

INTiLE Interview with Interviewee 8

Q2

Interviewer

It should start recording. Yeah. Started recording. I will probably see the transcription popping up in a minute. There we go. Okay. So let's go into the first question, which really is covering your previous experience. So would you tell me about your experience of introducing new technologies into UK law enforcement?

Interviewee 8

Err, so my policing experience, 27 years is predominantly as a career detective. So having led the [REDACTED – 5] in my own force for a number of years, it wasn't really until I came into [REDACTED – 5] that I had direct experience of influencing the design, the business need requirements of and a sort of having leadership over the the the technical delivery of enablers such as that. So the prior experience when I was working for a home force was very much around what are the force level priorities, what and when can be delivered by force IT systems and then would probably be pulled into bit general businessy discussions around for your particular department, what do you think are the, should be the priorities and where that could be fit in? So it would, it was very, very remote experience, I would suggest when operational.

Interviewer

Yeah.

Interviewee 8

Coming across to [REDACTED – 5] now [REDACTED – 5] is framed operationally, but our technical ambition has, as you know, when we spoke before, has probably grown alongside for the last 2 1/2 years. So I was given quite a unique opportunity to lead a team, on-board technical providers from industry and cyber security expertise to design and deliver two things. One, the requirements of our own programme. So what does our own network, what does our own resources require? What functions do we need? How we design them, how much might they cost? Who's gonna use them all that kind of stuff? So we could determine and prioritise business requirements for [REDACTED – 5] itself. But also, because of if we wanted to develop a tool that does X, then I'm sure other forces other programmes similar to us or otherwise are probably looking to develop similar tool X, in which case we took quite an altruistic view very early on to say if we're going to do this, we also need to look for a mechanism whereby we can share this as widely as possible in a a cost effective and sustainable way.

Interviewer – FQ2

Yeah, okay. Thank you. And perhaps focusing on the bit of where you are now, what's really come from that experience that you would use if you had a future similar requirement?

Interviewee 6

So if I was looked so to the, we're looking to develop things in two ways. One is individual tools that do a task and the other thing is the much bigger picture around platform enablers so that you can have a number of different tools and functions and you can put them somewhere central, centrally hosted with central cyber assurance and access issues. For me, the easy bit for these things is the technical. So if we determine a business need requirement, if that's determined in-house, so just for our own programme's purposes, that's entirely within our gift to give. If we're looking more broadly across policing, then we need to dock into entities such as the [REDACTED – 1] so that there can be a proper understanding prioritisation of if you're going to do this for more people than your own programme, who says that that thing that you're looking to develop is a priority? So getting your ducks in a line to pick the right technology and opportunities is the first thing, but the tech is the easy bit. We purposefully onboarded technical resources, either recruited them to our own programme and also had contracts that brought industry to work for us, so every keystroke they make belongs to the programme.

That has distinct advantages in terms of intellectual property rights, ownership, steerage of of the tools that are being designed.

Rather than what tends to be a policing strategy of, I want to do a task now who has got a tool X that might do some or all of that task. So you're kind of retrofitting to the business need. It might do 80% of what you want it to do and then you are probably paying industry through the nose for any adjustments and care and feed that you need thereafter. My view is why shouldn't we, couldn't we be developing that for ourselves?

So technically literate people in house and also contracting people to work on those tasks for us. So here's the business need. Now you help design the technical response. Those technical outcomes have come along in quite a timely way. So we have a within our particular programme we've got a, a quite mature nine step technical design authority process which will take you on a line of maturity from - I've had a good idea to its live and being used and the steps that happening between.

The technical steps tend to be addressed fairly early on. They are then, you then do your show and tells your test experiences, and then we comment and say, well, that's not what I wanted, tweak this, tweak that, but they can be built. The biggest and first challenge you come up against is cyber assurance.

Again, following it through and paralleling through that technical design authority process, you should be building in solutions to those assurance challenges as you go, not retrofitting, in my opinion, assurance at the end of that process.

Again, that's time consuming and requires dedicated capable assets, but is still very

doable. So I've now had a business idea, I've built the thing, somebody's assured it for me and I'm ready to go to testing. You should have already identified your business users, otherwise you failed at your first business need part of the journey, in which case you should have somebody that you can engage with two tests and operationalize the thing. That is a whistle stop tour of TDA, but that that doesn't account for what have been in my lived experience, the biggest challenges for of these things around or predominantly strategic priorities, and I'm talking about the national policing picture here, strategic priorities and small and big 'p' politics.

Because we've got an awful lot of programmes that are trying to do the right thing, what we don't have, in my humble opinion, is a cohesive digital data S&T landscape within policing that allows all those things to come together to do it well as a community. We tend to leave programmes to kind of if you've got your own money and you're doing that thing for yourself, crack on.

When those programmes such as ours try and play the game properly and say we we're gonna design this for ourselves, but we also want to give it away to everybody else and please have full transparency and and live that journey with us we'll take all of your advice and feedback because we want to land it for everybody, you find you come up across those political and funding blockers by people saying who are you to say what should be offered out across policing? And I think it's that, it's that small, smaller, big 'p' politics, little bit of egotism from certain individuals in terms of them as individuals and or the seat that they occupy in certain parts of the policing hierarchy.

But we focus so much on.

What do we want the big scale strategy to be? So everything has to fit the big scale strategy. My view is credibility comes with delivery and if we have infinite scales right from from local policing technical solutions just for that local policing team all the way up to something that everybody might want to access, you need to focus on your ability to deliver that in a sustainable, cost-effective way that other people can access because if you don't have deliverables, you haven't done anything. You've written a strategy. It's a very long answer, wasn't it? Sorry about that.

Q3

Interviewer

That's fine. I'm happy with that. Thank you. So we'll move on to the next area which is about governance. So what governance considerations do you feel are necessary to introduce new technologies into UK law enforcement?

Interviewee 1

So the governance issue talks to the nub of those challenges, those small and big 'p', politics. I personally am a big advocate of understanding strategy at the different levels of hierarchy. So looking at force level, what are the force technical priorities and frankly what have they got money for, what have they got resources for and that differs in every force in terms of scale, capability, budgets, all that kind of stuff.

Equally, what do we want from each of the regions? The [REDACTED – 1] in terms of looking inward to their own [REDACTED – 1] connectivity, and then all the way up to what should be our national data and tech strategy. We need those things. The difficulty I have with them is the strategy and the sometimes excessive governance that goes with them can be can become blockers to progress, so we almost get a paralysis of governance and strategy and less focus and interest and accountability around the deliverables. You know, what have you actually done so for for example, you've got very clear structures so that the data digital goes up through [REDACTED – 4] as a feeder to that you've got the [REDACTED – 5] and our particular programme, I have the aspiration that we achieve our governance via that means, but also our oversight and direction to that national strategy. What you then prioritise for your own programme again can be devolved down into that programme. The difficulty, I think comes when the programme tries to expand beyond its own borders. So if our technical ambition had only ever been, we will design and deliver this just for [REDACTED – 5] you know, this is ours, just for our use, regardless of how good, bad or indifferent those tools or opportunities were, nobody would have batted an eyelid. Because we have said, God a few of these things, God they're really good they're going to save a lot of money and time and gosh, I can, other people heard about and now they want them, let's give them away, you then enter into the governance, oversight and decision making of much bigger policing machines and those machines, in my humble opinion, are unable at the moment to be sufficiently flexible to address those opportunities in a timely way; ie there is one route in, one process, full fat process, and not necessarily the means to be agile in terms of business need requirements now. I've got a tool now it works now and I've got operational users that need it now. Well hang on. That might take 18 months to push through that machinery. So they are there. They have an absolute function and must be adhered to in terms of of compliance in terms of commercial opportunity, in terms of of national strategy, but the practical application of them often leads to paralysis of activity.

Interviewer – FQ3

Yeah, I think that actually covers the next question, which is about whether those considerations are actually ready, available and achievable within law enforcement.

Interviewee 3

I think sometimes part of the problem is people don't know what game they're playing, so we I I thought think that actually the the way that our particular programme had approached it was not only altruistic, so we're not just in this for ourselves, we want, we want to do it for other people, was very collaborative. Everybody have a look in at what we're doing and pull it apart, if you like. You know, tell us so we can learn and make it better and improve. But also played what I thought were the right games in terms of the governance and the politics by debranding, I have literally stripped all of our and and I feel a bit sorry for my own team, but I've stripped all of our branding off what we're doing and put it even put it in the accent colours of national policing, so the example [REDACTED –

1] and put it under the named governance of these other structures, [REDACTED – 5] even though they haven't influenced that process.

Because not only do I want to secure their support, give them the opportunity to, you know give give a view in a steer around that governance in case we're going in a completely perverse direction, but also so that it cleared the political and sometimes egotistical landscape and enabled us just to get on. And even that hasn't worked. So I played the game I was told to play and I still have hit the buffers and that that's where I find it most challenging.

Q4

Interviewer

Yeah, okay. Thank you. The the next question moves on to the requirements for introducing new technology. So thinking about these main requirements, what do you think are the main building blocks to successfully introduce such new technologies?

Interviewee 1

OK, I'll I'll reach a little bit what I've already said. But the first thing for me is business need. So do you have a proper under before you do anything, any keystroke, to design a technical anything, do you understand what the operational business need is? Who you're doing it for, who the perceived users of that thing are, and what the intended outcomes are, because I have seen a lot of technology talked about that is then either showcased or operationalised into a live environment and users, detectives, investigators, cops, colleagues have said that's not what I would have wanted. So if if you think so, for example, if you were looking at something around [REDACTED – 2] or something like that, the first port call for me would be to go and go and meet with those people. Have some lived experience. Talk to them about what they can't do with current technology, where they think the biggest bang for their bucks. So if we said [REDACTED – 2] is a priority area for policing now let's put lean some technical enablers into that. You've got to understand what it is they need, why they need it, now the practitioner's point of view is really relevant, but not always the answer to everything. So they might suggest something that is just so cost prohibitive, you know, I I, I can't even think of it, but so costly as you say, well, that's just not realistic. Or they suggest something that isn't scalable or they suggest something unwittingly perhaps that isn't lawful. So I want data from X to come into this. We can't do that because of all the governance around it and stuff like that. So I'm not suggesting the business user is the is the the sort of sole requirement, but for me you must start there. So what what you're trying to do for whom and how is it going to be used? And the second part of it is quite clearly gonna be funding and feasibility.

So if you're designing something at force level and the business user says, yep, that's for me and it's gonna be amazing and this will enable me to track all of my offenders and I'll know any moment where they are, what they're doing, that's fine, but it's gonna cost your force £50 million to do it, again, that's just not going to be realistic. So what's the, a, what's the funding and opportunities? Now part of that might be the thing itself doesn't cost, but

the technical infrastructure can't support it. So you've come up with a technical solution or or or or options that would mean, yes, the thing itself is achievable and affordable. But I'm gonna have to pump £3 million into local infrastructure before I can use that thing because it's not coordinated for it. So if you're looking at technical solutions across the policing landscape, you have to have a pick and mix opportunity for me because not everybody is starting from the same position. This isn't just what I like that thing, it's is it possible for my programme, my force, my organisation for other reasons?

And also have scalable opportunities as well. So not necessarily something where you say every force has to have this [REDACTED – 5], it might be that force A, B and C have already got something that kind of does the same thing locally, in which case you carry on. So if we're going to develop strategies, technical opportunities for policing, know your business need, have a means to realise it, but have it so it's scalable and flexible across the community. Otherwise you'll generate technical opportunities that only the rich could afford, and they're only the big force is going to afford. Errm, some might be overbilled and others just aren't feasible because of local infrastructure or other considerations. So. And that's that's where you need some sort of central function that can say, do you know what this good ideas and innovation hither and thither, you know, how can we start to link this together? I I was at meeting in London with [REDACTED – 4] yesterday. It was his inaugural on the back of a [REDACTED – 2]. He's inaugural, regional innovation lead coordinators where he started that piece of work who's got what, where is it, are other people interested in how might we support a means to share these things more widely?

Interviewer – FQ4

OK. Thank you. And I think you've touched on some of the next question, but is there anything which may prevent the successful implementation of new technologies for law enforcement?

Interviewee 6

Budgets is an obvious one, depending on the scale and where you plan intend to plug plug it into, it's an obvious one. Infrastructure starting points is an obvious one that you might love it, but you just can't, won't work, won't fit. Existing commercial and contractual arrangements. How. Are you sort of tied to other existing partners, you know, etcetera, other big, big ones, cloud enablers, everything that are particular programme does, I'm pre-redacting myself and I keep doing that for your thing, [REDACTED – 5] everything that [REDACTED – 5] does is purposefully intended to be a cloud provision. There are still some forces that you mentioned the word it's a dirty word. So again you're kind of pre-limiting some of these technical opportunities, because they are only supported within cloud type infrastructure. Multi-service provider. I'm talking about platform providers here. So the argument around we've got the national labelling programme, which is why we went down the [REDACTED – 3] route, so at least we'd get the base opportunity to connect to force systems because we pick something that they've at least all got something of because of the [REDACTED – 3]. But have you designed something with inflexibility so it

could only be [REDACTED – 1 and 3], in which case have you completely cut them out of the game? So we need for me to look at cloud-based technologies.

We need to look at multiplatform opportunities or the flexibility to adapt, retrospective design.

And we need to have a pick and mix that's scalable to the budget and requirements of each of the programmes and and forces and regions etcetera.

Interviewer – FQ5

OK. Thank you. Next area is around 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 learned from these to help future introductions?

Interviewee 1

My lessons learned are on the slight bitter side only because I believe I think I said to you before, I believed I was playing the game as it was meant to be played, so best chance of success depending on the scale of what you're trying to do. If it is at a very, very local level, then you clearly need to engage senior leads around the business needs. You know, if we could do this thing, it's going to make it quicker, better, more exciting for your teams. Some baseline funding from your own force, but and obviously some capability capacity from force level IT now part of that will be will force ICT have got a core functions to maintain, your requirement your request your new business need is always gonna come further down the queue. So you might have to wait for the technical enablers to actually to create that for you. But also does the force does that scale of hierarchy give you the ability to onboard other technical resources? So have you actually got the right skill base to do what you require?

What's the force level capacity for ICO and ISO compliance cause as I said, our technical design authority process has a complete parallel of cyber assurance. I think most people think of that once the tool is completely built. So cyber assurance has got to be a day one discussion, in my humble opinion, otherwise you're causing yourself some retrofit challenges.

So business need, cyber assurance as we go, making sure you got the right technical assets and that the bitter experience is, if you're going to scale it beyond your organisation so beyond your local sphere of influence, then you need to make sure that you dock in with the right levels of national governance and strategy, so that either they can go yes, yes, we're all in and actually we can enable funding and mandate for delivery for you, or at least they will say, noted we won't get in your way. You know, you carry on with the requirements of of your particular programme even when you do those things, which I've done half to death the last 2 1/2 years, people move on, policies and strategies change, and the pace of technical delivery and cyber assurance often means that even when you get agreement six months later, the positions changed and you're almost starting that permission discussion again.

Interviewer – FQ5

Okay, thank you. Which of those there were several there, which do you think would be the most impactful to help ensure successful introduction, introduction of new technologies?

Interviewee 3

If I was doing it depends on the perspective, sorry. So I'll have to pick two if I was doing it from an Ops point of view, it has to be business need who actually want to, what they're gonna use it for and blah blah blah because and I don't necessarily mean Ops need in terms of frontline, it could be a technical solution to support a [REDACTED – 5]. But if you don't design the thing to do what the business users require, then you've wasted your effort. The enablers in the bigger sense, get your political allies in a row first.

Q6 Interviewer

Okay lovely. Thank you. Uh, next area is around key to success. So can you tell me what you think the most important key factors are to successfully introducing new technologies into law enforcement?

Interviewee 3

That probably comes back to the deliverables comment so anybody can have a great idea anybody can with the obviously where like the expertise design as something and go look at worked for me it's the full wrap around experience of yes it worked, but where's your evaluation? So it did you press go and it gave you the outcome you expected but actually, who says you couldn't have done that quicker, better, cheaper blah blah blah elsewhere? So where's the rigour around the evidence basis? Evidence based policing is talked about a lot but isn't generally with the degree of rigour that I would suggest would fit that definition. So where's your evaluation? Where is your proof? And, if you can. Preferably not just with he. Let me give you a case. Examples tell me a story. You know, he he's an example of when I've done a thing, goes down really, really well if you can put the economics with it as well. That's not always easy. But I can prove to you I saved x amount of time or FTE and or casheable savings, that's worth its weight in gold. So, an evidence-based evaluation to support the second bit, which is fundamental delivery of the thing. Because sometimes we, we gauge technical success at whatever scale, and this might be something, you know, a programme that [REDACTED – 3], that's one thing all the way up to [REDACTED – 3], you know, just a colossal project. It's it's about the delivery, you know. How far did it go? Did it actually do what we thought it was gonna do? Has it made an operational difference because you might get lots of users, because they've been told to use the system. But actually has it made their, has it made it a better, quicker, improved experience, high quality outcomes and what are you tracking as your deliverables? If you look to deliverables within the technology itself, so did I keep to budget, did I keep to time, did I do the cyber assurance, did it get hosted when and where I said it was going to be? That's one set of deliverables. The more important set of deliverables for me is, did it make

a lot of difference, did it save FTE, did it make the job better, quicker and the most crucial, and they can't all get to this stage because of the nature of the tech, and what difference did it make in the community? So did it lock up more people, save more people, help more people, give them a better lived experience with engaging with policing.

Interviewer – FQ6

Okay, thank you. And of those which do you feel be the most impactful to help ensure successful introduction new technologies?

Interviewee 8

Did it blooming work? It's got to be the, it's got to be the deliverable of the tech itself.

Interviewer

Yeah.

Interviewee 8

Did it does it actually work? Did it do what it was designed to do? For who it was designed for?

Interviewer - FQ7

Makes perfect sense. Thank you. Next area is around urgent operational requirements. So can you explain the impact which urgent operational requirements might have on introducing new technologies to law enforcement?

Interviewee 8

Hmm.

One might be unintended and the other could turn out to be rather wonderful, and they both relate to the urgent nature of a need to introduce something. So, as said, everything I've discussed there in terms of governance and assurance and all this kind of stuff, they are essential requirements to make sure something lands once and well and is robust and defensible, etcetera.

When you have something that is so urgent that you either have senior leaders within law enforcement saying, errm you gotta have to find workarounds, cause I've got to have a response to this thing right now because either I don't know legislation has changed, a new threat has been identified. You know, something has happened to dramatically change the landscape and we don't have a response to it and there's a greater risk by us doing nothing at all, than there is by less, ohh quick, we've design something, plug it in off we go. Now, as long as you've got all the mitigations to that noted, accepted and held somewhere i.e., we know the cyber insurance isn't completely finished, but our response to that is additional protective monitoring and it will go here and this will be the response, etcetera. As long as you've got an owner for them and mitigating action in place.

We should be doing that if there's a means for us to respond to this threat and do it better.

Interviewer

Yeah.

Interviewee 1

We should be doing that the the, the, the two sides of the same coin are. Ohh God, that's when it could go very, very wrong. You could, heaven forbid, have a data leak breach, something that catches the Daily Mail's headline, which ruins credibility for everybody. And actually that tool was going to be amazing. But you press go two weeks too early before it was ready, something went wrong and now it's ruined forever cause nobody will touch it now. So it's the urgency of something that drives inappropriate risk management around it. The other side of the coin is because everybody's on board, they've recognised demand, you've got a load of cash thrown at it, which rarely happens and everybody is bending over backwards to make their time and skills and expertise available to you to get this thing going. That's when lurches of impressive and much needed innovation happened because everyone's gone good God, if we don't do this, in which case we really pull out all the stops. So all of that mired, ohh good God. It's gonna take 18 months process you find you can, you can really condense some of those if everybody's on board with the same oh my God scenario.

Interviewer - FQ7

Yeah, absolutely. And and of course, there could be some negative impacts that come as a result of that and you've alluded to some of those. So how might we actually best overcome any of those negative impacts that come from urgent operational requirements?

Interviewee 1

Umm. It's the governance and mitigation to it, and again it it, it doesn't really matter the scale of that. So it it if it is forced level good God we've got a critical need for [REDACTED – 1]. We've got to do something this while we're gonna do it or all the way up to [REDACTED – 1] level systems, oh my God, there's going to be something go wrong here. We've got have a reaction to it, that scale doesn't matter, you have to have an owner, a clear means to understand that full [REDACTED – 3] process, you know what is the risk that the assumptions, opportunities, all that kind of stuff and then have a means to mitigate them. And then you sit down with somebody saying, I'll take responsibility for that and you go, what's your risk appetite for this one? You know, you happy for this? Yes, yes. No. Or is it gonna be um er a showstopper. If it is, then we stop at that point and everyone rethinks again, etcetera. So you've just got to understand what your risks are, who's taking responsibility for them, what you can do to mitigate, and then at what point they become go or no gos.

Q8

Interviewer

Yeah, okay. Thank you. The the next area then is around non-technology or the non-technical factors. So do you consider there are any non-technical factors which may also be important to ensure the successful implementation of new technologies?

Interviewee 8

There's always mate. I think most of what we talked about have been non-technical. You know, I'm. I'm not the technical person of the team and, perhaps this is a self-reflection, my bits tend to be harder than other people's because it involves the politics and the funding and the governance and all that kind of structures. So, um, the the the technical bit remains easy bit I think I've covered them really. So cyber assurance you have to parallel throughout and then make sure you've got the right political and governance support for what you're doing no matter what scale or port in the hierarchy you're at. You know, understand who the the important people are and where you can convince them to to support.

Interviewer – FQ8

And it's an obvious question from the the discussion we've had so far, but what level of importance do you think these have compared to the technology aspects themselves?

Interviewee 8

Technology is the enabler.

The other things, the governance, the mandate to do it, the the ownership, the business users, um, they are the policing requirements, so so technology, it's not the junior partner, because without it you don't have any of these work streams at all, but that needs to be driven by the other things. So who says it's a priority?

And who said who determines the business need and and users and audience and purpose and outputs and evaluation factors and everything. You should understand those or at least be a long way along the journey to understanding all of those before you ask for a keystroke to be made on designing the technical solution itself.

Interviewer

OK. Thank.

Interviewee 8

And the technical solution ought to be flexible enough to account for variances in those things in the future as well.

Q9

Interviewer

Sure. OK. Next area is around vision. So how do you think developing a vision about implementing new technologies in law enforcement can be best achieved?

Interviewee 1

Again, I guess that depends on scale.

Forces will have their own IT strategy, some of which is written to maintain service, maintain critical service and that will always come first. So it's I don't think by any means it's because smaller programmes or forces are not interesting in innovating, but they've got critical core business that they have to serve first with what is often they're very limited budget and a limited skill set and I'm not being rude to force level IT, but they generally have a person that does a critical function and when that person's away, you know it causes some issues not let less so in in bit bigger entities, bigger programmes, bigger forces.

Sorry, can you repeat the question? I thought I was.

Interviewer

Yeah, sure. It's about how do you think developing the vision or it can be achieved?

Interviewee 1

Umm. The the vision for wider policing again needs to come down through portfolio, such as as [REDACTED – 4], from people like [REDACTED – 4] to say, you know, these are deemed across policing to be, um, business need priorities. And I think it, a vision of, a vision is some is a is a place you want to get to. The strategy is the means to do that. I think generally speaking, policing has a more or less consistent vision of what it wants to do, and that tends to be so high level. You know, we want to use technical enablers in order to facilitate the timely effective management of threat and risk for our investigations. It tends to be so high level that you're rarely gonna get dissenters to a vision. When you come down to the strategy as to who's gonna do what and who have ownership of it, that's bound into the governance. You then go down probably a couple of layers further before you get into the practical, what exactly do you want to fulfil that vision? That's where we all starburst.

Interviewer

Yeah.

Interviewee 1

Because we all go, I've either got different ideas for it or I'm developing something just for my force or all the way down to right into the granular level of practise. I'm a [REDACTED – 4] that leads a, I don't know, an [REDACTED – 5] or something like that and I've heard of some new technology. I'm gonna I'm gonna reach out directly to the company and see if I

can get some local funding from my [REDACTED – 4]. So we have an overarching vision we have national strategy, I think there's then a bit of a gap between where the programmes look to to say I know what I'm trying to do, can anybody point me in the right direction as to how best to go about it, or or even better, has somebody done this already and I can adapt that to my own programme or or or forces need, so I don't think the vision is the problem mate, I think it's more about the starburst at the lower levels of how we actually want to contribute to that.

Q10

Interviewer

Okay, thank you. Um, next area's around preventing resistance. So would you describe any resistance which you feel may arise from the introduction of new technologies to law enforcement?

Interviewee 1

So again start, so I always do, start with the practitioner level. Ohh God, what do you want me to log on to now? Is that gonna need training? Do you know I'm not very computer literate or technically literate? It's not my bag. I just wanna go out there and talk to people or, you know, put handcuffs on or speak to victims and all that kind of stuff. I just want to do my job. What are you now making me learn? And what's the ability for forces programmes regions to deliver, when I say training, I don't just mean here's a training course, but actually training in a way that resonates with the user. So quite often we'll say it is a new system. If you log on to here, they'll click through. It will tell you how to use it. Probably that'll do it for 80% of people, but others will go Oh my God, I can't even read that I don't. It says log on to the start thing. Where's the start thing, on my screen? Do you know what I mean, you've got almost an infinite variety internally of people's capacity and interest in new technology so. Who's it going to? What have you done before it arrives to warm them up to it? So explaining to them why it's been designed, what it's going to do for them. So yes, you may not be comfortable with the training or using the system, but we if you don't feel that was enough for you, will put in some local mentoring or.

Stick with us because after a couple of weeks, this is what you'll be able to do and won't that, that'll save you hours of your time. If it resonates with people, if they understand it actually makes a difference to their workload, they'll be on board all day long. If they think it's a technology that helps the organisation but creates a burden on them, that will be more challenging to introduce.

If if they think it's something that is administrative or just just doesn't resonate with what they need, they probably won't even won't even open it.

So to optimise it you need to make sure you land it properly with the business users in a way that they can understand the opportunity, in relation to that. From a force or a programme point of view, um, they need to get that bit right with the users, but they also need to be able to evaluate, track and understand what it actually did. So you put this thing in you, you gave everyone a week's worth of training. Gosh, that was a commitment. You

even put in some CPD. That's great. And you kind of left it to run.

Or did it do what you wanted? Is there any challenge? Do you need to recode it? Do you need to repurpose it slightly? But actually it works so well for this cohort of individuals. Have you ever thought of repurposing the algorithm so it can be used by a completely different? So you used it for [REDACTED – 4], but actually you might be able to use it for [REDACTED – 4]. You know, gosh, let's look at those next opportunities. So where where, where within that implementation plan, not only is the evaluation of the thing you originally intended, but where's the evaluation of next steps and opportunities, you know where it could go to next and how we might dock that in.

Q11

Interviewer

Yeah, okay. Thank you. And that sort of touches a bit on the next question, which is about when we sort of deem this to be successful. So thinking about a successful implementation, what do you feel needs to be achieved to attain this level of success?

Interviewee 1

And again, it's this, the success is entirely subjective to the to the person you're asking. So success in terms of the tech itself, on budget, on time did what it said doesn't break, doesn't cause a data breach or all the wrap arounds around the technical delivery is the first thing, then it's around the evaluation of user experience, outputs, quality, accessibility again security. So can you do things like the audit of it? So it's brilliant, everyone loved it, but we've got no idea who's using it and when and.

Red flags.

All the way up to, did it save FTE for the force? You know what, what, what kind of impact? So the scalability of your success measures is the first crucial part. So success for business users, success for the organisation and again, not all of them will have direct opportunity to do this vanilla technology. But the most critical one, if it applies, is success in the community. How can you monitor that? Because it the thing meant we got there quicker. The thing meant when we got there, we had better information to make better decisions on the ground. The thing meant when when we were, doing that, we were able to. I don't technology that might help physically help save a life, so we carry something with us now that that helps with that or we carry something with us now that protects us or protects the public. You can evaluate all those things if they are forward facing doesn't have to be physical contact quite clearly but something that is going to make the communities lived experience better and safer with better outcomes and the same applies to the users and the operational officers.

Interviewer – FQ11

Lovely. Thank you. And and do you feel there is any sort of conceptual time frame within which this needs to be achieved for it to actually be more widely accepted across law enforcement?

Interviewee 8

Depends what it is mate, to be fair.

So if you're, if you're talking about, if you're talking about big national programme [REDACTED – 3] and for them to properly resonate to the frontline, they have to understand that they are using something using a product, using a front end that actually has that technology attached to it, frankly, they don't care. Most officers and staff don't care what they log on to. They want it to work in the way they thought it was going to when they want to use it. So it will log on and it won't whirl around for two hours. It will actually do that thing and they, pardon me, they take away the anticipated product.

The the magic dust that sits in the back of a computer is kind of irrelevant to them, so if it does what it says it was gonna do when it said it was gonna do it and they know how to use it so they don't get completely stressed out because they weren't trained properly, then you have the operational function, be that front office or back office. You have that in the bag. They'll be with you and they'll be talking about it and they'll be telling their sister forces, you've got to have this and blah, blah, blah.

Um, it resonating with the digital and data community within force again, how's that better than what the [REDACTED – 4] were using before you might have a better output, but it takes me four times as long to do it. So I'd rather have these, I'd rather have the gold version than the platinum that you've just brought in because I can't afford those extra 4 hours to do it, so it would depend on the nature of the application for the more technically enabled colleagues. For ICT, um, it was brilliant of course you want the platinum version, but God, I had to reconfigure reconfigure the entire force system to do it, which whilst that thing works and I'm so pleased you're all happy about, I've now got another six months of work because it's impacted on connections elsewhere in the system, so it's had perverse outcomes. So it depends on the broad reaching, you know what skills they need, how long did it take to do did it impact on other stuff? Chief officers will be focused on absolute outcomes. You know, did did did this create savings for me in whichever way time, FTE, stuff like that. And what do my staff think and what are the newspapers saying about our outcomes that are represented through CJ process?

Q12

Interviewer

Okay lovely. Thank you. And the final question really is a.

Interviewee 8

Oh my God, thank God.

Interviewer

Yeah.

Interviewee 8

I know my answer is a bit long, but go on.

Q12

Interviewer

It is the kind of catch-all, of is there anything else we haven't covered? So are there any other factors or issues we haven't really discussed yet which you feel are important to successfully achieve implementation of new technologies?

Interviewee 1

I know, why haven't I haven't really discussed our case studies and I, trust me, I do nothing but talk about the the the detail of our particular technical, I don't, I don't. And as you're gonna react anyway, I don't think that's particularly relevant.

I guess it's, if I reflect back probably 2 1/2 years when we started this I I am an operational detective. I always have been all ranks.

I know what I need to, I can't even say the word, I know what I need technology to do. I know what I needed to do for me. More importantly, I know what I need it to do for my teams. So I understand the lived experience of this is the kind of product we need for whom and why. I found myself leading a programme where I had the opportunity to release some funds from that programme myself to fund technical stuff.

The challenge I I had, and I've learned a lot in the last 2 1/2 years I didn't have a technical bone in my body. I could barely text message I I did nothing but what was quite basic functions on the computer, so I knew what I wanted technology to do for me. I had no understanding of how to go about it. Now the thing about that is I don't need to understand, I need to articulate a business need. I need to provide the money I need to provide the governance and oversight and the evaluation thereof. I could do all those things, that's fine. The problem I had and one of the early learning experience I had, is I didn't know what skills I needed to onboard to help me with the technical. So as a career detective, business need, tick, and management governance structures, I've been a senior officer for a long time, tick, I can do all of that. I didn't know who to employ to actually do the doings of it.

And remember, going through what is first of all, do I recruit them into [REDACTED – 5] themselves? In which case, what role profiles do I need, what skill base, what, what previous experience am I asking for because actually what I needed 2 1/2 years ago for tech, bears no resemblance to what I need now, so I've changed all those role profiles. Second impact factor is, these skills are not prevalent enough, available enough within policing, so there aren't enough people for people to be comfortable that we bring on board these resources. Another factor is, we are [REDACTED -1] based and every penny I was spending I was stripping out of an operational budget. I couldn't meet what we're often 6 figure sums in industry to onboard the best. I'm not saying I bought the worst, quite quite the contrary. What I ended up doing with the resources I bought into [REDACTED -5] is I recruited people who were new out of university and actually their skills of skyrocketed because I've said I need you to do this at the other. They've learned it. They've done CPD, they've worked with industry partners. So the first thing is I didn't know who to employ

because I knew what I wanted to do, but I didn't really know what skills or capacity was needed to achieve those things. The second thing was I had the foresight, thank God, to employ through industry contracts so that people could work to our programme as I described before. So every keystroke belongs to us.

If they leave or we ask them to leave, they give us back our laptops off they go and everything's retained by us. You still got the care and feed problem. Something's been designed by someone else. But.

The benefit of having contracted industry partners was I could say to them, I want you to build a a thing that does a thing and they would say right for that thing, I need skills, business analysts. I needed this and I need a a platform developer. Great. Ohh, three weeks later, I now need you to build something, ahhh for something else we need so and so. So all they were doing is flexing within their existing contractual arrangements to the budget I'd giving them, but they were able to pick and mix from their own teams to say according to what [REDACTED – 6] current priorities are, we, those three people can go and do something else. I need two more from over here. You can't do that if you are entirely reliant on resources that have been employed within. And we do that too often in policing, we basically say let's recruit some tech people and then we go ohh, they can't do what I need them to do. Make an industry contract contract and it's their problem to find you the resources for for the agreements of that contract would would be a a learning point for me. So it worked out well for us, but it was a painful journey to start with.

Interviewer

Lovely.

Thank you very much. Well, you'll be pleased to know those are the end of the questions. So I'm just gonna stop you.

Interviewee 3

Good. I can't talk anymore. I hope that was useful.

Interviewer stopped transcription