



# west midlands police and crime commissioner

## Ethics Committee

Wednesday 2<sup>nd</sup> March 10:00 – 14:00 hrs

Meeting held virtually via Zoom

### Present:

Marion Oswald (MO)	Chair of Ethics Committee
Thomas McNeil (TM)	Assistant Police & Crime Commissioner
Anindya Banerjee (AB)	Ethics Committee
Claire Paterson-Young (CPY)	Ethics Committee
Malcolm Fowler (MF)	Ethics Committee
Peter Fussey (PF)	Ethics Committee
Jennifer House-Go (JH)	Ethics Committee
Derek Dempsey (DD)	Ethics Committee
Tom Sorell (TS)	Ethics Committee
Emily Gilbert (EG)	Secretariat (OPCC)
Davin Parrott (DP)	Data Analytics Lab (WMP)
Matthew Tite (MT)	Superintendent NDAS SRO (WMP)
Sam Todd (ST)	Value & Business Architect (WMP)
Steve Clarke (SC)	Data Scientist (WMP)
James Spooner (JS)	Data Scientist (WMP)
Karl Shutes (KS)	Data Scientist (WMP adviser)
Evani Radiya-Dixit (ERD)	The University of Cambridge

### Apologies:

Jonathan Jardine (JJ)	Chief Executive (OPCC)
Jamie Grace (JG)	Vice Chair of Ethics Committee
Chris Todd (CT)	Assistant Chief Constable (WMP)

<b>1</b>	<b>10:00</b>	<b>Welcome and updates</b>  A short introduction was made by the Chair acknowledging the third anniversary of the formation of the Ethics Committee and thanking members for their continued support.  Committee member Janine Green has stepped down from her role due to work pressures. The Chair wished Janine the best for the future and requested that a formal letter of thanks be sent to her from the Committee.	<b>Marion Oswald</b>
----------	--------------	--	----------------------



		<p>The Chair noted a successful recruitment round for new committee members. Places have been provisionally offered to four additional committee members (with expertise in medical ethics, computer ethics, human rights, social work, and vulnerable women).</p> <p>Chair noted that, in light of the Committee's third anniversary, a separate interim meeting should be organised to take stock of projects reviewed by the Committee to see how recommendations have been implemented.</p> <p>Chair gave a short introduction to agenda item 8 and suggested that guest presentations should be incorporated more regularly into future Committee meetings. Committee members were encouraged to approach MO or TM regarding guest presentations.</p> <p>Finally, the Chair announced that the House of Lords Justice and Home affairs report commenting on the Ethics Committee will be issued in due course.</p>	
2	10:10	<p><b><u>Lab Projects and committee questions</u></b></p> <p><b>Long-Term Knife Crime</b></p> <p>The presenter highlighted previous recommendations from the Committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The need for further work to clarify the extent of the deployment of these tools;</li> <li>- The importance of clarity over interventions relating to: i) how strongly will the analyses be relied upon, and ii) what interventions will follow (because over reliance on data or overly coercive interventions, e.g. increased Stop &amp; Search activity, could potentially give rise to ethical issues).</li> </ul> <p>The presenter explained that the overall aim of the project is to provide an evidence base to aid strategic decisions about the prioritisation of investment from the Home Office and the OPCC in order to reduce knife crime in the West Midlands.</p> <p>The presenter states that knife crime (used causing injury) fell between c.2000-c.2012, but numbers have subsequently risen since 2015 (nationally and locally).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- DP notes that, following previous advice from the Committee, wider socio-economic factors/ processes were examined to unpack long-term knife crime trends. There is some weak evidence pointing to a relationship between socio-economic variables (notably unemployment and inflation) and knife crime.</li> <li>- Given the weakness of the evidence produced from this approach (and given that socio-economic variables, if used, would need to be</li> </ul>	Davin Parrott



forecasted also) the presenter stated that the simplest approach (based on a Bayesian state-space model) is the best guide to future levels of knife crime over a long period.

Committee questions and responses:

- A member questioned whether rises in knife crime in the West Midlands were related to region's particular age demographic.
  - The presenter responded by saying there are generalities around this issue with some of that information coming from Project Guardian (this is not information that has been verified by this project).
- A member expressed concern regarding the width of the prediction intervals within the analysis and the value of any predictions/ policy recommendations which emerge as a consequence. He asked whether there were any wider studies looking at long-term knife crime trends which could be used as a benchmark to compare approaches/ models.
  - The presenter responded by saying that he was not aware of any studies that could be used to compares approaches/ models. He accepted the point regarding the size of the prediction intervals and that there were other modelling approaches that could be used but the efficacy of these models was broadly unknown (but is happy to explore these alternatives nonetheless).
- A member questioned the scope of the project (noting the difficulties associated with predicting 5-year trends as opposed to 1-year trends) and asked for DP's view on this.
  - The presenter accepted this basis of the point raised by DD and explained that when reporting on the project no great value should be attached to predictions over 1 year.
- A member questioned whether there was any data that goes further back than 2000 against which present and future trends could be measured and/ or predicted.
  - The presenter stated that there is no data looking further back than 2000 so there was no way to say if present trends are in accordance with previous long-term trends.
- A member noted that hospitalisation trends and knife incident trends did not match [fig. 4 of the report] and asked whether the presenter had any thoughts on this.
  - The presenter stated there are no Data Sharing Agreements in place with health organisations which would allow for an in-depth analysis of this.



- A member shared details for NHS monthly data for admissions for sharp objects (including Force Areas where incidents occur) which may assist the project.
- A member asked whether/ how the data presented overlapped with the Covid-19 period (referring to periods of reduced reporting) and stressed the need to pay close attention to the pre-Covid and post-Covid periods.
  - The presenter stated that data runs to late 2021/ early 2022 (so completely overlaps the Covid period). He agreed regarding the need to look at pre-Covid and post-Covid variables (but this is only useful in order to provide retrospective context and does not assist with predictive modelling).
- A member questioned how the model is going to be used and whether it was something we could have confidence in.
  - The presenter stated that model would only be used for a strategic assessment of potential resources for Project Guardian.

#### **School 'Catchment' – For violence prevention**

The presenter highlighted previous recommendations from the Committee:

- The Committee recognised the positive intentions of identifying schools and areas where supportive/ public health interventions might be deployed;
- However, the Committee also suggested that the proposal raises some very significant issues about the handling of this type of data around the categorisation of schools and the profiling of children;
- The Committee also raised concerns around the language in the paper (describing children as violent offenders) and advised that alternative language should be used.

The presenter explained that the overall aim of the project is to inform the geographical focus of the VRU's prevention activity in schools by identifying schools of interest not presently receiving prevention activity.

- The project was originally intended to develop origin-destination matrix leading to a prioritisation scheme, but no publicly available data regarding travel to school patterns could be found and there is a low number of WMP records with school attendance data for relevant nominals.
- Based on further analysis using a decibel of evidence measure (used to assess the potential cost and benefits of the project) it was



concluded that there was not enough evidence to inform VRU prioritisation with a good degree of confidence/ accuracy. DP thus proposed that the project be discontinued.

Committee questions and responses:

- A member noted that there most likely is relevant data available (not held by WMP) and questioned whether this was explored.
  - The presenter confirmed that publicly available data was sought by both WMP and the VRU and nothing additional was found. Also noted that there was a general reticence toward data sharing in the West Midlands.
    - A member noted that lack of data sharing raised wider concerns regarding the use of data and question whether there were better ways to think about data sharing that would help violence prevention activity.
- A member sought clarification on the amount of additional data that would be required in order to reach the necessary decibel of evidence level.
  - The presenter stated that there would need to be significantly more data along with access to records which are not currently available.
- A member raised the general issue of availability of data (not specific to this case) and expressed that there is always a challenge in encouraging data sharing across the public sector due to a lack of clarity regarding proposed outcomes.
  - A member noted that problems around data sharing varied from project to project, but institutional failings (e.g. inertia or lack of capacity) play a big part.

**Impact Areas (IAs) – Activities and Effects**

The presenter highlighted previous recommendations from the Committee:

- This is potentially an extremely beneficial project;
- This proposal seems to be for only a retrospective, exploratory data analysis used in order for a current set of 'impact areas' to be justified;
- It would have been useful to have been sent the legal advice and DPIA;
- The aim of this project is helpful, given the level of discussion and debate around the importance of police presence;



- A key issue to work through, however, is being sure to carefully analyse the activities that are being attributed to police presence and the impact of this presence;
- There also needs to be a proper analysis of co-variables that could be impacting trends;
- Further suitable comparisons between activities might be required to ensure that the model does not purport advantages of a more intrusive method when a less intrusive method might have had the same effect.

The presenter explained that the overall aim of the project is to consider the impact that the presence of WMP officers has on the occurrence of crime. 2 approaches were taken to assess the effect of Police presence:

- A 'macro' model comparing IAs to non-IAs (but similar over a number of dimensions).
- A 'micro' model using different sizes of spatial and temporal grid squares in a specific IAs to compare occurrence of incidents to police presence over space and time.

The main findings from this analysis were:

- There is a small difference in the impact and comparison areas;
- The IAs appear to have a small number of incidents greater than the comparison areas;
- Policing time has a very small effect on the number of incidents in the IAs;
- The relationship between time/ number of visits and incidents/ crimes in the areas is non-linear, suggesting diminishing returns to policing activity;
- The relationship with crimes is less strong than that of incidents and there is minimal difference between impact areas and comparison areas;
- Examining a micro level impact of officer presence within an example IA (Hillfields in Coventry), officers have an impact for approximately 45 minutes though there are times where this is reduced to less than half that;
- The influence of officers tends to be on incidents rather than crimes, which might be more premeditated than incidents.

Committee questions and responses:

- A member noted that he considered the interpretation of presence as a little obscure and this may render the understanding of impact as too narrow.



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The presenter explained that presence was determined by the physical presence of a radio on an officer in that location or within a grid square over a prolonged period of time (i.e. presence that was pre-planned by WMP and not simply fleeting).</li> <li>- A member asked for an explanation as to why IAs have more stop and searches with more resulting in no further action.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The presenter assumed that this may be due to the fact that IAs, being of greater interest to WMP, will inevitably result in a greater deal of interaction with the public.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- A member offered a note of caution regarding the effect 'mere presence' has on deterring crime and suggested that the long-term relationships officers who are in regular contact with specific communities/ areas hold the key to preventing crime (which is why community policing is so important to 'problem solving policing'.)</li> <li>- The presenter agreed with the points raised by TM and offered reassurance that the figures presented regarding presence and incidents/ crimes were baselines which need to be considered alongside qualitative assessments of the impact of the development of long-term relationships between WMP officers and the communities they serve.</li> </ul>	
<b>3</b>	<b>11:15</b>	<b>Coffee Break (10mins)</b>	
<b>4</b>	<b>11:25</b>	<p><b><u>Lab Projects and committee questions (continued)</u></b></p> <p><b>Analysis of Drone Unit – in-principle submission</b></p> <p>The presenter states that there has been an approach from the Drone Unit to undertake an analysis of the cost effectiveness of the Drone Unit (taking account of the costs incurred by WMP's helicopter service).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Drone Unit would like any information obtained to be presented in the form of a dashboard which can be regularly updated and used for reporting purposes.</li> </ul> <p>Committee questions and responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A member questioned how possible it was to estimate benefits, costs, and risk associated with the operation of drones.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The presenter stated that until the data was explored it is impossible to say (with benefits calculated by an analysis of the pecuniary costs of use viz. the costs of crimes detected/ prevented).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<b>Davin Parrott</b>



- A member asked what kind of assessment of benefits would there be viz. the quality of activity replaced by the use of drones and what (if any) engagement had there been with local communities regarding the use of drones.
  - The presenter responded that, in terms of understanding the quality of activity undertaken without drones, further engagement with various departments would need to be undertaken. In terms of community engagement, the presenter suggested that use should be made of WMP's Twitter to measure responses as well as boosting engagement with schools regarding their use and the benefits.
- A member asked for elaboration around the risks to privacy (specifically what would and would not constitute surveillance in the eyes of highly trained drone pilots) and further highlighted the nervousness felt by communities regarding drones which more engagement was needed to understand (suggested through a diversion focus group).
  - The presenter responded by clarifying that considerations regarding privacy and the definition of surveillance would absolutely comprise part of the final project report. It was further stated that information is always available via the Drone Unit website for communities which are nervous about the use of drones (DP also welcomed the suggestion of engagement through a focus group).
- A member raised the issue of drones being used to combat anti-social behaviour (particularly low level anti-social behaviour) and whether there was a definition of what this constitutes which could mitigate the possibility of disproportionate policing responses.
  - The presenter could not say if there was such a definition of anti-social behaviour, but stated that drone use in such cases would be where there is a call for service (with the call handler identifying the incident as anti-social behaviour) and drone use is deemed more appropriate/ effective because they can arrive quicker to observe more of the incident.
- A member raised the prospect of drones being used to detect/ combat anti-social and dangerous driving (which is a big problem in the West Midlands) and asked about the cost-effectiveness of this.
  - The presenter stated that drone use is limited in legislation by line of sight and, consequently, are not able to proceed or follow vehicles considered dangerous driving.



- A member noted the issue of gaining legitimacy through thorough engagement and confusing this with mere communication (sections of communities will always object to/ be suspicious of the use of drones and more is needed than a 'decent' communications strategy). The member noted also the emphasis given to the cost-benefit analysis regarding the use of drones and the potential that, given that use of drones are always more cost effective than using police helicopter for instance, this invites the conclusion that the use of drones is desirable. With that in mind, the member asked what the internal processes are regarding the use of drones (especially when used for an extended period of time or when there is a greater possibility of collateral intrusion).
  - The presenter stated that more time would be needed to consider those questions as the project progressed but the points made would certainly be taken on board.
- A member raised the specific question regarding the possibility of counter activity (details on p.2 of the project document).
  - The presenter stated that this point was taken from the Drones Unit strategy and that there was limited information on it. Further information will be reported back to the Committee.

#### **Assessment of Makeup of FCID Prisoner Handling Team**

The presenter highlighted previous recommendations of the committee:

- This proposal in principle raises few ethical issues, if any.;
- This is a proposal for internal process monitoring or evaluation;
- The impact on legal rights, is effectively nil;
- If the impact of this project is that relatively inexperienced officers are not dealing (as much) with assembling case files that are too complex for them, the overall public benefit would be desirable;
- It would have been useful to have been sent the legal advice and DPIA;
- It will be interesting to see to what extent this legal advice/DPIA considers any possibility of anonymisation/pseudonymisation of data being drawn down for this project in future;
- Resource allocated should continue to receive the same level of expertise and training in terms of health and safety.

The presenter explained that the overall aim is to recommend the best size of a Prisoner Handling Teams to be based within Custody blocks.

- These teams would look at violent and acquisitive volume crime, process people in custody, and undertake secondary investigations;



- No previous data on the work load or makeup of a prisoner handling teams as they did not previously exist;
- Levels of demand show seasonal (and non-seasonal) variation around a relatively constant level, with a tendency to be higher on early shifts;
- The conclusions showed that BE based at the Perry Barr Custody block would need between 16 and 20 officers and BW would need between 10 and 12 officers (but there would need to be flexibility around this according to need).

Committee questions and responses:

- A member asked how the results of the analysis would be used/ considered.
  - The presenter confirmed that the results will be provided to Force CID who will use them to put the prisoner handling teams together. Force CID have said that that they would like to review in 3 months with a second assessment potentially to follow.

**Update on roll-out and evaluation of IOM model**

The presenter confirmed that conversations were ongoing with and training had been provided to 2 Local Offender Management Unites (LOMUs), Dudley and Birmingham West.

- Looking to take this project to 6 months for those 2 LOMUs following which we qualitative data will be available;
- The project will keep abreast of how accurate the predictions from the models are and then take the beta testing through to June (to be reviewed thereafter).

Committee questions and responses:

- A member asked who was doing the qualitative research and that officers leading the training in LOMUs had been trained themselves.
  - The presenter confirmed that they have provided training in the use of the dashboard and the interpretation of it. The individual taking the qualitative data is a Ph.D. candidate.
- A member asked if there any other qualitative risk assessment ongoing or if an independent assessment as well your own assessment was being undertaken.
  - The presenter confirmed that WMP will undertake their own assessment regarding accuracy/ usage etc. The qualitative



		<p>element of the assessment will be undertaken by the Ph.D. candidate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A member questioned if there is an agreement between/ within WMP and the Committee about what juncture we need to feel confident that the ethics advice has been embedded. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The presenter stated that the project would need 6 months to build a detailed picture as to how people have used the advice and whether it's changed any sort of decisions that people may have made otherwise. Once the six-month period is over a review will be presented to the Committee (this was accepted by the Committee).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
5	12:25	<p><b>Comments from WMP regarding Additional Papers in-principle from Ethics Committee Meeting 03.11.21</b></p> <p>Two papers have been presented on today. WMP has no further comments on the final paper.</p>	Davin Parrott
6	12:30	<p><b>NDAS update and discussion</b></p> <p>The presenter outlines the project and the current position:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NDAS is Home Office funded on a 12-monthly basis. The current funding is due to end on 31 March 2022;</li> <li>- The current NDAS project model is expensive and time consuming (with NDAS needing to go to each individual Force to secure data) – It was originally intended that NDAS would draw on a national dataset, however this has not been possible;</li> <li>- In September 2021, NDAS began conversations with other projects in the data analytic space (including TOEX and the Police Digital Service) – It was the aim to collaborate with these projects to deliver NDAS in a more efficient and effective way;</li> <li>- It has now become apparent that the Home Office do not wish to commit any additional money to data analytics work until they're absolutely certain what each project is delivering, to prevent overlap;</li> <li>- Chief Constable Jo Farrell (Durham Constabulary(Durham Constabulary and Chair of IMORCC) leads has asked for an extraordinary working group to meet every Monday from the 31 January to the end of March to discuss this – the working group is chaired by Iain Harrison from the Met and brings together key</li> </ul>	Matthew Tite



practitioners from across national programmes to think about what this area of business looks like moving forward;

- Monday March 7<sup>th</sup> there will be a presentation by ACE to the working group, mapping out the broad strategic proposals for activity post April 2022 – MT is unaware of the implication for NDAS, and has only been in conversations around NDAS;
- MT noted concerns regarding the work NDAS has delivered over the last 5 years – if NDAS stopped at end of March, there would be no way to fund projects/ platforms (West Yorkshire and West Midlands) where data is stored;
- MT is in communication with Home Office officials and is working to secure an additional 3 to 6 months funding to ensure that NDAS can be transitioned effectively.

Committee questions and responses:

- A member raised concerns over the loss of data and losing the platforms. Are the platforms held by Accenture?
  - The presenter explained that the platform is currently used Amazon Web Services and if funding is cut the Amazon Web Services will stop providing the service (it is not about ownership through WMP or Accenture). There is also an additional issue that the strategic collaboration has not decided what platform they will use nationally. MT also explained that the Home Office are also concerned by this and have committed to continue funding the platform until a transition has been decided.
- A member asked what is TOEX
  - The presenter stated that explained that TOEX stands for Tackling Organised Exploitation and is a project focused on organised exploitation and are recruiting staff into ROCUs to tactically manage the outcomes of their analysis.
- A member expressed concern over the project timescales and the end of funding.
  - The presenter agreed with this concern but expressed appreciation for the Home Office's understanding regarding the need for an extension of funds to transition.
- A member asked how much has NDAS been able to demonstrate benefit from the project at its current stage.

The presenter noted the modern slavery tool as an example of the benefit of NDAS. The presenter proceeded to share three executive summary points from a recent draft evaluation in response to the NDAS Modern Slavery Tool: i)



		<p>the ethical considerations around the Modern Slavery Use Case have been really well thought through; ii) the report reflects favourably on the involvement of SMEs and the collaboration that has been utilised to ensure the model achieves its aims; and iii) WYP report a need to improve the connection between software functionality and operational utility.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- A member noted that within the evaluation it would be really key to know if networking analysis regarding modern slavery was aided or not and what is the basis of some of the scepticism noted.<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- The presenter explained that West Yorkshire Police officer noted that when the tool is deployed operationally there may be a need to attend court and give a response to court proceedings regarding how certain individuals were identified and what led to certain policing activity taking place which led to arrests and recovery of evidence. Practitioners in West Yorkshire Police noted that they are confident in the tools that they have experience of using but they do not necessarily feel that they can talk about the detail of the NDAS tool with the same confidence. This has shown that a focus should be made on continued education and upskilling of people who are using the tool to instil confidence.</li></ul></li><li>- A member asked if there is scope for court case gaming workshops to work through presenting the evidential process that its legitimacy is clearly articulated.<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- The presenter expressed that this is absolutely a consideration but this is not an immediate consideration. The presenter outlined the option he presented to the Home Office regarding funding: i) funding the project enough to keep the project running until it can be transitioned to a new platform; and ii) Funding the project for the next 3 to 6 months, whilst continuing to educate upskill and drive the use of the tool. It was felt that the Home Officer prefers the first option.</li></ul></li><li>- A member asked if there is enough in-house expertise in WMP for this project to run without Accenture to reduce costs.<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- The presenter confirmed that he believes that it could be done with WMP via the data lab, with the assistance of a few additional staff, to maintain the current level of service (but this would be a long-term solution which may not be workable in the context of funding potentially ceasing).</li></ul></li></ul>	
--	--	---	--



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A member raised concerns over the closure of the project and the ethical issues arising from losing valuable learning for policing/ Home Office gleaned thus far from the project. Noted this concern was widely shared and suggested that the Committee put together a summary of these concerns.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The presenter welcomed the offer but requested that time was allow to brief the WMP Executive Team (ACC Meir) before a summary of concerns was shared. This was agreed to by MO.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- The presenter noted that this may be their last attendance to the Committee and expressed his gratitude for the Committee’s insights/ advice regarding this project.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Committee thanked the presenter for their hugely thoughtful and detailed approach to the project and at the Committee meetings.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
7	13:00	<p><b><u>Committee to draft advice</u></b></p> <p><b>NDAS – The Committee does not offer an outcome due to the lack of clarity over the future of the project (outcome: N/A)</b></p> <p>The committee expressed concern to hear of the imminent cessation of NDAS funding, with no clear or certain commitment to the sustainable funding and resourcing necessary for transition or continuation of the ongoing operational evaluations. The independent evaluation commissioned by NDAS has highlighted a number of risks and suggested mitigations which will take time to assess and address. The committee highlighted the risk of the following adverse consequences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Writing-off of investment to date based on initial assessment and cost-benefit analysis is premature because potential operational ‘value’ and ‘benefit’ will take years to understand and evaluate properly. Development of operational practices is required to make optimum use of the new data and dashboard and also provide feedback to drive system enhancements.</li> <li>- Loss of access to the operational tools (as they reside on paid-for IT platforms) as potential in-house hosting and maintenance options have not yet been fully explored or identified.</li> <li>- Loss of accrued team knowledge; the team may be redeployed and so even if funding is reinstated the existing team would be very unlikely to be available.</li> <li>- Loss of further ethical knowledge and process advancement, because NDAS knowledge is already mature and so further work is likely to add to corpus of UK excellence in this sphere. This includes the key issue</li> </ul>	Committee



of practitioner understanding of methods of identification of networks by the organised exploitation tool in order to build confidence that such new methods could be defended and explained if challenged in court.

- Momentum and trust built with stakeholders may fade rapidly.
- Data projects commissioned by alternatively funded routes would not benefit from the conscientious and collaborative ethical oversight, and the collective learning in relation to law, ethics, data analytics and policing, built around NDAS over three years.
- Risk of deteriorating perception in some stakeholder groups that developing sustainable and ethical data projects is merely a fashion and not a serious commitment.

An ethical risk to the evidential continuity for investigations that have started to use the tools and based decisions on them.

**Update on roll-out and evaluation of IOM Model – the Committee requests for the project to be returned to the Committee in 6 months with more information (outcome: E)**

The Committee would like to see this project return in 6 months from the start of the evaluation date. The Committee would like to see the evaluation/piloting process using an assessment process that is wider than the use of PHD candidate (this includes the use of assessment evaluation criteria previously advised by the Committee).

- A member wanted to note the importance of ongoing monitoring for this project to ensure the credibility of the Committee's advice is safeguarded.

**Assessment of Makeup of FCID Prisoner Handling Team – the Committee advises approving the project with minor amendments (outcome: B).**

The Committee noted that this project appears to be a good use of demand data. The Committee notes that it is intended that the data will be provided to Force CID for review and potentially implementation of recommendations. Following this the project would be reviewed by the Ethics Committee.

**Analysis of Drone Unit (in principle submission) – the Committee requests more information from the Lab in order to provide approval or rejection (outcome: E)**



The Committee asks for more information to clarify current plans regarding the activity of Drone Unit. In addition, the Committee would like clarity on the potential societal and ethical risks going to be considered in the cost benefit analysis.

The Committee offers the expertise of relevant members of the Ethics Committee in order to ensure that there is an opportunity for the widest possible analysis of the project which will help to define the project and clarify the ultimate aim.

A member stressed that that whilst WMP could not explain all of their intentions regarding the use of drones going far into the future, the Committee can ask for an idea of what the intended aim for the use of drones is now. TM acknowledged that the use of drones may change over time, but the Committee's ethical approval would be reliant upon what is submitted now.

A member noted that there is support for a wider, expanded assessment of the project but expressed some discomfort with the discussion on consultation and lack of clarity on intend use.

Multiple members stressed that the discussion regarding DP's presentation should be focussed on the proposed means of analysis used to assess the benefits of the current use of drones (which is relatively well defined) rather than a wider ethical consideration of the use of drones.

- A member noted that his concerns regarding the wider use of drones go to the heart of his concerns regard the specific project presented by DP. TM questioned how an effective a cost benefit analysis could be done if there are no clear aims for the use of drones.

Chair suggested that the in-principle submission paper allows for concerns to be raised prior to the methodology is solidified. Noted that the purpose of the paper is to build a financial case for the Drone Unit to become a standalone unit and that should not preclude raising wider questions regarding usage etc.

**Impact Areas Activities and Effects – the Committee requests more information from the lab in order to provide approval or rejection (outcome: E)**

The Committee saw this as a useful analysis, but advised that not too much should be based on this assessment because it is in its early days of analysis. This analysis should be only the start of a longer-term assessment and it should make sure that it considers that that wider context of community policing (as acknowledged by the presenters).



		<p><b>School 'Catchment' For prevention of Violence</b></p> <p>The Committee acknowledges that the project is due to come to an end but noted that the project clearly highlights wider issues around data sharing (or lack thereof) for potentially beneficial uses.</p> <p>A member noted that the Data Lab should be utilising data sets to create a more joined-up data pictures (given how commonplace it is for police to work with schools and social workers etc).</p> <p><b>Long-Term, Knife Crime</b></p> <p>The Committee noted a number of concerns regarding the methodology behind the project. It was concluded that the 5-year models are not feasible/useful (as acknowledged by the presenters). The Committee advises that the issue of whether these types of predictive intervals should be used at all should be considered more widely. In addition, the Committee advises that issues regarding the impact of COVID should also be considered in the one-year predictions as well.</p>	
8	13:30	<p><b>Guest presentation from Evani Radiya-Dixit, Visiting Fellow, Minderoo Centre, Cambridge University</b></p> <p>The presenter introduced themselves as a researcher at the University of Cambridge who is currently working on assessing police use of facial recognition. It was noted that WMP is not currently using facial recognition technology, but the work explored in the presentation can help inform the committee on the area which may prove useful and offer considerations for all other areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- The presenter explained that for their research they have been developing a socio-technical audit (combining technology focussed questions about training accuracy and bias with societal questions about decision making and legal compliance) that assesses the extent to which the police use of facial recognition is lawful, ethical, and accountable.</li><li>- The audit can be conducted externally (by ethics committees) or internally (by police forces). Ideally the audit would be completed prior to deployment and then revisited. For this reason, the audit has separate questions for the pre-deployment and deployment phases.</li></ul>	<p><b>Evani Radiya-Dixit</b></p>



- The presenter suggested that the socio-technical audit can help police organisations by proactively assessing how and if/ how the technology should be used. It can also help to ensure legal compliance and therefore thus build public trust/ prevent reputational damage.
  - As part of the research, the presenter spoke with the information management lead from WMP. From these conversations, ERD learned about the challenges regarding poor data quality for suspects (such as suspect name or crime location).
    - The presenter has also spoken with members of the Committee, other Police organisations, and the College of Policing. From these conversations, the presenter gained an understanding of the need for consistent ethics criteria to evaluate specific technologies like facial recognition (and AI research helps address this).
  - The presenter described the 5 key established sections of their audit:
    - Section 1: assesses how reliable facial recognition is and how rigorous and transparent police evaluations of reliability are. This includes questions about algorithmic bias and model transparency.
    - Section 2: assesses how facial recognition is changing police decisions. For example, to arrest or stop and search. This section also assesses how accountable police are with these changes.
    - Section 3: examines how much expertise and oversight exists. For example, who has the power to terminate the project and what decision making influences the local community has.
    - Section 4: assesses how police are demonstrating that they are legally compliant. This included asking questions about necessity, proportionality, and human rights.
    - Section 5: examines how police are addressing harm and unintended consequences.
- Committee questions and responses:
- A member asked a question about an issue around the safety, accuracy, and fairness of facial recognition concerning subjects of black ethnicity.



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- The presenter explained that this area is being considered in the audit and will be addressed in the section focusing on system reliability. The presenter also expressed a desire to ensure that the algorithm of facial recognition is audited consistently and areas of improvement are identified (e.g. whether there are patterns of less accurate performance on lower quality imager with different demographics).</li><li>- A member asked what are the data sets that are being used for this assessment or any kind of facial recognition.<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- The presenter explained that there are training data sets used to train the facial recognition model (this would fall under the system reliability section of the audit). The presenter added that there are often code images that are matched against a database and there are questions that arise regarding who is on that database and how that database is being constructed (this would fall under legal compliance section of the audit).</li></ul></li><li>- The Committee explored the example of handheld mobile of facial recognition tools being explored by South Wales Police and how ERD's audit would likely be useful for that. The Committee also put forward the idea that the audit could be useful for other contexts such as the use of drones.</li></ul>	
<b>10</b>	<b>14:00</b>	<b>AOB and Meeting Close</b>	<b>CLOSE</b>