



**ETHICS COMMITTEE**

**Wednesday 1<sup>st</sup> July 2020, 10:00 – 12:30 hrs**

Meeting held virtually via Zoom

**Present:**

Marion Oswald (MO)	Chair of Ethics Committee
Jamie Grace (JG)	Vice Chair of Ethics Committee
Thomas McNeil (TM)	Strategic Adviser to the PCC & Board Member (OPCC)
Anindya Banerjee (AB)	Ethics Committee
Claire Paterson-Young (CPY)	Ethics Committee
Tom Sorell (TS)	Ethics Committee
Rebecca Hemmings (RH)	Ethics Committee
Malcolm Fowler (MF)	Ethics Committee
Janine Green (JG)	Ethics Committee
Peter Fussey (PF)	Ethics Committee
Jennifer House-go (JH)	Ethics Committee
Rachel Holtham (RH)	Secretariat (OPCC)
David Parrot (DP)	Data Analytics Lab - WMP
Samantha Todd (ST)	Data Analytics Lab - WMP
Chris Todd (CT)	Detective Chief Superintendent - WMP
Yvonne Bruton (YB)	Chief Inspector - WMP
Scott McCarrigle (SM)	Response Manager - WMP
Nick Dale (ND)	Superintendent, National Data Analytics Solution - WMP

<b>1</b>	The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked the continuing work from WMP and the OPCC and expressed thanks to the committee for continuing engagement with the process. Mentioned that the Ethics Committee is getting national recognition. Also mentioned interviews for new EC member specialising in Data Analytics were being held 8 <sup>th</sup> July.
<b>2</b>	<p><b>Community Tensions and violence</b></p> <p>DP delivered a presentation and the following points were noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The model is essentially looking to see whether reports of community tension can be used to predict violent episodes in those same communities</li> <li>- Reports show the intelligence logs regarding community tensions remain fairly stable through time where violence has increased</li> <li>- Looked at various means of linking reports of community tension with crimes</li> <li>- The Lab concluded that, based on its exploratory analysis, this is not currently possible with any meaningful degree of accuracy</li> </ul>



- Therefore a predictive model cannot be built at this time

The Committee had the following questions:

- Are community tension reports now insufficiently reliable and therefore should not be fed into other models? DP noted that there wasn't a particular concern about the reliability of community tension reports in their own right
- Is there anything more generally we can learn from the fact that this model didn't work? DP noted from an intelligence point of view it is more useful to get an idea of what is going on around community tensions but from a data lab perspective it looks as though the model can't be built
- Do we think if there were better quality neighbourhood policing might improve the quality of the community tension reports? ST noted that the information that comes through for the community tension reports doesn't only have details on policing, it includes information on what is seen nationally, other police forces and comes from a range of other sources. DP added from a strict modelling point of view it might possibly result in better intelligence, but it might just be the fact it's fairly diffuse information generally that impacts on its usability in a model
- Are any more attempts going to be made on this model? Is community tensions information going to be used? DP noted that it might be useful for applying a view of inputs into some future models, for example if the number of county tension reports were counted over a period of time it might be useful being some sort of time serving modelling. As it stands at the moment the data do not allow a predictive model to be built
- Is there no link between community tension and violence? DP noted and agreed that the model is worth another look in future and will be brought to the Committees' attention, but with this particular model the signal just isn't there to link the two

The Committee had the following general comments:

- A committee member thought it was a really good conversation to be having; many who sit on multiple ethics panels have for a long time asked for people to be more critical about data that they used and for this process to conclude that it's actually not reliable enough, the team should be commended on their own critical reflection; really good practice that these conversations are taking place
- It is good to see projects can be let go where it's clear they might be flawed

Committee advice

No advice required as project discontinued.

The Committee commended the Data Lab for taking a critical approach to this project and being prepared to discontinue a project if demonstrated to be ineffective.



3

### Knife Crime

DP delivered a presentation and the following points were noted:

- The interim report examines trends in knife crime (used causing injury) over time and space, i.e. it looks to predict where knife crime may occur in the West Midlands based on past data and trends
- It proposes developing a predictive model as to the number of knife crimes occurring over a 4 week period (including broad location)
- Hotspots have been identified as essentially being city centres and this has been consistent over the years – broadly these locations are where the most offences have occurred
- Age of offenders have been trending downwards
- Essentially using the single time series and spatial patterns of past events to forecast itself for the future
- Because nearby locations often have similarities, information shared between locations can form the basis of prediction

The Committee had the following questions:

- What interventions would it guide? Would it be part of a rationale for S.60 Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994 authorisations? DP noted it is essentially predicting where hotspots are likely to occur over a four week period; quite broad areas over 1sq kilometre. It was originally to be fed into Project Guardian which is a WMP policing operations programme more aimed at prevention of knife crime. YB added that Guardian project is surged funding for immediate police response to the incidents of violence so would allow, with more intelligence, deployment of officers onto the ground which could be the Guardian taskforce; currently working though linking this with neighbourhood policing in the longer term
- Does this model provide new insights, or could WMP have already seen which areas would be higher risk for knife crime? DP noted that there have been some broad locations where these crimes have been occurring quite regularly for the past 20 years is in and around the city centres; it helps visualise and sure up the knowledge. The aim is to try and highlight the areas that might not be so obvious and to help focus resources in a particular spatial area over a sub-four week period, but the real value would be in identifying more unusual locations where knife crime is infrequent to help inform a police response that is currently lacking due to this gap in analysis – the model would need to proceed to look more closely at whether these insights exist
- Given the current racial tensions, how else (outside of formal groups and committees), will the public (specifically black communities) be made aware of the effectiveness of hotspot policing in this area? YB noted that work from the Violence Reduction Unit would potentially seek to flood the area with more early prevention initiatives and might help leverage in additional resources to better engage with the communities. There is a risk of a whole range of issues that this will potentially end up feeling more impactful on different communities and in particular BAME communities. Addressing these risks would fall under the programme of more general community engagement by the force



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- How will the model's performance be measured? DP noted that in terms of the model, in the first instance, it will look at how close the model's predictions are to real incidents to assess its accuracy</li></ul> <p><u>The Committee had the following general comments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- A committee member mentioned there has been a similar proposal in Essex and did an ethical review of the project which has led to extra work needing to be done in relation to transparency and the interventions. This looks similar at this stage. Suspects the hotspots are already known, would also be concerned about stigmatising different communities which is a risk with any geographically based model. There is a self-fulfilling prophecy element that never seems to feel right</li><li>- The committee would have appreciated more detail on the modelling – what are the origins of the models, what covariate information is used, how are the spatial structures modelled, what are the predictive force of these models etc. but this is not the forum to discuss these questions precisely. Just to flag the issue that maybe a future paper could contain more detail</li><li>- Another member mentioned that YB's assurances around the proposed interventions are very helpful but has concerns that not everyone in WMP necessarily sees the supportive prevention as being as important, so public may be concerned about changing priorities or inconsistent policies/practice across WMP as a whole</li></ul> <p><u>Committee advice</u></p> <p>The Committee unanimously voted in favour of option 'E' under the Terms of Reference, meaning "It requests more information from the Lab in order to be able to advise".</p> <p>The Committee is particularly keen to learn more about: the analysis checking for biases in the data; and the interventions that are likely to follow these predictions, and whether these proposed interventions trigger ethical concerns over aggressive policing practices and the problems that might follow.</p>
<b>4</b>	<b>County Lines Network – Briefing</b> <p>DP delivered a presentation and the following points were noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- The aim of this model is to use AI to analyse large numbers of intelligence logs and crime records to identify people involved with county lines (i.e. organised crime groups exploiting people to deal drugs along transport routes across the country)</li><li>- The model involves ascertaining any information of relevance to vulnerable people involved with county lines</li><li>- The model aims to create a network of those involved with county lines by analysing intelligence logs and crime records through AI to ascertain links between different criminal events or concerns around vulnerability</li><li>- The model would explore links between this network and the serious organised crime Network conducted under other analyses previously considered by the Committee</li></ul>



- Looking across the network(s), calculate the harm created via county lines related crimes
- Calculate a measure of centrality for nominals, i.e. identifying individuals deemed close to the centre of organised crime networks and therefore assumed to be more likely to be engaged in serious criminality
- Develop a prioritisation scheme for individual nominals which should include measures of their centrality

The Committee had the following questions:

- Who constitutes a 'victim' and 'perpetrator' - not easy and young people being exploited do criminal things they didn't want to do - what external expertise is feeding into these sensitivities? DP noted that they can quite often be both, people that are perpetrators may have started off as victims and it would obviously be useful information to be able to identify as part of the project. Essentially the need to go over victims as well as offenders is to be able to ascertain the true extent of the network; it falls more within the general policing activity in terms of how those people would then be addressed, but this particular project is aimed at being able to provide intelligence to better support risk and harm assessments and to help concentrate their efforts more. YB added reassurance around much broader approach around county lines and that victim/perpetrator distinction and support is on the agenda
- How does this project differ from the serious organised crime network project? DP noted that methodologically it is pretty much the same, but going over different ground; it will try and specifically identify county lines people involved which other network analyses do not specifically address
- At what stage is the project at? DP noted that the project hasn't started yet, the document sent to the Committee is the only part of the project as it stands at the moment

The Committee had the following general comments:

- One member's view is that this work is to be welcomed, given the gaps we know exist in county lines intelligence meaning children and victims are suffering, and vulnerability is not being addressed. The project does however need to ensure it has a comprehensive and credible plan around how victims will be supported and not inadvertently criminalising victims of exploitation
- One member had concerns around children and vulnerable people – also concerned with the interventions and the risk of unfairly criminalising. There were concerns that female victims and vulnerable adult involvement was under reported, and the risk that this model might direct focus to male victims, even though 9 out of 10 tend to be in the offender category rather than victim category. As such, would like to see more substance and analysis around safeguarding and supporting victims
- Another member adds that given that we know it is often hard to determine who is a victim and who is an offender in county lines, would like to see more in the intended activity area relating to prevention and safeguarding as well as enforcement. Thinks more on interventions and



	<p>the wider context in relation to the forces response to county lines might be helpful</p> <p><u>Committee advice</u></p> <p>The Committee unanimously voted in favour of option 'C' under the Terms of Reference, meaning "It advises approving the project with major amendments".</p> <p>The Committee is supportive of the overall aim of the project. However, major amendments should focus on providing more information and devising more thorough proposals around the risk of criminalising children and safeguarding of victims, recognising that the victim/perpetrator overlap can be complex.</p>
5	<p><b>Predicting Violence – Briefing</b></p> <p>DP delivered presentation and the following points were noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Similar to the knife crime project, but with the aim of predicting where violence offences more generally might occur across the West Midlands</li><li>- Use definition of 'most serious violence' previously used in the Youth Violence project</li><li>- To look at the trends in violent crime over space and time, i.e. identify hot spots</li><li>- Develop a model to predict the likely number and location of violent incidents over the coming 4 week period</li></ul> <p><u>The Committee had the following questions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Could you explain a little more about the exploratory data analysis phase on p5 of the doc. i.e. which processes for identifying bias/data quality issues? DP noted that the exploratory data analysis phase is similar in most projects; it's essentially about whether a question can be answered by the quality of data and the data at hand. In this project it would involve plotting the incidents over space to look at it in a time perspective to identify patterns over time and space, and thoroughly exploring the data and seeing what the issues are; looking at incidents rather than people</li><li>- Given that there is so much overlap in this project and the knife crime 'hot spot' project, and with both being in early stages would it not be worth just looking at knife crime project alone? DP noted that it was a good question. However, they are not far away from being able to check its accuracy and suggesting a view on the best overall approach to take, and because of the stage of where the violence project is at it wouldn't necessarily overlap workwise with the knife project. Some of these issue we have to at least look at to see whether it's taken on as a project, i.e. sometimes it's hard to see if there is any value in looking until a preliminary exploration is conducted</li><li>- Has WMP considered working with health partners on this topic specifically? This might help see if there's a similar view of physical harm, geographically, between organisations. It might also help inform public health responses. DP noted that is the desire, there have been many discussions with West Midlands based statutory partners about</li></ul>



	<p>data sharing. For this project it would be useful but we don't have any specific data sharing agreements in place. It may be challenging to get a fine level of data detail from partners, required for this level of model</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- In terms of outcomes and hotspot policing it would be interesting to know if that tactic leads to a real reduction or displacement of harm to other areas where it has been used? DP noted that from work that was published and provided online it seems to suggest that hotspot policing can lead to improvements in surrounding areas as well, however it is a good point. If these reach a conclusion to get produced we can see what responses have been made by WMP as a result of the work and can then relay this back to other incidents in neighbouring locations and see whether there has been some relationship between the two; envisage would take a year or two.</li></ul> <p><u>The Committee had the following general comments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- A committee member mentions the major ethical concern is aggressive policing practice, damage to community relationships and institutional racism through disproportionality – I think more information about what exact activities will be deployed, and the proportion of these compared to more traditional/enforcement related responses (i.e. a small bit of youth engagement, but coupled with a large amount of stop &amp; search tactics which is more problematic)</li></ul> <p><u>Committee advice</u></p> <p>The Committee unanimously voted in favour of option 'E' under the Terms of Reference, meaning "It requests more information from the Lab in order to be able to advise".</p> <p>The Committee is particularly keen, as with the knife crime project, to learn more about: the analysis checking for biases in the data; and the interventions that are likely to follow these predictions, and whether these trigger ethical concerns over aggressive policing practices and the problems that might follow.</p>
<b>6</b>	<p><b>Mental Health Predictions – Briefing</b></p> <p>DP delivered presentation and the following points were noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- A project where there is a need to have a really good look at the data (i.e. to much better understand the impact of mental health (MH) problems in the community in the West Midlands) – it appears at the moment that it's not particularly well highlighted</li><li>- Also interested in looking at links between alcohol use and MH patterns</li><li>- Investigate presence of MH markers for events across the different police systems</li><li>- Investigate any seasonality trends around MH incidents when taken as a time series and any spatial patterns. Analyse presence of any relationship between MH demand and crime / ASB more generally</li><li>- Analyse, if possible, wider societal factors which contribute to MH demand</li></ul>



- Assess the ability to predict demand arising from MH
- Overall aim is to enable a reduction in over-policing of MH incidents

Joined by Inspector Scott McGarrigle, lead on Mental Health triage team within WMP and made the following comments:

- Understanding what the problem is, roughly deal with 1800 – 3000 MH incidents a month; problem is we have no real grasp or understanding of the different complexities around those MH incidents
- Like most police forces in UK, WMP are pretty much reactive when it comes to MH; will respond to people when they call – need to be more proactive
- Have some idea around seasonal changes around MH demand, for example in February, for some reason there is a reduction in MH incidents but don't know why that is
- Good appetite to look at this from a partner agency point of view
- Roughly 5% of demand is MH related
- Need to understand the cross link between crime, anti-social behaviour and MH, if we can be more proactive it could have a crime reduction effect

The Committee had the following questions:

- Will any consideration be given to whether officers involved in MH responses have ever been accused of racism? SM noted that the key is to try and reduce police intervention, the tension under section 136 under the mental health act is always a contentious issue particularly where BAME communities are concerned. Want to get to preventative stage and stop people getting into crisis in the first place. This is about taking responsibility from front line policing officers and making sure we're using the right policing strategies around MH, which could be neighbouring police teams or local mental health partners at board level
- Is predictive model/data lab approach the best way to go ahead? DP noted that the project is in the very early stages, is a more ambitious longer term project in many respects. Initial item is can we predict demand on policing so far as it relates to urgent responses to MH incidents in the community

The Committee had the following general comments:

- One committee member mentioned that it is really good that WMP are looking at this, if the agenda is about recognising the role of mental health problems as precursor to making the case for compassionate support; this would be an excellent agenda. Mental health problems are not always easy to see, there isn't always agreement over diagnosis, and sometimes diagnosis requires an unduly high threshold despite severe stress being a real problem and factor behind crime
- Another member agrees with above and thinks the aims of the project are too ambitious – providing predictions of mental health related incidents region by region, monthly in advance seems very ambitious and unlikely to be realised. Not enough detail in the paper to judge what is going on



- A committee member agrees referring to their experience as a defence advocate/lawyer – the proportion of caseload with such issues was increasing exponentially and focused diversions rather than a s.136 catchall are urgently required – however, MH issues are so prevalent and people so unsupported in our society and criminal justice system that it's an extremely positive agenda for WMP to be looking at mental health issues.
- Obviously, a large proportion of the population have mental health issues and do not commit crime - vast majority don't. But many who do commit crime (including those imprisoned) have mental health challenges, alongside other challenges, and thus the relevance of this project
- It seems this is (legally) sensitive to a greater degree than other data analysis projects tabled for this meeting. Where is the legal advice on this, from a data protection compliance point of view? (We're talking about the use of health data, from WMP or partners, after all, not just data for what most would say are more clearly 'law enforcement purposes')
- One committee member mentioned 3 quick points:
  1. Agrees that there is research that touches on diversity issues here, i.e. the way aggression is characterised depending on ethnicity in the MH context. I'm confident in the professionalism of police but it might be helpful to place specific attention to this
  2. totally separate: if the proposal is a more coarse grained analysis of general demand issues, it might be worth reconsidering the title of this project - i.e. without looking at the details, the existing title could invite specific connotations
  3. Probably not necessary to say but: if this model affects tasking is there a risk that officers attend locations/situations 'primed' in the sense they are expecting MH incidences? Could this influence the use of s136?

Committee advice

The Committee unanimously voted in favour of option 'E' under the Terms of Reference, meaning "It requests more information from the Lab in order to be able to advise".

Generally, the Committee would like to commend the Lab and WMP for looking at this vital agenda, particularly if it is about understanding MH prevalence in communities as a basis for working with partners for a more strategic response that is less about law enforcement. The Committee would therefore like to encourage WMP to continue to explore this particular project. In doing so, the Committee advises that the project proposal needs to be more specific about what exactly is being looked at and the intentions behind the project. It also advises very careful consideration is given to data protection rules around use of data regarding mental health and appropriate consents for the use in question.

7

**Committee's general comments on WMP Lab papers**



	<p><u>The Committee also made the following general comments for summary:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- There have been a number of similarities between projects presented to the Committee, in terms of aims, models and interventions. The Committee recommends that the process could benefit from a focus on a smaller number of projects, dealing with the Committee's comments and advice, and ensuring that the effectiveness and impact of these models are evaluated in detail before moving onto similar projects</li><li>- In terms of the structure of papers presented to the Committee, it is requested that these deal specifically with previous advice given and that mathematical, statistical and machine learning methods are presented so as to be understandable to the lay member</li><li>- The Committee requests that papers should always specifically deal with the interventions that would result from deployment of the proposed model</li><li>- Legal advice and the DPIA should be provided to the Committee in all cases</li></ul>
<b>8</b>	<b>10 minute coffee break</b>
<b>9</b>	<p><b>NDAS Update</b></p> <p>ND delivered an update on NDAS (i.e. the National Data Analytics Solution – a national level Home Office funded AI project led by WMP on behalf of a number of other police forces) and the following points were noted:</p> <p><i>Modern Slavery:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Recommendation B was given by the Committee previously with caveats</li><li>- The project team will work closely with West Yorkshire Police to ensure that the tool is embedded in current decision making processes and the accuracy is communicated</li><li>- We are currently about 5 weeks from operationalisation. We will report back to the Committee before this as to the likely first steps that will be taken once they operationalise</li><li>- We've contacted both West Midlands and West Yorkshire Anti-Slavery Networks and will be briefing them on the model and seeking their feedback. The WMASN briefing is set for 6<sup>th</sup> Aug</li></ul> <p><u>The Committee had the following questions and comments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- There was worry with how the stakeholder engagement has been described; that just briefing organisations with this is really not in the spirit of the advice given by the Committee previously. What is needed is comprehensive and real involvement of stakeholders in the actual design and then putting into operation; is the engagement proposed really enough to address the concerns around supporting vulnerable victims? ND noted that in terms of operationalisation it is intrinsically linked with work that both police and partners do, so police sit on those boards and work with the partners on those issues to do with Modern Slavery. The actual delivery of the product from the model will be part of the business of those networks.</li><li>- It was noted that the briefing paper was easy to read so thanked ND for that. There was a reference to a visualisation tool, in the next report it</li></ul>



would be useful to tell the committee about the visualisation and how it works and what information it tells the user. Thought it was positive that you were going to think about the effect of the outcome on the policing activity. It's recommended and would be useful for the committee to see the comparison between the previous way of doing things and doing things now with the model

*MSV:*

- ND explained the MSV NDAS proposal (i.e. the predictive model around serious youth violence) is now quite a radically different mode due to identified inaccuracies with the data modelling previously, which now provides different options to users
- It now focusses on the top 100 people that the model identifies in terms of risk of committing MSV; it would need police officer discretion and justification before any action taken and could not just act on the NDAS score alone
- Focal cohort – assisting with existing decision-making processes (which in the papers have been called a “force cohort”) to help prioritise and then visualise to give a contextual understanding of the predictions. Also enables the sharing of best practice. Work is still ongoing but there are early indications that this improves the accuracy of the decision making in classifying and prioritising individuals who present a threat of violence

*The Committee had the following questions and comments:*

- How useful is this model going to be? ND noted the general MSV cohort is less focused therefore potentially less useful. However, where, for example, WMP will seek to identify people under 25 who are potentially going to commit MSV, that's where the focus can be and where the model can actually improve the cohort decision process. The actual results for that, where the models has been run quite a number of times, have produced a decent understanding of the precision rates; early indications are the precision rate is better than both the NDAS cohort, the general MSV cohort and the original decision making process within the Force
- One Committee member asked for clarity on why the precision rates are considered sufficient. ND said this is ascertained by comparing the model's precision rates against force decisions
- One Committee member said the rationale for the cohort identification for interventions (well-explained by the Venn diagram!) makes a lot of sense, as the accuracy rate in terms of individual predictions is clearly very low
- One member is worried about the project as a whole and the Committee are raising the same concerns right from the beginning, repeatedly and feels like the project is being pushed forward no matter what. Not seeing a proper acknowledgment of the issues raised and it's just not clear on how it will be used. A number of other Committee members agreed, ND noted that the model will not go ahead without consideration from the Committee
- [see Committee advice below]



*Organised Exploitation:*

- ND explained that this is the next new use case we propose the Committee considers
- The structured analysis of force data identifies key words / phrases and context that indicate organised exploitation, to do with:
  - Line – key words that indicate the use of a drugs line and also the names and numbers of the lines themselves
- It therefore identifies the people involved in organised exploitation, then seeks to understand their role on a scale of “workforce” to “management” with a set of business rules that seek to classify the individuals
- The scale on p.15 of the submission can be produced for the force area as a whole or for discrete networks
- The intention is to help co-ordinate the management of the threat accordingly
- Pursue individuals higher up in the hierarchy, potentially using the more intrusive/resource intensive investigative resources
- Disrupt those who may be facilitating the exploitation of those lower in the hierarchy
- Work within the statutory partnership arrangements in the Community Safety Partnership to Protect/safeguard those identified as exploited at the lower end of the hierarchy
- Better understand the recruitment of those who are exploited to Prevent others being recruited
- It is appreciated that before operationalisation, we need to evaluate the model to test its accuracy in identifying events and the part individuals play in the hierarchy. We will keep the Committee updated on this work
- It is anticipated that as the use case progresses, we will develop a labelled data set which will then allow us to use machine learning techniques, rather than the key word approach, to identify organised exploitation events. This would be a significant change to the model and we would return to the Committee to discuss this before implementing this change

*The Committee had the following questions and comments:*

- One committee member wanted to register their objection of using the term ‘workforce’ for people being exploited or forced into criminal activity. ND noted that it was a fair point and is open to the Committee’s suggestions on other terminology
- How will the output be categorised? ND answered that the output is intelligence, it will be used in a number of different ways, so in Force level will expect it to be used to understand the threat across the Force and understand the individuals and networks that present the most threat. At a local level it adds a huge amount of value in terms of understanding which lines, groups and individuals both present a threat but in complex partnership environment what to do with the networks once you understand the threat.



<b>10</b>	<p><b>Committee advise on NDAS update</b></p> <p><b><i>Modern Slavery</i></b></p> <p>The Committee unanimously voted in favour of option 'B' under the Terms of Reference, meaning "It advises approving the project with minor amendments".</p> <p>In giving this advice, the Committee notes and expects that the draft visualisation tool will be presented to the next meeting of the Committee, and the evaluation of the effect of the tool on policing activity, including a comparison between previous way of doing things and doing things with the model, will be presented to a subsequent Committee meeting.</p> <p>In addition to the comments already made, the Committee advises that a far more thorough programme of engagement with key partners is developed to help ensure the model will be used to support victims and vulnerable people identified as a result, including a comprehensive and credible plan over the complex dividing line between perpetrators and victims.</p> <p><b><i>Most Serious Violence</i></b></p> <p>The Committee unanimously voted in favour of option 'D' under the Terms of Reference, meaning "It advises rejecting the project".</p> <p>The Committee agrees that currently there is insufficient information around how this model improves the current situation around decision making in preventing serious youth violence, why it considers the model's current accuracy rates to be sufficient and a detailed set of proposals and safeguards around the kinds of interventions needed to avoid causing injustice for young people including risks around disproportionality and coercive interventions that may cause harm. The Committee has expressed these concerns previously on more than one occasion without sufficient clarity being provided, and therefore as the project stands, it advises the project is discontinued.</p> <p><b><i>Organised Exploitation</i></b></p> <p>The Committee unanimously voted in favour of option 'C' under the Terms of Reference, meaning "It advises approving the project with major amendments".</p> <p>The Committee advise in particular that significantly more information is provided around how this tool will be used in practice, including how it will be used to support vulnerable young people and also recognise that some will have been forced into criminality. This may involve significant detail around how partners are involved in preventing crime and supporting vulnerable people.</p> <p>The Committee encourages consistent communication between the WMP data Lab and NDAS to ensure both teams are learning from each other as they design these models.</p>
<b>11</b>	<b>Meeting Closed</b>