

INTiLE Interview with Interviewee 11

Q2

Interviewer

And there we go. It looks like that's recording and I can see the transcription coming up on my side as well. So we'll go into the first question, which is just an introductory one around previous experience, really. So would you please be able to tell me about your introduction of new technologies into UK law enforcement?

Interviewee 11

OK.

Oh, right.

Clearly, my involvement in [REDACTED – 2] extends from starting life as an [REDACTED – 5].

Through a range of management roles, I was a [REDACTED – 4] and then became a [REDACTED – 4].

Where I held that role for 17 years so.

In terms of introducing new science and technology, I suppose the most relevant example for me would be [REDACTED – 2].

So I was actually part of the.

What was called the [REDACTED – 2] in the [REDACTED – 1] as a [REDACTED – 4], so I oversaw a large part of the expansion of the use of [REDACTED – 2], so I have experience in that sense. I also have been involved in roles where I've introduced new techniques and new technology into [REDACTED – 2] and all that goes with that. And now as a [REDACTED – 4] 'cause I'm on this, I'll say the other [REDACTED – 6] in relation to the undertaking of [REDACTED – 2].

But we do have a heavy emphasis in the [REDACTED – 6] on how organisations effectively demonstrate that the science and technology is reliable. So that's the broad range if you like, that I work in, but I'll probably end up by saying it's primarily obviously focused on [REDACTED – 2] not other science and technology that law enforcement or the criminal justice system use.

Q3

Interviewer

Yeah, OK. And that's no problem at all. I think it's still enriches the work that's been done anyway, so thank you. Looking then at governance areas now. So what governance considerations do you feel are necessary to introduce new technologies into UK law enforcement?

Interviewee 11

OK. I think there's if you don't mind, there's two, two-part answer.

Interviewer

Yep.

Interviewee 1

The first part relates to my role as a [REDACTED – 6] and I think the second part relates to the broader governance of what I would call the whole system. So that's working with others which.

Well, doesn't anymore, but would have included the Biometrics Commissioner, the ICO, the forensic ethics group and others who contribute to the governance of the use of science and technology, but from different perspectives.

And in that sense, there are, for example, the [REDACTED – 5]. I don't know if you've heard of that, but that is a.

An overall governance group that has a statutory basis for the [REDACTED – 2], for example.

If I start with my part one, my role as [REDACTED – 6].

As I've referred to clearly, regulation, in my view should start right at the beginning at the development or even the idea for innovation that can be applied in the criminal justice system.

And and ultimately can be come a [REDACTED – 2] activity.

Perhaps a little bit of explanation about the statutory basis. So I'm now [REDACTED – 6]. To work to a [REDACTED – 6].

The absolutely critical nexus between, if you like [REDACTED – 6] and science and technology is validation and you'll find [REDACTED – 6] validation is about you demonstrating that you understand the science and technology you're using.

And in the context of [REDACTED – 6] inappropriate use of that science and technology. So there's a very heavy emphasis in the [REDACTED – 6] on validation and validation just to expand a little on that, that so that is about understanding the science and technology so.

If I take an example of say, the tool used to [REDACTED – 3].

Buying it off the shelf and just using it isn't good enough.

You need to understand what that tool does. You need to understand when it finds data and when it doesn't find data, and to do that you would need to conduct validation studies. And again, you may be well familiar with this, but using ground truth data so you use known data, and you test the tool to see whether it can actually recover the data it claims it recover, whether that's [REDACTED – 3] or whatever.

And and that is really the the starting point of the [REDACTED – 6] in a sense or certainly the model that applies, having validated your science and technology, you then devised your your method and your procedures and you would also look to and again it's a general thing in [REDACTED – 6] is about people using science and technology. So the competence of those people is part of the [REDACTED – 6] model and demonstrating competence is a requirement in [REDACTED – 6] and then wrapped around all of that is a

process of [REDACTED – 6].

So that's quite a, you know, that's quite a major enterprise, but it's it's very much focused on.

Where individuals use science and technology.

To generate effectively [REDACTED – 6].

Because the operator of the device that you need to have some training but they don't need to be an expert in how you [REDACTED – 3]. They don't need to understand all of the science and technology behind that. They just need to operate the device so that that's a [REDACTED – 6].

So where you got a, you know low or no technical competence required.

Say by police officers or police staff, you can have a different model. [REDACTED – 6]

And probably a good example of something at the moment that I think is challenging would be the comparison of faces from video footage.

So you could use technology to generate a [REDACTED – 6].

Interviewer

Yeah.

Interviewee

So it's a long answer for the first part. Should I do the second part now and just talk a little about that?

Interviewer

Yep, yes please.

Interviewee

So in terms of governance, there are structures and I think I think they're really important and I think that there's two parts to that. I think one is.

Even though I [REDACTED – 6], I must look at the whole system so.

When people compare [REDACTED – 2], are they using legally held material?

Are they doing that in an ethical way and I touch on that in some ways with bias in, you know, in science and technology interpretation.

But there are other groups who look at those things, so the Biometrics Commissioner was looking at legality. The ethics group look at that. There's then things like privacy and personal data, and the ICO looks at that. So there are a number of other.

Well, they're not [REDACTED – 6], but there are another of the partners in the overall governance of the system. And I think that whenever you're introducing science and technology and I've lived through this or I've lived through it in [REDACTED – 2] and actually I chaired the strategy board, the statutory board that oversees this. So I lived through that period when there was a lot of public concern about [REDACTED – 2] and its application and for example.

The proportion of black males on the database, which was again very sensitive with certain communities and why that was, and even though it was nothing to do with the [REDACTED – 2], it had a massive impact on public confidence. So I think that joined up whole system approach to governance and oversight is important, but it's equally important at the very early stages when you've developed science and technology to get those parties into a discussion.

About the application of the science and technology and how it's going to be used.

Because I'm very much in the camp, not just in this role, but I always have been in the senior leadership roles I have is that you need to take people with you.

I have heard people quite senior people say, well, now what we need to do is we need to get away with this as long as we can and then, you know, when people catch up with us, they'll change the law. Well, no.

That is not the way to operate, so the, the, the impact and the visibility of science and technology and law enforcement is such that I think you should have always be on the side if you like or or have the approach of taking people with you so they have confidence in law enforcement and confidence in the criminal justice system.

Interviewer – FQ3

Yeah. OK. Thank you. And are all of these considerations that you've mentioned both readily available and achievable within UK law enforcement?

Interviewee 1

I think the simple answer is is yes.

There's certainly, you know, there are, there are structures and there are ways to do it, but the qualification I would put on that is.

We we never have simple governance.

And we never have simple structures. So we have 43 police forces.

And you probably guess I'm gonna say this so.

The complexity that that brings.

As well as the governance structures, so there are, as I've described already, you know, there are different players in this, but I come together with other sort of other people who play a part in governance, but there's no defined structure for that. So there's no.

You know single process or mechanism that says right, we're introducing science and technology, we're going to go through these steps and we're going to do this consistently and across the board. And it may be that there's the science and technology to use my [REDACTED – 2] example. I've I've no interest because it's not [REDACTED – 2], but there's no mechanism. No one tells me about.

New science and technology, how they're going to or and they're going to apply it.

And perhaps they don't need to because it's not [REDACTED – 2], but when it does turn into being [REDACTED – 6] then it's a bit late to try and put the genie back in the bottle and say right, we're now using this technology all over the place everywhere.

Right. So it's going to be subject to [REDACTED – 6], right. So we're now going to have to retrofit.

Validation and all of the structures that should be there.

And.

There are. There are some examples of that.

Where I think people haven't thought through at the beginning where that takes them.

They can see the operational application and impact, but.

And that's great. And I've seen this in other areas, but if you go down that road and you have technology and science use and it and it falls into that category and then you get the challenging core and then you get the evidence discredited.

You've got all the legacy of just dealing with all of that, and that's happened in [REDACTED – 6] in that, you know, the science wasn't fully understood an ideal, [REDACTED – 6] So I think that.

As I say, that early intervention. But then you know, there really aren't the structures in place that you know it's it's more by chance than anything that I'm likely to get to know about something.

[REDACTED – 6]

Q4

Interviewer

Yep. OK, thank you. Moving on to the next question, now that's about the requirements to introduce new technology. So thinking about the main requirements needed, what do you think the building blocks are to successfully introduce such new technologies?

Interviewee 1

Well, from as a [REDACTED – 6], validation, validation, validation.

And I mean meaningful validation. I won't go into detail [REDACTED – 6] in terms of what it means. But so and I've described it in broad terms already, but.

To repeat, you know you need to understand the science and technology you're using.

You need to understand its strengths and weaknesses, and you need to understand the potential for error or false positive or false negative results. You know you. You can't just take it out-of-the-box, switch it on and use it. If it's got an interpretive element. So.

Yeah. I think in [REDACTED – 2] that is well rehearsed, well defined [REDACTED – 6]. But it's all about validation.

Interviewer FQ4

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

Interviewee 1

Well, there shouldn't be. I don't think with the right thinking and the right foresight.

I don't certainly from a sort of scientific perspective, there shouldn't be. There may be challenges in in the complexity of it and and getting it you know actually validating it. And I think I'm thinking there of as we move into sort of an AI world.

We potentially got the challenge of actually not knowing how it arrived at the result.

So that will be a challenge and it will certainly be a potential challenge in the criminal justice system because at the end of the day, the computer can't give evidence a person has to, and when they're asked the question, how did you arrive at the result? I'm not sure the courts are going to go along with what the machine or the computer told me, so. So I think there is something that I don't think I I think that's sometimes overest, you know, over-egged.

But I think there is, [REDACTED – 2]. Then I think there are lots of issues about.

You know, is it the right thing to do? Do the public understand the communities, accept it?

You know, there's a.

There's a much bigger piece about considering the impact that using that science and technology has and saying having.

Lived through the development of [REDACTED – 2], which is, you know, got a massive impact and has solved so many serious crimes. But when you go, when you discover things that start to cause concern.

And even just [REDACTED – 2] was a was a massive concern. It starts to undermine the use of the technology.

So, thinking that through.

And the consequences of it is obviously a really important thing to do and I go back to the the kind of whole system view.

Q5

Interviewer

Yeah. OK. Thank you very much. The next area now is about lessons learnt. So thinking either about your own experiences or your knowledge of introducing new technologies to law enforcement. Can you describe what lessons you feel can be learned from those to help introduce new other new technology?

Interviewee 1

Sorry, this is gonna sound a bit repetitive, but I kinda covered it in the sense of, you know think think about the validation requirements as soon as you realise the potential, the technology or the science has got and think more broadly about how you're going to implement that in a way that gives confidence in the criminal justice system and the public at large in terms of the technology and science you're using. I think that's.

It's different from health in a way, although there are some similar, but using science and technology in law enforcement, you know, national security and those areas comes with

more sensitivity I find, than perhaps applying something in a health environment. So therefore all the more need to think that through. So therefore my experience is thinking those things through at an early stage as well as doing the validation. So understanding the limitations of the technology is where you need to be.

Q6

Interviewer

OK, lovely. Thank you very much and my questions just so that you're aware are deliberately designed so that you probably will end up repeating yourself, not deliberately, but because it's the nature and the flow of the questions. So coming on to the next one then which is around key to success. Could you tell me what you think the most important keys to successfully introducing new technologies in UK law enforcement are?

Interviewee 1

I suppose the ultimate it has a positive impact.

In that in that you know the science and technology can be used and generate information or evidence, that is accurate and reliable, which is the sort of the purpose of [REDACTED – 2]. But.

It, you know, it needs clearly needs to have that.

Usefulness and and that positive impact so that.

You know.

And in a way, there's a I've seen some developments in science and technology that don't really address the problem. So I think you kind of start from and I get this in [REDACTED – 2]. People come to me and say I've got this wonderful idea that we could do this type of analysis.

And using my experience of both operationally, but you know being in a very operation environment, when I look at it, I say yeah, but that's not really going to have any impact on detecting burglary, or identifying rapists that that it's it's a nice piece of science and it's very interesting.

But I really can't see the application, so I think I think that's probably, you know, there needs to be.

You know it needs to be really thought through about the. Does this have sort of a positive outcome, in a law enforcement or criminal justice context?

And I've had, you know, I've had several in this role. I've had examples of people coming to me with.

Umm, you know ideas or things that could be done which are very interesting scientifically, but I can't really honestly say it's going to be of any use.

Q7

Interviewer

OK. Thank you. The next question which actually I think you've touched on earlier on anyway, but I'll ask it is around urgent operational requirements. So can you explain the impact which urgent operational requirements might have on introducing new technologies for law enforcement?

Interviewee 1

Umm, yeah, I've encountered this in, more in my kind of [REDACTED – 1] role where, you know, there's a problem and we need to find quick technical solutions or we need to speed up processes to provide information more quickly.

I think. I think sometimes there's two two things in there, I think. One is we don't realise. So if you look at something like mobile phone theft.

We didn't kind of really, I mean collectively as society. So we had mobile phones. We didn't realise then they become a target for criminals and and stealing that was a really good idea. So all of a sudden you've got a massive demand to deal with.

And and you know, there are examples of that. So our inability to think through.

Where crime, criminality is going and you could say the same about Internet crime or child abuse image, you know.

It it seems to become an urgent requirement because we've not anticipated it.

You do get the kind of. You know we need to do things really quickly, but I see that as more a kind of process improvement thing rather than the kind of urgent operation environment that in my experience urgent operational requirements come out of the fact we didn't see it coming.

So therefore, the smart which ultimately we did, we solved the problem in mobile phones by having you know better tracking and identification. So you couldn't sell it on so easily and therefore it doesn't become a target of criminality.

So I I would defer to the sort of.

Criminologists and others there in terms of, OK, so we're always going to have crime and criminality, but where is it going? And what science and technology do we need to either you know, mitigate its effects, or even eliminate or, you know, reduce them at least?

So.

I'm I'm I'm kind of not persuaded by the argument that, well, we need to, you know, don't worry about the validation we've got. You know, we just need to get on with this and it's really good and you know, and it works really well.

I'm d to say, I've seen too many examples of where down the line you turn out. It doesn't work quite so well and you didn't validate it thoroughly and now we've got a whole, you know, we've got thousands of cases to review. We've got appeals, you know it's it's a short-sighted strategy to to kind of go down that road I think.

Interviewer – FQ7

OK. Thank you. And actually the next follow-on bit of that, I think you've answered, but I'll ask it anyways is how are any negative impacts of that best overcome?

Interviewee 1

Well, I think if if you've in a sense, if if this is what you're sort of where you're going, if you, if you've kind of rushed in a new science and technology because it's urgent. We haven't done the validation and then we've got to fix it.

That can be very costly. It, public confidence goes.

Credibility in criminal justice and goes and you, you you find it very difficult to recover.

So I think.

I think again it's the same answer, but you know you need to think it through at the beginning and anticipate that. And even though that might take a little bit longer before you implement.

At least then you're on solid ground going forward, and I don't think that needs to be onerous. And in fact, I've said in terms of [REDACTED – 6].

I'm I'm very interested 'cause we have a model at the moment that is built around the current process.

I can see, you know, we could do if you take my [REDACTED – 2] example, there's no reason why we couldn't do roadside testing for [REDACTED – 2], or certainly in in custody so we could develop science and technology that could actually go down the type approval regulatory model.

And that would enable.

You know, recovery of [REDACTED – 2] would be a similar thing that would recover a much broader use and would address, you know, some of the volume.

And other impacts here. So there I'm up for you know, an alternative regulatory model. But the bottom line is it needs to generate accurate and reliable evidence to be used in investigations and criminal trials. So.

You know, I think there are other ways of doing it if we're clever and smart about the use of the technology.

But I think there's too many examples of sort of crashing in and and then discovering that it wasn't well understood. And now we've got a, you know, retract sort of thing.

Q8

Interviewer

Thank you. Turning now to the non-technology factors, do you consider there are any non-technology factors which may also be important to ensure the successful implementation of new technologies in law enforcement and what might they be?

Interviewee 1

Well, yeah, I think I'm. I mean, the legality. So you know you you need to, where does this fit within the law as it were?

I suppose in my world, [REDACTED – 6]

I think there are the whole thing around ethics and you know, ethical use and applications and how that's supplied.

Which kind of takes you into the kind of broader community understanding and engagement of the use of that technology and and an openness about, you know, the testing you've done and what it means.

And and using.

Variety of structures to do that. So you you do get proper independent review. You know I've always done that with I think about things like we introduced [REDACTED – 2]. So this is where you [REDACTED – 2], but.

We engage with lots of groups. We explain to them how it works. We explained all the safeguards, you know, and that was.

It it, you know, there were concerns, but it didn't cause such a problem that people lobbied for it to be not to be used, if you like, that they saw the benefits and they saw the safeguards. So it's again, it's, you know, it's that broader consideration.

Interviewer – FQ8

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

Interviewee 1

Well, I think in many ways they've got to be more important than the technology because. If you've if you've not validated it, you're taking a massive risk which will just come back to bite you.

And I think if we're in the business of policing by consent and the law enforcement model we have.

And the way we operate then you would want again to take people with you and you'd want public understanding and you'd want, you know, that those sort of safeguards, accepting and, at the end of the day, not everyone is going to agree and some people you know, won't. But yeah, I think you've got to make the effort to to take people with you. I think just the simple application the technology without any thought to that is really not the way we do business, I think.

Q9

Interviewer

Yeah. OK. Thank you. The next area is around vision. So how do you think developing a vision about implementing new technologies within UK law enforcement can be best achieved?

Interviewee 1

Not sure if it's a vision. I mean, I think I'm. I'm probably a practical scientist, so I would probably be more interested in the process, but I think there is a strategic view. So not, you know, not down in the weeds. I don't think I call it vision. I think it's more a kind of. Strategic view of how it's approached that takes account of all of the broader factors I've spoken about.

It could be called a vision. I mean, I won't get hung up on the words, but it is that broader understanding and then.

Being a practical scientist, you know what are the stages or steps you go through, or how do you describe that?

In a in a broad and high level way so that you are managing.

You know the introduction, science and technology in a in an effective way.

Interviewer – FQ9

Yeah. OK. And then who within the overall process of that do you think should actually be creating that?

Interviewee 1

You should be creating the vision. I mean I think.

I think the commissioning of it.

If we're talking about applications in law enforcement, then the commissioning should come from.

You know the police service, if you like.

I think in terms of who undertakes it, well, there's clearly not that capability within policing. So I think you'd want to have, dare I say, an academic organisation. But you know, you'd want an organisation that would be able to do that and has all the capability, knowledge and skills to do it and draws on the right group of people to do the design of that.

Whether it's.

It's a commission from again. This rather hinges on whether it's got a political dimension in the sense that, you know, is this something that should have some kind of statutory basis or or there's a ministerial or Home Office interest.

I don't have a view, but I guess they would need to have an input. It depends where your pitching is because ultimately if you're seeing.

You know the kind of elected parliament is the, you know, the kind of ultimate oversight of this.

Then I think they'd want to have a say, but.

The starting point would be for.

I've have thought policing to commission it, but probably there's a Home Office input to that.

Q10

Interviewer

OK. Thank you.

Now turning to preventing resistance about new technologies, so would you be able to describe any resistance which you feel may arise from the introduction of such technologies within law enforcement?

Interviewee 1

Yeah, I I mean my my experience of this is the resistance comes from.

A lack of understanding of the science and technology and how it's being applied so.

The resistance is created by the way things are introduced, I don't think people start from a well, maybe some groups you know who will just be kind of anti, you know change or using science and technology but put put that sort of tendency aside, generally resistance, I think, comes from a lack of engagement and a lack of understanding.

And a lack of transparency about what is actually being used. So you create this sort of [REDACTED – 2]. You create this kind of situation where.

A rather sort of trivial way, so you know if you'd read some of the reports when I chaired the strategy board about [REDACTED – 2], you'd have thought we were [REDACTED – 6]. You know, it was, it was.

So it just it started as a sort of concern and then it just snowballed into lots of lobby groups and organisations.

Taking an interest.

Human rights groups and so on, and really voicing concerns. And then it was compounded by not having the information to.

You know, explain how things were being done and then to find.

You know, kind of inappropriate.

Ways that, for example, people were [REDACTED – 2] that were outside of the law and and a whole bunch of stuff which just shouldn't have happened because it was all racing ahead at pace.

And eventually, you know, it led to a kind of major reset with the protection of Freedoms Act, so.

You know, we must learn some lessons from that.

To go back to your point, the resistance comes out, I think, of the way it's been handled.

Interviewer – FQ10

Yeah. OK. And you've, I think you've kind of answered the next part of it, but that's about how might that resistance be best overcome?

Interviewee 1

Yeah. Yeah. Well, it's all you know, it's all in the preparation and the thinking through and. Taking people with you.

Q11

Interviewer

Yeah. OK, so now we'll get to the point where it's about deeming the introduction of the technology having been successful. So what do you feel needs to be achieved to attain a level of success for introducing new technologies for law enforcement?

Interviewee 1

Well, I mean, if [REDACTED – 2] certainly within [REDACTED – 1], you know there's a, there was a lot of.

I spent a lot of time looking at the overall performance and impact and effectiveness. Of [REDACTED – 2], and that was partly a scrutiny about, you know, the size of my budget and various other things, as you would expect.

And that was right. There was a, you know, well, what are we getting from this? So the starting point for me is to measure the impact so.

You know, if you've used the science and technology, you've made that investment and you've got all the costs of change and everything that goes with that. What is it actually achieving?

And I think sometimes we do get, you know, people like technology, so they they they rush out and buy something and apply it. But does it have any real impact and the real impact. And again in [REDACTED – 2]

I think just kind of just start that debate about, you know, the way that things impact. And that's also very useful because if you can say, well, OK, you may have concerns about this, but this is really impacting on our ability to tackle [REDACTED – 2] or or whatever it is. And I think you've got powerful arguments. So I think that's where I would come from on that it and it's it's a kind of demonstrating the benefits. The other thing important to say as well, which was again a debate I used to get into. Don't forget with things like.

[REDACTED – 2]. It's not the ability to identify, it's also the ability to eliminate.

And and I, you know, [REDACTED – 2]. So the power to eliminate is equally important. And and therefore the false negative results. So when you know if you should have eliminated someone and you didn't.

That is, you know that has a massive impact because they may well, certainly in [REDACTED – 2] and we've seen examples of this.

In very high profile cases.

The the science and technology wasn't done appropriately, so the person wasn't eliminated and actually based on other evidence, they were prosecuted and convicted. And then, of course, when you do the science properly, you find it wasn't them. So you need to think about all the possible outcomes.

But I think at the end of the day, you can look at broader benefits and and the impact on society and confidence and stuff. But I think you start with is there a real impact here?

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 in law enforcement?

Interviewee 1

Not really. I mean, I think there's.

I always favour a sort of stage approach. If you've got something that's quite big. Rather than sort of Big Bang, I think introducing it and again it's a kind of classic scientific way of doing it. So you you do a sort of pilot or a test study. So you if you roll something out, roll it out and know that it works and gain confidence in that.

Is the approach, if you like to implementation that I would, I would advocate.

Just releasing science and technology on thousands of people.

And setting them off to do it has got some massive risks attached to it.

Q12

Interviewer

Yeah. OK. And and you were pleased? No, we're on to the. The final question now, which is the kind of catch all area. So are there any other factors or issues we haven't yet discussed which you feel are important to the successful implementation of new technologies within law enforcement?

Interviewee 1

No, I think the only thing which.

And it's quite topical, but I'll say it is what I do think and it and it has an impact on on cost regulation, I think it is the fact we have 43 police forces and 43 PCCs.

And the money sits with them and the decisions sit with them so.

You could have at least 43 different ways that technology or science is implemented, and when it comes to [REDACTED – 2].

You know 'cause, there's a commercial sector as well.

You know, if you're introducing something like a new tool to extract data from a smart device that you might not have been able to use before, you're going to get 50 plus

organisations all independently validating it all independently, developing the processes to use it.

There is, that is, you know, hopelessly inefficient and ineffective and impedes the pace at which you can introduce things, because you've just got such a complex delivery model if you like or delivery basis so.

I just think sitting now [REDACTED – 6]. I just think, wow, you know, and I'm, I'm I'm being challenged over the bureaucracy and administrative burden of this. But I just think well, why have we got over 50 organisations all replicating?

You know that if there's inefficiency, which I admit there is and I, you know, I'll do my best to make [REDACTED – 6] as I can, but.

I can't get away from. I've just got so much, so many organisations just doing the same thing.

Umm. And I think that's the biggest challenge that it's probably and again I'll go back to my [REDACTED – 2] days. You know again, I was the [REDACTED – 4], but I was the [REDACTED – 4]. I was [REDACTED – 4] at one point and the governance I had to go. So if I wanted to introduce something corporately across, I think that I did it across the UK, but just England and Wales, I mean the amount of time I spent cajoling everyone into one way of doing things was just unbelievable, really.

Interviewer

Yeah. OK. Thank you very much and you'll be pleased to know that is the end of the questions. So I'll just stop the recording.

Interviewee 11

Excellent.

Postscript:

Immediately after the interview, the Interviewer raised with Interviewee 11 that it would be more challenging to redact their anonymity because of the responses provided. The Interviewee was content with this given their role is more public facing than other interviewees. The redaction process applied for this part of the research has been equally applied to this interview but it is recognised that identification of the interviewee may still be possible and Interviewee 11 is content with this.