

INTiLE Interview with Interviewee 13

Q2

Interviewer

And there we go.

I can see that the uh transcription recording has just started so well.

We'll go on to the the first question, which is a bit of an ice breaker question and that's around your previous experience.

So could you tell me about your experience of introducing new technologies into law enforcement?

Interviewee 13

Yep, so my previous role in [REDACTED – 1], I was [REDACTED – 2&4]

One of the particular areas that I led technology implementation was in regards to an idea that had been raised through an evidence based policing forum.

We we were asking frontline constables where were some areas that they thought there were some gaps in the enablement of them doing their jobs and one of the areas that was raised by a by frontline constable was the fact that they were coming across [REDACTED – 2] on a regular basis and when they would ask the subject what it was, you know, they'd get all sorts of answers from [REDACTED – 2] and then there was a process that they'd have to then follow to get [REDACTED – 2]. And then track down the person and will take significant time and effort.

So they sort of said, look, we'd like a portable device where we could [REDACTED-2].

At that point, there was only what we used to call [REDACTED – 2], which were quite cumbersome.

[REDACTED – 2].

So long story short, we co-developed a handheld device.

Which was a [REDACTED – 2] on the street that would then Bluetooth the result to the officer's phone, which was into an app which provided umm what [REDACTED – 2].

Umm.

And then they could enter, you know, the subjects details etcetera and create a report from that on the side of the road.

But what what we really did was enhancing the officer decision making.

So they're an opportunity then on the side of the road when they got a pretty good indication if they were gonna refer the person [REDACTED – 2].

So we did see some enhancement around Officer decision making, but to introduce that technology into the organization, I required uh collaboration and consultation with a number of internal stakeholders and external stakeholders.

So internally you know there was an IT component there was getting the app whitelisted on phones.

There was financial implications.

There was a significant training component that we had to develop for the officers.

There were promotional videos, so not only for training, but externally to the community so that they knew what we were actually using in the community.

There was executive approval so as an [REDACTED – 4] the [REDACTED – 4] endorsement.

We had to brief the [REDACTED – 4] so there was ministerial consultation and then externally, because we partnered with [REDACTED – 1].

We had to ensure that the data transfer was meeting the [REDACTED – 4] guidelines.

You know the information was being stored on a secure cloud.

All these type of technical issues.

So, so the bringing it to life.

The concept was relatively easy, but actually bringing it to life, there was a whole lot of other considerations.

Umm.

Also, just in regards to the hardware that we were using and that was built in [REDACTED – 2] and so there was quite a bit of due diligence that we had to go through with the supplier, including procurement, making sure that we were compliant with government procurement rules.

So yeah, quite extensive background work.

The idea was actually the easy part and the delivery, because officers, umm, pretty much the uptake on the devices was instantaneous.

We ran a we ran a bit of a pilot initially to test the the the viability of the device in [REDACTED – 1].

And then at the conclusion of that, we evaluated it and and we could see that it was adding significant benefit to our business.

So that's how we made the decision around investment.

So that's a very high level, but that's one example.

Interviewer – FQ2

OK, lovely.

Thank you very much.

And what came from that experience?

Which you would use with a future similar requirement.

Interviewer 13

Umm.

Well, I think from from my own experience that was the first time that I'd sort of lead

a technology project.

Probably one of the things that I take away from that experience in particular is really having a good process or methodology about how you introduce technology into an organisation and really covering off all those things such as privacy and data and procurement and all those basic things.

But there's also a piece in there around that engagement with the community.

So from a [REDACTED – 1] perspective in particular, we have disproportionate outcomes for certain members of our community.

So any new equipment that potentially could exaggerate the the those disproportionate statistics always come under scrutiny so that community consultation was really important.

So in a [REDACTED – 1] context, I reached out to our [REDACTED – 5], who were able to provide some guidance on how we would use the device and some of those more vulnerable communities because we knew that there was high proportion of [REDACTED – 2] in those communities.

So there was that aspect around trust and confidence and legitimacy that we had to really build into our into our thinking.

But probably the big thing that I would learn is that these things take time and you've got to bring technology into an agency that is going to enable an agency rather than just buying stuff off the shelf because a lot of the time we buy stuff off the shelf, it's not fit for purpose and we don't find out until we've two or three years down the track. We've spent 10s of millions on a on a product that's not really delivering what we thought it was going to deliver.

So building it in consultation with the business and users was really, really important.

And I think the pilot that we ran in regards to frontline users using the devices, providing feedback on how intuitive the devices were we had to make them such things as cop-proof in the sense that protective cases because, you know, things get dropped and smashed and left on top of car roofs and stuff like that.

So it was all those type of things that we tested with the frontline, which was really important.

Q3
Interviewer

Lovely.

Thank you.

The the next area is around governance, which I think you've touched on some of that.

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

Interviewee 13

Umm, so I think first of all, there's there's two.

There's two parts to that I think you need to have a working group, and it doesn't need to be overly bureaucratic, but a working group with people that are actually gonna use the tech so that at the front end you really defining the problem that you're trying to solve rather than uh, you know, something that sounds great.

It's got a flash brochure that comes with it, but actually you've got to really define your problem.

So what we found it anyway was having that working group.

We really unpacked the problem that they had and simplistically it was they needed a device to [REDACTED – 2] on the street.

But there was a whole lot of other aspects to that in the sense that some areas in the [REDACTED – 6] they could easily get to locations that had devices such as the [REDACTED – 3], which is pretty good device, but they were static devices.

But when you're in the rural area, you know considerations around Wi-Fi connectivity because this device needed to connect to Wi-Fi to feed it back to the mobile phone.

So those working groups are really important.

So you're working with you in consumer and you're really teasing out what the problem is that you're trying to solve.

And then the second part of that is you need that strategic oversight, which is all that risk and assurance for your organization.

So such things as privacy implications, finance is obviously a big one, getting priority with your IT if you need IT support because you know they're dealing with a million and one priorities.

So where is this gonna fit on their list of priorities?

Can the new technology actually plug into existing systems?

Are you there or just dropped out?

Interviewer

Yes, I can hear you. Yeah.

Interviewee 13

Right, now I just dropped out for a sec, and then obviously, you're gonna need executive support to get that technology over the line.

So I I really see those two components as critically important and that's the sort of model that we use was like I say that more operational working group and then the strategic oversight to make sure that all the checks and balances were put in place and ultimately, the to make sure that the technology that's gonna be brought into the organization is actually gonna be sustainable because the last thing you wanna do is

introduce a tool that's really beneficial to the frontline.

And then 6 to 12 months later, having to pull it offline because it hasn't met, you know.

You know security testing internally or there's a problem around the way that the data is stored or any of those issues that can really reputationally impact the organization.

Q4

Interviewer

Lovely.

Thank you.

The next question is about the requirements to introduce next new technologies.

So what do you think are the main building blocks to successfully introduce such new technologies into law enforcement?

Interviewer 13

Umm well, I think to do it successfully, I always come back to defining your problems that you're trying to solve.

So if you're looking at it through a continuous improvement lens, there's gonna be emerging problems that there's no current technology that's gonna fill that void, but a lot of the problems that policing are facing, most jurisdictions around the world are facing similar challenges.

So I think the first thing that you've got to do is really good horizon scanning to understand what other jurisdictions are doing in that particular area.

What other technologies have been using.

So I think that's always a good starting place rather than trying to reinvent the wheel, so to speak.

I'm the other piece to that is like I say, really unpicking the problem that you're trying to solve.

So going through good problem solving methodology such as you know there's there's plenty of different versions out there, but we use quite often.

SARA [REDACTED – 1], so that's scanning to understand what the problem is. The analysis, so actually looking at umm, you know what what the data is telling us if it if it's a data data related question, what's the qualitative feedback from our staff around what they're finding then then come up with your response rather than sort of just jumping to your response and then the other big piece is actually assessing the impact.

So I think you can put technology out there and if you're not seeing it being used, it's obviously there's staff have been trained in it properly or they don't have confidence in it and we know that if technology fails, cops aren't gonna use it again.

So we suffered some of that with when we rolled out [REDACTED – 3], for instance in [REDACTED – 1] probably 10 years ago now, you know, we rolled out iPads and and phones, um cops weren't using the iPads, they were using the phones, they weren't using the iPads.

So we quickly recalled those after about 12 months because we could see the usage wasn't, there's no real big uptake in it.

So I think those are probably the things that jump out at me, um, and it sort of like I say, there's there's two factors has been really clear on the problem you're trying to solve.

And then the second piece is having that trust and confidence of your users that it's actually viable.

Interviewer – FQ4

Lovely.

Thank you.

And is there anything which may prevent the successful implementation of new technologies in law enforcement?

Interviewee 13

Umm.

Well, I think one we know sometimes technologies can be expensive.

So you gotta know you're all of life costs.

So there's one thing buying a bit of kit for you know, X amount of money and then finding out the licensing is gonna increase extensively over a period of time.

So really, understanding all of life costs all of that, those little things that sometimes you don't think about as you know, if a piece of equipment gets damaged, you know, how does that get replaced?

What's the time frames on getting that stuff turned around?

How quickly is it gonna be replaced? So that that I suppose really good asset management principles have to be have to be in place.

And then then then secondly.

I really think policing umm, you know we were under more scrutiny that we've probably ever been and that's you know, down to a range of different factors, high profile events.

You know, everybody's social media now you can capture an event and post it really quickly, so that trust and confidence with your community is really big.

I think if you're gonna go out and do a and introduce a piece of technology that really impacts day to day policing, with communities having that transparency and discussion with your community about what the problem is you're trying to solve is vitally important.

If you don't do that, especially around things such as facial recognition technology, AI, you're gonna lose parts of your community really quickly, and that can really undermine the success of that piece of tech, that actually might be doing some really good and reducing harm and communities, but if it's not properly the store and that's not properly implemented and there's gonna be a real big problem.

Q5

Interviewer

OK, lovely.

Thank you.

The next questionnaire is about lessons learnt.

So thinking about either your own experiences or your knowledge of introducing new technologies, can you describe what lessons you feel can be learnt from these to help the introduction of other technology and law enforcement?

Interviewer 13

Umm, so we run a [REDACTED – 1] quite regularly.

That sort of fail fast approach.

So if if something's not working.

Either pause and actually understand what what, what's not working, and and tweak it. But don't just keep pushing on if it's not gonna work, so that's probably one thing that we've we do and we really focus on is that failing fast if it and and I think that's really important and that sort of goes back to the credibility of the tech that you're introducing, if it's if it's not credible with your your user, it's not gonna be used.

Umm, the second thing is really being here on how you're gonna enable your organization to get the best out of the technology.

And now that might be training that make that might be making sure that the right policies are in place.

But implementation is critically important and I think you can do that through umm, good governance, making sure that all those areas of your implementation plan are being led and managed well to ensure that you know you you're meeting all those obligations but uh.

And that probably comes back to the main point around accountability.

So making sure that everybody on your project team knows what they're accountable for and having a really good project lead because that's fundamentally important to ensure that ultimately somebody's accountable for all these different components.

Interviewer – FQ5

OK, lovely.

And and which of those do you feel is the most impactful to help ensure the successful introduction?

Interviewee 13

Umm well, it's a mainly it's a coordination.

You've got to have really good coordination and having all those stakeholders, both internally and externally, um, together.

And that really comes down to the project lead and and this particular example that was me.

And so, you know, I made sure that, umm, you know those basic principles of project management were been adhered to.

But ultimately, I was holding myself accountable to particular time time milestones, financial restrictions that were obviously placed upon me about, you know, how much money I had available to run the the proof of concept and the pilot, and then holding to account those different components that had responsibility for delivery as well.

Q6

Interviewer

OK.

Thank you.

Next question is around the key to success.

So can you tell me what you think the most important keys to successfully introduce a new technologies to law enforcement are?

Interviewee 13

Umm.

Well, I think some of it are probably what I've covered off.

I I I probably would say umm.

Like from my perspective anyway, policing's only got finite amount of resources and and finite amount of finances.

So when you are looking at introducing technology, we know it's expensive.

You've got to be very surgical and clinical about why is it you need this piece of tech and it can be simple as it can be from something as simple as a better IT software right through to some hardware, be it ANPR cameras or in this case handheld device and you've really gotta have it linked to your organizations, priorities, strategic priorities.

So it's actually gotta be enabling the business to be successful and if it's not, it's not

gonna be relevant with your strategic leaders in the organization.

So ensuring that you're linking it back to, you know, community safety and and reduction of crime, fundamentally, that's what we what what here for and then um, uh, you can't really.

I don't think you can really go wrong as long as you can link it back to those strategic priorities and then the bit I keep going on about, I know quite a bit as that is that trust and confidence with your communities, because if it's if it's a piece of tech that the community feel that is over intrusive or is going to impact other, you know, certain demographics in your community and you even have to explain that it's you've already lost that battle.

So having those conversations up front around the problem you're trying to solve, I think goes a long way to to to bring in the community along with you, and probably not so much in the tech space, but another example where we've seen that play out in in the [REDACTED – 1] context was we are a generally [REDACTED – 2] police service.

However, we have access to [REDACTED – 2] model.

I'm it didn't go down very well because we didn't have that conversation with the community.

So all of a sudden we went from a generally [REDACTED – 2], which were completely foreign to the [REDACTED – 1] environment.

And that pilot got scrapped really quickly because the community were outraged that this had occurred. Well, parts of the community were outraged.

Fast forward 12 months.

We ran another pilot where fundamentally we still had the same capability, but it was done in a way in consultation with the community about why why we needed this particular model and how it was going to operate.

And we vastly, completely different outcome in the sense that the community were actually with police about why we needed this and we got the investment we needed to roll that out [REDACTED – 1].

So it's just a small example and I think it goes for tech as well that if you're gonna introduce tech that's gonna have an impact on the community and you've gotta have those conversations early on.

Q7
Interviewer

OK, lovely.

Thank you.

The the next questions around urgent operational requirements.

So can you explain the impact which urgent operational requirements might have on introducing new technologies within law enforcement?

Interviewer 13

Uh, Yep.

So probably one of the examples that jumps out at me is we use a bit of software in [REDACTED – 1], which there's just recently been introduced to [REDACTED – 1].

It's a [REDACTED – 2], however we use it for a range of different investigations.

It's a really good intelligence tool.

We use that in emergency situations, so if you [REDACTED – 2] you can use emergency provisions to do that.

So in those sort of situations where there's an immediate threat to to life.

You know those, we've got provisions within our [REDACTED – 1] that we can implement technology or existing technology anyway relatively instantaneously.

There's nothing that I've been personally involved in where we've had to implement technology or a piece of tech for an ongoing and emerging risk.

You know we we've had situations such as the [REDACTED – 4&6] where we would have to use potentially [REDACTED – 2] technology to, you know, make sure that [REDACTED – 4&6]. But those situations are very, very rare, and most of the time we we've had to introduce tech, it's already existing tech where we just need to turn on other functions to deal with an emergency situation, um, but they are in extreme cases.

Interviewer – FQ7

OK.

Thank you.

And how might any negative impacts of the urgent operational requirement be best overcome?

Interviewer 13

Umm well, I think really good decision making about why you've had to use those provisions so.

Uh, and a lot of the time that will be down to an individual being the the most senior person at that time.

And you know, if something occurs at 2:00 o'clock in the morning or and there's no real, you know, senior leaders around, sometimes that's just down to the individual leader.

So really good decision making about your justification.

Obviously, complying with legislation and making sure that the decision that you're making is fair and equitable and proportionate to whatever risk that you're facing.

So you know, just I think [REDACTED – 1].

Umm.

So yeah, making sure that you've you've gone through that and making sure that you're obviously documenting your decision, which is likely to come under scrutiny at

a later date depending on, you know, the outcome, especially if it's anything to do with I'm use of force against the member of the public and or an invasion potentially of their privacy.

And it might be for good reason to make sure that you're documenting that appropriately.

Q8

Interviewer

OK.

Thank you.

Uh, next question area is around the non-technology factors.

So do you consider there are any non-technical factors which may also be important to ensure the successful implementation of new technologies in law enforcement?

Interviewer 13

Uh, yeah, definitely.

So there's a whole lot of, as I say, stakeholders that need to be involved.

So you've obviously got your tech your tech side of the business, be it umm you IT your uh, you know the the the people that the the technical team set will come and do the the installs, et cetera.

But there's definitely other components and those that jump out at me, you know, policy groups.

And you, you, you police colleges or your or your training.

If if training required be if they have to design an online module or a or an e-module, you've got your communication and media teams that may need to communicate that out to the public.

Uh, you've got.

Potentially non-technical advisors that will be talking to how this is gonna actually be used in an operational setting.

As I say, you've got your community stakeholders that you need to talk to.

So I think the tech the tech sides, usually the easy bit, it's all those other bits that you have to bring together and coordinate to land these projects successfully.

Interviewer – FQ8

OK.

Thank you.

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

Interviewee 13

Umm.

Well, I I would probably put them on an equal footing in the sense that you can go out and you know be it like I say, these these devices, right, we we built them, we knew that they worked umm, the the hardware was, you know, built by experts.

So the tech was there, but you actually need to enable the tech to operate within the organization and that's why those other stakeholders, uh, we need the support.

You need the expertise um and and as I say, you need to be able to coordinate their resources to ensure that each component of the implementation is gonna be, you know, be on time, be robust and and potentially come up against scrutiny.

So I I think there are equally important as actually the technology itself, because without it you're not going to be able to implement your tech.

Q9

Interviewer

OK.

Thank you.

Next question area is around vision.

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

Interviewee 13

Umm well, I think everything needs to be aligned to whatever organization is implementing it.

The key strategic priorities.

Umm so from a from a policing perspective or law enforcement perspective and ultimately we have a mission or a vision to reduce crime and harm.

So I think the all technology really is contributing to that overall mission.

If it's not, it probably is not relevant to the organization and it's not likely to get support.

So I think being really clear on how that technology is going to enable the organization to deliver on its priorities are going to be critically important and and then as I say, a lot of the time you're competing for umm, you know, very small amounts of innovation fund funding to you know deliver proofs of concept.

So and being really clear around if the the the pilot or the proof of concept is successful and how you would upscale that within an organization and you know from this particular example and you know we were, we were fortunate to get funding to buy, I think it was about 15 devices which we piloted, but when we upscaled we had to go and buy about another 120 devices.

So you know, ensuring that you can actually deliver that cause if you run a

successful proof of concept and then to have to turn that off because you can't get the funding, there's will be hugely disappointing and a waste of everyone's time so. Yeah, getting getting all that type of thing.

You know those decisions made early and and sometimes it's not about the.

Just say for instance you need, you know, five devices that are gonna the organization kind of afford sometimes it might be staggering the implementation.

So you might buy 2 this financial year, 2 the following financial year and the one in the third year.

So just working with all those stakeholders about how this can be delivered and and and that diversity of thought around the table on on that can be extremely unbeneficial.

Interviewer – FQ9

OK.

Thank you.

And who within the overall implementation process do you feel should actually create the vision?

Interviewee 13

I'm well, I think you well from a from a [REDACTED – 1] police perspective, you really need it really sets with the executive, so they've they've already set the vision of the organization through the [REDACTED – 1].

We've got a a strategic plan on a page [REDACTED – 1].

It's really clear it's about what we hear, for how we're gonna do it.

The the You know the the the resources that we're gonna need to do it and it's clearly articulated everybody in the organization understands what our business is and what our focus is.

And that's set by ultimately our wider executive.

So I think they've already set the vision for you and then really it's up to the project team to lead that implementation to ensure that that piece of tech is gonna have the best chance of, you know, enabling the organization to deliver on those key strategic outcomes thereafter.

Q10

Interviewer

OK.

Thank you.

Uh, next question 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 13

Uh.

So again, speaking from my own experience.

And I'm thinking about things such as facial recognition technology.

Uh and some of the concerns, privacy concerns.

And then some of the challenges around.

You know, false positives with certain demographics in the community.

Umm, which is a real challenge and I don't think it's unique to [REDACTED – 1], but unique.

It's really a global issue, and that particular area.

So I think with the emergence of AI as well, there's some fear around how that can be used.

But I think the big challenge is these type of technologies are gonna continue to evolve with or without police and law enforcement.

As as organisations, we really need to look at how we can make use of these technologies, but in a safe way, you know, ensuring that we're complying with existing legislation, making sure that the technologies are being deployed ethically, proportionately, fairly, all those type of things.

Umm, because there is going to be, I think, a real challenge around the emergence of digital crime on how police can respond to it.

We're gonna need technology to enable us to be able to respond, prevent and resolve those crimes and without those tools, we're not going to be effective, which is gonna impact our trust and confidence even more.

So I really think again it goes back to uh, been really crystal clear on how you're gonna use the tech, what safeguards you've got in place, how you're going to provide that assurance around, you know, auditing particular bits of tech to ensure that it's being used appropriately by people within the organization.

So having a really good robust framework around that is going to be really important, but.

Yeah.

Again, coming back to the problem you're trying to solve.

So you're not just implementing technology for the sake of it.

You're actually, there's a.

There's a viable problem that's putting community safety at risk.

And this piece of tech is required to mitigate that as possible as much as possible, but it will have the appropriate safeguards around it.

Interviewer – FQ10

OK.

Thank you.

And I think you've covered the next aspect, but I'll ask it anyway, which is how you might overcome that resistance?

Interviewer 13

Yeah.

So I think these these, there's a range of different factors in this in the sense that you've got, you've got the privacy [REDACTED – 1] perspective, right.

That's gonna ensure that.

What one assurance is that?

Data and and people's a identities and and their private data is gonna be protected.

So there's compliance there, there's compliance with legislation under the [REDACTED – 1] that we've got to comply with.

So this, I suppose some of that.

The governance around it through legislation is is is really, really important.

So making sure that you have the right the right eyes going across those decisions, be it umm, your legal section, your emerging tech groups that are formed with experts, be academic experts that we have that sort of set over emerging tech.

And then.

The other the other, but really is, umm, your internal engagement with your with your people.

So that crystal clear on expectations around the use, putting in some of those safeguards around you know

Uh triggers in the air around, you know, misuse so that you can pick up people that may be misusing technology, but also some of that basic prevention around warning people when they log on around their obligations.

And then I know banking's done quite a lot of that around fraud where you you constantly getting messages around appropriate use of PIN numbers and all that.

So I think there's some real good behavioral insights aspects that you can introduce into.

And so some of that taken the appropriate use of it.

And then thirdly, obviously as you as your community, so again been and that can that can sometimes set an a range of different areas.

So we proactively publish our use of force statistics.

I know it's not unique to [REDACTED – 1], but it's transparency reporting is really, really important.

Sometimes you can't because there's operational sensitivity and security that you've

got to protect.

But I think that should be the exception rather than the rule.

So if if we are using tech, we should have a level of reporting to the community about how we're doing it appropriately and proportionately and fairly.

Q11
Interviewer

OK.

Thank you.

Next question is around when you deem it successful.

So thinking about a successful implementation of new technologies and law enforcement, what do you feel needs to be achieved to attain the level of success?

Interviewee 13

Well, I think you gotta clearly define it the front end.

What success looks like.

So, umm, you know, that could be as simple as you know, we want x amount of individual users engaging with the tech within the first three months.

We, you know, the benefits and the business case that you you're gonna have outlined around why this is really important.

You gotta you gotta make sure that you're actually reporting back on that.

So for us, a lot of it was we wanted to see a reduction in costs and analysis of [REDACTED – 2], which we saw pretty quickly.

Interviewer

Yeah.

Interviewee 13

We wanted to see an uptake in officer referrals to [REDACTED – 2].

Again, we saw an increase in that space.

And then thirdly, there was some qualitative stuff that we did with officers around satisfaction of using a device that provided an instant, umm, a analysis of [REDACTED – 2], noting that wasn't it couldn't be used [REDACTED – 2].

We're still working around how that could potentially look, but umm, you know, were they satisfied?

Was it living up to those expectations?

And then there were some observational work around decision making.

So when we were running the pilot, we were looking at offices that were relying on gut instinct and sometimes those [REDACTED – 2] that I talked about.

And then trying to elicit, you know, the the subject saying, yeah, it's [REDACTED – 2]

versus those that had these, these handheld devices that within about 15 seconds gave them an analysis.

So looking at how those decision making decision making processes were working and it was far more advanced and with the use of this particular piece of tech than the old school.

Uh, trying to [REDACTED – 2] on the side of the road.

So yeah, just being really clear on what, what does success look like at the front end and and and actually holding yourself accountable to assessing that because.

And you know, without that you're not really providing that return on investment for your organization either.

If you can't define what success looks like.

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 13

Um, I don't think you can put a.

It really depends on the technology you're introducing.

Umm, our proofs of concept we ran were for six months.

Umm, uh, we didn't get full investment for six months post that.

So we, we we wrote up the evaluation, we keep the devices in service.

So we didn't have sort of a cold date where we sort of turned them off.

We maintain them in the areas that they were operating, so we were still getting significant amount of data coming back from the devices.

So when we did finally write the evaluation, we had some up to date statistics that went into that evaluation.

So I really think it's it's depending on what piece of tech that you're introducing that might take 12 months to get the right amount of data to sort of understand if it's having the desired impact or it could be as quickly as three months, it really depends.

But I think you've got to allow yourself to get as much insight into the use of it, be qualitative or quantitative, and then and then come back to your business case about what the problem you're trying to solve.

And in those key KPI that you're after and yeah, and and and go from there.

Q12

Interviewer

OK.

Thank you.

And the final question, you'll be pleased to know it is more around any other factors we haven't discussed.

Interviewee 13

That's alright.

Q12

Interviewer

So is there anything else we haven't yet discussed which you feel is important for the successful implementation of new technologies for law enforcement?

Interviewee 13

So my my my own experience.

Umm, uh, I think that collaboration between tech companies and police needs to continue.

You know, police services virtually every day will get cold called by some tech company that wanting to sell themselves, sell them something off the shelf.

That can be a bit risky.

At least you've got exactly the same environmental factors and you know, for instance, the [REDACTED – 1] are using it and [REDACTED – 1] want it.

They've got the same problem and they go to [REDACTED – 1] and they say yeah, it works and they can buy it off the shelf and it's happy days.

But sometimes that emerging tech or brand new tech, umm, uh, yeah, I think you've really gotta be clear with those tech companies on what you're after, why you're after it and work together to to solve that problem.

Because I think history will tell us, especially around IT if we buy and off the shelf stuff, a lot of the time it doesn't work and you can sync millions of dollars into something that's actually never gonna work.

And I I also think it drives accountability with those tech companies as well to to deliver something that's actually user friendly for police.

So for me, I'd say collaboration with tech companies.

As as really really important.

Interviewer – FQ12

OK.

And how do you best incorporate that into the implementation process?

Interviewer 13

Umm. Well, I think that comes back to some accountabilities with them as well.

So um now example we actually had them around the table at the working group level so that they could actually hear from the users how they were gonna use it, why they were gonna use it a particular way so that they could go away and think about that.

And then, like I say, keeping them on-track around time, time, timelines as well.

Umm so making sure that those expectations were made really clearly.

And I also think from a policing perspective, there's lots of jurisdictions you can actually trial these pieces of tech and these companies can then, you know, later on down the road they they think about commercializing that.

That's obviously not our concern, but running proofs of concept and then to see if it actually works and different jurisdictions is always an opportunity as well, rather than sort of just buying something and seeing if it works.

Interviewer

OK.

Thank you.

You'll be pleased to know, that's it.

I'm just going to turn off the transcription.