

FOI Disclosures July 2020

Index

This month we have responded to questions relating to the following topics:

- [Correspondence regarding arrest of royal protection officer](#)
- [Complaints made to IOPC Reportline](#)
- [Number of IOPC investigations and time taken to complete](#)
- [Complaints about Dominic Cummings](#)
- [IOPC workforce and the effects of legislative change](#)
- [Powers of a constable and IOPC Operations Manual](#)
- [Complaints about IOPC investigators](#)
- [Evidence relating to Operation Lansdowne](#)

If you require a full copy of any of the embedded attachments, please contact Requestinfo@policeconduct.gov.uk quoting the reference number from the relevant response.

| <u>Ref</u> <u>1008440</u> Back to top | <u>Correspondence regarding arrest of royal protection officer</u> |
|---|--|
| <u>Request</u> | <p>Your request relates to a referral to the IOPC described in this BBC online article. You request the following information:</p> <p><i>-I would like a copy of all IOPC emails between Sussex Police, Met Police and IOPC relating to this case.</i></p> <p><i>-I would like a copy of the report outlining the conclusions of the investigation</i></p> <p><i>-I would like a summary of action taken in relation to this case</i></p> |
| <u>Response</u> | <p>We can confirm that the IOPC holds information under the first part of your request.</p> <p>We do not hold information under the second or third parts. As stated in the BBC article the matter was investigated by the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) without any involvement of the IOPC, with the result that we do not hold this information. You should therefore contact the MPS for a copy of any report and a summary of the action taken.</p> <p>The information we hold engages the exemptions under sections 40(2) (personal data) and 44(1)(a) (prohibitions on disclosure) of the FOIA.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>This exemption under section 44 applies when disclosure of the information is prohibited by or under an enactment.</p> <p>Section 5 of the Sexual Offences (Amendment) Act 1992 (“the 1992 Act”) provides that it is an offence to publish the information specified in section 1 where this relates to a person who is the victim of an offence under section 2.</p> <p>Substantial parts of this information relate to a person or persons whose lifetime anonymity is protected by the 1992 Act. In refusing your request we have taken into account that the information protected by section 1 includes, under sub-section (2), any matter “likely to lead members of the public to identify a person as the person against whom the offence is alleged to have been committed”. The effect of this provision is that a publication prohibited by the 1992 Act does not have to expressly identify the individual, it simply has to include information that might, when pieced together with other information, lead to the person being identified (this is often referred to as jigsaw identification).</p> <p>We have concluded, therefore, that section 44(1)(a) of the FOIA applies to this information because its disclosure is prohibited by section 5 of the SOAA.</p> <p>Both section 40 and section 44 are ‘absolute’ exemptions meaning that there is no requirement to consider the balance of the public interest before refusing the information.</p> |
| <p><u>Ref</u> <u>1008397</u> Back to top</p> | <p align="center"><u>Complaints made to IOPC Reportline</u></p> |
| <p><u>Request</u></p> | <p>Your request relates to complaints made to the IOPC report line and is as follows:</p> <p><i>1. How many complaints have police staff made to the IOPC within the following time periods. (Please note that "complaints" includes complaints, whistleblowing, concerns, and incidents that police staff have flagged to yourselves):</i></p> <p><i>March 2019</i></p> <p><i>April 2019</i></p> <p><i>March 2020</i></p> <p><i>April 2020</i></p> <p><i>If possible, please break this down by police force and whether the staff member was operational (e.g. police constables) or supportive (e.g. analysts/administrators).</i></p> <p><i>If it isn't possible to break down the forces, please say whether the complaint came from a staff member within an English, Welsh or Other force. (Other here would include the British Transport Police and Ministry of Defence Police).</i></p> |

| | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| | <p><i>If it isn't possible to break down the staff members by role, please omit this.</i></p> <p><i>If you are unable to give a specific monthly tally for March and/or April 2019, you may provide the total number for the year.</i></p> <p><i>If you are unable to give a specific monthly tally for March and/or April 2020, you may provide the total number for the year to date.</i></p> <p><i>2. Does the IOPC hold data about these cases in a spreadsheet or database? If so, please could you provide a list of the data fields – for clarity, this could include but is not limited to categories such as “type of complaint”, “status of complaint”, etc.</i></p> <p><i>For each item on the list of data fields, please state if the value is to be filled in as a free text field, or a value selected from a drop-down menu. For each of the fields where a value is to be selected from a drop-down menu, please include the options from the drop-down menu.</i></p> |
| <p><u>Response</u></p> | <p>In relation to part 1 of your request we can confirm the following:</p> <p><u>March 2020 - 4 reports</u> 2 officer 2 unknown other</p> <p><u>April 2020 – no reports</u></p> <p><u>March 2019 - 5 reports</u> 3 officer 1 police staff 1 not recorded</p> <p><u>April 2019 - 6 reports</u> 5 officer 1 unknown other</p> <p>We have decided that you are not entitled to know the forces to whom these reports relate because this information engages the exemptions under section 30(2) and 40(2) of the FOIA. Our refusal takes into account the data we are disclosing above and other report line data we have recently disclosed under a separate FOIA request. Our assessment is that full compliance with your request would create a real risk of an individual being identified should the withheld data be combined with other data disclosed by the IOPC. Even if identification was not reasonably likely on the basis of the IOPC’s FOIA disclosures alone, someone sufficiently motivated to identify an individual could link the IOPC data to other data accessible to them in order to complete the ‘jigsaw’.</p> <p>In the case of the information to which section 30(2) applies we are refusing your request after concluding that the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosure. Section 40(2) is an absolute exemption meaning that there is no requirement to consider</p> |

the balance of the public interest before deciding that the information can be refused.

As to part 2 of your request, the table of data on which we record report line contact contains the following:

| Column heading | Pick list of options (where applicable) |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| Name of person making the complaint | |
| Force the complaint is against | |
| Case reference number | |
| Details of the allegation | |
| Action taken | forwarded to the force passed to intel no further action Consent requested |
| Protected disclosure | Yes/no |
| Subject of allegation | Corruption Failure to investigate Bullying Specific operations such as Op Embley Work specific issues Discrimination Whistleblowing Unfair practices |

It may assist you to know that the majority of the concerns raised with the IOPC are about either corruption, discrimination or failures to investigate the concerns raised. We have various options for dealing with calls to our report line. The action we take will depend on the seriousness of the concerns raised, but we must obtain the reporter's consent before passing any information to a police force. Nearly all of the reports we receive are considered suitable to be dealt with by the relevant force.

| | |
|---|--|
| Ref 1008421 Back to top | <u>Number of IOPC investigations and time taken to complete</u> |
| <u>Request</u> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>How many cases the IOPC are investigating at this time as a result of referrals.</i> 2. <i>How long these cases are taking for the IOPC to investigate - in particular if there is a legal obligation to adhere to a timeline to complete an investigation.</i> |
| <u>Response</u> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Regardless of whether there has been a complaint, police forces are required to refer certain matters to the IOPC, for example, incidents involving death or serious injuries. |

These are known as mandatory referrals.

A referral can originate from one of three possible sources - a complaint, a death or serious injury, or a recordable conduct matter. In addition:

- a police force can choose to refer a matter voluntarily to the IOPC
- the IOPC may instruct a police force to record and refer a matter
- the IOPC may initiate an investigation without the matter being referred

The IOPC then decides how the matters/complaints referred should be dealt with, which includes independent investigation. An independent investigation can also be started:

- when the IOPC decides to independently investigate a case that had previously been dealt with by the IOPC as an investigation appeal
- when the IOPC decides to re-investigate a case that had previously been investigated independently

At 31 May 2020, the IOPC had 339 open independent investigations. These investigations had been open for an average of 168 working days, which is equivalent to eight months.

2. To provide you with a more complete picture of the time the IOPC takes to investigate its cases, I also include information about the investigations we completed in 2019/20 and this financial year to date. The investigation duration is calculated from the date the referral is received by the IOPC to the date our investigation report is completed. In 2019/20, we completed 718 independent cases, including cases managed by Directorate of Major Investigations. The average time taken to complete these cases was 236 working days (just over 11 months). Between 1 April and 31 May 2020, we completed 63 independent cases, including cases managed by Directorate of Major Investigations. The average time to complete these cases was 235 days (just over 11 months).

The durations of our investigations can vary due to a number of factors, including different levels of complexity, the number of complainants, the number of subjects under investigation and referral to Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) for advice on criminal charges.

We aim to complete our investigations within 12 months and in

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>2019/20 our target was to complete 80% within this timescale, inclusive of our most complex cases managed by our Directorate of Major Investigations. Our target for 2020/21 is to complete 85% of investigations, excluding our most complex cases managed by our Directorate of Major Investigations, within 12 months. In addition to our key performance measures and targets, the Policing and Crime Act 2017 and supporting regulations introduced a number of changes which came into effect on 1 February 2020. These changes included the requirement for the investigating body to provide the complainant and other interested persons with a written explanation if an investigation is not completed within 12 months, and each subsequent period of six months thereafter.</p> |
| <p>Ref 1008466 Back to top</p> | <p><u>Complaints about Dominic Cummings</u></p> |
| <p><u>Request</u></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Please provide copies of all communications and correspondence with Durham police in relation to the Dominic Cummings case;</i> • <i>Please provide a breakdown of all complaints received by the IOPC in relation to the Durham investigation into the case, with a brief description, including the nature of the complaint.</i> |
| <p><u>Response</u></p> | <p>We understand the phrasing of your request , i.e. ‘<i>the Dominic Cummings case</i>’ to relate to the widely reported matter involving Dominic Cummings’ visit to his family and to Barnard Castle during a period of lockdown due to the Covid-19 pandemic.</p> <p>We have searched our systems to establish if we hold any correspondence that may fall in the scope of the first part of your request and can confirm that the IOPC has not corresponded with Durham Constabulary about the circumstances of Mr Cummings’ visit to Durham with his family in April or any policing issues connected with that visit. The IOPC has not received a referral in connection with the Dominic Cummings case. Therefore we do not hold any information under the first part of your request.</p> <p>The second part of your request refers to complaints received in relation to the Durham Constabulary investigation into the case. We understand this to refer to any public complaints made about this widely reported matter.</p> <p>It is pertinent to explain that complaints about the police are considered and recorded in the first instance by the Appropriate Authority– in this case this would be the Professional Standards Department of Durham Constabulary. Members of the public may send their complaint to the IOPC, but our role at that stage is limited to forwarding them to the Appropriate Authority for their consideration. Most public complaints are then handled by the Appropriate Authority</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>without any involvement of the IOPC. Complaints made online via our website are automatically sent to the relevant Appropriate Authority.</p> <p>We provide this explanation to illustrate that the IOPC does not keep a comprehensive record of <u>all</u> police complaints, we only hold records relating to correspondence received by us.</p> <p>Any direct complaint received by the IOPC relating to Durham Constabulary's investigation into the Dominic Cummings case would have been forwarded to Durham to consider and record where appropriate.</p> <p>It may be helpful to explain that a member of the public can only make a complaint against the police if they are eligible, which in general means that they must have directly witnessed an incident involving the police, or have been affected by it. A person cannot claim to be adversely affected or to have witnessed the conduct simply by viewing or listening to media coverage.</p> <p>Searches of our systems show that although we have been contacted by thirty five members of the public who have referred to the Dominic Cummings matter, we do not feel their correspondence meets the definition of eligible complaints regarding Durham Constabulary and their investigation into the case.</p> <p>Consequently we have concluded that we do not hold any relevant information in connection with the second part of your request.</p> <p>You may want to consider redirecting this part of your request to Durham Constabulary as the Appropriate Authority with the responsibility for recording complaints in the first instance.</p> |
| <p><u>Ref</u> <u>1008522</u> Back to top</p> | <p><u>IOPC workforce and the effects of legislative change</u></p> |
| <p><u>Request</u></p> | <p><i>I would like some statistics on workforce numbers and composition (if possible i.e. broken down by ethnicity, gender etc.).</i></p> <p><i>Lastly, on the statistics page on the IOPC website there is a note that a number of changes to the complaints process have taken effect from February 2020. This is presumably because of The Police (Complaints and Misconduct) Regulations 2020? What are the main effects of these legislative changes on IOPC practices?</i></p> |
| <p><u>Response</u></p> | <p>We publish information regarding workforce on our website. The following link is the staff diversity report for 2018/19. For the purposes of comparison of the workforce prior to our expansion in January 2018, you can refer to page 100 onwards of our Annual Report of 2017/2018 which can be found in the 'Previous Reports' section of this page of our website.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>You also asked about the main effects of legislative change on the practices of the IOPC.</p> <p>Information regarding the reforms to the police complaints process can be found on our website here. Further details about the police complaint process can be found in our Statutory Guidance.</p> |
| <p>Ref 1008557 Back to top</p> | <p><u>Powers of a constable and IOPC Operations Manual</u></p> |
| <p><u>Request</u></p> | <p><i>Please could you disclose your Operations Manual?</i></p> <p>AND</p> <p><i>This factsheet on your website https://www.policeconduct.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Documents/Investigations/our-investigations-a-guide-to-IOPC-independent-investigations.pdf states that "in criminal investigations, our investigators have the powers and privileges of a constable, such as the power to arrest or to seize evidence".</i></p> <p><i>Please disclose:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. the source of the legal power in question, and</i> <i>2. any guidance, policy or manual you have which guides on how you exercise these powers.</i> |
| <p><u>Response</u></p> | <p>The Operations Manual covers our Investigations, casework and related administrative functions. It is a web based resource rather than a single document. It consists of nearly 500 web pages including further links to 746 items of downloadable content such as template letters, forms and other related documents. Some of the linked pages contain further links. There is no export function available or method of compiling the individual pages and resources into a single output.</p> <p>This means that in order to respond to your request for the entire Operations Manual website we would need to manually extract and convert the contents of each individual page or linked document.</p> <p>Section 12 of the FOIA allows the IOPC to refuse a request when the estimated cost of carrying out certain activities exceeds £450, or 18 hours at £25 per hour. It is most likely that the activities required to comply with your request to provide the entire content of the Operations Manual would far exceed this limit.</p> <p>Given the format in which the Operations Manual is held, it is difficult to give a precise estimate of the amount of information involved but if we were to convert all of this content into PDF as we did with our previous response, it would be likely to consist of well over a thousand pages of text and the work involved in extracting, converting and presenting would be very likely to exceed 18 hours even before</p> |

we have carried out the task of ensuring that all the relevant material has been gathered from linked sources.

In addition, the content of the Manual would need to be vetted to remove personal data and other information that would not be disclosable under the FOIA. This means that completion of your request would be likely to take several weeks even if the information could be extracted and converted within the cost limit.

We would invite you to refine your request to the particular areas you are most interested in as this should assist us in responding within the cost limit. We note, for example, that in your previous request you sought information about our investigatory powers. If you require any other specific information about how we carry out our investigations it may help you to focus your request if you were to read our [guide to IOPC independent investigations](#) and visit the other information available on the [investigations page](#) of our web site. The investigations search tool on this page can be used to locate information about investigations we have carried out into certain key areas and may help with focusing on a particular subject area that forms part of our guidance.

Our recently published [annual report](#) may also help you to refine your request to a particular aspect of our work.

We include relevant information from our Operations Manual that may be helpful to you to explain the legal context of our investigatory powers. This can be found [here](#).

The phrase “powers and privileges of a constable” comes from paragraph 19 of Schedule 3 PRA. This provision confers those powers on a person designated to take charge of, or assist with, an IOPC independent investigation, for the purpose of carrying out that investigation. Designated persons, when conducting an independent investigation, can exercise powers that a person holding the office of constable could also exercise

IOPC investigators exercise only the powers and privileges of a constable necessary for the carrying out of its own investigations. It follows that there will be powers, for example stop and search, that will not be required in practice with the result that we have not produced any operational guidance as to their use.

The powers under the Police and Criminal Evidence Act (PACE) which are exercisable by a constable are

:

- Stop and Search (s1)
- Apply for a search warrant (s8) or to obtain access to special procedure or excluded material (s9 and Sch 1)
- Execute a warrant (s16)
- Enter premises to execute warrant or carry out an arrest

(s17; NB that section also confers power of entry to recapture a person unlawfully at large and to prevent serious harm to persons or property, these powers are not likely to be required for the purpose of an IOPC independent investigation)

- Power to enter and search of premises after arrest (s18)
- Power to seize items (s19) including computerised information (s20)
- Power to retain seized items (s22)
- Power to arrest (s24)
- Power to release on bail following arrest (s30A – release prior to taking the arrested person to a police station, i.e. “street bail”)
- Arrest for further offences (s31)
- Search of a person following arrest (s32) (including power to enter and search any premises where the person was immediately prior to arrest)
- Apply for warrant of further detention and extension (s43 and s44)
- Power to arrest for failure to answer police bail (s46A)
- Power to search persons answering to live link bail (s54B) and retain items seized (s54C)
- Powers to take without suspect’s consent their fingerprints (s61) or impression of their footwear (s61A)

Some of the above are unlikely to be needed for the purpose of an IOPC investigation.

The powers and duties which relate to detention and charging under PACE are conferred on an appointed custody officer, not a constable. An IOPC investigator would make representations to the custody officer about bail, but the decision is for the custody officer to make.

Subparagraph (6) of Paragraph 19 Schedule 3 Police Reform Act 2002 allows the Home Secretary to modify provisions of PACE and the PACE Codes of practice to IOPC investigations as necessary. This is achieved through the Independent Police Complaints Commission (Investigation of Offences) Order 2014. This allows IOPC staff of particular grades to perform the functions of an inspector or superintendent where PACE requires authorisation by a more senior officer. In particular this makes provision around decisions to delay access to legal advice, interviewing without legal advice, deciding to remove a legal adviser from an interview and urgent interviews of vulnerable suspects

Not all investigatory powers exercised by police come under PACE or are exercisable by a constable. Powers to use directed or intrusive surveillance, use covert human intelligence sources, to obtain communication data and to obtain warrants to interfere with property

or equipment are governed by statute which provides for the oversight of use of these powers by senior officers and/or external bodies.

The IOPC is separately named in this legislation as a body which can use these investigatory powers so our legal entitlement to use them comes directly from separate statutes and secondary legislation.

In addition to arrest search and seizure the PACE powers likely to be relevant to IOPC investigations relate to power of retention and powers in relation to interviews under criminal caution. We attach the following:

1. Guidance on the retention and disposal of property
2. Interviewing under caution and/or access to legal advice:
 - Key considerations for interviewing subjects
 - Pre-interview disclosure
 - Recording interviews
 - Conducting interviews
 - Interviewing subjects under COVID-19 restrictions *
 - Obtaining a statement under caution under COVID-19 restrictions *

* temporary guidance in response to COVID-19

As confirmed above our powers derived from PACE do not account for all of our investigatory powers. We also hold operational guidance in relation to our powers under the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act and this can be considered for disclosure if you were to request it.

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><u>Ref</u> <u>1008483</u> Back to top</p> | <p><u>Complaints about IOPC investigators</u></p> |
|--|--|

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| <p><u>Request</u></p> | <p><i>1) Please provide a copy of your current complaint policy. Specifically please state who investigates potential criminal or unethical conduct committed by IOPC investigators, even if it is not included within your policy?</i></p> <p><i>In the years 2018 - 2020:</i></p> <p><i>2) Please confirm numbers of complaints made regarding IOPC investigators. Please provide categories for the complaints if possible (incivility, falsifying evidence etc etc).</i></p> <p><i>a) Please confirm number of complaints upheld against IOPC investigators.</i></p> <p><i>b) Please confirm if any disciplinary action has been taken against IOPC investigators as a result of any complaint.</i></p> <p><i>3) How many arrests were made in relation to IOPC investigations? Of these arrests:</i></p> <p><i>a) How many of the persons arrested were serving police officers or staff (or former, where this relates to the matter arrested for)?</i></p> |
|------------------------------|---|

| | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| | <p><i>b) How many of the arrests were conducted by IOPC investigators or staff?</i></p> <p><i>c) How many of the arrests had detention authorised at a police station or other PACE compliant custody facility?</i></p> <p><i>d) Of the detentions authorised under PACE, how many were authorised by IOPC investigators or staff rather than a police custody sergeant?</i></p> <p>4) Please confirm if the IOPC has made any payments for civil claims arising from its investigations, and provide the number of claims paid, and the amount paid out per year.</p> |
| <p><u>Response</u></p> | <p>1. <u>Complaint policy</u></p> <p>Our Feedback and Complaints Policy explains how we handle feedback and is available here on our web site. Additional information is available on the Our service: complaints and compliments page. The full policy is included with this letter. Information about how we handle complaints, including investigation, is on pages 4 to 9.</p> <p>If an allegation of a criminal nature is made against IOPC staff, service users are advised to report the matter to the police, as the IOPC has no remit or powers to conduct criminal investigations. If during the course of reviewing a complaint we discover a member of staff has potentially acted in an illegal manner, the IOPC may report the matter to the police directly.</p> <p>2. <u>Data relating to complaints about IOPC investigators</u></p> <p>The data you have requested is contained in the attached table. This confirms that 132 complaints were made during the relevant period against IOPC Investigators, Lead Investigators, Operations Team Leaders and Operations Managers. Of these complaints, 38 were upheld, 25 of which were partially upheld.</p> <p>We can confirm that disciplinary action has been taken during this period as a result of the complaints process.</p> <p>3. <u>Arrests under IOPC investigations</u></p> <p>The IOPC holds information about arrests of officers made in the course of its own investigations.</p> <p>We have made enquiries internally as to the accessibility of data confirming the number of arrests in the period 1 January 2018 to the present time. We have confirmed that this data cannot be extracted by means of an automated search owing to problems with the reliability of data about arrests recorded on our case tracking system. This means that the only way to find and retrieve the data you require is to carry out a manual search of the papers relating to each of our investigations that were in progress during the relevant period.</p> <p>In the period from 1 January 2018 to 29 June 2020 the IOPC started 1,487</p> |

investigations. In addition, a significant number of investigations started before 1 January 2018 were in progress during this period and so would also have to be considered under your request if we were to produce the data you require.

Section 12 of the FOIA allows the IOPC to refuse a request when the estimated cost of carrying out certain activities exceeds £450, or 18 hours at £25 per hour.

Based only on the 1,487 investigations that were started in this period we could produce the required data within 18 hours only if it was possible to complete our search of each case file in well under one minute. We estimate that it would take, on average, about 10 minutes to retrieve each file, read the relevant contents and confirm whether or not an investigation subject was arrested.

We have estimated, therefore, that the work involved in complying with this part of your request would exceed the cost limit under section 12 of the FOIA, with the result that we are not required to disclose the information to you.

We have considered whether the data you require could be identified by some other means but have concluded that only a methodical search of the case files could produce data that would be accurate and helpful.

We should explain that in accordance with the Police and Criminal Evidence Act (PACE) an arrest is not lawful unless it complies with a two-part test. The first test relates to the arresting officer's reasonable grounds for suspecting a person to be guilty of an offence. The second test relates to whether they believe the arrest is necessary to meet one of the criteria as set out in section 24 of PACE. Both parts of the test need to be met. In addition the IOPC regularly conducts voluntary interviews under criminal caution. Data relating to criminal interviews in our investigations can be produced to you on request if required.

We are sorry that we cannot provide the particular data you require. Some of our investigations data, including data on arrests, has been identified by our Director General as key data that we are failing to capture in a reliable way. Work is in progress with the objective of improving the quality of our key data but it is anticipated that this will take some time to complete.

In relation to part (b), we can confirm that all arrests are made by IOPC investigations staff exercising the powers of a constable.

As to (c) and (d), a person who is detained is always taken to a police custody suite where detention must be authorised by a police custody sergeant in accordance with the Police and Criminal Evidence Act. The IOPC does not operate its own custody facilities. It is usual practice to take the arrested person to a custody centre outside the area in which they work, preferably to a location in another force area.

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>4. <u>Civil claims</u></p> <p>The IOPC has made two payments for damages during this period. A payment of £20,000 was made in 2018 and a payment of £5,000 was made in 2019. These related to separate claims.</p> |
| <p>Ref 1008487 Back to top</p> | <p><u>Evidence relating to Operation Lansdowne</u></p> |
| <p><u>Request</u></p> | <p>Your request relates to our assessment of a referral from the Greater London Authority (GLA) concerning the conduct of former Mayor Boris Johnson, you asked if we could:</p> <p><i>“...supply what records you would have wished to examine which could have resulted in a more definitive review and judgement.”</i></p> |
| <p><u>Response</u></p> | <p>This information is available in our detailed assessment decision which is published on our website. Paragraph 4 of Appendix C states the following;</p> <p><i>4. Evidence and information that the IOPC believes would have been relevant to the review either never existed or has now been deleted, in particular:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The reasons for accepting or rejecting applications to participate in trade missions do not appear to have been recorded.</i> • <i>No formal application for the sponsorship of Innotech by L&P appears to have been made or required. Similarly, no formal record of the decision to pay sponsorship appears to have been made or required.</i> • <i>The material stored in digital devices, email accounts and computer drives belonging to Mr Johnson while Mayor and his appointees was deleted when he left office in 2016. The requirement in the GLA records Management Guidance for material concerning GLA business (which includes sponsorship and trade missions) to be transferred to executive officers prior to deletion appears not to have been followed.</i> • <i>Mr Johnson’s solicitors have said he has no relevant material in his custody or control, and Ms Acruri has said that she deleted any relevant email correspondence and other electronic records.</i> |

