

INTiLE Interview with Interviewee 9

Q2

Interviewee 9

Yes. So I I'm now working 10 years at [REDACTED – 1]. I was in the private sector before that, so, so my experience is restricted to my time at [REDACTED – 1] where I was working as a project manager for 9 years, in the ICT department and a lot of the the technologies were introduced where new capabilities.

And the last year I've been working at the [REDACTED – 5], where we're less about directly implementing, innovations, but, you know, sort of meta involved in order to enable others to do so.

Some of the technologies were introduced in my projects where, well, I'm quite proud of them. So we we introduced [REDACTED – 3].

We introduced a concept called [REDACTED – 3] to securely transfer and and allow the exploitation of of certain data certain data sets.

Yeah, we we increased the security level of our networks. So I was, I was responsible for that. A lot of things like that or indeed new software capabilities.

You know, such as very specific law enforcement, unique in-house developed solutions.

Interviewer – FQ2

Yeah. OK. Thank you. So what came from that experience which you would use with any sort of future similar requirement?

Interviewee 9

I think the.

There's, there's probably, there's probably several learnings here. The first one is at the requirement stage or if, if I dare say, at the customer stage where you say, does the customer know what they want and can you help them understand what it is that they want. So it's really about defining a problem that they need to resolve and sometimes, the project starts without that clarity.

At the.

At the sort of political stage, even maybe before that, there there's often institutional inertia. You know, we've always done it this way. Why would we want to change it?

That sort of thing? Or there is, you know, maybe there's there's competition between units or departments who say, well, we want it this way. No, we want it that way.

So so there are a number of things that you need to line up beforehand. If the project is to be successful and a wise man once told me that.

Yeah, I think it comes from carpentry that you know, you measure twice and you cut once and that has been a principle that's been very successful for me.

Q3

Interviewer

Thank you. OK. We'll move on to the the next area and this one's around governance. So what governance considerations do you feel are necessary to introduce new technologies into law enforcement?

Interviewee 9

Well, this is an interesting one because the top-down innovation can be can be, you know, ground breaking.

Although I think often you know things like process innovation or maybe tweaks that make a job more efficient come from the bottom up. So you need to have a system that allows you to filter down.

To align, you know, let's say senior and then middle management behind certain things and then you need to obviously as part of the project have a communication plan to bring the users along who will ultimately be using or benefiting from the innovation.

And if you have something bottom up, you need to do some kind of upward management.

Through, you know, transparency, you know benefits realisation, things like that or or say benefits articulation in order then later to realise those benefits.

So governance, I think as as boring as it sounds is I think key, you know there you often hear in, in the IT world that agile is a mindset.

This training to train that the agile mindset well, innovation is a mindset as well and. I've I've I guess I've been lucky in the sense that.

The innovations I've been introducing were agreed upon ultimately by by my stakeholders.

Interviewer – FQ3

OK. Thank you. And do you think all of these factors that you just mentioned there are actually ready, available and achievable within law enforcement?

Interviewee 9

Well, I think I think.

No. Is probably short answer.

I'm going to focus on, I guess, two things. One is one is inertia. I think law enforcement is a more traditional hierarchical organisational structure which.

Not, you know, it's not pervasive that there might be, say, fat hierarchies, or it's not always possible for for bottom-up innovation, say or you know, things like that.

Projects tend to be linear maybe.

Maybe more prescriptive without necessarily knowing what what frontline staff really need. That's just from my limited experience, of course.

The second thing is law enforcement, certainly here at [REDACTED – 1] we have such stringent security requirements that a lot of things are not possible that are maybe possible in a in a private sector setting or even in another public sector institutional setting. So one example might be cloud computing. You where I think law enforcement could be potentially way behind where the rest of industry is simply because.

Well, speaking just for the for the [REDACTED – 1] case, we have to be really, really specific with our data protection supervisor, for example, to prove that the data does not go say to servers in [REDACTED – 1] for processing or that the sub processes in the cloud service who may be in [REDACTED – 1] or elsewhere do not get access to the data. So these things are really, really quite stringent and as a result they tend to slow things down. I'm not saying that that's a bad thing, I'm just saying it is a fact.

Q4 Interviewer

Yeah. OK. Thank you. And the next area now we have already sort of briefly touched on and that's the requirements to introduce new technologies. So thinking now about the main requirements, erm what do you think are the key building blocks to successfully introduce new technologies?

Interviewee 9

Yeah. So I think I think.

Stakeholder alignment.

You know, bringing bringing not only management, but especially the users along with you. So that requires a clear articulation of the the benefit of any new technology or or innovation.

Clarity of purpose, you know, clarity of mission or or indeed.

I mentioned at the beginning the problem definition and what problem are you actually trying to solve?

Are all critical inputs and then I think if those things are aligned.

The the technical delivery.

Usually is is. I don't want to say it's the simple bit, but it's it's, you know, that's where you have the technical experts to do their job.

But if I could use this moment, we used to joke at a previous company of mine, we say, OK, you developers, you start coding and tomorrow we'll tell you what you're working on. You know that that doesn't work necessarily.

And.

Yeah, I think I think those will be the principal elements. I think again, there's this principle of cutting, sorry measuring twice and cutting once that you that you pre or you front load your alignment effort.

I think ultimately is is a key factor for success.

In the in the sort of agile mindset, you do have emergent opportunities and and maybe changes of direction. But I think in a heavily regulated environment like law enforcement.

I'm not so sure that you can be quite that, you know, responsive to emergent opportunities and therefore, I think that the front loading of of that alignment is key.

Interviewer – FQ4

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

Interviewee 9

Yeah, I mean, I I know from from my own brothers who who my brothers, law enforcement officer in in the [REDACTED – 1] and he once said yeah, they got a new system. They had a, you know they had four older systems that all were maybe a bit on their last legs but they worked and then a new system came in and nothing worked anymore and it was supposed to be this you know all singing all dancing integrated system and nothing worked anymore. So I think I I think the the.

Say if there is a political will or the the you know at the senior hierarchy level that there's a will to improve things or make things more efficient, that's one thing. But the people who do the work need to be listened to.

In order to to fully and successfully embed new technologies and new innovations. Otherwise, you know it's you wouldn't, you wouldn't you know, sit up in, in above ground and tell the coal miner down in the at the scene. You know how they need to do their job. And sometimes I feel that this is, you know, this this can happen and therefore you have you have.

High profile project failures. You know, it's they project fail at the start.

In my view.

Q5 Interviewer

OK. Thank you. So next area now is about the lessons learned from these areas. So thinking about your own experience or knowledge of introducing new technologies, can you describe what lessons you feel can be learned from these to help the introduction of other new technologies?

Interviewee 9

Yeah, I think I think the principle lesson I think is that it's it's not the technology. per say, and the introduction of something new that you know, that's the shiny bit that maybe is, you know, where where you have somebody cutting a ribbon and you know it's how it's being used.

Is is a determinant of success so so you know, just popping some big computer

system in place doesn't necessarily achieve the objective so.

If, if I might say you know something like.

Proper user experience definitions or or or. You know, making sure, making sure that.

It actually solves the problem. It sets out to solve.

I think are the key lessons learned. I'm sort of saying what I've said previously in reverse, if you know what I mean. But but I think after.

Even before my time in law enforcement, working in the technology sector, these these things are almost like universal truths to me now.

The alignment.

And by that I mean, you know, really from top to bottom that we say, OK, we're introducing new system to to achieve these things and these are the benefits and OK there may be slightly new ways of working or you need to acquire new skills or learn how to use the software interface or the user interface, sorry, of the software. All of that can be planned, but it must be incorporated in the planning so you can't throw something into production and then figure out afterwards or the journey to to retrieve the benefits that you're after is going to be a much longer one.

Yeah. I mean, there's probably other other lessons, especially around, you know, communication.

Transparency.

I've I've been involved in projects where there's been a political agenda, which usually, satisfies people other than the users of of the things, so you might say, OK, here's something shiny and new, but.

It's because.

Of a relationship of somebody with somebody else, you know, and does this software itself or the system itself actually do what the users need.

And that alignment has at times been missing, so I think.

Filtering out any personal agendas is part of that which is difficult in the sense that if if you have seniors, say senior political backing.

It's really difficult to filter out their political or or or or party political agenda. For example, I don't a solution for that, but but I've seen that happen as well.

Interviewer – FQ5

Yeah. OK, thank you. And there's a few there. So which of these do you think will be the most impactful to help? Sure that ensure a successful introduction?

Interviewee 9

Yeah. I mean from personal experience, so we we increased for example, the security level of our network here at [REDACTED – 1] moving to [REDACTED – 3] and that was very, very much a negative impact for the for the day-to-day usage of

the systems here. It's obviously a security improvement, but the the persons who are affected by it, excuse me.

Have to have to do more work to get even into the thing, and after a few minutes.

If they if the machine is idle, you know it locks again and they have to do the same thing again so so it can be a bit of a pain and as a result we had to make sure not only to explain how it works, but why.

It it was necessary, and it was a key security control for the for the security accreditation, which itself then allowed other things to happen. So as part of a bigger picture. So communication, I think communication is the key.

You know from from, from the alignment that I spoke of from the articulation and then the realisation of benefits, it's all held together by communication.

Q6

Interviewer

OK. Thank you. And that probably touches and may even actually answer the next question and that's around the key to success. So can you tell me what you think the most important keys to successfully introducing new technologies in law enforcement are?

Interviewee 9

Yeah, indeed the I mean, when you're at the introduction level, then it's clearly you have to have a good communication plan. You have to have.

The backing of of your of your users, but also the backing of the the hierarchy that goes back to an earlier comment of mine. So the second one would be alignment.

From the outset, you know.

I always like to start with the problem statement of some kind.

So those will be, yeah. But communication I think ultimately is is the glue for all of these things.

Q7

Interviewer

Yeah. OK, lovely. Thank you.

Another next section is another sort of angle which is around urgent operational requirements. So can you explain the impact which urgent operational requirements might have when we introduce new technologies to law enforcement?

Interviewee 9

Yeah, this is this is a good one actually. So here in, in, in our context, we have either the need for speed or the need for compliance. And so how can you make the two meet?

You know, over in the private sector they maybe move fast and break things, but but

we still have to be within the within the governance frameworks or the or the compliance requirements. You know we're still a law, you know on the basis of laws and regulations.

So we've we've managed to to.

Carve out resources for for a dedicated operational support team so technology support team.

To to enable accelerated provisioning. So most commonly this will be in in our context around data analysis products. So let's say a major operation coordinated by [REDACTED – 1] involving multiple [REDACTED – 5] or or you know.

Other [REDACTED – 5] with with collaboration agreements.

Working together.

Often, you know, yields, say, a large number of of data sets or.

Say in mobile phones or or servers and things like this and this data needs to be analysed really, really rapidly. So if that requires some quick, some quick.

You know, technical work in order to, you know, to make the most of that, that, that moment, what we what we have for example is.

A standing agreements with certain of our regulatory stakeholders.

I don't know that there is any better way of doing it. Certainly sometimes you have to you have to have a standing agreement and then you know, make sure you you fix it afterwards. Kind of thing. You know. So so.

In many cases, be it in, in, in the legal profession, you know at at, at the courts, or wherever you, you have to weigh up the.

The the cost of non-compliance versus the cost of non-movement or or slow movement and sometimes I think you need to you need to take the the route that the speed say say if it if it was to.

You know, in the case of [REDACTED – 2] or other such, you know, very serious and and time sensitive operations you you don't want to have to go to the regulator. Who takes weeks or months to to come back with an opinion. So you need to have some kind of standing agreement. And I think that's possibly the the best way that we've currently identified.

Q8
Interviewer

OK, lovely. Thank you.

We'll move on now to the next area, which is around potential non-technology factors and I think you've suggested a few of these already. So do you consider there are any non-technical factors which may also be important to ensure the successful information and new technologies and if so, what are they?

Interviewer 9

Yeah, I think I think ultimately.

So the alignment I've mentioned the buy-in of the users are key determinants here, but also I think.

So we've been, we've been studying or working to understand how the [REDACTED – 1] for example, they have a system whereby frontline.

Staff officers can can.

Receive resources to do something innovative and and to to test it and to play around with it. That generates, aside from, you know, if like the process of innovation itself, it generates.

You know.

The frontline stuff becomes stakeholders in the success of an initiative.

It's like almost like a cooperative kind of thing, you know which, which I think is really is really key.

Often innovations new technologies are seen as as or some automation is going to take my job away or something like that, which can lead to resistance.

Whereby if if people are on-board.

Those who may you know, need to change their set of tasks as a result of the introduction of this can be can be brought along through communication and and things like that. So I think, yeah, I'm. I'm kind of touching on things I've mentioned before.

Interviewer – FQ8

Yeah.

Lovely. Thank you. And what level of importance do you think these have in introducing new technologies compared to the actual technology aspects?

Interviewer 9

I think I'll be fairly adamant that those are critical success factors.

Software I don't say is 10 a penny, but but the the you know the the hardware and software that that does the processing of data and processing of input.

Yeah, it's not generic. I don't mean it that way, but but the but whether it gets used in the way it's intended and and those kinds of things are are down to the people who will do the work, you know and if there is a sort of a silent rejection of a new computer system, for example.

I think it can be as whiz, bangy and and shiny as you want it to be, but it's not going to be successful. So I think I think ultimately the the key success success factors, sorry, are in fact non-technical ones.

Q9

Interviewer

Yeah. OK, lovely. Thank you. On to the next area then which is around the vision. So how do you think developing a vision about implementing new technologies within law enforcement can be best achieved?

Interviewee 9

So there's probably, you know.

So the first, the first one might be.

Yeah, that's a good question. So there's the element of what's in it for me. So so that's that's a very personal if if I maybe start and work my way outward, what's in it for me, could be, you know, it makes my job easier or it takes away some of the drudgery or some some other job or, you know, whatever it makes data entry easier. So I can spend more time out on the streets.

You know, as a police officer.

So, so articulation of benefits.

You know, value proposition, those kinds of things at the personal level. So you need to address that the the slightly you know taking slightly wider view, maybe the next layer of the onion outwards is addressing people's intrinsic motivation, I think if we are honest, we work in the public sector, probably because there's some level of idealism.

Being part of a greater whole, something like that, and that can be tapped into as well to say, you know, if we reduce the time from an emergency call to a, I don't know an ambulance or or a police car being dispatched.

That allows us to be better as a as a, you know, public service. So there's that. And then, you know, as a as a maybe the the very outer layer might be something societal where you where you can.

You know.

Make [REDACTED – 1] safer. Make [REDACTED – 1] safer. You know that that kind of thing. So I think I think.

The vision needs to.

Not only to say what it is, but.

Why it is and and I think that's key.

Interviewer – FQ9

OK, thank you. And who within the overall implementation process, do you feel should actually create this vision?

Interviewee 9

Yeah.

I think that would be situationally dependent on the type of projects, so I think a small software upgrade you know wouldn't need a vision. But if you're introducing something major, it should be really.

At the highest level, I think people are motivated by the fact that, say, the chief of police knows about the project that you're working on.

Or that you're going to be affected by. So I think I think visions, vision statements come. You know, they are by nature flying very high. So they should be articulated by those higher up.

Q10

Interviewer

Yeah. OK. Thank you. Moving on to the next item, this is around preventing resistance. So would you describe any resistance which you feel may arise from the introduction of new technologies in law enforcement?

Interviewee 9

Yeah, I think that the the main, the main no, not the main one but but a significant one would be.

Say say a police officer knows how to do a particular process, step in a certain way, and if that was to change.

You know that they could potentially be resistance to it. I have a I have an example from my own experience where somebody was copying.

[REDACTED – 2], you know, which is very very basic tool. So when we upgraded the the operating system [REDACTED – 3] also was upgraded and they were resistant to that because they knew how to do it in the old one. So the fact that it was just as easy and the new one at that point was immaterial. So so.

The sort of basic inertia of, well, hang on, it works this way. Don't make me don't make me change. That is a very, very powerful force.

Excuse me so.

Again, going back to my communication points from earlier or you know in in that you might include a training plan for example.

Other other forms of resistance I think would be.

Institutional competition.

Or or.

Departmental competition or or you know not coming to decision because the key stakeholders are pulling in different directions where we go back to an earlier point of alignment or in this case because they are misaligned, nobody makes a decision.

One other thing.

That this is probably not not universal because it depends potentially on which police

force.

I just happen to know that in just back from a from a workshop.

In [REDACTED – 1] they say, well, we have to have everything defined up front and that's why everything takes super long and and in some cases never happens because you it's impossible to define everything up front. So this sort of more traditional way of of defining a solution and then.

You know, having that sort of linear implementation approach and then five years later, you have a system and the problem might have moved on by then. So so the sort of paralysis by analysis kind of thing could also be an impediment.

Which I suppose it's not really resistance from people *per se*, but it's sort of this sand in the gears kind of thing, which is because everything moves so slowly.

So those will be those will be 3 areas where I've seen it with my you know from my own experience.

Interviewer – FQ10

Yeah, and how might that resistance be best overcome, do you think?

Interviewee 9

Yeah, again.

Communication transparency.

Benefits articulation, you know, value proposition.

Maybe appealing, you know, to to the thing that motivates the people doing that work, you know, I talked about people's intrinsic motivation, but there might be something else which would be say.

Listen, you do a lot of data entry by removing this from your hands. You can do more. I don't know creative work or or you know.

Work that appeals more to your nature so so you can you can be.

Understanding why there might be resistance and through communication overcoming that.

Q11

Interviewer

OK. Thank you. That the next area is about effectively deeming the introduction to be successful. So thinking about a successful implementation of new technologies in law enforcement, what do you think feel needs to be achieved to attain this level of success?

Interviewee 9

So I was talking to you for so long that my my screensaver came on that. Could you please repeat the question? Apologies.

Interviewer

OK.

Yes, of course I can, no problem at all. So it's around deeming the implementation successful, so thinking about a successful implementation within law enforcement that you've been involved in, what do you feel needs to be achieved to attain the level of success?

Interviewee 9

Yeah, it's, it's a very common question actually. You know when can we say that we were successful? So so you probably defined some SuccessFactors upfront.

You have some post implementation measurements you know. So for example, if if you wanted to measure or if the objective was to reduce time, you know can you measure that the process takes a shorter amount of time?

Certainly. Certainly in the more traditional project management methodologies.

You define the scope up front so so you say, OK, we're going to build this system with these features and we're going to roll it out on on this platform and so on and so on.

But as I said earlier on you, that's an easy that's an easy definition of success because you just build it, but they might not come, you know, the the users might not come. So you have to have on top of that.

Supplementary efforts.

Beyond the technical implementation itself I mentioned earlier in this discussion that sometimes the technical workers, again, not simple, but it's straightforward.

Performed by technical experts, you know, and therefore they can build the system, but the the adoption of the system then becomes the the tricky part, so I think.

I mean, there's there's numerous ways you can you can, you can do this.

User satisfaction scores or or you know.

Things things that you can you can turn into metrics and measure.

Yeah, the system might be customer facing. I know we're talking law enforcement context in in the customer facing context, you might say does it help improve customer satisfaction. You know stuff like that.

On on the on the.

Yeah. No, I think I think that's that's probably it in in some in some projects you know technically they never stop because you know you might say OK well.

Phase One is complete and let's just get started and then you work. You know you can, you can try and be adaptive as you see how over time you know maybe the work changes, maybe the nature of the crimes you're combating changes and and therefore the systems themselves need to change. But if you define a something up

front, you measure it afterwards. I think that's a simple enough way to. To draw a line under a particular effort and then to move on.

Interviewer – FQ11

Yeah. OK. Thank you. And do you feel there's a time frame within which this needs to be achieved for it to be more widely accepted within law enforcement?

Interviewee 9

Hmm.

Well, if it takes maybe maybe to to turn around and say well, it shouldn't take five years, if you know what I mean if you take you, if it takes you five years to implement and and roll out something.

The the original problem may no longer be relevant, so I think there there is a case to be made. To be quick, you know and and knowing how public sector works and that you have to find the budget and you have to have this and you have to have that if you implement something within a calendar year and measure it the following year I think would be a reasonable assumption.

Q12

Interviewer

Yeah. OK, thank you. And now we move on to the the final question, which is kind of like a catch all scenario. So are there any other factors or issues we haven't yet discussed which you feel are important to successfully implement new technologies within law enforcement?

Interviewee 9

Well, yeah, there's sometimes maybe.

So.

Well, let's say from from from a specific uh, [REDACTED – 1] perspective, uh, we have to ensure certain things.

That there are political agendas, for example.

Our data may not go to the [REDACTED – 1].

So.

And this is for data protection reasons. The data protection regime in [REDACTED – 1] is deemed by.

The authorities here not to be of equivalent nature and therefore we.

Interviewer

Yep, go back there. Yeah. Yeah. I think somebody may have intervened there with the comments that you were making.

Interviewer 9

OK.

They are listening.

Yeah. And and can I just say, I really like [REDACTED – 1]. No. But they're all joking aside. All joking aside, I think if.

If there is a political agenda that has to be satisfied as well as the the problem that needs to be solved, or if the political agenda.

Twists the problem maybe into a direction or or into a shape that.

Is is, you know unrecognisable then then that can be inhibiting or slowing down or or you know a difficulty factor. And I have had that in in one or two projects as well.

Interviewer – FQ12

Yeah. And and how do you think you best implement that into the actual or incorporate it into the implementation process?

Interviewer 9

Yeah, yeah, I'm. I mean, when you're when you're the, say, the project manager and and you're planning something like this, you're you're a small cog in a big wheel.

Right. So.

What I found and and my preferred preferred way of working is.

To chunk things into segments or stages, and if you if you start with one stage, you might say that OK, maybe the the interest has waned and people have moved on and you can you can go about working in peace for the subsequent stages.

It's. Yeah, that's the only thing that jumps to mind right now often, I guess at the implementation level you you know, you're the recipient of somebody's direction.

So there isn't that much you can do. You could. You couldn't try and you know. But again, I don't think it properly works if you were to try and satisfy everybody all of the time. So you have to figure out a way to situationally adapt I guess.

Interviewer

Yep, OK, lovely that that comes to the end. So I'm just going to stop the transcription.