

INTiLE Interview with Interviewee 10

Q2

Interviewer

There we go. So from my end it's saying that the recording transcription started, so I've just got to let you know that's taken place. So we'll go on to the first area, which is a kind of introductory part just around previous experience.

So would you be able to tell me about your experience of the introduction of new technologies within law enforcement?

Interviewee 10

So I've been at the sharp end of it as a user. When I was in [REDACTED – 1]. I remember doing my baton training with the new 24-inch baton that was going to, you know, save the world.

I've done breathalyser training for roadside breath screening.

So there are various, the new quick-cuffs when they came in, which was brilliant. So I've done a lot of it where I've had stuff rolled out to me and of course common stuff, radios and all those kind of things.

Then I've been involved in looking at.

Both from a governance perspective and accountability perspective and an academic perspective. So when I was [REDACTED – 4] to [REDACTED – 1], the introduction of body worn video was a very significant one.

So that's where the force start from, you know, outline business case. We're thinking of buying this great thing and here's why it's good and elected members in particular and [REDACTED – 4], looking at what does that mean, not just how much does it cost? How does it work?

All the underpinning challenges around that and how will it be used and so forth?

And then at the same time, from an academic perspective where I've looked at how things have been introduced.

And then compare them so you know [REDACTED – 2] v [REDACTED – 2], for example, which is very interesting and the sort of level of public support that each attracts. And then, latterly, and currently as the [REDACTED – 6], and as I you know, as I've just spent, the vast proportion of my 2 1/2 years in this role talking about new technology in in policing, slash law enforcement and and one of the things that I've been at pains to do is point out the difference between policing and law enforcement. So where as we've got the US, you know, language creep across the Atlantic, you know, in the US, hardly anyone that I work with there talks about policing. They talk about law enforcement. But here, as you know, you know, probably 70% of what our police do is not law enforcement.

And there is a very distinct difference in terms of public appetite and support for using new technology in the non-law enforcement part of policing. So vulnerability finding people or, you know, getting them back home, stopping things happening, you know, all that safeguarding stuff.

So I think it's really important distinction to retain, whereas of course when I'm working with the [REDACTED – 1], for example.

It's law enforcement, and that's actually why it's it's, it's different and there are other bodies that do law enforcement, like [REDACTED – 1] and and [REDACTED – 1] and others, [REDACTED – 1], which that have really have anything to do with the delivery of policing.

So I think,

in those contexts, I've covered a lot and on [REDACTED – 6] and one of the things that I'd

raised with them is to say that if 20 years ago we'd been predicting which of the following will attract the most controversy, an introduction of a weapon which will deliberately be directing an electrical charge into the body of another human being in order to get compliance for the police, or cameras, I don't think any of us would have predicted it was going to be the latter, but it is. So, you know, I've got all that kind of stuff buzzing around all the time. Plus [REDACTED – 3] plus [REDACTED – 3], and in particular I've done quite a lot of work with the [REDACTED – 1] on use of [REDACTED – 3]. So quite a lot. It's a very long answer, I'm sorry.

Q3

Interviewer

No problem at all. Thank you very much, so we'll we'll move on to the next question. That's around governance.

So what governance considerations do you feel are necessary to introduce new technologies into UK law enforcement?

Interviewee 10

Hmm.

Oh, I so I think they're really clear.

But not often clearly observed.

So when you start with, who is accountable for the use of new technology in local policing?

The answer there is your elected local policing body, whether that's deputy mayor or whether that's a Police and Crime Commissioner.

But that is absolutely their territory, and it's one of the reasons why they're elected into office is to reflect the views of their community, not necessarily the whole of the England and Wales, but their communities in relation to the introduction of new technology.

And you know, collectively, they should then feedback into the national picture and the second area is also theirs, which is contracting and procuring because.

Every one of the 43 geographical police forces in England and Wales has a a chief officer.

And that chief officer is, since 2012, allowed to enter into contracts.

But you can only enter into contracts for procurement of things if your PCC or mayor allows you to and I have not in 10/11 years come across any PCC that has given them carte blanche, which means the contracting party, if you're going to buy water cannon or drones or Tasers or anything else, will be the PCC or the mayor, and that's often missed.

So obviously they rely very heavily on advice from their chiefs and their chief staff and the blue light procurement, all those things. Bottom line is it will be their name if it's been done properly, it will be their name on the contract and therefore you know, you would probably expect a degree of governance and oversight in relation to that, that contractual part of it.

And then the final thing will be OK.

And now we've introduced it, how is it working?

One of the things that's come back from my [REDACTED – 3] for [REDACTED -1], the police and and others like the NCA has been.

When I asked them who hold you to account for your use of [REDACTED – 3].

Not one force.

Said their Police and Crime Commissioner or Deputy Mayor.

And actually they are the only people who can hold you to account. So it's a pretty easy question and the fact that they don't feel held to account means they're not feeling the governance in that respect and therefore they haven't put it in the questionnaire.

So it's not to say that they're not being held to account, but it's not sufficiently palpable or transparent for them to even notice.

And that's where the accountability stuff lies. And then you've got the overarching bit of, of course, from government and Home Office that says, OK, well, there's some national programmes we need.

So in [REDACTED – 5] for example.

And using things like the strategic policing requirements, you know, some things have to be done the same way.

At the same time, or they're not going to work at all anywhere. So that's that kind of national overlay.

But I think bottom line is it's local accountability that ought to be driving and monitoring.

Interviewer – FQ3

OK. Thank you.

And the follow up question I think you've kind of sort of part answered it and suggested that so are all of these considerations readily available and achievable within UK law enforcement?

Interviewee 10

Yes, completely yes. And the and they're all underpinned by primary legislation.

In fact, the only one that is underpinned by secondary legislation relates to [REDACTED – 2] and one of the things that I did in the previous life was help set up the [REDACTED – 5]. I'm afraid so.

[REDACTED – 5] in [REDACTED – 1] and that was pulling together a [REDACTED – 5] for the whole of policing in England and Wales and it was [REDACTED – 5] if you're a police force in England and Wales is [REDACTED – 5] and that was that was written in by Ministerial Order.

I don't think they've ever [REDACTED – 3] and that in itself is a really interesting case study because that was it's not so much introducing the technology, but certainly in terms of your question on governance, that was an attempt to impose national governance on what was a [REDACTED – 2] way of doing things, ie local police authority as it was then bought a [REDACTED – 5].

And then used it, but only used it [REDACTED – 2], you know? So but.

[REDACTED – 4] did a report into that that said, look, there's got to be a better way.

[REDACTED – 5] was introduced, query was it better, certainly cheaper would close their [REDACTED – 2] and we reduced the number of [REDACTED – 2].

So that's probably really interesting case study for for governance rather than just the new kit. And of course as we know in policing in the UK, [REDACTED – 2] is an [REDACTED – 2].

Interviewer

Yeah, yeah.

Interviewee 10

I mean, nobody does [REDACTED – 2]

It's so yeah, I might direct you towards that. It's really interesting stuff there.

Q4

Interviewer

OK. Thanks very.

Look into that a bit further on to the next question and that's around the requirements to introduce next new technology.

So thinking about the main requirements needed to introduce new technologies, what do you think are the main building blocks to successfully introduce the technologies?

Interviewee 10

Hmm, so this and this. This was the subject.

My own PhD.

In Waves, I mean it was digital. Accountability in policing is.

PhD thesis I'd I'd like to split them into three. There is the technological.

What can be done, there is the legal what must or mustn't be done, and there is the societal what people will support or expect to be done.

And quite often you just get an over emphasis on one or two of those. It's very rare you find all three being discussed from the same source, because people are usually in one one vantage point or another.

And that's really helped me massively in this role where people go what do you think of body worn video?

And you think OK, and you just apply those 3.

And and they and and they do lead back to things like accountability, particularly the the societal one. But the introduction

Of of things, needs needs to take account of all those I, I [REDACTED – 6]

Asked a question at the beginning of the panel.

And the preface to their question is, is what is what stayed with me.

And she said if we're introducing new technology in [REDACTED – 1].

First we build the trust and then we build the system.

And we pointed at people, and then she went on to ask a question. And I grabbed this and gone right, this is the polar opposite of what we've all done.

We build the system and then spend a lot of time trying to persuade people why it's good for them and why they should trust it.

And actually what you've just described must be the optimal way of doing it. So you build the trust first and it's nothing to do with the tech.

So you take the societal bit and then you start talking about the other bits and introduce the wizardry.

And that's not what we've done.

Interviewer

Yeah.

Interviewee 11

Yeah. So I thought that was a very interesting that that was, culturally that was fantastic.

Interviewer

Yeah. And is that publicly documented anywhere that I would be able to find, because that sounds very relevant.

Interviewee 10

[REDACTED – 6]

We got, we got a name check and I said this is how to do it, I said I'm going to be telling everybody. So yeah, so if you needed a specific reference to that, I'll be able to send it to you.

But it was I think that is brilliant.

Interviewer

[REDACTED – 6]

Interviewee 10

Yes.

Interviewer

Thank you very much.

Interviewee 10

Sure.

Interviewer FQ4

Is there anything which may prevent the successful implementation of new technologies into UK law enforcement?

Interviewee 10

Yes, lots. So one, the fragmented landscape I've just described.

And it's not just that it's fragmented. They do have a right, you know, more than a right.

There's an expectation that local PCCs will determine all this stuff in accordance with the wishes of their communities and the more diverse the communities you've got, the less likely is you'll find something that everyone's happy with.

So you've got that fragmentation. You have got the fact that there.

There isn't a single conduit. I mean with the.

NPCC has only just got Paul Taylor, hasn't it recently as the Chief Scientific Officer.

So there isn't that place to go to, which I think a lot of other disciplines and professions do have where you can go and get that internal expertise that isn't attached to one particular organisation.

I think we have got the.

The fact that there isn't a single national.

Point for all of policing there might be now for you know, for for the agency, but there isn't. There isn't.

The equivalent.

Where you could just plug in national projects, they're all cobbled together with the Home Office in the room usually, and people doing it in addition to their day job at chief officer level. Or they've been second.

From it, but it isn't what they do.

We've had failures in the past, so history is against us.

[REDACTED – 5]

Interviewer

Yes, I am. Yeah, yeah.

Interviewee 10

[REDACTED – 5]

And then we've got the pace.

And and and and the impulsion towards. You know using new stuff.

There's an expectation, so go back to the societal one. It's not just what people will support being done. They expect it to be done. They people using kit that you know would have been the preserve of state intelligence agencies 10 years ago and they've got it on the table at home and they go well, why can't the police use this? It's really easy. I can track my teenage daughter, you know, when they're coming home from, why can't you do it? But so I think there's two. There's two things.

Two things in in that encapsulating that one is the tech and two is that people don't understand why the police can't just do this, and you can't just grab hold of something and you can't just deploy it. And it is very different from if you do it as a consumer.

And then I think there is also the stuff that I've spent a lot of time on around who, who
[REDACTED – 3]

So you you need trusted.

Technological partnership as well as the kit, so there's no point just trusting the kit to do what it's supposed to do. You need to trust the people who are working with you to do what they're supposed to do, and I think all those areas together with an overarching kind of, I don't know what it is really, it's it's not, this is not just news media. This is kind of there is a lot of Global chatter about.

Oh, this is what the police will do, don't, you can't trust them.

If they get hold of this, they'll do with this. It's not just mission creep. It's it's kind of perception that the they won't.

They won't be able to help themselves.

And it's kind of folklore, but it's on a it doesn't respect jurisdictions because it's people exchange it. You know the tech connects all of us in this, so we're using the same tech,

[REDACTED – 6]. If you misuse or are reported to have misused facial recognition,

[REDACTED – 3] as the police in Cumbria around Sellafield, then that will immediately be an issue in Canberra. It will immediately be an issue in Tokyo. You know.

Know they're shared in a way that other bits of policing probably aren't, because it's all very kind of quaint and and and, you know, jurisdictional. But the tech isn't because we're all we're not only using the same tech.

We're probably using the same half dozen companies.

And that also makes it really hard. So you're not just trying to assure people in

[REDACTED – 1] you're trying to assure people in the Western Hemisphere and that's really tough, I think.

Interviewer

Yeah. OK. Thank you.

A lot there for me to look at that, which is really useful. Thank you very much.

On to the next question.

That's around the lessons learned.

Interviewee 10

Hmm.

Q5

Interviewer

Thinking about either your own experiences or your knowledge, introducing the technologies, can you describe what lessons you feel can be learned from these to help introduce other new technologies for law enforcement?

Interviewee 10

Yeah. So first lesson is to do the opposite of what I've saw recently in the [REDACTED – 1] diagram, which is to have.

The support of the citizen.

As a critical outcome, as well as a desired input.

Because you do need it as an input, obviously, but that must be an outcome. So it goes a bit back to the [REDACTED – 1] really.

I think that the.

Inviting challenge, not waiting to be I've just said this at the [REDACTED – 6], don't wait to be challenged or sued or complained about, invite challenge. So say we think we've got it right. We've done all this, all this testing around the kit.

We think we're right come in and show us where we're not and do that very frequently not just once then deploy it.

Remember what assurances you gave when it was still new?

Because I watched the [REDACTED – 4] I think it was last February where they were talking about why do we waste so much time pixelating out the background on body worn video footage for policing?

And even the [REDACTED – 4] didn't know, the [REDACTED – 4] said. Well, we should.

Loads of police time and I'm shouting at the screen. Well, there was three reasons.

One, it's data protection requirement 2. You need to avoid.

Straying into [REDACTED – 2] inadvertently because actually, there's there's there's a lot in the background that people are doing, which you need to pixelate.

But three, the main one that you're most likely to miss is you may have given it as an assurance when you were saying to communities. Here's a.

[REDACTED – 2] 'cause we did in [REDACTED – 1]. [REDACTED – 3]

Well, if that was an assurance, remember that because the people will have moved on and the tech will have moved on. But then.

[REDACTED – 4] going, why do we bother doing this?

So keep keep track of your assurances.

Because otherwise it's not just. It's not just well you know we've moved on a bit since then and you know we don't need to for that particular use.

It goes back to the public trust and confidence again where people say, Oh yeah, last time you promised this and then you got rid of it so.

I think that's a a very strong lesson and also I think.

Being prepared to.

Accept that you you weren't right with your first business case. Or that the world has moved on.

And that world might not be yours.

So again, it goes back to this interconnectedness.

If other, if other jurisdictions are finding using the same kit in the same circumstances that there are problems with it or things that they hadn't foreseen at the time, it's really important that we stay plugged into that.

So I I think there are lots of lessons and then the really obvious ones like you know, litigation changing, particularly when it comes to human rights, you know it can take five years to get to Strasbourg.

That's a very long time from people going. We're not happy with.

Doing with our [REDACTED – 6].

To a court saying it's completely disproportionate.

So yeah, keeping an eye on the on some of the the litigation as well.

Interviewer FQ5

Yeah. OK. Thank you very much and I think I know the answer to this one, but I will still ask you which of these do you feel be the most impactful to help ensure successful introduction new technologies?

Interviewee 10

I think it's that I think it's having the involvement of a spider group of people as you can, not just technical expertise.

Because and this is where we're heading with anything that involves AI isn't it. If people don't understand it, you're simply asking them to take it on faith, and we've seen where that gets us so.

It it really is important that people not just get it and they don't need necessarily to understand it to any particular.

Scientific level. But if you sit and show me a painting.

By somebody and say that is a really good painting, that that takes genius to paint. And I think well it looks like somebody's run it over.

I'm. I'm again it's a felt response.

And nothing you could say to me is going to shift that felt response to goes. You may well think that was a great painting. I still think it looks like it's been run over in a in a ditch.

So which is fine when it comes to art, maybe.

But if it's and one of the things we've got certainly with [REDACTED – 3], it's a a lot of a lot of citizen concern is a felt response, which means you can't argue people out of it. So what have you got?

You've got a trust and confidence around all the infrastructure, ie how it got here, how we know it's good, why we think it's going to work, how we're rigorously going to oversee the the test results and and what it produces. Because simply going, yeah, trust us it's a good painting.

It's not going to work and there is I think there's something really interesting here about about [REDACTED – 3] because people haven't done that with [REDACTED – 3]. They're not.

Not doing it with, you know, [REDACTED – 3] that you know, they've accepted a lot of that technology, which is, you know, would probably be quite difficult to explain scientifically. I I think one of the things about [REDACTED – 3] is that no, nobody's going to think. Well, I've looked at [REDACTED – 6].

But everyone has got a view on [REDACTED – 3] and they go well. That's clearly [REDACTED – 6] look at it, and even if it isn't.

So I think that's going to be a real challenge, particularly in the future. You've got to get people comfortable with it.

And also what we've got that's different now is that it is this is interesting for me in sort of [REDACTED – 3] discussion. So I start by saying there's no such thing as [REDACTED – 3] what you're talking about is, is.

These are.

These are [REDACTED – 3] Really they're [REDACTED – 3]

One basic function of which is to [REDACTED – 3].

But when you say, oh, [REDACTED – 3], which people do they go well? Yes it does.

And actually it lies really convincingly. Now. [REDACTED – 2].

So the [REDACTED – 3] does lie when people go oh.

You know, [REDACTED – 3] stops crime. That's what local councillors seem to have thought for the last 30 years, academics go well, no it doesn't actually.

But here's what it does do. And then.

You need to start again your back at Ground Zero because [REDACTED - 3].

Once you've got intelligent kit that says that's him from that address and he drives that vehicle.

Now it might stop crime, particularly if I know it knows who I am and if it doesn't stop me offending then I'm an idiot and I wasn't much of a risk to start with, so all all those kind of things, we're going back to because some of them you have to start again because what was true then is not true now about the tech.

So I think.

Understanding some of that too will be important, because otherwise, if you if you go out and then you introduce some brand new bit of kit and some new scheme.

And then somebody demolishes it with that kind of observation, you won't really get to talk about your new thing. You'll have, you'll still be talking about, you know why you haven't thought of it and how people can trust you again.

So I think a lot of these routes come back to trust and confidence.

Q6

Interviewer

OK. Thank you very much.

And that probably touches on to the next question as well, which is the key to success.

So could you tell me what you think the most important keys to successfully introducing new technology to law enforcement are?

Interviewee 10

Hmm.

So I think being really clear about those about the the balance of the three areas. So what's possible, what's permissible and what's acceptable?

I mean, you need them on a Venn diagram, don't you? Because ultimately in an accountable democracy, you need to be in the middle of those.

And you also need to again that the context is different, so the ICO will say all the time. Just because you can doesn't mean you should. I mean, they love doing that. And then I go well, not actually in policing.

So in policing the the legal position as I'm you know, it's very clear that.

You you have an Article 3 obligation to protect people from, you know, torture, inhumane, degrading treatment.

And the extent to which you've done that will will partly be based on what means you had at your disposal.

At the time.

And when that meant how many vehicles, how many detectives? You know, how much money?

It was. It was kind of, you know, relatively straightforward to work out.

But when it comes to to new kits and science and technology.

You know, police forces are now having the capability come closer and closer to their grasp.

That could in some certain sense, almost certainly have stopped a murder or a kidnap. Or a terrorism outrage, in which case we shouldn't be talking about, should we? You should be explaining why you didn't.

And why you haven't used something which was probably an available tactical option. And of course the police do this all the time, we know that.

But as technology is coming, it's giving them more and more tactical options and I think there will be, there will be already things and [REDACTED – 6].

When you've got explain why you didn't use it and that's not the case for anybody else, I mean it is maybe for the, for, for the state at large, but that isn't the same for most other users. So one of the things that we need to differentiate is where policing is different. And of course that's why Law Enforcement directive is there for the GDPR, so there are things about policing that are.

They make it slightly different and for me that's one of them and all the the the the post War Boys litigation. I can't the cases now, but this is this is where two of the families from Warboys is the black cab rapist.

They sued the [REDACTED – 4] on the basis that you had.

The things within your grasp that you didn't use and as a result we suffered here and and they won and I would imagine that almost certainly that will be the basis on which subsequent cases.

Have been settled by [REDACTED -1].

And those didn't deal necessarily as far as I'm aware with technology, but that's where we're heading.

And one of the but I've had this conversation with, with with [REDACTED – 4] where he has said, oh, so you know, that seems a bit of a stretch that, you know, the police liability for not preventing things could be determined by where they chose to put a [REDACTED – 3].

And I've said that [REDACTED – 3] is no longer about whether police choose to put their [REDACTED – 3]. It's about what they choose to do with the product of everybody's [REDACTED – 3], because that's what they've got access to. So your ability now with with technology to [REDACTED – 3], things that you're not in control of.

But which you can now pull together and use with the right AI driven editing tools means that you can do stuff quite easily and cheaply that you could never do before, and that might be highly intrusive. But given that you can do it.

You then back in the just because you can't. Does it mean you ought?

I think in some policing case, yes it does.

So I think that's gonna be one of the.

One of the real challenges and all of this stuff, I think what what should probably happen is

red teaming upstream so you know, try and break it, which again, I think the military are better at doing. But I think if you've got an idea, and then you think, OK, this is terrific, right, who do we know, who knows a lot about this? And I think the police will invite people in to help them build it, but it's a bit like I used to do when I was being [REDACTED – 1] where sometimes I would send the case that I have worked up or something I was about to do and then pay external council to show me where I'm wrong and break it. And then you, you know, you can come back and go. That's pretty robust actually, we've really thrown a lot of rocks and shoes at this and I think red teaming in, in, in terms of tech ingestion will be probably much more important in the future for for policing than it has been 'til now.

Interviewer

OK, there's a lot in there. That's absolutely.

Interviewee 10

Yeah.

Q7

Interviewer

Related, thank you very much.

On to the next area and that's around urgent operational requirements.

Interviewee 10

Yeah.

Interviewer

So would you be able to explain the impacts which you feel urgent operational requirements might have around introducing new technologies for law enforcement?

Interviewee 10

Yeah. So I.

As as long as the it's a bit like Technical Support units of old, isn't it?

When you've got lots of clever kit that isn't going to be used all day and all night.

But for it to be available, it needs to have gone through lots of checks and measures and tests and so forth and be up to date, so that in the event that you do need it, you've got all that covered off, and then it simply becomes about proportionality of deployment.

And again, I think this goes back to the previous answer where you've got so.

If you if you had the capability to plug and play [REDACTED – 3]

If you were able to do that, and maybe you know some of the boroughs around it.

And you have [REDACTED – 4] how how would you not do it?

Interviewer

Hmm.

Interviewee 10

And if you had that capability?

That would be potentially tremendous, but it will be very short for a very short time period in a very confined, albeit heavily populated part of the UK.

And then you put it back and I think that having that if as long as all the standards are met

and the kit is available and everything's tested and it's just going to be deployed and then returned, that ought to be where we're heading for. And then a review of, well, did it actually work? And you know to what extent all those kind of things and then constantly, constantly measuring that it is not well we used it for that and it works. Why don't we just use it for this somebody you get the whole kind of mission creep thing going on.

Interviewer

Yeah.

Interviewee 11

But I think that's that's possibly increasingly where we are going, where in a proportionality as an as a as a legal requirement.

Is such that it's going to be pretty unlikely that a lot of technical stuff that you're using in policing would it will be proportional. Certainly my [REDACTED – 3] to use it all the time for everything.

Which is why I've said [REDACTED – 3 and 6] I mean that is, that's the very definition of disproportionality and almost everyone that you're running through it, you know, at the beginning is not the people you're looking for, so.

And it's and it's a very big risk that I've just [REDACTED 3 and 6]. But the prospect of switching it off is too hideous for, you know, for policing and law enforcement generally. So where, where do you get that balance?

I think I think [REDACTED – 3] is quite a good case study for that.

But I think the ideal would be if you could, wheel it out, plug it in, put it back.

But there will be, there will be the, you know, the importance. Going back to your question about governance. OK, so who says that's the only time they've used it?

And how do you deal with things in policing such as well, covertly, this will be very helpful. And it'll be completely ruined if we had had to tell everyone we are using it. Therefore we're into the whole RIPA infrastructure and IPCO.

But what does that mean for our, you know, all those kind of. So I think the overt/covert interface is also really interesting for policing because most most bodies don't really worry about that. You know, [REDACTED – 1] aren't going to worry about that all unless someone's using their [REDACTED – 3]. You know, for covert ops and all that stuff.

So I think, yeah, there there's some real challenges ahead with doing that, but one of the one of the principal ones will be I think.

Either you bring it out and the world's moved on so it doesn't work as it was supposed to when you had the prototype or, you know, the the arrangements around it aren't sufficiently.

Clear to prevent it being used so.

You know, how would you know if you're on the exec team, whether some kit have been used?

It's brilliant. [REDACTED – 3] I realised quite early on the reason they didn't know is because they deal with spend thresholds and [REDACTED – 3] cost less than 100K.

Well, in [REDACTED – 3] and I think one of the interesting things for me in terms of

governance and accountability for tech is that as it becomes cheaper, if if your accountability mechanism relies on spend threshold, it's going to become less visible. And I think there is stuff with tech that you can get into a lot of trouble with very little money when it comes to police and tech, can't you?

In which case you need something else that flags it to go amongst all these other sea of stuff you're responsible for those little bits over there.

Well, you've got them and you're using them. And yet they're, you know, they cost buttons in the in the big scale of things.

[REDACTED – 3]

And so with your background, you may well have experienced this and you think this is brilliant, but then they would, when it gets up the chain, people say, what the hell are you doing using that? And I said, well, we kind of bought it out of petty cash. It's great. We'll take it down because, you know, we haven't had all the procurement decisions.

So actually I think that will flag a big risk that says, you know, all the right with all the right intention. You can get local procurement and deployment of stuff that would have a very big.

Blowback.

If the people in charge knew it, it happened and I'm not quite sure how you do that, but one thing you don't do is spend thresholds anymore.

Interviewer – FQ7

Yeah. OK. Thank very much again really useful that information and I think you've actually just answered the the next part of it, which is how might any negative impacts be best overcome.

Interviewee 10

Yeah. And I think that's how you do it.

It's got to be about.

There'll be some that you won't cause, some will be misreported, some will be misapplied, some will be and and some you won't be able to say, will you? That's again.

The covert overt challenge where there will be things where you won't be able to provide quite the reassurance you wanted to or correct stories because there's a bigger public interest issue, in which case you've got to come back to trust and confidence in your oversight generally.

Interviewer

Yeah.

Interviewee 10

And one of the things that's really important, I think is that.

The more time and effort you put into having a proper trusted.

Governance arrangement. The more you'll get the benefit of the doubt when one bit of kit goes wrong on one day, which it will, we know it will, because then you won't. It won't be a call for a systemic realignment of everything we need to [REDACTED – 3] because one

thing has happened, you will get more benefit of the doubt that this is a single instance. And look, yeah, we got it wrong. So I think that's how you avoid it if you can.

Q8

Interviewer

Thank you very much and on to the next area which is around non-technology factors now we've obviously already discussed this, but do you consider there are any non-technology factors which may also be important to ensure the successful implementation of new technologies and what might they be?

Interviewee 10

Yeah. I think there are lots of them. There's the whole folklore, there's the people think they know far more about tech now probably than they ever did.

That you know, there is no idea to dumb or policy too egregious that you won't find agreement for it on on social media so.

You know, we have kind of industrialised confirmation bias. So in the past.

Say, oh, you know, you go out to look for reasons why you're right, that the police shouldn't be doing this. Well, now your ability to do that is just off the scale.

So that's going to be quite hard, probably much harder countering that.

And the the one of the areas for me in non-technological issues because it's very hard to measure.

And predict is what they call the chilling effect of surveillance. So if people think that the police are able to.

Do certain things listen to you from, you know, drones or you know.

Listen to your phones on the school run, you know, see who's going past and the car just for speeding. If that's anything

If people think that's the case and then they make changes to their lifestyle as a result, that's the chilling effect. That's really significant.

It's not a technical issue. In fact, it could be totally wrong, but it can be as important as the tech not working itself.

And there is there's a massive literature on chilling effect formed from surveillance in particular, and if people think, well, you know, if I if I use my car to get to this protest in London, then I know that the the registration mark will be shared with Greater Manchester in three months' time when there is another protest for the same issue. Therefore I'm getting the.

Or worse, I'm not going at all.

All, all that is constitutionally really important, and it's nothing to do with the tech. It's more. Much more about the psychology of what people think the tech can and will do.

And I think with [REDACTED – 3] that's going to be a really important one because.

You know, it's bit like [REDACTED – 3] And I guess you could do the reverse for trying to defeat the technology itself.

And that's that's going to be a big risk.

Interviewer – FQ8

OK. Thank you.

And level of importance do you think these have in introducing new technologies compared to the actual technology aspect itself?

Interviewee 10

I think they are every bit as important to possibly going to be more important, because if you haven't addressed them, again, you're going back to the [REDACTED – 4], aren't you? First you build trust and then you build the system.

And you won't be trusted. You won't get another chance.

If your [REDACTED – 3] malfunctions or you know something is disproved at court because your toxicology process you know wasn't as it should be, yeah, that would, that would be a problem, but you can deal with it and rectify it. You can correct it.

You you can't patch trust and confidence.

So if it if you blow it in version one, you don't get to roll out 2, 3 and 4 and say, oh, we finally learned from this.

Q9

Interviewer

Yeah. OK. Thank you.

The next area is around vision.

Interviewee 10

Hmm.

Q9

Interviewer

So how do you think developing a vision about implementing a new technology within law enforcement can be best achieved?

Interviewee 10

Yeah, absolutely critical.

But then we come back to the fragmentation, don't we? And how do you have it?

And has everyone signed up to it? And you know, because it isn't. It isn't one thing. So you don't have a cyclops arrangement where we're all looking with one eye at the same thing for revision. You know, you've got hundreds of different approaches and and, you know, legitimate avenues not. I think that's really hard.

So I think the importance of having it is elemental, the ability to get to it.

Is really tricky.

Interviewer – FQ9

Yeah. OK and then who within the overall implementation process or development process, do you actually feel should create the vision?

Interviewee 10

I think you need a single.

A single leader from the the user end. So the people who are ultimately going to be saying and I think goes back to my, you know, tactical option.

It's not just the people who say, well, I used it for [REDACTED – 2]

I think it it needs to be someone who is in a position to say. Here's why we didn't use it on

this occasion amidst whatever has happened.

And I think because of our policing model, that's quite difficult. But we've done it with other areas, haven't we? So if, as long as you have a single source that you go back to, there's that kind of the senior risk owner, aren't they? To go.

Yeah, but this is, this is me having control of this and therefore.

They need to be able to set that vision to start with, otherwise no one's going to put that up for the job.

Q10

Interviewer

OK. Thank you.

And the next area now is about preventing resistance.

Interviewee 10

Yes.

Q10

Interviewer

So would you describe any resistance that you feel may arise with the introduction of new technologies in UK law enforcement?

Interviewee 10

Yes, enormous and I guess at both ends. So the one end you've got the.

The the the the police operatives going well.

Well, that's crap. My phone at home's better than that, or you know, this doesn't all day. So they told us it was going to do this and it can't. All you know, all that kind of.

So this, this, this sceptical stroke, cynical end user.

Who will share that cynicism, scepticism with the rest of the world and the citizenry, who may already be somewhat sceptical and cynical in any event because they're at the other end where they go, oh, we've seen this being used in China and this is the end of the world or, you know, we know this doesn't work, again a very good example is [REDACTED – 3]. Therefore, it's simply going to industrialise bias against already marginalised groups.

Interviewer

Yeah.

Interviewee 10

And and part of the challenge of that is you know we know already it is enormously difficult to prove a negative, but that's what you're gonna be doing a lot of the time, showing what it isn't, or what it doesn't do.

So again, you've got there will be lots and lots of of resistance and barriers.

But the only chance of overcoming them will exist if you've got a governance, trust and confidence and accountability, which actually is one of the reasons why I've I've produced. I'm on.

Interviewer

Yeah.

Interviewee 10

Doing [REDACTED – 6]

Interviewer – FQ10

Yeah. OK. Thank you and I think you've probably part answered that question.

Next question then which is how might such resistance be overcome?

Interviewee 10

Yeah. And I think it's having a framework like that that covers governance and accountability. And when you listen to the lot of the discussion around AI, for example, you will have transparent AI and workable AI and accessible AI. Very few people are talking about accountable. It's the accountability is one of your earlier questions. If someone has to be accountable for the use of it, where do I go to to find out more about it or to complain about it, not just in the sort of conduct way and you just send me off to professional standards.

This needs to be about, you know, where do I get answers from where do I raise questions? Where do I get assurances from, that's accountability.

Q11

Interviewer

OK. Thank you.

The next section, which we're almost there, you're pleased to know, is around when we sort of deem something to be successful. So think about a successful implementation of new technologies in law enforcement.

What do you feel needs to be achieved to attain this level of success?

Interviewee 10

Think something's come on my screen. Let me get you back.

There.

I think a shared a shared understanding.

Of of how you're gonna measure the success and a very clear link between the inputs and the outputs, which comes back a bit like that.

In a public public understanding and supports is a is a desired input, no, it's not. I mean it might be.

But the principle is is it's an essential outcome and if you haven't got those, you can have all the other inputs you want. And I think being really clear about those because some of them will be technical, lots of them will be technical and lots of them aren't. And the people who think about the first ones are very different from people who think about the second ones.

So you've got technology, you've got lawyers, and you need psychologists in this.

And because ultimately, sometimes it's about the tech, but it's always about the people.

And therefore you need folks in there who will say. But you know what's going to happen? The minute you release this and technical people go well, who the hell would do that? You go humans.

So that's I think building that in say it starts with its people and then look at the tech because I'm actually it makes me laugh. This is where we get the human in the loop stuff, you know I'd have thought to an algorithm, you know, human fail safe is an oxymoron. It's either a fail safe or it's human, because almost everything that's gone wrong in the centuries using tech that we know of in law enforcement was the people. It wasn't the tech itself.

So recognise that from the off.

Interviewer – FQ11

OK. Thank you.

Do you think there's any sort of form of conceptual time frame within which this needs to achieve for it to be more widely accepted?

Interviewee 10

No, don't know. I think that's so broad and situations and technology specific and it will change all the time, I think so no, I don't.

Q12

Interviewer

OK. Thank you.

And now we're on to the the final question, the the kind of catch all as always.

So are there any other factors or issues we haven't yet discussed which you feel are important for the successful implementation of new technologies for law enforcement?

Interviewee 10

I don't, I don't think so.

I don't think so.

I think there there is. It's hard to describe the kind of small and big P politics.

Around it, but I think there there are some things where people just are implacably opposed to something as a concept, and that's what we're seeing with, certainly with [REDACTED – 3]. And there are organisations that are set up, their sole purpose is to defeat it being used, and I think that'll be a challenge because again, it's that's not just arguing with someone that the painting is look is a good painting rather than it's been run over. That's someone going I don't like paintings and you shouldn't be allowed to paint.

OK. That's, it's a really hard conversation to get into isn't it?

And if you're in a democracy and that's the position of a of a party.

And they're running things, well there you go.

That's a reality. The kind of you can't, you can't.
That trumps everything.

Interviewer

OK. Thank you.

That that's the formal end of it.

Interviewee 10

No problem.

Interviewer

So let me just turn the transfer off.

Interviewee 10

Cool. OK.