WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE MINISTER FOR HOME AFFAIRS BY DEPUTY S. PITMAN OF ST. HELIER ANSWER TO BE TABLED ON TUESDAY 21st FEBRUARY 2012

Question

In relation the "Interim report" of the Metropolitan Police into the handling of the historic abuse enquiry can the Minister inform members –

- i) who wrote the report, and where in the report is this stated?
- ii) did the report indicate its status and, if so, how did it do this, and what was its status?
- iii) was the report an official report of the Metropolitan Police?
- iv) how many pages of actual body text were in the Interim Report, excluding pages such as author, acknowledgements, title page, and cover?
- v) how many pages of actual body text were in the Final Report, excluding pages such as author, acknowledgements, title page, and cover?
- vi) who asked for the Interim Report, when was it requested and why?
- vii) is it usual practice for an interim report to be produced for an evaluation and appraisal report of this kind?

Answer

I previously answered most of these questions in a written answer number 5421 on 8 June 2010.

- i) The report was written by an officer of the Metropolitan Police Service Specialist Crime Review Group and that is stated on the front sheet of the document. The report was the work of five members of staff from the Specialist Crime Review Group.
- ii) The status of the report was Restricted Crime and that was marked at the top and bottom of every page.
- iii) Yes. In addition to the detail in i) the report had the words, 'Metropolitan Police' together with the appropriate logo on the front page.
- iv) 17
- v) The full report consisted of 63 pages together with 11 appendices consisting of 96 additional pages and is dated 18 December 2008.

vi) I repeat my answer dated 8 June 2010 to part f) of that question:

The ACPO Homicide Working Party recommended that a full review be conducted by an outside police force of the Historical Abuse Enquiry. Accordingly, on 6th August 2008, the now Acting Chief Officer of Police wrote to the Metropolitan Police Force requesting the production of such a report. Subsequently, detailed terms of reference were agreed for the production of the report and work commenced. The main purposes of the report were to advise on the management of the Historical Abuse Enquiry and to provide advice and guidance in relation to the conduct of individual investigations. It soon became apparent that serious issues were arising as to the previous management of the Historical Abuse Enquiry. Details of these concerns were passed on to the now Acting Chief Officer of Police who began to raise these with the Chief Officer of Police from September 2008 onwards. The now Acting Chief Officer of Police also began to share these concerns with other senior officials and with Deputy Andrew Lewis who became the Minister for Home Affairs. By early November 2008 the report was nearly completed. By that stage it had become apparent that some of the issues were so serious that they could prejudice the fair trial of certain individuals. The concern was that serious cases might be stopped by the Royal Court because of the previous actions of the former Deputy Chief Officer of Police. For that reason the now Acting Chief Officer of Police asked the Metropolitan Police Force to produce a report on what they had found up to that point so that a press conference could be held correcting issues relating to information which had previously been given to the press. The Metropolitan Police then produced the Interim Report which they sent on 10th November 2008, to the now Acting Chief Officer of Police as an attachment to an email. The concerns of the now Acting Chief Officer of Police were fully vindicated by the judgment of the Royal Court in the matter of The Attorney General v. Aubin and others [2009] J.R.C. 035A.

vii) It is not uncommon to receive some form of interim report / early findings in order that those findings could be considered and pursued as soon as possible. In this case an interim report was specifically requested.