Dear Patrick,

I am writing to clarify two of my answers during the Private Notice Question tabled by you on the report by Sir Richard Henriques and the report by the Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC) on Operation Midland and whether or not Her Majesty’s Government will review the composition and terms of reference of the IOPC on 8 October.

I stated that it was a matter for the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) to hold the Commissioner to account. It is of course for the Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime, headed by the Mayor of London, to hold the Commissioner to account.

In response to a question from Lord Berkeley of Knighton, on pre-charge anonymity, I explained the presumption of anonymity for suspects before charge remains, but that there are circumstances where the release of name may be approved, for policing purposes. This is correct, and the process and reasons why a name may be released before charge are set out in the College of Policing’s Authorised Professional Practice (APP) on media relations. The release of the name by the police in these circumstances, is not against the law. I want to clarify, that in terms of the media, the Independent Press Standards Organisation (IPSO) Editors’ Code puts in place robust requirements around accuracy and privacy. The press must take care not to publish inaccurate, misleading or distorted information or images. Editors are expected to justify intrusions into any individuals’ private lives without consent, and any publication in breach of that would have to demonstrably in the public interest.

I am copying this letter to all Peers that spoke during the debate, and will place a copy of this response in the House Library.

Baroness Williams of Trafford