. How can we create new collaborative relationships to allow a smaller public sector in London to keep this global city safe and secure?

I've already demonstrated some of the risks if we don't do this.

Where are the opportunities?

Within policing

Let me talk briefly about policing first. I don't believe the current structure of 43 forces in England & Wales is either efficient or sustainable if we're to bring about the transformation we need to cut costs and increase productivity.

Criminals don't respect the 1974 local government boundaries. They seek markets with high population densities to sell drugs and steal property. And they pass local and national borders with ease. We need to be as flexible and aggressive as they are, and we don't need the HQ costs that go with multiple forces. .

I know there are powerful arguments for maintaining local accountability, but I believe this can be done with fewer forces. Police Scotland has brought together 8 forces. Holland has one. It can be done. I think 9 forces would be the right number to cover England and Wales.

It's particularly necessary if we're to get the real benefits we need from digital. We can't invest 40 or even 20 separate times in systems that are designed to do the same job. We've got to increase our buying power and accept off-the-shelf solutions.

Blue Light collaboration

Outside policing, there are clear opportunities across the emergency services. I believe we could move to a single 999 system for London, with the same call-handlers deploying police cars, ambulances and fire-engines.

I believe it would start to open up synergies in our deployments as well as our call-handling. We have frontline staff in all three services with paramedic skills to varying levels. A joint approach to deployment would avoid duplication and allow us to make sure the public get the right service at the right time.

This is not a bid to take over or run other services, I am sure we all have enough in our in tray to keep us going. It is however looking at 999 / Blue light services as the public see them. Three different locations to answer the phone; multiple IT contracts often with the same supplier; three different vehicles responding to an incident that only needed one service, the way we currently do it does not pass the 'person in the street test'.

I would like us collectively to have a plan within 12 months, where the default assumption is we are bringing the blue light services in London together. This will not just save money it will deliver a better service to the public.

In criminal justice

I believe we need to look at all the services that make up the criminal justice system in the same way. Whilst I support the principle that prosecutors should be independent from police, we should be better connected both digitally and organisationally.

We've recently been working closely with the CPS to develop a shared approach to rape and sexual crime, developing common objectives and a holistic view of how we can improve the system from beginning to end.

In the next few months, we will jointly publish the review that the DPP Alison Saunders and I commissioned from Dame Elish Angiolini. I believe it will demonstrate there is greater potential for collaboration and more effective use of our resources, but most importantly a blueprint for a more compassionate and effective service for Londoners.

I would like to explore further the potential for cooperation with the Probation Service to see if we can align our goals and services more effectively.

With local councils

Achieving the same goals with local authorities in London will be trickier, if only because we work across 32 Boroughs at present. That builds in extra expense for the tax-payer into our structures and limits the scope of collaboration within existing Borough boundaries.

We are questioning whether our Borough-based structure is sustainable, and I know privately that council executives are questioning whether London can still sustain 32 separate administrations, despite the excellent work that's been done to share services where possible.

If we're going to jump to a new model, let's jump together.

It's really important we get this right because councils' own financial challenges are putting at risk the vital partnerships we have to safeguard the most vulnerable, like children, those at risk of domestic abuse or drug or alcohol-dependency.

And believe me, that collaboration is vital to public safety.

CCTV is a good example. Local councils fund much of it in London, and we want to enhance it to do an even more effective job helping us catch criminals and keep public spaces safe.

The risk is that if we all work in isolation to make the kinds of savings we need, we'll leave big holes in the infrastructure that keeps the public safe.

Moreover, if councils pull back from interventions that help drug-users, those with alcohol problems, that divert youngsters from criminality or gangs, then we will see a repetition of the problems we've seen in mental health.

The Mayor's role

A final thought on collaboration within the public sector.

London's had a Mayor since 2000.

The system is mature, established, and it holds us to account, especially over how we spend the public's money.

It's a foundation on which we could base a new alignment of public services in London, with a single line of accountability.

Effective collaboration starts from shared objectives and that's easier to achieve if those are set by the same person.

Radical change and collaborative success will be much more likely if we have joined-up leadership of the criminal justice and emergency services.

6) Extending Total Policing

We can't allow collaboration to stop there. We have to reach out even further.

Just like the military, we too need the active consent and support of the public. We need them to take responsibility where they can for protecting themselves and keeping safe, with our support. And we need to build a greater body of knowledge and expertise to professionalise policing and a build a new evidence-base to support digital policing.

Prevention first

I've been clear that to protect people from significant threats like counter-terrorism or from sexual assault or exploitation, we need to ask partners and the public to play a bigger role in working with us to tackle preventable crimes.

Many already do. Crime prevention has worked over the last 50 years but I would argue that this is despite rather than because of a government or police strategy to embed it.

Much of it has happened because businesses and our colleagues in local councils have met the public's demands for secure homes, secure vehicles or safer public places. We've helped where we can, sometimes nudging manufacturers rather vigorously where we see failings that lead to sudden surges in criminality, as we saw when smart-phone theft spiked in London a couple of years ago.

Well, I believe that keeping the public safe should be just as high a priority as keeping them healthy, and I'd like it to achieve the same high profile that prevention has in health over the last 20 years.

So much of the focus in health has shifted away from acute care towards the individual's ability to keep healthy. You can see it in the way products are marketed, in the school curriculum, with the introduction of health-checks for those of us of a certain age.

No one thinks it's my doctor's responsibility if I don't eat well, drink sensibly or exercise.

That's down to me, surely, isn't it?

How do we achieve something similar in public safety? How can we work with business or other agencies to achieve this?

Not least because two of our biggest drivers of criminality – alcohol and drugs – also have important impacts on public health as well as public safety

Alcohol continues to be a force multiplier in the volume of crime in the UK. In the evening, up to 80% of arrests can be alcohol related. The users put their safety at risk as much if not more than their health, with similar costs for society to pick up. So

we need to find a way to expand the preventative message to 'Stay healthy, stay safe'.

And we need to make sure there is good control of the supply of alcohol. This means licence numbers, density and licensee-regulation being a priority for local authorities, however much they would like to develop local economies.

We know that many injuries occur inside or outside licensed premises, and if we can close down the repeat offenders, we will.

But do we really need as many licensed premises chasing limited business? The system needs reform and we have to police it better.

Drugs produce two types of crime; first the acquisitive crime to pay for them; second, the vicious and ruthless violence to enforce the illegal market. As a user, just as with alcohol, you put your safety at risk as well as your health. The police mustn't give up enforcing this law, and we need continued intervention from other agencies to push prevention.

In particular, **young people** should be the priority for the public safety agenda. They are disproportionately affected by crime, either as a victim or offender.

Design has been a critical factor in reducing crime. As digital products multiply, we need all manufacturers to have an obligation to minimise the risk for criminality so we don't end up with the kind of spike we saw with mobile thefts.

But design can only work to prevent crime if the **public** then take the right steps to protect themselves. Some of that may seem obvious; cars parked in garages are less likely to be stolen; houses with alarms are less likely to be burgled; houses which have been burgled and their neighbours are very likely to be re-attacked in the following 6 weeks; and much online fraud can be avoided if people simply update their proprietary security software.

Nudging behaviour

Encouraging the public to change their behaviour to stay safe as well as healthy is a challenge. But we have two things running in our favour.

First, the digital revolution is starting to unlock the huge potential for collaboration with the public to allow us to focus our efforts on those most at risk and encourage them to stay safe.

Secondly, we think there are exciting opportunities emerging from the developing thinking around behavioural insights. Some of my team are working closely with the government's behavioural insights team to understand how best to apply their expertise to 'nudge' people into avoiding risky behaviour.

We'd like to open up a collaborative space where we could work with the best talent in business and behavioural marketing to help us achieve a real impact in this area.

And I'm also convinced that the academic world has a role to play.

With universities

I am passionate about the need to develop a stronger evidence-base for law enforcement, to match the important work that's been done in medicine and other areas.

Digital policing will give us the data we haven't always had before so we can better understand when and how we get the outcomes we seek.

I want to place the police service on a sounder intellectual and professional foundation. We've not been as good as we should in understanding our successes and our failures, and the police have not developed an academic body of knowledge or evidence from which to develop our professionalism.

Medicine, engineering, architecture long ago decided it was inadequate to learn by failure. Our universities have the capability to help us research, develop and teach policing knowledge as an academic discipline. And to help us with the ethical dilemmas we so often face.

So we are working with the Mayor to encourage one of London's top universities to set up a Centre for Policing that could build the kind of professional evidence-base I think we need. That would include the challenges of keeping the public safe in a global city.

It is no longer good enough, in my view, to rely on a pot-pourri of criminology, law, forensic science and management theory to improve our peace and security. So my vision is for a Faculty that would move policing and public safety to the next level, and provide a beacon for international development of policing styles and norms.

It would also give the UK a world lead in this vital area, attract international students, and potentially access a commercial income stream wider than the £12bn presently spent on policing

Digital policing needs well-qualified recruits ready to apply digital skills to 21st century criminality. Our biggest challenges like those in cyber and counter-terrorism will not be solved by brawn alone.

For Scotland Yard's detectives to have the global reputation in the future that we have now, we need to lead in digital as we have in DNA and forensic investigation.

And we need the academic foundations on which to build a new professionalism.

7) THE POLICE AND THE PUBLIC

So we have a plan, we have great people, we have the determination.

We are a 'can-do' service, and I hope the public respect us for that.

I wish you could all have seen our Excellence Awards a few weeks ago for the best and bravest officers and staff.

- Capturing the Met's values in action.
- The courage of officers who rescued a drowning woman from a canal.
- The compassion shown to victims of crime.
- The professionalism & integrity of officers and staff who battle with serious illness and still turn up for work.

Like our colleagues across the country, they're battling to cope with increasing demands from a bigger population, with an ever-growing expectation that we can and will protect the vulnerable, with all the care, compassion and humanity that requires, whilst still bearing down on the high volume of low-risk crime that affects the greater number of people.

Perhaps we – their leaders – have been guilty too often of saying 'yes we can'.

We never say 'no we can't'. It's anathema to police officers.

But now we must be clear. Every time we're given a new priority, we have to ask the public, what do you want us to do less of, to de-prioritise?

If you want more resources put into shoplifting or cycle-crime, where is the area on which you think we should spend less?

If, like us, you want more effort devoted to stopping domestic abuse, where should that come from?

Health has done this better than policing.

There was a time when the debate about rationing dare not speak its name.

Now the NHS is clearer that not all drugs are affordable, not all operations offer benefits to match the costs. And it has the mechanisms, like the [National Institute for Health and Care Excellence](#), to help weigh up the evidence away from the practitioners or the policy-makers.

It's painful. It doesn't always get it right, but it makes transparent the decisions that would otherwise be taken behind closed doors, without the knowledge or input of patients.

For policing, the corresponding debate is about risk. That's what we do, manage risks on behalf of the public; and there are many. The risk you might be attacked, shot, stabbed, robbed, run over, sexually abused even.

Only this week, we heard there are now 46,000 people on the sex offenders' register, more than twice as many as there were when it started in 2003.

That's an awful lot of risk, and let's be frank; the police can't guarantee they won't do it again.

For too long, we've managed these problems in a closed way, getting on with the job and our own can-do ethos. Now we need to be more open about the way we analyse risk to deploy our resources and decide what we should and shouldn't do.

Of course, we want to focus our officers on minimising the biggest dangers to the public.

So we need to arrive at a shared view of what the critical risks are, so we can stimulate individual responsibility to manage the preventable crimes that offer the lowest risk to public safety.

We need to make more transparent some of those choices we make now, and will make a more of in the future. For example, we estimate that we spend more than 50 million pounds every year in dealing with missing person cases. Very few ever become a crime. A child recovered before they get into trouble doesn't feature in any crime statistics that I know of. And yet we pursue 42,000 cases a year to minimise the risk of a child being harmed or worse.

And we need to have a grown-up conversation about how much time we should spend reinvestigating the past, whether it's our own failings or institutional failings. As a police officer, I will never shrink from the task of bringing a bad person to justice whoever they are, without fear or favour. But we have to be better at weighing up the likelihood of success against the risks that those resources might be able to prevent or mitigate in the present day

There's no question our service will change. It must if we are protect our frontline capability to keep the public safe.

We have to redefine what 'visible policing' means in the capital, or we'll be taking officers away from high-skill, productive jobs just to be seen out and about.

We have to have the freedom to move our resources to where the population and the demand is growing in London, even though that will be painful for others.

We have to make collaboration work or we'll be picking up the pieces from society's failings.

But if we can have that support, then I'm clear, we will be successful and London will be the safest global city.

Ends.