



Police Encounters with the Public
Second Report: Vehicle Stops
April 2016

London Policing Ethics Panel
Chaired by Lord Carlile of Berriew CBE, QC

Contents

About the London Policing Ethics Panel	3
Biographies	3
1. Introduction	6
2. Background	7
3. Recording	10
4. Transparency	14
5. Management	16
6. Policing the River Thames	18
7. Conclusions	20
8. Recommendations	21

© London Policing Ethics Panel 2016
<http://www.policingethicspanel.london>

About the London Policing Ethics Panel

The 'London Policing Ethics Panel' (LPEP) is an independent panel set up by the Mayor of London, Boris Johnson, to provide ethical advice on policing issues that may impact on public confidence. As part of his Police and Crime Plan for London, the Mayor has challenged the Metropolitan Police to achieve a 20 per cent improvement in public confidence by 2016. LPEP will complement the existing structures in place in the capital to oversee the way London is policed, and will provide in-depth consideration of ethical issues around current and future policing practice in London.

Biographies

Lord Carlile of Berriew CBE, QC – Chair



Lord Carlile is a serving Life Peer of the House of Lords, a former MP of the House of Commons representing Montgomeryshire (1983-1997), a Bencher at Gray's Inn and a practising QC with Barristers' Chambers 9 - 12 Bell Yard. Lord Carlile sat as a Recorder of the Crown Court and as a Deputy High Court Judge. He was the Chairman of the Competition Appeal Tribunal from 2005 until 2013. He was the Independent Reviewer of Terrorism

Legislation; the Independent Reviewer of the Government's PREVENT policy; and the independent reviewer of National Security policy in Northern Ireland. He plays a senior role in the formulation of policy on mental health and youth justice. He was appointed a Life Peer in 1999 and was awarded the CBE in 2012 for services to national security. He is a Hackney resident and has lived and worked in London for many years.

Baroness Berridge of the Vale of Catmose

Elizabeth became Baroness Berridge of the Vale of Catmose in the County of



Rutland on 20 January 2011. Within this role Elizabeth works on projects relating to policing, human rights and foreign affairs, as well as being patron of the Rutland foodbank. Elizabeth is Co-Director of the Commonwealth Initiative for Freedom of Religion or Belief, which is based out of the University of Birmingham. She also co-chairs the All Party Parliamentary Group on International Freedom of Religion or Belief, which spawned her interest in the Central African Republic, and is on the Steering Committee of the International Panel of Parliamentarians

for Freedom of Religion or Belief. Elizabeth is a member of the House of Lords Select Committee on Social Mobility and the Ecclesiastical Committee, as well as a trustee of British Future. She is a commissioner on the Conservative Party Human Rights Commission

Elizabeth studied law at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, and undertook barrister's training at the Inns of Court School of Law in London. She has lived in Trinidad and Tobago and Ghana, and remains keenly interested in both countries and their regions. Since 2005 she has lived in the London Borough of Westminster

Grace Ononiwu OBE

Grace took up her post as Chief Crown Prosecutor (CCP) for the CPS West



Midlands Region (Incorporating West Midlands, Staffordshire, Warwickshire, West Mercia and British Transport Police) in June 2014. Previously she was the Chief Crown Prosecutor for the CPS East of England Region (incorporating Essex, Suffolk, Norfolk and Cambridgeshire). As Chief Crown Prosecutor she is ultimately responsible for all prosecution decisions and

conduct of cases by CPS lawyers throughout the Region. She also has a personal involvement in many of those cases and there are occasions when she meets victims of crime or their families to explain the reasons for the decisions taken in cases that involve them. Grace qualified as a solicitor in 1991. She originally joined a private firm of solicitors in High Wycombe practising criminal law then joined the CPS as a Crown Prosecutor. Grace has held a number of positions in the CPS, which led to her ultimate appointment as Northamptonshire CCP in April 2005, making her the first African Caribbean to be appointed to that position in the history of the CPS. In April 2009 Grace was appointed Legal Director for North Region, CPS London, before becoming Deputy Chief Crown Prosecutor (DCCP) responsible for all the London Boroughs. Grace has made a significant contribution to the CPS Equality and Diversity agenda and was previously the Chair of the National Black Crown Prosecution Association. She was awarded the OBE in 2008.

Meg Reiss



Meg began her career as a prosecutor in Brooklyn, New York investigating and prosecuting both white-collar and violent crime, culminating in her appointment to the Homicide Bureau. In 2000, she joined the international investigative firm Kroll Inc. as a managing director, and in this role served as a deputy monitor of the Los Angeles Police Department under a landmark US federal consent decree that involved overseeing training of street officers and supervisors to reduce discriminatory practices and excessive force while building trust through community policing.

After a serving as global chief of internal investigations for Marsh, Inc, in 2005, Meg joined the Nassau County District Attorney's Office ultimately being promoted to Chief of Staff overseeing more than 350 prosecutors, investigators, and support staff while launching an award - winning Drug Market Intervention initiative that reduced overall crime by 71% and drug crime by 87% in its first year. Meg relocated with her family to London in July of 2012. After finding a home in Hammersmith and settling her daughter into school, she became a member of the federal monitor team working on behalf of the US Department of Justice, Financial Conduct Authority, and Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, overseeing HSBC's compliance with the terms of their deferred prosecution agreement.

Professor Leif Wenar



Leif Wenar is Professor at the School of Law, King's College London, where he holds the Chair of Philosophy and Law. His degrees in Philosophy are from Stanford and Harvard, and he has been a visiting professor at Stanford and Princeton and the Carnegie Council Program on Justice in the World Economy. He is an editor of *The Ethics of Philanthropy*, and the author of a new book, *Blood Oil: Tyrants, Violence, and the Rules that Run the World*. Since first moving to London in 1998 he has lived in Chelsea and Brixton, and since 2004 in Bloomsbury near King's Cross.

1. Introduction

1. This report is about the stopping of vehicles by officers of the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS). In our first report on police encounters with the public, which considered stop-and-search procedures¹, we drew attention to the fact that the stopping of vehicles, though in many ways similar to stop-and-search police encounters with pedestrians, was subject to less scrutiny and accountability and that the conduct of traffic stops needed urgent attention. In this report we assess the law and practice governing vehicle stops, we consider to what extent officers are accountable for their actions, and we recommend changes to improve transparency. We take into account the March 2015 report of Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) on Stop and Search procedures generally, as well as written and oral evidence gathered by the Panel. We wish to express our gratitude to all those who gave their time to help us with this task.



¹ 'Police Encounters with the Public – First Report: Routine, Non-Covert Encounters', July 2015

2. Background

2. In England and Wales, under Section 163 of the Road Traffic Act 1988 [RTA] "*a person driving a vehicle on a road must stop the vehicle on being required to do so by a constable in uniform*". The power to stop vehicles is used for a wide variety of situations, including checking that drivers hold the necessary licences and insurances to drive, establishing ownership of vehicles, dealing with moving traffic offences, investigating involvement in crime, conducting breath tests and halting traffic in the interests of public safety when, for example, there has been a road traffic accident.

3. An officer is not required by the RTA to have a specific reason for stopping a vehicle or to explain to the person stopped why the vehicle has been stopped - though such an explanation is expected to be given. Once a vehicle has been stopped, an officer may require the driver to produce his or her driving licence, ask the driver or the passengers to account for themselves, question them and, if reasonable grounds exist for suspecting that prohibited items are being carried (for example, drugs or firearms), search the vehicle and its occupants. Officers may also arrest the driver or passengers if they have grounds to suspect that a criminal offence has been committed. In such circumstances other legislation would be applicable, including the Firearms Act 1968, Misuse of Drugs Act 1971, Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 and Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994.

“...no central or local record is kept of vehicle stops as a whole. Consequently, there are no reliable data on the number of stops that take place.”

4. There is no requirement under the RTA for any records to be kept of vehicle stops where there is no follow-up police action. In some circumstances a vehicle stop is recorded - for example, if the stop results in the issuing of a fixed penalty notice for an offence, if the Police National Computer (PNC) has been accessed to conduct a check on the vehicle or its driver, if a search is carried out or if an arrest is made. But these do not tell the whole story as many stops do not result in any further action and no central or local record is kept of vehicle stops as a whole. Consequently, there are no reliable data on the number of stops that take place. As an indication of volume, the MPS informed us that in London numerous checks are carried out of vehicle number plates, some of which result in a stop taking place.

5. In this respect vehicle stops are treated differently from stop-and-search or stop-and-account encounters involving pedestrians, which are governed by a code of practice and are recorded. This difference of treatment is not easy to defend. Moreover, there are some concerns about disproportionality. As one senior officer put it to us, *"we have a challenge with young, black men who perceive us to be exercising the power unfairly"*. Yet without records of who is being stopped, why and with what outcomes, it is impossible to establish whether or not these perceptions are valid.

"...without records of who is being stopped, why and with what outcomes, it is impossible to establish whether or not these perceptions are valid."

6. At the other end of the spectrum there is a situation on the River Thames, where the MPS Marine Unit has no RTA-like powers to stop water-borne traffic and may only require a boat to stop if it has grounds under other legislation to suspect criminal activity. Yet the Thames is an open waterway and, as one senior officer said to us, *"you can sail up from Gravesend to Central London...and you can dock wherever you want"*. But the river police cannot require a boat to stop in the same way as can their colleagues on shore in regard to vehicles. Whilst the disparity between dry-land and water powers does not raise an ethical issue as such, we do suggest below that it would be sensible for land and river law and practice to be equated.

7. In March 2015 HMIC recommended, as part of its report on Stop and Search, that *"within twelve months chief constables and the College of Policing should agree and implement a set of minimum recording standards for the police use of the Road Traffic Act 1988 power to stop motor vehicles"*². We were told that this recommendation had not been accepted on grounds of perceived cost and bureaucracy. HMIC's 2015 inquiry found that *"none of the 43 forces had conducted any audits to determine whether or not their use of the power was fair and effective"*³.

² HMIC Report on Stop-and-Search, Part 2 ("How effectively and fairly do the police use Section 163 of the Road Traffic Act 1988?")

³ *idib*, Page 50

8. HMIC carried out an online survey of members of the public, and received about 10,000 responses – about 7,500 of whom were drivers. 47% of respondents reported being in a vehicle stopped by the police at some point in their lives. Of the drivers who responded, one in eight of were from a black or minority ethnic (BME) background. When asked whether the police unfairly targeted people from BME groups when stopping vehicles, a large majority of black respondents, and a small majority of respondents from Asian or mixed-ethnic backgrounds, felt that there was such unfairness. While these perceptions are perhaps understandable, HMIC's survey also indicated drivers from BME groups, though more likely to have their vehicles stopped, are less likely to be arrested, given a fixed penalty notice or issued with a summons as a result. Such surveys, resting as they do on individual perceptions, must be treated with a degree of caution, but they do raise the question of whether in some cases people from a BME background are being stopped in their vehicles for no clear reason, let alone suspicion.

3. Recording

9. We advise that recording of vehicle stops is needed in order to demonstrate fairness and to establish effectiveness. As we have observed, there is a belief in some quarters - a belief that would appear to have some foundation in survey evidence - that vehicle stops are in some cases being targeted at particular groups. Without recording of stops, including who is being stopped and why, it is impossible to establish objectively the validity or otherwise of these concerns. Good policing depends on public trust. As one senior officer said to us, if the public don't think that the police are making decisions that are fair, they will withhold their cooperation and policing will become less effective over time.

10. Recording is essential, however, not only to see whether vehicle stops are being conducted fairly. It is also necessary in order to establish whether its objectives are being achieved. An organisation which is not able to measure whether the policies it is following are achieving their desired effect is not fulfilling its purpose. As it was put to us, *"it [recording vehicle stops] shouldn't be seen as unnecessary bureaucracy, it should be seen as good business intelligence"*. Seen from this perspective, recording of vehicle stops offers as much benefit to the police as to the public.

11. According to a representative of the MPS, *"we can see the benefits but we can also see the challenges"*. The benefits were seen as improving public confidence (*"demonstrating that we are doing the work ethically, we are open, we are transparent"*) and better crime-fighting and road traffic safety.

12. On the debit side, the main objection we heard to recording of vehicle stops was that it would prove bureaucratic and divert officers from their principal policing role. It was also suggested to us that the recording of data from what might be called straightforward vehicle stops could be counter-productive. An officer might, for example, stop a vehicle simply to advise the driver to wear his or her seat belt or to check the authenticity of someone driving in the early hours of the morning in an area where there had been a large number of nocturnal burglaries. It was put to us that recording in such cases risked causing resentment by lengthening the time during which innocent drivers are delayed on their journeys or by

“While we understand and share the concerns expressed about the potential administrative burden of recording all vehicle stops, we are clear that there must be transparency in situations where freedom of movement is being interrupted by police action.”

raising concerns as to why personal details are being recorded. We address the question of police-public relations in a separate section (see below). In this section we focus on the administrative objection to recording.

13. While we understand and share the concerns expressed about the potential administrative burden of recording all vehicle stops, we are clear that there must be transparency in situations where freedom of movement is being interrupted by police action. There are in any case two developments on the near horizon which would seem to make recording both inevitable and simple. The first of these is the introduction of body-worn video (BWV) recording, about which we reported in January 2016 and which is being rolled out within the MPS from this year onwards. We were told that the policy for BWV use includes mandatory video recording of vehicle stops and that cameras will be issued to traffic as well as other units.

14. The second development is the planned roll-out, we were told from 2017, of electronic tablets for use by MPS officers in place of pocket books. We found consensus that, if the right procurement solution were to be adopted, it should be possible for officers involved in vehicle stops to input the details of a stop by means of a simple series of clicks on drop-down menus. One senior officer described how an officer who had stopped a vehicle might go about the process:

"Why have I stopped them? So there's an App on the phone that is a drop down. I press key 1,2,3,4 or 5. They'll soon get the understanding of what 1,2,3,4 or 5 mean, but it's a single-key input that automatically gives live-time feed into the force systems".



15. Such a solution would also significantly reduce the administrative burden of recording stop-and-search and stop-and-account events, which is already undertaken by the MPS (though there is no legal requirement to do so) and in which the majority of stops are currently recorded on paper for subsequent manual input to an IT system.

16. Recording of vehicle stops will not of itself ensure that stops are always justified. But it will provide a picture of who is being stopped and why; and it will make individual officers more accountable - because it will show local police managers who is conducting more stops, of whom and for what reason. As it was put to us:

"They should be able to scan [the input data] and say 'We've got an officer who's stopped ten vehicles in the last hour. What's going on?' It prompts. It offers some indicators".

As such, it provides an evidence base for assessing fairness and effectiveness and, where necessary, for targeting remedial action.

17. Ironically, the MPS Marine Unit records its boat stops - admittedly much fewer in number than vehicle stops on land - even though it has no RTA-like powers to make such stops. It has to rely on intelligence or on other legislation for the purpose. As a senior officer put it to us, *"you can't just do something and there's no record of it".*

We recommend therefore that all vehicle stops should be recorded, including data relating to the vehicle and its driver and the reason for the stop, and that recording should be implemented with the roll-out of tablets for use by MPS officers, with the introduction of BWV and as part of the migration of stop-and-search and stop-and-account recording from paper to electronic format.

18. Precise recording requirements will need to be devised to suit particular circumstances. For example, in a situation where an officer decides to stop traffic generally because of a potential road safety hazard (if, say, there has been a motorway accident), there is clearly no need for each car to be approached and an explanation given. Our recommendation applies principally to situations where an officer decides to stop a particular vehicle for a particular purpose relating to that vehicle or its occupants.

19. An aggrieved driver or passenger in a vehicle stop may not make a complaint immediately after a negative encounter and may find, when he or she does so, that corroborative BWV evidence has been automatically deleted after 31 days. This is an issue which applies not only to vehicle stops but to other police encounters with the public in which BWV is activated. It will be necessary to ensure therefore that members of the public who are stopped, whether in a vehicle or on foot, are aware of this limitation, to which the next section of this report is relevant.

4. Transparency

20. As observed above, we encountered the objection that recording of vehicle stops could have a negative impact on police-public relations, for example by delaying motorists on their journeys or recording their personal details. However, a senior officer put it to us that *"the lesson we learned from stop and search...is that on many occasions it is not necessarily the fact that you are stopped and searched; it is about the quality of that encounter, courtesy and the reasons and explanations"*.

Most drivers can be expected to respond positively to being stopped if it is conducted with courtesy and respect, if the reason for the stop is explained and if the procedure is seen to be transparent and is not unreasonably prolonged. As regards the last of these requirements it seems to us that the recording of the basic details of a stop need not add significantly to the time taken if a suitable IT-based system is employed.

21. The potential difficulty arises where a stop is carried out clumsily and the person stopped feels aggrieved. He or she may be inclined to raise the matter but may feel powerless in doing so from not knowing the officer's identity or how to go about the process. We therefore raised with a number of those whom we consulted the suggestion that an officer who stops a vehicle should be required to explain the reason for the stop and to provide the driver with information (for example, by handing over a small card) detailing the officer's police number, the station at which he or she is based and details of how to comment on the stop (favourably or unfavourably) if the person so wishes. The card could also draw attention to the deletion of routine BWV footage after 31 days. There was consensus among those we consulted that this simple methodology would be a desirable improvement. It would make officers more conscious of the need for courtesy, it would help to reassure members of the public that there was an avenue for complaint or other comment and it would provide a window for the MPS on the quality of vehicle stops. If such an arrangement were to be adopted, its introduction should be accompanied by a public information campaign to ensure that members of the public know what to expect in the event that they are stopped.

"Most drivers can be expected to respond positively to being stopped if it is conducted with courtesy and respect..."

22. It was put to us by one of those consulted that a requirement to record every vehicle stop could result in the unintended consequence of an officer deciding to issue a fixed penalty notice, conduct a search or take other follow-up action as a means of demonstrating that the stop had been justified. We are not able to comment on whether such situations might arise in practice, but it seems clear to us that the transparency we are recommending would serve to discourage such behaviour.

“...officers...frankly admitting that a mistake has been made, apologising to the person stopped for the inconvenience caused and providing him or her with the details to take the matter further if desired.”

23. In this context it is important to recognise that officers will not always get such stops right. They may believe, for example, that a vehicle is carrying prohibited drugs or weapons or that the driver is over the alcohol limit but, having stopped and perhaps searched the vehicle or breathalysed the driver, they may find no evidence to support their belief. These are awkward situations and, if they are not handled with care, they can help fuel suspicions that groups or individuals are being unfairly targeted. In such circumstances it is important that officers should be mindful of the need for what is called in the commercial world 'service recovery', which means frankly admitting that a mistake has been made, apologising to the person stopped for the inconvenience caused and providing him or her with the details to take the matter further if desired.

We recommend therefore that, where vehicles are stopped, the officer concerned should always explain the reason for the stop and, in addition to making an electronic record of it, should provide the person stopped with information (for example, by handing over a card) identifying the officer and his or her station and giving details of how comment might be made.

5. Management

24. We were concerned to hear that, twelve months on from HMIC's report⁴, its recommendation on the introduction of minimum recording standards for vehicle stops had not been agreed by the National Police Chiefs Council⁵ and that, as far as was known, none of the 43 forces had begun to implement such standards. While our remit is limited to the Metropolitan Police, it was put to us that, if an IT-based recording system for vehicle stops is to be introduced, it should be a national rather than simply a London requirement.

25. We would support such a view, though we do not see this as a conditional matter: in our view the case for introducing such a system can be justified on its own merits. Vehicle and vehicle-borne crime is highly mobile and it would be revealing to see whether the same vehicles were being stopped in different police areas or in some areas but not others and for what reasons. If a low-burden monitoring system can be introduced into the MPS, it is difficult to see why it should not be adopted elsewhere.

26. More generally, we picked up a sense from different sources of a perceived reluctance on the part of the MPS to adopt innovative techniques to improve transparency in regard to vehicle stops. One of those whom we consulted, who was involved in community monitoring of policing, told us that *"we have had discussions about vehicle stops and the response has always been 'Well, that is the law and until the law changes this is how it is going to be'"*. A senior officer, who was not referring specifically to the MPS, spoke of *"a cultural and psychological problem in policing"* which was *"resistant to change and resistant to criticism"*.

"Vehicle and vehicle-borne crime is highly mobile and it would be revealing to see whether the same vehicles were being stopped in different police areas or in some areas but not others and for what reasons."

⁴ See paragraph 7

⁵ Known until 2015 as the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO)

27. We fully understand how such attitudes can develop and how the collection of data can be seen as a diversion of policing from its principal objectives of deterring crime, apprehending criminals and maintaining public order. However, it is a mistake to see the two activities as unrelated. We have drawn attention above⁶ to the view of a senior officer that, if the police are perceived, rightly or wrongly, to be acting unfairly, public cooperation will be harder to secure and policing will be less effective as a result. Policing by consent requires a balance to be struck between directly fighting crime and promoting an environment that is conducive to doing so. As we have remarked above, taking the trouble to know why vehicles are being stopped should be seen as good business sense rather than negatively as just a bureaucratic burden.

⁶ Paragraph 9

6. Policing the River Thames

28. We have drawn attention briefly⁷ to the stopping of boats on the River Thames by the MPS Marine Unit. So far as we aware, there is no ethical issue involved here but there is an inconsistency between the powers available to the Marine Unit and those exercised by their colleagues on land to halt cars or other vehicles. Whereas Section 163 of the RTA gives the latter the power to stop a vehicle without any specific reason, stopping a vessel on the Thames requires authority under other legislation. As it was put to us, *"if a boat comes flying up the river and there are real concerns about it, our officers will act under Schedule 7 [of the Terrorism Act], but only if it relates to terrorism. If there's something else, we don't have the powers"*.



29. The power to stop vessels is held by the Port of London Authority (PLA) and, we were told, derives from the 1968 Port of London Act. The PLA's power to stop vessels was transferred to the MPS temporarily during the 2012 Olympic Games. This gave the Marine Unit the ability to stop a vessel if they had suspicions that it might be involved in criminal activity. It was put to us that the temporary transfer of powers had been a success and that consideration should be given to a more permanent arrangement - *"if we're not proactively enforcing the law, then people will use that as a method of entering London without being stopped"*. The PLA did not appear to see a problem with the current situation. In a letter to us, it stated that *"as far as stopping vessels is concerned, we are careful to establish that a clear need to stop a vessel exists in order to maintain the safety of navigation, which is our prime responsibility"*.

⁷ Paragraphs 6 and 17

30. It is not within our remit to express a view on this organisational issue. We draw it to attention, however, within the general context of vehicle stops and as an apparent inconsistency of practice to which attention might with advantage be given.

7. Conclusions

31. It is difficult for us to provide ethical guidance on the stopping of vehicles by the MPS in the absence of hard evidence regarding the frequency, nature and outcomes of such stops. For this and for other reasons we consider that the time has now come for the stopping of vehicles by MPS officers to be recorded. We have acknowledged that the current practice on vehicle stops is out of line with those on stop-and-search and stop-and-account situations involving pedestrians, and that survey evidence suggests that people from black or minority ethnic (BME) backgrounds are being stopped disproportionately and in some cases unreasonably. Only by gathering data through recording of vehicle stops will it be possible to validate or discount these concerns. We are pleased therefore to see reports⁸ that the Home Secretary is considering instructing all police forces, including the MPS, to collect information on road traffic stops in order to reassure minority communities.

32. We recognise that the introduction of recording may be challenging. However, the need for transparency is a vital ingredient of good police-public relations and of the concept of policing by consent. We believe that any additional burden on officers can be minimised by the introduction of electronic tablets in place of pocket books. We are informed that roll-out of tablets is planned to begin in 2017. The recording of vehicle stops could be implemented in parallel with the migration of stop-and-search and stop-and-account records from paper to electronic format and the introduction, from this year, of body-worn video equipment to all MPS officers, including traffic units.

33. We endorse the view expressed to us by a senior officer that for most people who are stopped in a vehicle it is not the fact of their being stopped that risks causing offence so much as the way the stop is conducted. We consider therefore that, when a stop takes place, the officer responsible should hand to the driver of the vehicle information (perhaps in the form of a small card) giving his or her police number, the station at which he or she is based and details of how any comment on the stop, whether favourable or unfavourable, may be made. We believe such an arrangement could have the triple advantage of focusing on the need for polite and tactful handling of stops; of providing an outlet for any residual resentment that may exist and a means of remedying any fault that may emerge; and of enabling station managers to build up a clearer picture of how individual officers are handling such stops. In this context it is important to recognise that officers are human and will not always get vehicle stops right. Where it is clear that a vehicle has been stopped unnecessarily, albeit with the

⁸ The Times 26 March 2016

best of motives, officers should be prepared to admit the mistake and apologise for any inconvenience caused.

34. The difference between the rules for halting vehicles on land in London and waterborne traffic on the River Thames are difficult to justify. There is, so far as we can see, no ethical issue involved here but we draw attention to this structural issue as deserving of attention by the appropriate authorities.

8. Recommendations

We recommend that all vehicle stops should be recorded, including data relating to the vehicle and its driver and the reason for the stop, and that recording should be implemented with the roll-out of tablets for use by MPS officers, with the introduction of BWV and as part of the migration of stop-and-search and stop-and-account recording from paper to electronic format.

We recommend that, where vehicles are stopped, the officer concerned should always explain the reason for the stop and, in addition to making an electronic record of it, should provide the person stopped with information (for example, by handing over a card) identifying the officer and his or her station and giving details of how comment might be made.