

INTiLE Interview with Interviewee 12

Q2

Interviewer

OK, so let's go into the first question, which is a bit of a sort of an icebreaker, really. So it's about your previous experience. So would you tell me about your experience of introducing new technologies into UK law enforcement?

Interviewee 12

Yep. So I think the areas that I've been most directly involved with and certainly more recently would be, so [REDACTED – 2] and introducing that into a previous place I worked and and building a capability to sustain that was was one area.

Prior to that and at times parallel to that, and then a more simple way in many ways was.

The introduction of [REDACTED – 2] when that was first introduced as one of the kind of the early adopters of that where I was working at the time.

Those kind of the the two sort of real tangible recent examples that come to mind, there's, there's always new systems and stuff. But in terms of a technology which is perhaps not familiar with policing, those would be a couple of examples, albeit [REDACTED – 2] everywhere now, but at the time it wasn't.

Interviewer – FQ2

Yeah. OK. Thank you. And was there anything that came from that experience which you would use for any future similar requirement?

Interviewee 12

I think, both of those actually were predicated by a a business case which supported the introduction. So there was there was a tangible business case which described the benefits that would be realised from their introduction.

So that was helpful.

And in terms of the implementation and the use of subject matter experts [SMEs] is something which I learnt is, is incredibly helpful and arguably more helpful than consultants.

Q3

Interviewer

Thank you. Next area is around governance. So what governance considerations do you feel are necessary to introduce new technologies into UK law enforcement?

Interviewer 12

I'm just. I'm just thinking back about the previous answer actually, but actually just focusing on this one. I'm just I'm conscious of the UK law enforcement element to that as opposed to organisational. So you will naturally need organisational governance when you introduce these technologies and it's important to have the right people with the right skills.

And the right structures into which that feeds to keep everything on track appropriately.

But in terms of UK law enforcement, it's kind of that's a slightly different question. And perhaps it cuts back across the local implementation, so there's a risk that locally people can run away with implementation of new technologies which might not be the best thing for UK law enforcement. So that's where the governance for UK law enforcement, I think is really important to give clarity to what should and shouldn't be happening and and if it's happening in what way that should be delivered and what what frameworks within which they should people should be operating.

Q4

Interviewer

OK. Thank you.

Next area is then onto the requirements to introduce new technologies. So thinking about the main requirements, what do you think are the the key building blocks to successfully introduce such new technologies?

Interviewee 12

Umm.

So.

Bringing benefit.

And that might be that might be financial, it might be operational, might be.

Efficiencies that that come across both of those areas or or other areas.

The.

What was the question again, sorry, what are the?

Interviewer

What are the main building blocks to successfully introduce such new technologies?

Interviewee 12

The building blocks.

So yeah, building blocks. So yeah. So so having a benefits case which which demonstrates why you're doing what you're doing.

It being sustainable.

So again, you know, there's a risk that people chase shiny things.

And actually, they're not what is required in the long term.

So then they just, you know, they're kind of like fashions. They can come and go.

So it needs to be something which is sustainable.

From from the perspective of the organisational or services needs, but they also, it also needs to be sustainable insofar as it needs to be supported.

Whether that's infrastructure, ongoing maintenance contracts etcetera, again, you can't just procure something because you think you need it and then expect it to sustain itself.

The, it needs to be accepted by the workforce.

So you've got to you've got to have.

The workforce needs to understand why it's it's going to use this technology and in order that it will use the technology and it doesn't just sit there idly on the shelf, so to speak.

And with that, we'll potentially come training requirements.

Certainly kind of.

Good communications in order to sell whatever it is, or maybe not sell it. Maybe you should sell itself. But but at least make people aware of of its.

Its availability and its benefits.

Probably a lot more, but those are the immediate things I think.

Interviewer – FQ4

OK. Thank you. And is there anything which may prevent the successful implementation of new technologies for law enforcement?

Interviewee 12

Kind of reversible of those.

Failure. Failure to do any of them, but in particular you know if if it's not something that's needed by the workforce, or if it's not something that's wanted by the workforce, then it's not going to get adopted effectively by the workforce.

And.

If if it's a kind of a whim which hasn't been well thought out and doesn't fit into those wider governance arrangements.

Then there could be blockers in that.

The kind of the sponsor hasn't thought of.

They they could be policy issues, they could be legal practises, they could be ethical practises which haven't been thought through.

Q5

Interviewer

OK, thank you. Next question is around the lessons learnt. So thinking about either your own experiences or your knowledge of introducing new technologies, can you describe what lessons you feel can be learnt from these to help the introduction of future new technology?

Interviewee 12

So.

I think in a kind of a practical sense of implementation and I kind of referenced it before the kind of the importance of SMEs. So I think when when you introduce a new technology into policing, you really do need the the service to be buying into this and to understand how you're going to implement this and and I say it kind of like you know, in a cynical way that SMEs can be more more important than consultants, but the there is a reality in that and consultants can be very helpful because just their their professional practise and and and experience means that they they know how to get things done at pace and and and all that kind of stuff which is gonna be really helpful when you're trying to work with public services in particular to to affect change. But what they don't understand is your business necessarily and and you you have subject matter experts in in your business and.

My experience from both of those examples I I shared actually the both the [REDACTED – 2] was having people working alongside your project manager and your consultants who just know the business and say, hang on, that's not gonna work. You need to be thinking about this.

It's worth its weight, and if I had to trade one off against the other, I would trade off the consultant against an SME I'd never try and implement.

Any kind of substantial change, including the introduction of new technologies without an SME to guide us through that, I might well be able to do without a consultant.

Q6

Interviewer

OK, thank you. Next question is around the key to success. So can you tell me what you think the most important keys to successfully introducing new technologies into UK law enforcement are?

Interviewee 12

Well, the successful implementation, which probably cuts back to the last question. It has to bring that benefit.

And that benefit has to be.

Seen at a strategic and an operational level.

So the front line officers and staff have to make good use of this and then have to kind of get to a point where they think, how did I ever survive without this?

And.

Organisationally, service-wide you need to be behind it.

And [REDACTED – 2] is a good example of that. So there were there were lots of blockers and cynics and luddites, even you know that that just didn't want this.

From many different areas.

Police officers, civil society, bosses.

And now you will find advocates in all of those areas for the use of body worn video for different reasons.

[REDACTED – 2] where where I'm doing stuff there.

Individual cases there's there's. There's often it's very easy to land things, but when you look at service wide change you will often have the support of the frontline officers and staff who can see a benefit for bringing in capability, but you can't easily get the strategic support at Chiefs Council level, for example, and things often fall down because you haven't got agreements across Chiefs and Chiefs Council when you're talking about service-wide change.

So operational support on its own is not enough.

But strategic support on its own if the front line aren't going to use it is not enough either.

And I would suggest you know strategic support with with a heavy hand of of of compliance is is not going to be enough either it's got it's got to be wanted by the frontline if it's going to be adopted.

Q7

Interviewer

Yeah. OK. Thank you. Next area is around urgent operational requirements. So can you explain the impact which urgent operational requirements might have in introducing new technologies to law enforcement?

Interviewee 12

Probably a double edged sword comes to mind where you might have urgent operational requirements driving innovation.

But equally, you could have urgent operational requirements driving perverse behaviour, corner cutting and failure to kind of appreciate legal policy, guidance, etcetera.

But.

And then.

You know you the the sort of the the technical if you if you look at it from a kind of a very sort of operational perspective. You know where somebody goes to an

[REDACTED – 2].

Then you know, someone might go, oh, well, there's an interesting challenge and we haven't got anything we can take off the shelf. But let me have a think about that.

And then that drives innovation.

But then again, if they're just going to stick it in somewhere and they haven't got the authority to do that.

If they haven't considered the collateral intrusion around that it starts gathering data on other people's.

And impact in other people's human rights. Then you know it's it's not going to be something we can use in the in the evidential chain or whatever, you know, those things haven't been considered that that can be the downside of urgent operational needs as we just get things done and then actually, even though we've done it in goodwill, we can't use it effectively afterwards because we haven't thought through the implications.

Interviewer – FQ7

Yeah. And how might the negative impacts be best overcome for those urgent operational requirements?

Interviewee 12

I guess if you've, if you've. If you're really in the innovation space, then then it's difficult because you don't know how you innovate. But if you can have a framework in place in advance which will sustain those innovations.

[Watch is trying to answer you there]. Then then that would probably be ideal.

Often, though, we're talking about urgent operational violence within a kind of anticipated parameters. So.

So we should be able to have those.

Those frameworks in place, whether it's legislation, whether it's regulation, whether it's policy and guidance.

So thinking ahead, anticipating these things and then having those in in place so that we can we can we can give some flexibility and agility and empower people.

To still meet operational urgent operational requirements in.

A but be able to adapt to the specifics.

Q8

Interviewer

Yeah. OK. Thank you.

On to now the non-technology factors. So do you consider that there are any non-technical factors which may also be important to ensure successful implementation.

Interviewee 12

So the the, the cultural issues and whether that's around acceptance of the user to the new technology.

Acceptance of the organisation to the use of the technology, the external factors, so you know it's not just about what works for your workforce, your organisation, but actually.

The people outside our organisation that we impact.

So particularly in policing, you know the the public.

And the the victims, the witnesses, the the suspects and those members of the public that don't fall into any of those categories that could potentially be impacted, you know, particularly when you get into areas like [REDACTED – 2] and then there are there are, you know, a raft of people that we need to consider. So all of those non technological issues which basically boil down to kind of.

Human human rights.

But the range of human rights.

And the the people who drive those agendas internally, externally.

The objectivity that you bring to considering all of those issues is is really important and and what is what you can put in place in order to to support that.

I think those are key factors.

Political. But how was the question framed again? Sorry.

Interviewer

So it's about the non-technology factors which may also be important to ensure successful implementation.

Interviewee 12

I was gonna. I was going to touch on the political influence, so that can that can be a positive. Where it it can support the introduction of of new technologies. It can also be a driver for the introduction of technologies that you don't necessarily want to introduce against [REDACTED – 2].

Interviewer

No.

Interviewee 12

[REDACTED – 4] this week saying [REDACTED – 2].

[REDACTED – 2].

Now it's only a letter, but it's, you know, it's the Home Office effectively trying to direct what technologies policing should and shouldn't use.

[REDACTED – 1]

And communities are different in different places and they would have different views and the letter from the [REDACTED – 4] doesn't take that into account necessarily so.

You know.

Political influence can be positive and negative dependent, but it is a factor.

Probably lots more I could. I could go on and about, but there's great enough to get.

Interviewer

Is that letter public domain information at the moment, or is that just directly to officers?

Interviewee 12

I've got a feeling it is because I say that because I was at an event last week, I think it was last week, time flies these days, at the Turing Institute.

And it was a [REDACTED – 1] workshop on the use of [REDACTED – 2] specifically.

I was sat next to somebody from the [REDACTED – 1].

And who was referencing the [REDACTED – 4] directions around the use of [REDACTED – 2]. That was before I'd seen the letter, so I don't know if the letter was slow go getting to me or if it had gone out in, in, in another by other means publicly elsewhere. I suspect it has. You know, they tend to do this, don't they?

Q9

Interviewer

I'll have a look for that. Thank you. Next, there is about vision. So how do you think developing a vision about implementing new technologies can be best achieved?

Interviewee 12

And it's interesting one so.

So we need we need strategies which support.

Kind of, the synergy between a vision and a strategy isn't there.

But specifically in the world of developing technologies, you know?

The technology develops exponentially or or or.

Capabilities within capabilities develop exponentially at least.

And so who knows what's coming next?

So that vision probably needs to be quite broad.

But if we don't have a common vision, then we do all go off doing different things is the risk.

Which then means it needs to be, more focused and I'm kind of contradicting myself now.

So so yeah, we need we need, we need a vision which empowers people to develop new capabilities, but it needs to be focused enough to keep us within the hedges.

When we are considering those other issues that we've mentioned, like legislation, guidance, policy, ethics.

And we need to be clear about what we're seeking to achieve. I guess that's the key thing in any vision is what are we seeking to achieve here?

Interviewer

Yeah.

Interviewee 12

Rather than just chasing shiny things because then you're in exciting.

Interviewer – FQ9

And who do you think with the overall process should actually create that vision?

Interviewee 12

Well, when we're talking about policing, and are we talking about policing or law enforcement now?

Interviewer

Law enforcement in a broader sense, but it does obviously incorporate the policing side.

Interviewee 12

So from a from a policing's perspective, I would say you know that's NPCC and wider law enforcement across the UK.

Then, but then again, you get into law enforcement outside the UK as well.

And then it starts to get massively complicated, doesn't it? Because you know you can do different things in China as you are in in Five Eyes environments. So if I kind of keep it simple then yeah, from the policing perspective, I'd say NPCC need to give direction rather than individual forces and services within policing.

Or coming up with different visions, I think NPCCs getting better at that at.

With the introduction of Paul Taylor's role as a chief scientific advisor, that that's given a lot of clarity to where we where we're going. It's also really helpful when you've got that political influence that talked about to be able to to check back to our scientific adviser and say, is this right?

So.

You know should should, should a similar position be developed across law enforcement more widely? And you've got the complications then having you in the political frameworks we operate in?

NCA and policing might look to Home Office, but HMRC are going to look to the Treasury.

So that there's an extra complication there, isn't it? Who develops the vision across those law enforcement agencies?

But ideally you would want that kind of.

A political advisor.

Chief scientific advisor who you can defer to and say, are we on the right track here?

Q10 Interviewer

Yeah. OK. Thank you. Next area is around preventing resistance. So would you describe any resistance which you feel may arise from the introduction of new technologies to law enforcement?

Interviewee 12

Yeah, can often be, different things in different environments and different types of technologies. I guess I'm trying to think what, what, what, how do you synthesise that down to core themes, you know, sort of if I think about internally?

[REDACTED – 2] and the how do you operate it? Is it easy to operate?

I think the technology companies have collectively.

Gone about that in a positive way where it's, you know, it's easy to just tap on and and it's and through iterate iterations of the different models it's it's, it's robust and so. So those kind of practical things have been considered well, but then the intrusion that that provides.

There's there's a potential provider resistor so you know, do I want to be [REDACTED – 2].

Systems that we.

That we introduce and it might be the operating system around [REDACTED – 2], but it might be an intelligent system.

The clunkiness of those systems can be inhibitors.

And that can be again and that could be a bit of a double edged sword. So. So you might in a very kind of binary way you might talk about the kind of the the older members of our workforce who.

Don't know how to use things intuitively.

And then you might think about.

The the younger members of our workforce who who would be frustrated by things that aren't intuitive enough and don't don't want to be doing a five week course on how to use [REDACTED – 3] when they can pick up their their smartphone and crack on with whatever app they want.

Why cannot police and law enforcement technology be the same?

And then again, back to the kind of the older school thinking, but actually, you know, one of the things we really struggle around in, in, in law enforcement is the quality of

our data because people input things differently.

And so sitting down for five weeks and understanding how you input every different kind of entity is important so that we get quality data and we won't get quality data unless we do actually back to the younger generation and say, well, just develop the software so that I can only put it in in the correct way. And I still don't need to sit on a five week course. It just says it doesn't match try again, you know, so.

Those those sort of considerations.

How, how you can overcome those inhibiting factors, I think from an internal perspective.

Externally, I think it's often the kind of the perception of intrusion and and negative impact on one or more, rights.

And the assumption that that if the police are doing it, it's going to be for reasons that I don't like.

And.

Over.

Focus on.

Article 8 rights.

Others as well. From the perspective of the person who has nothing to hide, but actually that that doesn't mean I should have my privacy impacted.

Without consideration to the privacy of those that don't want to be inhibited from going about their daily business by others who would cause them harm, let alone the Article two and three rights of those.

Being our positive obligations to prevent them from being harmed.

So those are often inhibitors externally to the introduction of new technologies.

Monies, money's, a factor I haven't mentioned that yet, I don't think kind of maybe because it's given but.

Yes, especially here where I am.

[REDACTED – 1] That becomes a vicious circle, so the financial implications are significant. Nothing comes cost neutral.

And it might well provide efficiencies, but you've got to have the money up front in order to build it and or implement it. And then you've got to sustain it whether it's storage costs or whatever else that are not necessarily foreseen.

Again, there's probably many others I could think of, but.

Interviewer – FQ10

Yeah. OK. Thank you. And and how might such resistance be best overcome?

Interviewer 12

And it's the marketing I guess, isn't it from from in terms of those those user aspects that I mentioned, the internal user and that's a marketing campaign really, isn't it?

You've got to demonstrate to people what the benefits are.

And equally those those external inhibitors where people are saying, you know this is going to, this is going to do me harm my children harm. Then again, we need to demonstrate what the the balance of harm and benefit are.

And hopefully demonstrating that there's an overwhelming benefit to society through the introduction of this technology.

The money is a is a is a benefits realisation case. But you know you can write all the benefit realisation cases you want, but if nobody's prepared to give you the money up front then then you're not going to realise those benefits so.

But you've got a better chance of bidding for the money, I guess if you've got a good benefits case that you can write up.

Q11
Interviewer

OK. Thank you. Next area is when you deem the introduction to be successful, So what do you feel needs to be achieved to attain the level of success for new technologies in law enforcement?

Interviewer 12

Oh.

So, from the financial perspective, it is that benefits case, that's dead easy. So here's my benefits case. Have we realised those benefits? Yes or no? To what extent?

Percentage wise, that's quite tangible.

But in other areas, you know you it's, you know, it's kind of your qualitative and quantitative isn't, it's actually quantitative data.

But actually, it's very often going to be qualitative. So you know, do our people feel that this has been a benefit? Why?

And do the public think this has been a benefit. Why?

If.

You know, so.

If you look at look at the introduction of smartphones, I'm sure all the smartphone providers could could show you there's their their spreadsheets and their profits from having sold a load of smartphones. And you could say that's that's a success measured there. But the fact that everybody's got one.

Is really the success, isn't it? They've they've become ubiquitous.

And people don't think twice about about having a smartphone apart from when they haven't got a smartphone. Then they want to know where's my smartphone gone?

But do they go around articulating their satisfaction with smartphones, or is it just just an assumption? It's always like, you know, it's part of your kind of your hierarchy of needs now, isn't it? In the same way as you know we talked about the provision of of Wi-Fi being one of the new kind of layer on that on that hierarchy.

So it it's sort of a presumed to be of benefit and if you get to that kind of cultural status, whether it's in, you know, in a micro level in use within a team that people just get on with it and don't talk about it and become second nature, then that's going to, that's going to be indicative of success. But how how do you measure that? I'm not sure it's it's finding those those qualities of measures again, which I guess is just have to kind of bring back people back into into kind of thinking about it so that they can articulate it. I'm starting to waffle now.

Interviewer – FQ11

And do you feel there's any form of time frame with which this needs to be achieved for it to be more widely accepted within law enforcement?

Interviewee 12

It needs to be quick, doesn't it with technology.

Yeah, I mean, again, if you look to industry.

They they tend to things tend to tend to happen quickly.

Almost like fads encouraged to be become fads on then, and they become the norm.

And then they they iterate and then improve.

So you you know, if you're still struggling to implement something after a couple of years, then you probably failed.

And we and we talk a lot about, you know, being comfortable failing fast. Nobody nobody is in in law enforcement.

To be honest, I don't know if they ever will be.

But you know we look, I mean, if you look at the massive IT projects that go on for years, I mean, how long has the has has [REDACTED – 3] or in a how how can any of these ever be deemed to be a success?

Really.

Whereas again [REDACTED – 3] probably was a good example of something which happened really quickly.

A few early adopters took it on board and people looked and went. Oh, that seems to be useful. Why haven't we got it?

The the the manufacturers quickly started competing, gave you options, that drove innovation.

So I think that's a really good example, and it did happen quickly.

Q12

Interviewer

Yeah. OK. Thank you. And you'll be pleased to know, the final question is around other bits that we've not touched on. So are there any other factors or issues we

haven't discussed which you feel are important for successful implementation of new technologies for law enforcement?

Interviewer 12

No, I think we have covered most of it. People internally, externally the the framework within which you operate.

The the money, perhaps a relationship with the.

The providers, the producers, I haven't talked about that too much, but that's really important.

But again, you know that's where the subject matter experts become really important.

And as opposed to your consultants who cynically might have a commercial relationship with one provider or another, and your subject matter expert will say, well, that buttons in the wrong place on that one and just never going to use it.

You know, so.

Getting that information into being a smart customer when you I guess is is what that's about when you're working with suppliers, it's being a smart customer, encouraging competition, in in industry, so that we are not working with monopolies and monolithic kind of entities, you know, so we've gone for I think we're in danger of being very specific now. But in policing of going from.

Two options, two options around.

[REDACTED – 3] but you know that's that's that's not the way it should be really and you know it's if it's that then it should be a public service if it should be a police provision not a private provision because there's no competition there, we're just become slaves to the whatever they provide for us.

Interviewer

Thank you very much. I'll just turn the transcription recording off.