



ETHICS COMMITTEE

Friday 25th September 2020, 10:00 – 14:00 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
Malcolm Fowler (MF)	Ethics Committee
Janine Green (JG)	Ethics Committee
Peter Fussey (PF)	Ethics Committee
Jennifer House-go (JH)	Ethics Committee
Derek Dempsey (DD)	Ethics Committee
Andrew Howes (AH)	Ethics Committee
Rachel Holtham (RH)	Secretariat (OPCC)
Davin Parrot (DP)	Data Analytics Lab - WMP
Samantha Todd (ST)	Data Analytics Lab – WMP
Dean Gordon (DG)	Detective Chief Inspector, Public Protection - WMP
Chris Todd (CT)	Detective Chief Superintendent - WMP
Nick Dale (ND)	Superintendent, National Data Analytics Solution – WMP
Sanjit Kahlon	Head of Digital Policing Policy and Observer from the Home Office

Apologies:

Rebecca Hemmings (RH)	Ethics Committee
-----------------------	------------------

1	<p>The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced new members Derek Dempsey and Andrew Howes to their first meeting</p> <p>TM thanked the continuing work from WMP and the OPCC and expressed thanks to the Committee members for all their effort and continuing engagement with the process, and noted that the work is being recognised on a national and international level</p>
2	<p>Domestic Abuse</p> <p>DP delivered a presentation and the following points were noted:</p>



- Two main aims for this project: looking at factors that contribute to whether outstanding offenders (i.e. those who have already been accused of a domestic abuse offence, and for whom an incident log is recorded) do or do not go on to commit further crimes, and looking at factors that affect successful outcomes in a police investigation
- Project is in an explanatory model, trying to assess what contributes to the successful outcome of investigations, rather than aiming to predict anything
- It was noted that Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) in general has been trending upwards from 2017
- This research involved looking into the victim history, offender history and police response in police data, to ascertain the amount of work that has been put into investigations, and variables relating to that
- The research concludes that: the lead officer's involvement is significant and that ongoing engagement from one officer with the victim is associated with maintaining victim engagement and achieving a positive outcome; and separately the amount of effort or logs/entries that has been put in by the lead officer was associated with a higher likelihood of a successful outcome being achieved
- The report concluded that the findings suggest that key to achieving a successful outcome, is being able to successfully engage the victim throughout, such that they do not withdraw their charges (so called 'Victim Support') As officer focus rises (i.e. the amount of attention an officer is able to give to a case) the chance of victims withdrawing falls
- When looking at personal factors, ex-partners (i.e. victims who are no longer with their abusive partner) and men were found less likely to withdraw from the investigation. Younger and older victims were more likely to withdraw support, whereas middle age victims were found to be more likely to carry on with the investigatory process
- The more serious domestic abuse crimes tend to be associated with less chance of victim withdrawal; the highest level crimes typically result in victims continuing, whereas lower level offending results in a much higher chance of victims withdrawing
- In conclusion, the analysis found that reduced victim support and evidential problems arising hinder many cases. The speed of response and numbers involved in the case initially are important in whether the victim continues through the process. The amount of involvement of a leading officer (the one most involved in the case) is important and being a single port of call or contact through the case. If the perpetrator is involved in a lower level crime, then there is more chance of there being issues with support or continued cases

The Committee had the following questions:

- Members asked for greater clarity on what constitutes a 'successful outcome' for the purposes of this analysis. WMP said it was an investigation that resulted in some form of action being taken against the perpetrator including a charge or caution, as opposed to a case being dropped due to victim withdrawal or evidential limitations
- Is there anything specific to IPV here - or would these findings relate to other categories of crimes also? DP noted that it wouldn't be surprising if similar incidents, particularly in the use of resources towards other crimes,



have a very similar outcome especially with rape and serious sexual offences (RASSO). However there is a difference in process in terms of IPV incidents – IPV are more likely to be responded to via emergency ‘police/force response’ whereas RASSO is more likely to go straight into the more specialised Public Protection Unit, which could influence the type and specialisation of response

- How does the definition of domestic violence (DV) relate to IPV or are they used interchangeably? DP noted that in this instance DV and IPV are used interchangeably in the report
- The results indicated that quicker police responses (usually for emergency calls categorised as ‘Priority 1’) were linked to better investigation outcomes. Members did ask however, whether we can rely on the way WMP is prioritising emergency calls (so called ‘P’ grades), given that this is an area of contention in policing generally? DG noted that whilst there is subjectivity in allocating P grades, they are still useful for this analysis in the sense that what is being shown is that quicker responses to domestic abuse calls are linked to better investigatory outcomes. From a public protection point of view, although there is potentially some subjectivity around whether a lower P grade is justified when an offender has left a crime, these findings suggest that actually there may be merit in still considering these circumstances as top priority given the association between speed of attendance and successful investigation outcome. The Committee member added that this was helpful and feels that it should be spelt out more explicitly as it is quite a powerful narrative for making the case for policy change
- Members also asked whether we have explored whether there are any other variables, within police data, that might influence whether an officer records more logs that are not necessarily related to the offence or victim. For example, is there anything related to the time the crime is committed that impacts on whether an officer records more logs, such as having more time depending on where they are in their shift? DP noted that the data include the hour, date and the length of incident in terms of minutes but that these did not, based on the analysis, indicate causal relationships
- Was any consideration given to whether the kind of outcome being pursued (i.e. prison, caution or some other kind of sentence or outcome) impacted on a victim’s willingness to support the investigation or not? Further, what analysis has been done around what constitutes a ‘good’ outcome, within the wider context of ‘what works’ and what ‘satisfies victims’?
- Has WMP given thought to the idea that slower police response times sometimes result in victim withdrawal because, on occasions, victims have reflected on the nature, circumstances and seriousness of the incident such that they no longer wish to see a police enforcement response? This might occur, for instance, if the victim was under the influence of alcohol or drugs at the time of making an accusation
- How is this project going to be communicated to the public? We know a key issue is underreporting of domestic abuse – one concern is that if the messaging isn’t right, victims might be deterred from reporting incidents, or be fearful of how broadly their information could be used. DP agreed it would need to be carefully considered. DG added that the use of data is explained to the victim on attendance and that the message from the



police would always be to continue to report, and nothing in the document has raised any concerns regarding personal information

- How useful from a policing point of view is this research? DG noted that the findings seem to support the literature that preceded this and what it does is allow WMP to more strongly form an argument and support an approach to how domestic abuse is responded to
- Is there a relationship between criminal activity in general (i.e. is the wider offending history of someone accused of domestic abuse relevant or have any predictive value) and the committing of domestic abuse offences? DP noted it does seem to show a relationship between one's criminal activity in general and their domestic abuse offending. This probably to some degree plays into the fact that people who are committing volume crimes tend to have more chaotic or dysfunctional lifestyles, which in turn might be linked to domestic problems
- Are there natural experiments in the data set already between different policies for how to respond, or between individual officers regarding the nature of their response? DP noted that there was a large change in general policy to help processes and organisation of the Force in 2016 referred to as TS1. Therefore data is specifically taken from early 2017 onwards, but it would be possible to look to see if there is information further back to undertake these analyses. There are other slight complications however in terms of changing of recording systems and use of systems
- One committee member questioned whether there was a clear enough objective to this research, and therefore whether the use of personal data was/is warranted, and/or whether or not you could have had more impact by doing something else altogether. DP suggested that the objective was in their view clear for its purposeful exploration of patterns that could directly inform policy and practice to improve the positive outcome rate of domestic abuse investigations
- Members asked for clarity around the definitions used within the report. DG clarified that DA (domestic abuse) within WMP is defined as any incident involving any family member, so not just IPV. If the incident involved someone between 16 –18 it would be investigated by a child investigation department but still be marked up as DA
- Is it that IPV is more specific than child abuse? DG noted that DA is 16 years or older between intimate partners and family members. If the incident is below the age of 16 it is categorised as child abuse and PPU child abuse investigation department deal with these cases
- Are there any plans to test to see if the factors behind successful or unsuccessful investigations are similar in other forces? If so, it was felt it would be good to share the insights to make it unnecessary for other forces to have to repeat the work, and use more personal data to gain the same insights elsewhere. DP noted that at the moment there are currently no plans with other forces, but obviously others are aware through general discussions that this analysis is being undertaken within WMP, so opportunities to share readily exist. There would however be a slight concern about taking the findings to another force and assuming they are the same as there could be different processes and contextual circumstances.



The Committee had the following general comments:

- A few commented that this was the most detailed paper to date brought to the Committee, and there were a number of positives around the thoroughness of the report
- Particularly positive, was the way that the problem and data analysis was informed by applicable academic literature
- There was confusion about the use of the blue and red bars on the graphs, since sometimes blue depicted positive investigation outcomes, but at other times negative
- More detail is required around how the report's findings will inform WMP policy and/or additional analysis, including how this fits with WMP's decision making governance
- The Committee is eager to understand how these findings, or importantly any impact on policy, might be communicated to the public so as not to inadvertently deter victims from reporting
- It was felt a stronger descriptive analysis was needed in the report to help the Committee understand how these investigations are being run in reality, but it was also noted that DP and DG's contributions were very helpful
- The Committee recommended thorough legal advice should be conducted in relation to the Lab's work on this and more generally in order to satisfy itself it is meeting all data protection human rights and other legal compliance requirements
- The general feeling towards this project was that it should be congratulated for its objectives, seeking to grapple with a complex agenda but also having highlighted some potentially valuable patterns in how best to improve the outcomes for IPV
- It was felt that the report could be improved by: being clearer around the definition of IPV and what kind of offences are or are not in scope; further analysis of the role of causation verses correlation in relation to the patterns identified and a fuller explanation of the statistical modelling in forming these assumptions; and acknowledgement and plans for the use of qualitative work to explore the complexity behind the patterns identified and to address some of the comments above, particularly around correlation or causation ambiguities
- It was restated that the model should not be assuming someone who is accused of domestic abuse is definitely 'an offender', on the principle that one is innocent until proven guilty
- Starting with the premise that domestic abuse is extremely serious and wide spread, there are occasions where the accuser reflects on an incident and decides (without coercion) that an incident wasn't actually a form of abuse. This might happen when the accuser was intoxicated at the time of having called the police, and later realised that making the call was not merited or that the incident was not as they described. The fact this scenario can occur might impact on the reliability of the assumption that a fast police response always results in a better outcome, and therefore this complexity should be thought through
- What constitutes a successful outcome needs further analysis. After all, particularly where someone admits to guilt, the victim may not want, for instance, a custodial response. Therefore a more sophisticated assessment of what a good outcome looks like in different circumstances,



	<p>should be considered as this will likely impact on what the appropriate police response should be and could also be an important factor in helping the police more frequently achieve the outcomes desired by victims</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - On page 43 of the Domestic Abuse paper this section from the Lab needs to be clearer in terms of explaining what these figures show - The Committee has suggested having an appendix to help on the definitions - The Committee thinks the objective is extremely worthy but that the wider complexity wasn't investigated and a greater understanding is needed. This discussion that has been had and the paper is a positive step forward
<p>3</p>	<p>Committee recommendations on WMP Lab paper</p> <p><u>Committee advice</u></p> <p>The Committee unanimously voted in favour of option 'B' under the Terms of Reference, meaning "It advises proceeding the project with minor amendments".</p> <p>In giving this advice the Committee requests that definitions within the model need to be clearer responses to the 'general comments' above.</p>
<p>4</p>	<p>Coffee Break</p>
<p>5</p>	<p>NDAS Update</p> <p>ND delivered an update on the National Data Analytics Solution (NDAS), a national level Home Office funded data analytics project led by WMP on behalf of a number of other police forces and the following points were noted:</p> <p>Modern Slavery:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Feedback from an Ethics Committee demonstration led to improvements regarding the nature of the product (intelligence product) and the retention of the product according to the Criminal Procedure and Investigations act - NDAS will introduce the functionality to allow users who are professionals in the field of MS to feedback into the model something which is identified as MS but confirmed not to be MS - This will mean not only that that particular event will not be identified as MS in the future but also that we build a library of events in order to continuously improve the accuracy of the model - Continuing to work with practitioners to fully understand the effect the model will have on this policing activity. Early feedback indicates it will be beneficial for: supporting analysis of the scale of the modern day slavery problem; identifying "missing links" between people involved in modern slavery monitor the effectiveness of police disruption, support flagging to help manage risk, be a useful investigative tool to identify lines of enquiry, help to more readily understand specific issues, e.g. exploitation type, geographical area and to provide a richer intelligence picture including the ability to be more proactive in tackling these emerging issues - Continue to engage with other partners and have engaged with a number of people and bodies with a national responsibility in this area including, Justice and Care, Independent Anti-slavery Commissioner, Her Majesty's



Inspectorate of Constabularies and Fire Services and Caroline Haughey QC OBE. All of these were positive about the need for better use of data analytics and specifically the NDAS model

- Continue to engage with other partners including the West Midlands and West Yorkshire Anti-Slavery Networks
- Early indications from this engagement are to support policy and intervention, trend analysis of modern slavery, support the safeguarding of victims and vulnerable people, benefit the partnership response and improve the understanding of the relationships between victims and perpetrators

It is proposed that the next steps for Modern Slavery is operationalisation as a pilot in West Yorkshire and the West Midlands, and the activities to engage and develop the model further will continue

The Committee had the following questions and comments:

- Really positive that the intelligence side has been picked up (i.e. the need to ensure people aren't being wrongly associated with criminal activity, and the data created carefully controlled and handled) and there are going to be a number of handling, instructions and rules around the model. Could be potentially used as learning for the future for all types of models
- It was noted that more thought had gone into the deletion of flagging of MS where it turns out not to be true
- Would be useful for the Committee to understand what is meant by operationalised. ND noted that the term operationalising means that the insights generated by the model will have an operational effect. Police and partners will take action as a result of NDAS generated insights
- For new members on the committee ND restated the model's outputs - the model identifies events which are tagged as modern day slavery events and it also identifies logs which are not tagged but can be identified as modern day slavery events through natural language processing. Through people linked to those events the tool helps to identify networks of people involved in modern slavery (both as offenders and victims)
- This model has come to the Committee a few times to provide updates in meeting the ethical challenges identified. The Committee once again noted that in its view, it is very supportive of the project's objectives and of its potential to help tackle a major policing issue
- The Committee is supportive of the project moving to a pilot stage, but would like to know what/how exactly that is going to be evaluated. ND noted that the intention is to have a full academic evaluation of the model.
- The Committee suggested the operational evaluation was integral to ascertaining the model's value both from a value for money perspective and ethical standpoint
- As this is an 'intelligence document' rather than a predictive model evaluation this will not be straightforward and will likely need to be based largely on user feedback.
- was raised that there was a need for more clarity over how liabilities and compliance will be managed between forces
- It is great to see the efforts around ensuring the model has benefitted from engaging with lots of stakeholders, but it would be very helpful for the Committee to know what is exactly being said in these stakeholder



meetings, and for these reflections (both positive and critical) to be made public through this forum

- ND noted that members of the Committee would be invited to these sessions in the future
- The overwhelming message from the Committee, is its desire to help ensure that WMP can put an evaluative framework in place early to help ascertain whether the model works

MSV:

- The use case regarding a prediction tool around 'most serious violence' (MSV) was withdrawn from the Committee in its current form
- The NDAS team will continue to work with stakeholders on how they might develop a data and analytics model to help improve efficiency and effectiveness in tackling violent crime. There are elements of the current MSV tool which are not predictive and will still be useful in building a new tool and this may satisfy the Committee's concerns over the predictive nature of the tool
- MSV in itself is something which has a great effect on the communities and in particular young people's lives both as offenders and perpetrators. Police forces hold a lot of data that can be useful in tackling the threat of serious violence, therefore it is incumbent on us to continue to explore data driven approaches to serious violence

The Committee had the following questions and comments:

As the model has been withdrawn there were no further comments or questions from the Committee

Organised Exploitation:

- To address a comment made at a previous ethics committee meeting, language in the model was changed from "workforce – management" to "victim – perpetrator", to address potential insensitivity to use of the phrase 'workforce'
- The rules that identify what constitutes "involvement in OE" and the place on the "victim – perpetrator" scale are currently being validating and refined
- The model recognises that someone can be a "suspect" or "offender" in police systems but still be a "victim" for the purposes of exploitation
- Continuing to engage with police and partner subject matter experts to develop the model and ensure that insights from the model have the best chance of improving outcomes for young and vulnerable people
- Will continue to engage with the WMP Data Lab recognising that the Lab and NDAS' work overlap on this particular agenda, and to ensure the best model is available nationally to tackle the threat of organised exploitation
- Continue the development of the model and report back to the Committee when they believe it is ready for operationalisation
- The Committee was asked by ND for any further recommendations that should be taken into account during the development of the model



The Committee had the following questions and comments:

There were no questions raised from the Committee to ND on this model

Firearms:

- A very different use case from others that have been developed
- A discovery tool to identify known and recorded events linked to firearms trends
- The benefit is not derived from any machine learning model – the benefit is from the ability to find all potentially relevant events in a short space of time
- The data use case relies on manually inputted data and subject to relevant scrutiny (e.g. Home Office Counting Rules for crime reports, sanitisation for intelligence logs, national standard OCG Mapping process)
- There is also a geographical view of incidents which allows the user to quickly and effectively identify events that are proximate to the trend under investigation in both space and time, identify which events are likely to be linked (e.g. pre-cursor events) and identify the networks of known individuals associated with those events
- When using the tool, the user would start off with an understanding of whatever immediate threat is faced
- The tool will help them understand the context of the threat, identifying networks of individuals in police systems
- The threat would be managed using the 4P (pursue, prepare, protect, prevent) approach in conjunction with partners in the Community Safety Partnership
- It would not be possible to define every intervention as each situation will be unique
- The tool allows the user to identify individuals who are linked to firearms events and OCGs (organised crime group), to support decisions on appropriate interventions
- Officers with limited resources will be focussed on their responsibilities under Article 2 ECHR (European Convention Human Rights) and Osman v UK – this will protect any peripheral or irrelevant individuals from intervention activity
- The focus of police and partners will be to neutralise the immediate threat (safeguarding potential victims, recovering firearms, arresting potential suspects), improve the confidence of the community, identify and tackle the root causes of the violence and ensure a return to normality as soon as possible
- NDAS believe this use case is ready to operationalise in its current form with continued development, such as the addition of NABIS (National Ballistics Intelligence Service) data and cross-border firearms trends
- Any developments of this nature would be returned to the Committee for consideration

The Committee had the following questions and comments:

- The Committee understands that it's quite common adults ask children/younger adults to hide guns for them to have a degree of separation from themselves. To the extent that children and young people



become more known to the police in relation to gun crime through the networking tools that might gather new leads where guns might be hidden, this could give rise to a concern around this tool. Has any thinking gone into what exactly the response is around that particularly high risk/vulnerable cohort of people? ND noted that the first principle is to recover the firearm off the streets, so if it is in the possession of someone younger and more vulnerable they will come under police scrutiny. There is now a better understanding in the police around these vulnerabilities and continuing to develop understanding and the nature of the whole exploitation. ND is happy to take advice from the Committee on how to present these risks to officers.

- How will the model be tested to check for identification bias? ND noted that users will be well trained on the tool and how users should supplement information gathered with other police data/information
- In the paper it is noted that accuracy is not a required metric because this tool is not a predictive or classification model. A full academic evaluation will be carried out to evaluate the tool
- ND raised a point around potential statutory defence for minors under Modern Slavery Act on this issue. One Committee member checked this out but found Firearms offences seem to be exempt from the statutory defence (schedule 4): <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2015/30/schedule/4> ND stated that this is correct but in his experience, conversations with senior CPS lawyers and this report on the Section 45 defence by the Independent Anti-Slavery Committee (<http://www.antislaverycommissioner.co.uk/media/1478/the-modern-slavery-act-2015-statutory-defence-call-for-evidence.pdf>) the non-punishment principle will be applied if appropriate for defendants who have been given a positive conclusive grounds decision as a potential victim of trafficking, even for offences excluded by Sch 4. Modern Slavery Act 2015, including robbery, firearms offences and wounding/causing grievous bodily harm.
- Ethical concerns focussed on the use of network analysis and 'false positive' identification of individuals within networks and 'peripherals', particularly when the number of 'hops' within the network increases. The point was made that, assuming that a 'hop' represents one individual being connected to another individual, then it certainly can be correct that going beyond 3 'hops' can pull in many essentially unrelated individuals
- Network analysis also generates false positives just like every other technique and can link individuals to groups and events who are not actually connected in relation to the incident under study. "Same Address" will often generate a match if residing in the same block of flats for example.
- ND noted that the network analysis is designed to show connections not nominals involved in an event. The tool does not layer on an interface to show that an individual is involved, it is only showing data connections as they are presented in police data
- ND also noted that going beyond 3 hops would in any case likely make the network analysis unusable and the users would be focused on networks linked to specific events and individuals within those networks who are involved in firearms criminality



	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- <u>ND stated that this is a discovery tool which applies no advanced analytics to identify individuals and networks linked to events. We considered that it may not be appropriate to bring to a data ethics committee.</u>- <u>The Committee noted that this tool was enabling searching, analysis and consumption of data at scale to develop hypotheses which will influence officer's selection of data to focus on. This could mean better decisions or different decision could be taken therefore, this tool should be taken to the Ethics Committee</u>- <u>ND noted that this was the conclusion the project team also reached, which is why we submitted papers to the Committee</u>- The Committee noted that judgment is always required in the interpretation of results. ND agrees that judgement is always required in interpreting results from the tool and also stated that it will be made clear to users that as well as this tool they will use their knowledge, professional judgement and intuition in order to determine what interventions to put in place
6	<p>Committee advice on NDAS update</p> <p><i>Modern Slavery</i></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 that a clear message with the evaluation needs to be planned out. Alongside that the model should not be operationalising without determining what the evaluation process and criteria is. It was explicitly recognised that this planning should be proportionate and not cause undue delay for the beginning of the pilot</p> <p>More specific points around evaluation included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">o would benefit from qualitative and quantitative evidence as to whether or not the tool is achieving the project's objectives i.e. in the operational environment is the tool <u>accurately</u> identifying more cases of modern slavery than previous methods? In order to assess this, there would need to be data about how many cases of modern slavery were identified and investigated in a particular past period in order to compare to practice in the evaluation period;o monitors and tracks how the output of the system is being used and disseminated within police systems and decision-making processes i.e. to ensure that it is being treated as intelligence as per the MOPI guidance etc. and to understand how this information is treated in any subsequent investigatory process. This would need some form of process to 'follow' the tool's output into the eventual investigative use and subsequently. Maybe a few specific cases could be picked for this process rather than trying to do this with everything;o assesses false positives and false negatives, using officer input to identify these, and an assessment of the potential consequences of these if they had been acted upon in particular in relation to individual outcomes;



- assesses how false outputs are subsequently identified and rectified where this data has been disseminated;
- assesses how the tool has improved (if it has) as a result of false positives/negatives being identified;
- tracks how any new individuals identified by the tool are investigated and the ultimate outcome of this investigation, in particular as regards victims who may also be perpetrators;
- considers how aware are the users about how the tool works and what its benefits and its limitations are?
- Considers whether anything else has happened that shouldn't have done as a result of this tool - unforeseen stuff etc.?
- produces an estimate of whether there are any time benefits compared with previous methods;
- Considers if different end users acted consistently when using the tool?

Most Serious Violence

No advice given as the model has been withdrawn

Organised Exploitation

The Committee unanimously voted in favour of option 'E' under the Terms of Reference meaning it is not yet able to advise the Police & Crime Commissioner and Chief Constable on approval or otherwise of the model in respect of the ethical standards expected and has therefore requested more information from the Lab in order to be able to provide further advice. In turn, the Police & Crime Commissioner and Chief Constable are therefore advised to request West Midlands' Police Analytics Lab come back with more information as suggested above

It was noted that the Committee saw significant advantages in using a model of this kind, but felt more detail around how individuals are being 'linked', with specific examples, were required to feel assured false positives would not result in ethical problems

It would be beneficial for NDAS to give a demonstration of the model to explore these issues.

Firearms

The Committee unanimously voted in favour of option 'E' under the Terms of Reference meaning it is not yet able to advise the Police & Crime Commissioner and Chief Constable on approval or otherwise of the model in respect of the ethical standards expected and has therefore requested more information from NDAS in order to be able to provide further advice. In turn, the Police & Crime Commissioner and Chief Constable are therefore advised to request NDAS come back with more information as suggested above.



	<p>The Committee was very supportive of the overall aims of the model but felt there was a number of concerns around its use. It is recommended that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- More information is provided about how identification bias is avoided- More information is provided about how users will avoid 'false positives' which is an increasing risk the more 'hops' a network is expanded, bringing more potentially unrelated individuals to police scrutiny- There should be a clear understanding of how the issue of young and vulnerable people, who are exploited by others to hold firearms, will be managed.
7	<p>Update on plans for self-assessment</p> <p>As the committee has been running over a year now and benefited from new members joining, it was felt now would be a good opportunity to have a self-evaluation process</p> <p>The proposal is to ask all involved in Committee business, to fill in a short questionnaire based on the evaluation that is being done regularly by the National Statisticians Data Ethics Advisory Committee.</p> <p>An action was agreed to circulate the questionnaire to all and collate all answers to present at a future meeting for discussion.</p>
8	<p>AOB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- JG mentioned that the Information Commissioner's Office has just started a consultation process and has invited panellists to feed into a data analytics tool kit. What the Committee might want to consider is whether the Committee has a stance on the tool kit and submit a collective response. The ICO has invited a number of individuals from the Committee already as individuals
9	<p>Meeting Closed</p>