



**Ethics Committee**

**Wednesday 9<sup>th</sup> November 10:00 – 13:00**

**Meeting held virtually via Teams**

**Present:**

Marion Oswald	Chair of Ethics Committee
Jamie Grace	Vice Chair of Ethics Committee
Jack Tracey	Criminal Justice Policy Lead (OPCC)
Jennifer Housego	Ethics Committee
Derek Dempsey	Ethics Committee
Simon Rogerson	Ethics Committee
Sian Thomas	Ethics Committee
Tom Sorrell	Ethics Committee
Kerry Reid	Ethics Committee
Nathan Hodson	Ethics Committee
Matthew Tite	Superintendent NDAS SRO (WMP)
CSUP Ian Green	Head of Force Intelligence (WMP)
Insp. Alex Tarr	Offender Management (WMP)
Davin Parrott	Data Lab (WMP)
Sam Todd	Data Lab (WMP)
James Spooner	Data Scientist (WMP)
Rachel Knight	Secretariat (OPCC)

**Apologies:**

Thomas McNeil	Assistant Police & Crime Commissioner
Malcolm Fowler	Ethics Committee
Claire Paterson-Young	Ethics Committee
Pete Fussey	Ethics Committee

<b>1</b>	<b>10:00</b>	<b><u>Welcome and updates</u></b>  Jack Tracey provided an update on actions to be completed arising from the previous Committee meeting.  Chair proposed drafting a letter on behalf of the Committee to the incoming Chief Constable inviting a discussion on the Committee's work as well as consultation on the Race Action Plan (which he has taken over a Senior Responsible Officer for).	<b>Marion Oswald</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>10:05</b>	<b>RFSDi / IOM model (results from Beta testing)</b>  The presenter demonstrated how the harm score/ RFSDi for offenders is measured. This measure comprises crime history to help predict risk of future harm and is used by Offender Managers to aid risk assessment processes.  The presenter highlighted the main issues from the external evaluation findings:	<b>Data Lab</b>



- The layout of the dashboard and how easy to use it was
- 'over classification' errors/ missing nominals
- Insufficient training
- Further testing required
- Not including suspect status information

The presenter highlighted the main issues from the internal evaluation findings:

- More filtering needed on crime types
- Link required to Connect
- Not including suspect status information

Going forward, the intention is to redesign the dashboard (including greater filtering on crime types), include suspect information in RFSDi score, and make available to all Local Offender Management Units.

Committee comments/ questions:

- Member questioned whether the proposal is to expand the use of suspect data for individuals who have no offender history at the moment (or would the model still focus on known offenders but also include data on cases where they are also suspects)?
  - o The presenter confirmed that it is the intention that moving forward the harm score would comprise both (i.e. no distinction made between suspects with known offending histories and suspects without known offending histories). It was noted that Offender Managers found it useful to manage risk 'up stream' if suspect data is included.
- Member noted that there is not much of a sense in the external report submitted to the Committee of the hard work is has taken to get the IOM model to this point. Noted that the recommendation (4) to remove the RFSDi score for individuals currently under Offender Management orders seems to forgo a large swathe of information with which risk could be managed. Noted also that recommendations 7 and 8 in the report contradicted each other.
  - o Presenter agreed with the points raised (particularly regarding recommendation 4)
- Member noted concerns in the report around the usefulness of the RFSDi score itself (which has subsequent impacts on the quality of the predictions regarding future harm it yields). Stated that the small size of the sample in the report should not discount the concerns raised.
  - o Presenter noted these concerns primarily centred around not including the suspect data and that the score was built like this prior to coming before the Committee.
- Member asked what suspect information would include and is including this information likely to result in more higher scores?
  - o Presenter noted that current score includes intelligence reports and has been from the beginning of the project. With regard to suspect



		<p>information, this will include information on nominals for offences which they are suspected of but there is insufficient evidence to charge at the time (this would increase the number of nominals overall but high scores tend to drop under this approach).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Member noted that the inclusion of suspect data was potentially helpful for proactive policing but the ethical question hinged on what would happen to suspects identified early (if they are directed to some kind of diversionary or educational provision, rather than simply arrested, it could be justified).             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Presented stated that the whole intention of IOM is to reduce recidivism and to give individuals the support they need to do this (so all data is used to try and direct toward the most appropriate disposal).</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Member commended the good work in the reports submitted to the Committee. Noted the difference in take-up and perceptions of utility identified in the reports around the dashboard. Stated concern around the use of suspect data from an ethical perspective and noted how it fundamentally changed the nature of 'offender' management.</li> <li>- Member noted that the approach to the evaluation of this model and how it could be adapted was positive.</li> </ul>	
3	11:05	<p><b>NDAS update (specifically relating to the feedback received from end users and the HO conversations)</b></p> <p>Funding for NDAS concluded on 30<sup>th</sup> September 2022. The project was decommissioned and data was deleted throughout October. On a positive note, all of the coding for the building of NDAS was downloaded and saved within WMP IT&amp;D.</p> <p>At the point of closure, NDAS has operationalised a modern slavery use case in South Yorkshire (March 2021-March 2022) and in the West Midlands (March 2022-September 2022). End users comprised Project Guardian Team, VRP, TOEX, and strategic analysts looking at VAWG problem profiles, neighbourhood teams, and the ROCU. Regardless of the team, benefits were observed across WMP regarding visualisation of offender networks, time savings, and so on.</p> <p>Recommendations have subsequently been made to and agreed by the Digital Data and Technology Co-ordination Committee (NPCC) led by Durham Chief Constable regarding what could be done nationally to provide a service for all Forces to make use of. ACE have been recommissioned to scope what a national data service/ entity looks like moving forward for UK policing. New entity to be called the Centre for Data Analytics in Policing (CDAP) with a strategic co-ordination committee guiding the ambition.</p> <p>Whilst NDAS has stopped, the learning and benefits from the project remain and will be taken forward to the new entity.</p> <p>Committee questions/ comments:</p>	Matthew Tite



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Member ask if there had been any discussion around the need to mirror the kind of independent oversight provided by the West Midlands Ethics Committee? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Presenter stated that there have been conversations around this and factored into the operational development, including funding (but could not say for sure where those conversations have got to).</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Member request if it was possible for the Presenter to return to the Committee to update on the development of the new project. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Agreed to by the Presenter.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<b>4</b>	<b>11:20</b>	<b>Comfort break</b>	
<b>5</b>	<b>11:30</b>	<p><b>Evaluation of drug rehabilitation project (cost/ benefit analysis)</b></p> <p>The presenter outlined the basis/ parameters of the Offender to Rehab programme which focuses on retail offenders who shoplift to fund their addictions in Birmingham and provides them with support (including residential support).</p> <p>The presenter highlighted the main findings of the analysis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Within a year, there was a benefit compared to the cost of the delivery of the programme.</li> <li>- Pilot overview to be produced with overall statistics for the programmes as well as costs saved (including reducing reoffending) to be published on the PCC's website and the National Business Crime website.</li> </ul> <p>Committee comments/ questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Member noted the benefit of the cost/ benefit findings but this analysis is only one element of the study. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Presenter agreed but stated that the cost/ benefit analysis was important for partners investing in the project who wanted to see that their funds were being well spent.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Another member noted issues with cost/benefit analysis taken in isolation when talking about social impacts, with returns on investments going well beyond monetary values. Noted that the exercise seemed very thorough but suggested that caveats around 3 key questions (is it efficient, effective, ethical) should be included in any analysis. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Presenter noted that there is a general desire to see a monetary return of investment (especially from central government) and noted that they had no issues around including suggested caveats in future reports.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Member questioned what the 65 people included in the analysis were being compared against in order to measure cost-savings? Noted that it may not have been appropriate to do a cost-benefit analysis on these individuals given that their engagement with the analysis depended on their stage of recovery to want to participate in the programme (which is entirely observational). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Presenter agreed in an ideal world this would be the case but that this analysis was aimed purely at providing evidence for the continuation of the project for further funding rounds. It was also noted that this kind of evidential thrust was being pushed by the</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<b>Lab</b>



		Home Office who are keen to understanding the material cost of crime (in crude terms) and what programmes are proven to reduce that to justice the use of public money.	
6	12:00	<p><b>Prediction of vehicle theft (in-principle submission).</b></p> <p>The presenter outlined the basis of the project, with theft of motor vehicles becoming a WMP priority due to the scale of the issue. Some initial findings include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Appears there are clusters as to where thefts are occurring.</li> <li>- WMP working to understand relationship to 'chop shop' operations and wider criminality (because it is known that where vehicle crime occurs other crimes, some violent, also are more likely to happen).</li> <li>- This project is intended to predict (broadly) the main locations for all vehicle theft and to aid deployment decisions for vehicle crime taskforce (the aim is to give WMP officers the most amount of 'luck' possible).</li> </ul> <p>Questions/ comments from the Committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Member questions whether this project would be incorporated into an existing system <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Presenter stated that the project would likely end-up as a dashboard to be available to WMP officers to aid decision making.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Member noted that this was a well-constructed report. Went on to ask whether how many cars are recovered against how many are lost and what kinds of cars are most commonly stolen (if they are really expensive cars we should think about where limited police resources are placed)? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Presenter noted that the most commonly stolen vehicles were Ford Fiestas and Ford Transit Vans (so did not believe this was a case of policing the rich). The bigger issue with the data revolves around the consistency of recording the model of the vehicle, so that the analysis will likely focus on all vehicles (rather than specific models) moving forward.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Member questioned what factors were going to use to target areas? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Presenter stated that it will be driven by numbers of all car thefts over a given range of time for which there is a location.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Member questioned what unintended consequences there would be for locations/ communities which could face additional focus? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Presenter noted that it would be the case that a lot of the same kinds of areas would be given focus given the high density of crime in those areas. The key is to sit this work alongside scrutiny panel (especially for Stop &amp; Search) to ensure that intelligence led policing is conducted alongside the communities these operations are conducted within.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Lab
7		<p><b>Committee Discussion and AOB</b></p> <p>The chair extended the thanks of the Committee to the Data Lab and WMP officers for their contributions.</p> <p>IOM Beta testing (Option E – more information required):</p>	Marion Oswald/ All



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Committee uneasy with the extension of the frame of reference to suspects from offenders – there needs to be a distinction between suspects and proven offenders.</li><li>• Commend Lab/ WMP for their effort to get to this stage of the project and their openness to independent evaluation. They have clearly accepted recommendations regarding the risks associated with the predictive element of the work and the need for further training.</li><li>• However, members asked the Lab to return to the Committee with more detailed proposals on how the proposals relating to the incorporation of general suspect data which does not distinguish between suspect information with regard to a suspect who is an offender within IOM and a suspect who is not within that programme. There needs greater clarity on what is meant by ‘suspect’.</li></ul> <p>Drug Rehabilitation (Offender to Rehab) Cost-Benefit analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Hard to offer meaningful advice given that the project/ work has been completed.</li><li>• Committee commented that any final publication should consider whether future cost-benefit analyses are informative/ valuable if no caveats are offered around wider societal concerns. The Committee understood why some people/ organisations would want cost-benefit analyses, but the study undertaken in this instance was fundamentally unsound due to the lack of any control group (all that was measured was whether those who engaged in a support programme were more likely to desist from crime, but without a comparator cohort it was impossible to see if this is actually the case).</li><li>• Committee thought that cost-benefit analysis was of limited use – study was methodologically unsound because of the lack of a reliable control group and it was recommended in future that when such papers are submitted to the committee that they should be done so alongside a wider societal analysis.</li></ul> <p>Vehicle theft (proceed with minor amendments)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Useful explanation in the discussion of how vehicle theft is linked to wider issues around criminal exploitation</li><li>• Committee pointed out that the structure of the report was of a good quality, but noted the need to think about potential for over-policing and ensuring that wider context of linking this type of crime to exploitation offences is included in the report.</li></ul>	
<b>8</b>	<b>13:00</b>	<b>AOB and Meeting Close</b>	<b>CLOSE</b>