ETHICS COMMITTEE

Tuesday 8ᵗʰ June 2021, 10:00 – 14:00 hrs

Meeting held virtually via Zoom

Present:
Committee members

Marion Oswald (MO)	Chair of Ethics Committee
Jonathan Jardine (JJ)	Chief Executive - OPCC
Janine Green (JG)	Ethics Committee
Derek Dempsey (DD)	Ethics Committee

WMP/OPCC

Rachel Holtham (RH)	Secretariat - OPCC
Davin Parrott (DP)	Data Analytics Lab – WMP
Samantha Todd (ST)	Data Analytics Lab – WMP
Karl Shutes (KS)	Data Analytics Lab – WMP
Chris Todd (CT)	Assistant Chief Constable - WMP
Matthew Tite (MT)	Superintendent, NDAS SRO - WMP
Sarah Galloway	Inspector – WMP
Sarah Burgess	Constable – WMP
Robert Farr	Sergeant - WMP
Wendy Bailey (WB)	Serious Organised Crime Superintendent – WMP

Invited participants

Clair Graham (CG)	Birmingham's Children Trust
Mandeep Dhensa (MD)	Accenture
Luke Robertson LR)	Accenture

Apologies:

Jamie Grace (JG)	Vice Chair of Ethics Committee
Andrew Howes (AH)	Ethics Committee
Peter Fussey (PF)	Ethics Committee
Anindya Banerjee (AB)	Ethics Committee
Claire Paterson-Young (CPY)	Ethics Committee
Thomas McNeil (TM)	Ethics Committee
Jennifer House-go (JH)	Ethics Committee
Tom Sorell (TS)	Ethics Committee
Malcolm Fowler (MF)	Ethics Committee

1	The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and noted that the meeting was not quorate. Therefore the recommendations will be submitted to the next meeting for ratification.

2	**Brief overview of how referrals work between WMP & local authorities**
	Wendy Bailey & Clair Graham attended the meeting to discuss how referrals work between WMP and local authorities and the following points were noted:
	- WB introduced herself as the Superintendent in Intelligence, but also with responsibility for serious and organised crime and exploitation. Has worked previously with CG on child abuse so that's why they work together around exploitation.
	- One of the difficulties that they have around exploitation, from a policing perspective and an intelligence perspective is, there is lots of information and data, but don't really understand the networks that are controlling that.
	- WB is aware that some of the concerns have been around some of the children that get called out as a part of this data collection, but clearly when they understand the networks and the children involved, they can do referrals for safeguarding options.
	- They should be referring children in so that they can look at the safeguarding options and some preventative work around them and give assistance to that child. There's also a concern around the criminalisation of children within the process.
	- They were honest about the fact that police officers at times have missed some of the exploitation signs but think they're in a very different place with this now.
	- It's been discussed that somebody can be a victim and an offender in the process for a period of time, but either way that doesn't stop WMP working with social care and the other agencies that have a statutory obligation to safeguard children around trying to get some interventions into their behaviour as well and deter them from a life of crime.
	- WB noted that the data is really important because, from an intelligence perspective it's really hard for they to get upstream of some of these exploitation gangs. They probably know some of the victims and children but struggle to know who's running them, so that data will help the intelligence officers make the right decisions about what activity that they need to take.
	- CG introduced herself as Head of Service for the Empower U Exploitation and Missing Hub and they look at the safeguarding aspects of partnership with WMP, and a number of other partner agencies looking at the overall holistic needs of the child and identifying any risks and looking at protecting those children.
	- Will always be looking at children as victim first and then is always that fine line around victims then becoming offenders.
	- The role within the Exploitation and Missing Hub is to meet regularly and every day there is a Task & Finish meeting with the police, where they

look at the actions that have arisen over the past 24 hours or the past 48 hours.
- Intelligence is shared around children that there are concerns about, referrals made by outside agencies will always come through via the Exploitation & Missing Hub.

The Committee made the following comments and questions:

- A member asked, and it relates to all of the projects that involve children and referrals through to the hub, whether there's any risk around capacity, do they anticipate identifying lots more young people and therefore is that going to create any capacity and resource issues? CG noted that there will potentially be an issue, with the awareness raising work that they are doing with partner agencies their data has risen. The team has grown to meet demand.

3	**Criminal Network Analysis**

DP delivered a presentation on the below items and the Committee had the following questions and comments:

3.1 – Serious Organised Crime

- A member asked if there is a risk that you potentially highlight their own CHIS by doing this network analysis and if so how is that going to be dealt with upfront? This is unlikely given that any intel. would be sanitised and any intel logs can only be accessed via the correct permissions.
- A member asked around the inclusion of Urban Street Gangs, which as identified in the paper, there is a blurring of boundaries and there's been a concern about categorisation of people on gangs when that's not an actual criminal activity, how is that going to be dealt with sensitively? DP answered that essentially, they would try and strip anybody out who's included in some form of group that essentially shouldn't be (as part of the feedback process). The network generation process also down weights intel both by time and quality which should reduce the likelihood of erroneous inclusion.
- A member asked if someone is identified from Sandwell with being involved with someone in Birmingham, assuming they get referred to their local hub by their address, is there any risk of the person that lives in Birmingham getting more support than the person who lives in Sandwell, even though the core of the issues might be very similar? DP answered in terms of the different local authorities, from a WMP point of view, the answer would be no, each case on its own merits and dealt with through the normal procedures.

3.2 – County Line

- A member wanted to confirm in terms of data sources that the Lab are using the same data sources across all of these specifically referenced

pins. One example of where the data using is prisoners who've shared a cell for 30 days or more. It's not clear from the report that that's what it's been limited to. DP added the same rule is applied to all three, the PINS data themselves are then also quite largely heavily downweighted as well as and on top of the time down weighting.

- A member asked regarding appendix 6, there is a set of provisional weightings and was curious how the Lab has reached that particular set of weightings, is this an expert assessment? DP added yes, it was initially with discussions with subject matter experts within Intel.

3.3 – Child Sexual Exploitation

- A member noted that it was a very interesting literature review at the beginning, highlighting the difficulty of defining child sexual exploitation, some interesting results from the analysis of the data.
- A member wanted to confirm from reading the paper that it was intended to produce some strategic overview data and also more of a dashboard, focusing on nominals as well. DP noted that it would potentially identify victims as the model is at the moment but they would obviously be classified as such, but also classified as offenders and sometimes both. The member added since the Lab have identified the difficulty in defining exploitation, are they happy that they will be picking up the exploitation side of it. DP added that they are picking up on exploitation but it's probably something that will get triple checked before it ends up as the final version.
- A member noticed that ethnicities were not known for the majority of offenders and asked if that is because it's not recorded in the system, DP confirmed that it's because it's not in the system. The member added if the Lab thought this would be a problem going forward, DP noted that they didn't think the ethnicity was of any value or the use of that information wouldn't help in solving problems in terms of ascertaining whether somebody is in a network.
- A member noted that some of the victims ages were set to zero where dates of births were assumed to be errors and asked if there was any impact to any of the analyses by setting them to zero? DP noted that predominantly it related to victims where they were recorded as an actual event so as far as the network goes it essentially doesn'tadd difficulties..

3.5 – Network Analyses Operating Principles

- A member noted under 2.2 which is regarding dissemination, they really like the seven operating principles that have been outlined, but thought it would be useful to expand on some of those a little bit further. Another member was also positive on the paper the principles and noted that these clear set of operating principles are needed on more of a national basis.

- A member thought that it would be useful to have a very clear process of how errors are then corrected or how anything that is subsequently identified as incorrect is then removed or dealt with and how the Lab deals with the fact that some of that information might have been passed down the line or has moved into other records or being passed to other agencies. It would be helpful to have the emphasis on the reliability of the principles and the need to assess the reliability of the intelligence that goes into the system, it wasn't entirely clear whether people would understand that the output of the system is effectively a form of intelligence, and how would they determine the reliability of what they're seeing, and whether they should act on it or not.
- A member noted that this was a really good paper to see and a great first draft but was looking for a bit more detail in a number of areas, for example in 2.3 on the paper for tasking processes, which is the process for removing nominals from analyses, it mentions that the operational process is going to be a continual addition of new information, and noted whether that should be something that is considered at some point, that there should be a time period when, if an individual has not been subject to any further involvement in crime, or doesn't fit any of the categories for a continuous period of time that there should be some process by which they are removed. DP notes that this is a good point and when these are being developed it's based on MOPI(ied) data (Management of Police Information) which provides guidelines around how long offence records should be kept.
- A member asked how the outputs will be recorded, is there a way that the system will record. How is a record being kept of what the officer saw on any particular day and on what data would produce that? DP noted that PSD (Professional Standards Department) very much like to be able to track who's looked at what, and that's generally what it is that they want to do from an officer and staff perspective. There are some potential concerns, the dashboard with the software that is used to produce that isn't easily trackable, but it's something that the Lab are investigating so that they are able to track in the same way that an individual's journey could be tracked by any particular website.
- A member noted that it addresses some of the points that have been raised previously around the reliability of what's going in and really liked the fact that there's so much emphasis around professional judgement being such an important part of the decision making as well as what actually comes out of the model.
- A member noted that there were previous concerns about labelling people in certain ways and then agencies often inadvertently putting in place a negative intervention as a result of that. A member added it was reassuring to see that they need the information that the partner agencies are going to have, so that we're not going to see things like housing providers deciding to take tenancy action against somebody when we know that stable housing is actually a protective factor in a lot of these issues so it was just an observation from the member and to say thank you because it did address some of the concerns that have been raised previously.

4	**Coffee Break**
5	**NDAS Update**

MT went through actions from the last NDAS submission:

- One action was for the project to obtain legal advice around the violent crime use case, the project has done that MT written to the Assistant Director of their Legal Services department, and that individual has provided legal advice which was attached as a submission for the Committee to read in advance. MT interested to know if there were any questions off the back of that legal advice that has been received and it has been viewed by the Committee. The Chair confirmed that there was no need to discuss further on legal advice at this point.
- Another action was the Committee wanted to see the DPIA relevant to advise on the use case and MT wanted to just make the point that the DPIA is a constantly evolving document with various different Forces coming on board and different use cases, etc.
- Another action from the last meeting around the need for an extraordinary meeting for the Committee to look at a dashboard demonstration around binding crime. That demonstration was held on the 30th of April, and MT takeaway from that particular meeting was really positive and grateful for the comments. One main thing that MT took from the meeting was the recognition of the safeguarding element of individuals who may be elevated through the dashboard to an end user, one member was quite vocal around the fact that it would be really important to be able to identify which individuals, particularly young individuals, might be in need of a safeguarding review and having listened to that feedback and taken away those comments enquiries have been made with the Connect team, and there is actually an initial safeguarding assessment of the points of recording, and that can be answered in relation to a victim or offender or witness, and it contains a number of questions around any immediate safeguarding needs, and then any non-urgent support needs which generate partnership referrals.
- There was also a question around historic exploitation, and those fields are all contained within Connect, and it does also have a warning marker for modern day slavery, ready for use, but not yet been operationalised. So, having understood that, MT is going to explore a little bit further as to whether there is data already available that could be extracted into the violent crime use case that would essentially flag or highlight a particular individual, where safeguarding issues have already been identified and recorded by the attending officer to see whether that can be visualised at the dashboard. MT can't specifically say yes or no at the moment but just to give the Committee an update that that feedback has been progressing since 30th April to a point where they can look at some specific fields within Connect to see what that can bring to them in terms of that query that was made around the safeguarding element.
- Final action from the last meeting was around the protocols that would be needed really to ensure that end users were able to use the model, efficiently and effectively, and if the protocols are being developed, it's likely that they'll be developed further. As the use case gathers momentum and it forms and uses the same template that the modern

slavery protocols use, there's an element of consistency across the use cases. MT just wondered if there were any further comments or questions around the protocols around legal advice around DPIA. One member had a comment around the disclaimer document, it states that the dashboard does not create any new information which is not correct. The whole process is creating new information, which was the whole point of it in creating new insights, new evaluations and opinions etc about individuals or crime so this needs to be considered and then there is a need to assess that new information in terms of how it should be handled and evaluated. MT noted and agreed and will pick this point up.

5.1 – NDAS VC Case Studies

Three case studies have been compiled showing how the NDAS violent crime dashboard can give WMP an understanding of violent crime hotspots and what policing/partnership activities could be utilised to make an impact on the problem.

Case Study 1 - A neighbourhood officer has commissioned an intelligence product to identify individuals of primary school age under the "connected to" VC (violent crime) rules who are vulnerable and potentially at risk of causing harm or being harmed and who may benefit from safeguarding/intervention from a police and partnership perspective. The user would make selections for the relevant NPU for example Sandwell. You can then filter this down to choose a more granular area to refine the search. In this case Princes End neighbourhood from the data presented. Selected individuals who are 10 and under using the filters to refine the age group. This age group was filtered as under the age of criminal liability to demonstrate the strategic and multi-agency approaches that are practiced to intervene, safeguard and information share.

Committee comments and questions:
- A member noted that from their own experience in commercial sector is that the business people actually often don't challenge the data science because they don't really know how to and the data scientists don't challenge the business justification because they're focused on the data, and so it is actually quite difficult to handover all of the responsibility to the analyst unless those analysts are already well versed in exactly how that information has been put together.
- A member asked if the intelligence included in this case study, is this all intelligence or have NDAS excluded intelligence that's been graded as non-reliable? MT confirmed that it was all intelligence

Case Study 2 - An intelligence analyst has identified a nominal for Project Guardian using their criteria (individuals under the age of 25 with a history of a knife/sharp object event within the last 2 years). Walsall, St. Matthew's has been selected on the basis that it is an identified hotspot from WMP analysis. To assist with VC prevention, individuals within the 'involved in VC' grouping are of particular interest for this case study in terms of engagement and disruption from a police and partnership perspective.
A more granular view and focusing on the St Matthew's area: (Op Guardian are moved on a monthly basis to areas with rising violence and issues) Individuals who are active within this location are of interest. To assist with VC prevention

individuals with the 'involved in VC' grouping is chosen for this case study in terms of engagement and disruption.

Committee comments and questions:
- A member noted that they liked what NDAS has done in terms of these case studies and taking them to those officers that would be making the decisions around possible interventions. The member noted that there's a number of interventions that are similar to the ones that came up in the previous case study which suggests that there is that consistency of approach in terms of the officer using their professional judgement but also that tailored response to the individual part of the case study as well and thought it was reassuring that it looks like the officers are using the same approach when they're making the decisions around interventions.

Case Study 3 - Using data from WMP, an intelligence officer is tasked to find a hotspot for the VRU to focus on. Coventry is a known WMP hotspot which is then filtered down to a specific area. St Michaels is selected due to the data presented. The aim being to identify a high harm individual within this neighbourhood to assist with risk management and intervention from a police and partnership perspective.

Committee comments and questions:
- A member noted that it's really extremely useful information and, this case study is on somebody already known a great deal about and a lot of information already exists for these individuals. How do you see the benefit of this tool additionally over and above what's already there? MT added that the first thing that springs to mind is the network analysis. So, this will show not only the individual, but who else is that person connected to and what's the strength of that connection, this is something that can be done internally in the Force at the moment but it would take analysts significant amount of time to trawl through intelligence to find where intelligence is linked and then assess how linked the person.

6	**Comfort Break**
7	**Committee Advice & Discussion**

Criminal Network Analyses (WMP)

Recommendation – proceed with minor amendments.

The committee commends the data lab for the papers and recommends that the work proceed to the next stage, at which point the committee requests that the projects return to the committee for further discussion of the results and evaluation.

The committee recommends that particular attention is paid to the need to build in appropriate record keeping functions for the purposes of CPIA, audit and reproducing search conditions at a time in the past.

	The committee thanks the head of the lab for the offer to view the data visualisation tool and requests for this to be arranged, and the committee will be particularly interested in reviewing the dismantling prioritisation schemes created by the dashboard. The committee commends the lab for the draft operating principles for network analyses, and comments that the final version could serve as a template for other projects and to inform practice on a national basis. The committee requests that the amended version, considering the committee's comments during the meeting, is presented for any final comments at the next meeting. The committee recommends that additional attention is paid to the assessment, reliability and handling of outputs of the analysis, retention and record-keeping requirements, processes for removal of erroneous results, and guidance and procedures to ensure the use of the tool as decision-support only. **NDAS VC Case Studies** Recommendation – proceed with minor amendments. The committee commends the NDAS project for the comprehensive presentation and the considerable work that has been conducted to put together the case studies, and recommends that the work proceed to the next stage, at which point the committee requests that the project returns to the committee for further discussion of the results and evaluation. The committee notes the analysis and dashboard will create new data i.e. categorising nominals by harm, and creating linked networks, which is new information and thus needs to be recognised, evaluated and handled as such. The committee recommends that particular attention is paid to the committee's previous recommendation regarding the proactive flagging of connections and combined records that indicate a new/previously unknown safeguarding risk. The committee requests that further technical detail is provided at the next meeting regarding the underlying analyses for the production and visualisation of hotspots, typologies, nominal harm and networks, and in particular the use of intelligence categorised as 'unreliable' and non-crimes (and thus the reliability of the output based on such sources). The committee recommends that consideration is given to an expanded set of operating principles, such as the one currently being developed by the WMP Lab, paying attention to the assessment, reliability and handling of outputs of the analysis, retention and record-keeping requirements, processes for removal of erroneous results and guidance and procedures to ensure the use of the tool as decision-support only.
8	**Meeting Close**