

Q2

Interviewer

There we go. So recording started and the transcription started, so we'll go into the questions, and this is about your previous experience. So would you tell me about your experience of introducing new technologies into UK law enforcement?

Interviewee 6

Errm.

So. I guess. There's there's two elements to this, so I have new technologies insofar as, um, new methodologies of doing things with existing technologies and new technologies insofar as brand-new stuff. Which one do you prefer?

Interviewer

You can cover both, not a problem at all.

Interviewee 6

Ok. Errm. So from a from a local perspective errm or from a county policing perspective, between 20 2019 and 20 well, yeah, late 22. Um. I was tasked with delivering a a digital investigation team to [REDACTED – force/agency named] with the view to improving digital investigations.

Interviewer

Yeah.

Interviewee 6

That was a a fairly blank slate, so I had, um, licence to recruit staff into investigative positions, which I was able to define. So we we set a series of parameters as to what they would and wouldn't be doing, and it it focused ultimately on 4 areas which was [REDACTED – operational] and so it was able to create a team of people who were specifically tasked with being good at those things and to find the interplay within it. That was very much less about delivering new technology, but it was more about trying to streamline disparate sets of previously siloed work streams within policing into something a lot more fluid, and more importantly, whereas historically some of that work had been taken-up by analysts and um the wider Constabulary analytical department, but they were separate to operational policing. It was trying to embed that within operational policing as opposed to it being a constant yoyo of referral forms and sort of e-mail tennis.

What I did have within that local sort of project was the ability to hire a couple of software developers and they they were basically tasked with free reign to just make stuff better, um, for cops. So, we would do things, um, so for example as part of the [REDACTED – operational].

We.

We would often find ourselves in the position whereby that was really cool if people behaved as per what [REDACTED – operational] expected them to behave. But with the advent of things like [REDACTED – operational] ... many live enquiries but which completely fell against the existing process and protocol of no code on Constabulary networks, no deployment of anything that isn't fully assured and fully accredited and effectively the lack of, agility is the wrong word, but the lack of Constabulary process to be dynamic enough to go that could be really helpful, but we're going to stop you doing it because. So we ended up doing lots of this on stand-alone laptops in a very non-scalable way.

Um.

With the same team, a kind of side project fell out of that of standing up a kind of a [REDACTED – operational].

Um, which meant engaging with, sort of various funding streams to get lots of new kit into [REDACTED – identifies force/agency and operational capability] bringing Constabulary, existing network connections, bandwidth, everything else up to speed of just going, wait, policing you are ingesting loads of data, you need to up your game, was, was hard work.

Um and then the current role in [redacted – identifies operational team/unit] is, so my role in that specifically is to try and bring about new solutions. So building tools such as bulk translation, bulk transcription, document summarization, to enable it to be useful to policing. So in theory cops could get their suspect interviews and their video interviews, upload the media file, and have the transcription there and then within a couple of seconds, and then automatically summarise it. You couldn't take the human out of the loop entirely.

The technical part of that. Whilst not easy, is functionally simple, the politics behind it is horrifically painful.

So technically standing up a system that you can upload data to and have it do its thing, relatively simple. The assurance of that to make it secure to national standards. Not necessarily simple, but eminently achievable because it's a step-by-step process. The politics of landing it to policing, um is so weird. I you, I will go to countless meetings where we will say we have a tool, we have a translation tool, whereby we can bulk translate thousands of them, yeah, 6000 lines of Iraqi text manual quotation for £2000 and about 3 weeks work, auto translated by us for 83p in about 3 minutes.

You tell police officers and police staff who are operational that and they love it and they want it and they're desperate for it. You go to any level of actual would you like to make this accessible to your troops, and it becomes hard work.

It's a very painful journey in terms of we have so many layers of, we've assured something centrally, we've demonstrated that assurance to everybody and we'd like to make this tool available to everyone. And yet every force wants to run its own

assurance on it, or every force wants to run its own DPIA on it.

We don't trust each other in policing to do anything right outside of our own boundaries, and it's utterly mental. And so you then try and bypass that and go for a national placement of these tools and, you end up coming into other problems around well, making people who potentially should have a mandate to do things not look as good as what their mandate has been, you know, and and coming up against not competition as such, but, unnecessary hurdles to things that would help policing.

That's about it in summary I guess.

## Interviewer – FQ2

OK.

Yeah, that sounds pretty comprehensive to me and quite challenging. So what came from that experience which you would use with a future similar requirement?

## Interviewee 8

In what context?

## Interviewer

So what, effectively, what have you learned from that experience that if you then had to do a similar job in the future, you would take the learning from your experience and make sure you apply it to that new function?

## Interviewee 8

Um.

It's it's a difficult question to answer because. Um.

That I when, I when I say there's probably little to learn from a technical process, technical processes are fairly embedded. You, you, you you you gather your requirements you you're you're you're mock something up, you test it.

Yeah, the the actual technical delivery of a product to people is not a hard thing. The the lesson learned from, certainly the most recent couple of months is, it's really difficult in policing to organically grow something and then deploy it en masse.

Because there are, when you have 43 different chiefs and you have any number of regional chiefs, and then you have, a number of, uh, NPCC leads who, arguably, have a portfolio that maybe they aren't across fully that that that's not disingenuous, but if, if I turn around and you know, it's just, there might be people in charge of data and digital in cross policing who don't understand data and digital but have it as a portfolio. You'll then talking upwards to something that with with all their very cool experience and knowledge, maybe don't get fully what you're saying so.

I think learning would be try and engage right at the top at the start, but it's impossible to do that unless you're taking a product to go, this is really cool, but then it to get to that really cool product, to get it to the top to go it, wouldn't this be good stand stand up

against this and you know show you show everyone that's really got to fight through so many layers of bureaucracy that it almost dies before you get there. So you can't get there first with just an idea because they'll tell you to go away and build something proper when you build something proper, you end up having to fight for a bunch of people who you are either of maybe not spoken to on the way, so they get upset that you haven't spoken to them, but you couldn't have spoken to them cause you didn't know where you were going.

Interviewer

Yep.

Interviewee 6

So you if you pre-empt permission, you kind of get it wrong, if you go and seek permission early, you get told to go away and do what you're doing to get, it's mental. I don't know if that I'm preaching to the converted on that one?

Interviewer

You absolutely are, yes.

Interviewee 6

It's a very difficult route. Um.

Yeah, I, I've, I've been quite surprised as to how fragmented and, even at the top levels of policing in the Home Office, how we just don't talk to each other, in getting stuff delivered. So yeah.

Q3

Interviewer

Okay, thank you very much. Yeah, I can definitely relate to what you're saying there. So the next stage, which actually probably covers a bit of that, is around governance. And so what governance considerations do you feel are necessary to introduce new technologies into UK law enforcement?

Interviewee 6

Um.

So.

Um, technical delivery, change management, assurance those are largely laid out on those are step-by-step processes. So the, the, the governance around those processes, to a degree of nuance, one way or the other are, as far as I can tell, fairly ubiquitous. You know, you you follow the process and as long as all stakeholders are agreed, yes, that's the process will go on then then that's never gonna be too much of a problem.

Well, governance-wise outside of that.

I don't know. I don't know the answer and the reason I don't know the answer is because, every single role in policing seems to have around about the shelf life of about three years.

If you're on a career ladder up, you're not gonna sit in a role where you hold a portfolio for very long. If you're at that, top level your NPCC level, you're holding multiple portfolios or you're you're running a Constabulary, so.

You delegate downwards, not decision making, but you delegate the the a lot of the the sight of stuff downwards and, that circular nature of people not staying in roles long enough means governance is really, really hard to implement.

Um. So let's let's take an example of a this, we we have a translation tool that's ready to go. It's up and running. We have it deployed in a local constabularies.

Sort of ICT structure and the governance around it, is really simple. I've set up a bunch of business roles that are, you know, we will, we'll translate some stuff if it hits a thematic threat that turks can deal with and.

You know you've there's some due diligence done by the person submitting it that digital processing notices have been completed and and we're we're assured that everything is proportionate and the necessary and all the rest.

Governance thereafter, if you were to scale that out nationally.

It's really difficult because you're looking at, who administers access to it? Who?

What the budget's locally so 83p is tiny for 6000 lines of Iraqi texts. But that's one job in one Constabulary. Multiply that by  $n$  jobs per 43 constabularies plus jobs in regions, plus jobs to other UK law enforcement that might want to leverage it.

How do you how do you implement a charge back process? Or does policing per se turn around to companies like Microsoft or Google and says, right we wanna we want to just to give you a one-time fee of five million a year for unlimited translations for UK law enforcement but then how does that get billed out and who makes that decision and how do you build the evidence base for it without scaling it and it, that wider governance piece just becomes really clunky when you haven't got someone sat in a position who can see it from cradle to proper landing and so.

Um, in the expectation this is edited out, [*redacted – refers to identifiable senior police officer*] No, it's not. Is it reflective of a system that is, not agile enough to deal with the way that policing wants stuff, and it really wants to get ohh it's sitting forced level meetings going we could apply AI to this, we could do this and we need machine learning on this and everyone's going woo.

And then you get to actually go OK? What I've done some research, and here's some stuff that could help, oh, you've moved on, right? Well, we'll we'll go round this circle again and it's painfully painful.

### Interviewer – FQ3

Thank you. I can definitely sympathise with that.

Um, so I would ask whether any of that is actually achievable, but I think you kind of answered that.

### Interviewee 6

We'll so.

So is it achievable?

It is if you cut out, a layer of obfuscation and bureaucracy.

Um, so, I'm sitting here in a position with a number of tools that I can I can demonstrate usability and cost saving time saving for policing.

I have, a fully costed model whereby I can make them nationally accessible.

Um, we got the technical resources to make them nationally accessible and selling it as, hey, policing, look at this, this could be really cool. We're not pretending it's anything massive. And Christ, this needs a lot of work to get it from maybe two dozen people nationally using it, but using it to the benefit of a small, maybe 1 force, one user in every force could use it for the real top end jobs to save time and money, but prove the concept that you can then go, right, that's a model. Someone else go and scale it. Go and do something really cool with it.

But in that instance we have a position whereby.

Somehow, policing doesn't want to go, let's prove it, build an evidence base, takes the next step. Let's prove that next step, build the evidence base and scale it slowly and incrementally. What policing wants to do is go, let's get it, right, right up here to start with.

But what a journey to go on without any evidence base. What a journey to go on without actually testing it all out and going well. OK, there's a snaffle here. We didn't anticipate that. Let's just work through that.

And so is it. It's fundamentally achievable, but not I don't think in the models that exist already. Or the ways of working that exist already.

### Q4

### Interviewer

Okay, thank you. On to the next area which now is the requirements to introduce new technology, some of which you probably touched on already, but thinking now about the main requirements, what do you think are the key building blocks to successfully introduce such new technologies?

### Interviewee 6

Um.

Okay well, you need um, use cases, you you what you don't need is, bosses looking at

the news, hearing the word AI or something like that and then going ohh, I want that. That's that's not what you need.

I think you need a defined use cases. You then need.

A proper pipeline of people who can go, right we've got the use case, but what, what does that use case actually mean? You know that you want transcription, but within that transcription, do you just want, a transcript, or do you want something that will enable you to identify temperament? You know, some sort of ill feeling or good feeling or, you know, or do you want something that within transcribing video also does object detection or.

Do you want something that does facial recognition within it or scrapes number plates from cars or identifies knives or something you know? Can you? What, what do you actually want, the use case? Have you considered future proofing that and having some really proper solid requirements gathering, before then, taking those requirements and breaking them down into something actually achievable? I mean the, I think the policing landscape is littered with aspirational, um, really cool ideas that maybe aren't wholly defined, I don't know.

To stop using, I'm the wrong person to say this, but to stop using cops to try and do things, get some proper expert, you know?

It's always surprised me within policing, the first time I thought this was about 20 years ago, when I had to go and ask someone to change some duties for me and the person I was asking to change duties within HR was a cop. As you're a cop, you should be not in there.

And yet so we we'll we'll throw cops at projects and tech projects and project management here, but they're not project management and they don't know they don't know tech and they don't know digital, their police officers tell them to do policing and get someone else in to do the tech. So. And I get that there should be hopefully a bleed of knowledge and understanding both ways cause that the operational should absolutely inform the tactical.

But I wouldn't pay a plumber to build a house. I'd pay a brickie to build a house, and I then play a plumber to do the plumbing. I I wouldn't. I wouldn't want to. I just think we need to be clever in what we who we ask to do things.

Ahh man and then you can go on from there, can't you? The whole.

But.

#### Interviewer – FQ4

And actually, you've kind of touched on it again there, but is there anything which may prevent the successful implementation of new technologies for law enforcement?

#### Interviewee 6

Um. So my, raised stark experience is.

You'll enforcement doesn't understand it in the round, it it doesn't.



It doesn't understand *a* what it wants. I think properly or *b* how to get there.

And I don't think it, I don't think we do very well that whole, understanding what the expectations are from law enforcement and what the reality is of what someone can deliver.

Um.

That's before we. You can. I mean if you.

And the the other real big problem in delivering anything and it's maybe not new technology in the terms of maybe of what we've spoke about with software and delivering a new capability to policing.

But even delivering something that does new things with existing policing data, as soon as you try and crossover force boundaries or get one legacy system talking to another legacy system, it just falls down because it's.

Policing hasn't been forward thinking. It's gone, we need a missing person's system.

Right, you're cheapest, you'll do. Now, Christ, we need a case management system.

ahh, right, we signed a contract with you, you'll do.

Has anyone thought about that system talking to this system? Because those missing persons records might be really helpful to these crime and intelligence records, I know, but they don't talk.

Maybe they should and hey, it's easy to say with hindsight, but there's enough, there's enough, evidence out there for making future decisions to go.

Let's let's think. How could this interplay later on?

Interviewer

Yeah.

Interviewee 6

And stop getting into bed with, private companies who charge, multiple departments across multiple forces, multiple licences to do the same thing, and let's be cleverer.

Interviewer

Yes

Interviewee 6

Yeah.

Interviewer – FQ5

So that that kind of brings me onto the next question, which again links on with what we've just been discussing in part and this is around the lessons learnt. So thinking about your sort of experience and knowledge of introducing new technologies, what lessons do you feel can be learnt to help the future introduction of new technology for law enforcement?



Interviewee 5

Um, stop, being reactive, but be appropriately reactive. Don't be we have a problem, what's the quickest route to solving that problem? Because the quickest route usually is the the most, you'll get a result, but it will be expensive and tie you into stuff.

Um.

And just be, be measured and realistic. If the goal is to, achieve, ohh, so the whole process, let's say, for submitting a crime file involves X amount of officer time X amount of officer resources over a long period of time, which then results in maybe badly taken statements cause they're checked between different inquiries and they all, it all gets a bit mumbly, you know. Let's breakdown the problem and try and, identify what those, what the constituent parts of the problem are and then, stitched together the solution rather than just reacting to, I've got a problem, I'll buy something. I'll buy it. It's gone.

Um, I'm trying to just get I, I think it's a generational thing. I think it needs another 20 years for those sitting at the NPCC table to become more computer literate.

That sounds really bad and patronising, but it's not, but to be just become that more, having grown up with that technology to understand what is and isn't available.

Um, yeah.

Hey, my lesson about this is wait. Wait, wait until the current cadre have gone.

[SKIPPED FQ5 as insufficient information provided to answer this]

Q6

Interviewer

But that sounds a good idea. Moving on to the next question then.

Um, the key to success and again you you may have just intimated a bit there. But err, what do you think the most important key aspects are to successfully introducing new technologies to law enforcement?

Interviewee 5

And so, all joking aside, I I think one of the main aspects is to have, technical, the the people who can deliver technically.

Embedded is the wrong word, but really close to those that are delivering operationally. You've used [redacted – operational system]?

Interviewer

Yeah.

Interviewee 5

The.

The the painfulness of [redacted – operational system], it it I I quite like it as a system. It

does everything it should do it. It's some, you know.

There aren't many operational cops will sit there and go, yes, I get to sit in front of [redacted – operational system] today, that's me, because it it's not, it's not been born of a marriage of people sitting with a cop, going through a process and going like, how do you, how do you do this and how, how would this help you?

Um, embedding embedding technology has to be driven fundamentally by operational need.

But it.

You can only do that by having techie people who can deliver that, understanding what that operational need is and not living it, but, being closer to it.

Um. But the wider conversation around governance and structure? Ohh, I don't know, I don't know how to learn those lessons.

[SKIPPED FQ6 as insufficient information provided to answer this]

Q7

Interviewer

OK. And the the next question then is around something you may have experienced of urgent operational requirements. So can you explain the impact which urgent operational requirements might have in introducing new technologies to law enforcement?

Interviewee 5

Um.

I guess it's what, guess it depends on what you're what you're defining as urgent, isn't it? I mean we we all know that, in an urgent scenario, we might all chuck something through Google Translate or Google Lens or something like that in a very non-assured way and and just take a punt and go actually OK that is what it says it is and and. Is there anything ever urgent, urgent in the delivery of like a proper solution to policing? Are you defining urgency around that [redacted – operational]?

Interviewer

There's different definitions. I mean one example that's come up before is some of the implications that around COVID and how that suddenly from a policing perspective there were aspects there that had to come in quite quickly because of that.

Interviewee 5

OK.

Yeah.

Um.

Was it? It's, it's a, it's interesting thing cause I, ahh, on the back of COVID, on the back

of the police uplift, fund, of the 20,000 new cops.

Um, our local workforce planning were, effectively on-boarding 30 40, new cops every two months and then having to figure out where to post them and, from a, from an an urgent perspective that was quite a body of work. There was a lot of people manually going, right, cop a lives at postcode here and then bouncing that postcode against 18 different police stations to try and figure out where to deploy them. Um.

Is it? I would suggest that urgent, urgent is an emotive word isn't it, but there's a fairly solid use case to put a little bit of common-sense code and software into why don't you just automate that? Look through every police officer that you're recruiting, loop through every station that you're going through and that will save your research or your analyst or your HR person however much time per day doing that.

Um, I wrote I wrote a bit of code that did that and it was refused for all the network issues that existed, privacy, well it hasn't been assured. It's just, just calling an API call to Google Maps that your guys doing manually, it's all it's doing.

Um, so is there an? Is there an urgent need, there's always urgent need, but it's the lack of lack of agility of the Constabulary to respond to that, I think that's the issue.

#### Interviewer - FQ7

OK. And how do you think any negative impacts for this concept of urgent operational requirement might actually be best overcome?

#### Interviewee 8

Well, I don't know if. Well. So. I don't know. Are they even overcome? I don't know, is the short answer.

Um. Policing's always kit bashed its way through one way or the other, hasn't it? It's all, it always manages one way or the other to find find a way through, usually in, in an inordinate amount of time spent out of hours doing doing stuff that could have been done a lot quicker. So I.

How could it be avoided?

Goes back to the conversation right at the start, doesn't it, about making things more, just having a more mature conversation and a more, agile narrative around, here's an urgent operational need, right, let's get the right people in the right place and discuss what that need is, break it down and then deliver it, as opposed to right, you're here, your job to figure that.

So somehow that seems, seems to be the way it goes.

#### Interviewer

Yeah.

Interviewee 8

Yeah.

Q8

Interviewer

Definitely. OK. So we'll move on to the next question here, which is around the non-technology or technical factors. So do you consider there are any non-technical factors which may also be important to ensure the successful implementation of new technologies and what might they be?

Interviewee 8

Um.

Culture, I think barrier to get over. We love doing things the way we've always done it. Absolutely.

Were slaves to slaves, to the old way of doing things.

Um, I think you've also depends on. I mean so from a from an operational policing perspective, you've got a whole, why the criminal justice system that you've got to take with you in developing, delivering new stuff so.

It's really cool delivering a new way of extracting data from a mobile phone or, you know, a new methodology of reviewing some whatever data set it is you've got.

But you've got to take Crown Prosecutor on that journey, and you've gotta take a defence solicitor on that journey and then you've arguably got to take the court on that journey. And if it's new, is it even fit with legislation? Legislation is, hundreds of years old and you've got potentially take that legislation on that journey with you and it's the whole criminal justice system is based on a system of precedent, isn't it? The older something is, the better it is because it's stood the test of time and that is the absolute antithesis of technology that has to move forward at pace.

So yeah, I, kind of not forgetting the wording of the question to start with, but the the the block.

Interviewer

So it's about your non-technology factors.

Interviewee 8

Yeah, it's just that that the whole not upskilling is the wrong word but.

Affecting some sort of cultural change that goes.

I accept the precedent is there for a reason. I accept the structures are there for a reason, but you can't moan about criminal justice falling down under a weight of jobs if you're always gonna do it the way you've, always done it and have maybe a, a crime and case system that will only have a 1 Meg pipeline to a Crown Prosecution system

that then doesn't accept Excel sheets because you know, there's a, there's a blocker straight away. There's a non-technical thing that's just a, that's just a lack of management oversight to go, come on, we can fix this.

### Interviewer – FQ8

Yeah, yeah. What level of importance do you think these have to be able to introduce new technology successfully?

### Interviewee 6

Well it that they are of, they are the utmost importance. So they they that the cultural. The want to culturally improve something and the want to accept that, there will always have to be innovation and delivery at pace as long as the integrity of what you're trying to deliver is not broken on the way.

Um, unless you convince those right at the top that that's the way to do things, you're always fighting, aren't you? So you can be as technologically awesome as you like and have all the solutions, unless that's driven by a culture of improvement and a culture of not firefighting problems, then you, it's gonna it's gonna struggle. So it's it's far more important than the technical delivery I think.

### Q9

### Interviewer

OK, moving on to the next area that this is around now sort of creating the vision. So how do you think developing a vision about implementing a new technology can be best achieved?

### Interviewee 6

Um.

Probably through not having to sell that vision 43 times.

Um.

I, err.

So.

We have at the moment a product that I sort of mentioned it earlier, conflates [redacted – operational], we have made accessible to in the first instance people with [redacted – operational team/unit], but we have wanted to gift it to [redacted – identifies force(s)/agency(/ies)].

Um, just gifting something like that, it's hard bloody work. People are like well, how have you done that? We've done it like this, but if I try and explain it, you'll probably not understand because there there's a load of sort of data structures and models and what in there but, trust me, here's the source data. This is how it's overlaid. This is how it could really help your problem, solve your [redacted – operational]. Ohh, I don't trust it.

But what? And then try and sell that 40, you know that's. That's to one command in one Constabulary. To you multiply that by four or five commands in 43 or 4 four, you know, 43 constabularies. I've, I've genuinely found, policing to be hugely schizophrenic and that it wants stuff, but then as soon as you give them stuff, they're like uhhh, oh, don't like that. And and it's just strange and I.

Until we break down, this really siloed nature of the way we do things in.

That the panacea of anything technical and anything data related is that it all talks to each other in in therefore it's not siloed, it's made available.

But we live in a structure of that minimum 43 silos, probably at least 100, and, you know, 129.

You know, once you've got that many leaders across so many organisations that you're trying to go, this could help. It's a combination of ego and culture that just gets in the way.

### Interviewer – FQ9

Yeah. So who do you think within the either the implementation process or the the overall process around new technologies? Who do you think is best placed to create this vision?

### Interviewee 5

I don't think there is someone.

Um.

No, I, I, I genuinely don't think there is anybody who would be best placed to create it. I.

Um.

And and I I sit there, having had conversations with Home Office leads, who want to pass stuff over to policing so you end up going well, well, who do I speak to in policing? Well, maybe Police Digital Service. Well, actually, that's quite a painful process, you know, that's they're overwhelmed with a whole load of work and they've got to get their own prioritisation in order. So. Well, who can I speak to, your chief of DDaT, or well, no, you you're chief. Well, then hang on, then, there's there's a centre for data and analytics or, well, who's got charge of software? Nobody that's devolved to force area. OK, well, look okay so. So there is nobody there. There's there's no one place you can go to, to have that conversation.

### Interviewer

Yeah.

### Interviewee 6

Um, that's that's part of the problem, because you end up, I mean you don't want some one overseer of all things digital, there's.

But you kind of almost do as well, who gets it and can reassure policing that it's OK. But I yeah, I I don't know if there is anybody who you can do that to at the moment.

Q10

Interviewer

Yeah.

Okay um again, moving on to the next subject, which you briefly touched on is around preventing resistance. So would you describe any resistance which you feel may arise from introducing new technologies for law enforcement?

Interviewee 6

How would I describe it?

Interviewer

So can you just describe any resistance?

Interviewee 6

And.

So there's, there's resistance through actual job requirements. So if I if I go to [redacted – identifies force/agency] and say we've got a a translation tool which you know, we're opening up to your Constabulary. You don't need to install anything, you don't need to, to do anything, it's all accessible for through a browser. It's all secure. It's all been assured. By the very nature their ISO, their DPO, their protection officer, their information security officer are gonna want to do their own due diligence so, um, there's blockers, naturally, by virtue of people having their their jobs, not their job, isn't to be a blocker, but their job is to to do the due diligence per force. So that's entirely understandable.

Don't particularly think it's helpful because it it slows everything down, but I I I absolutely understand it.

There's a hell of a lot of ego in policing. Oh my God.

Just ego and siloed command, sort of, this is mine, so if it, if it helps me, I'll be cool with it, but, ahh, actually, that's not to do with me and my command, so I'm not gonna not gonna touch it and.

Of.

That that is a frustration I I just, I don't know. I don't. They're not. They're not people's toys are they? It's not, you know, it's not my toy, my technological toy, it's it's a toy. But 5:00 o'clock tonight I'll turn my computer off and I'll go play with my real toy. So I'm not my my toy to, to, to hide and to hold or to ransom off to policing.

I'm just, I think just a.

I'm I'm sure it exists in the private sector as well, possibly less so because it, you know, you're driven by profit there and or you know there's there's there's a drive to innovate



to make things, you know, your career exists on innovation, but here.

A combination of existing jobs, egos and just a cultural block seems to seem to stop the way every time.

Once again, I think I find myself drifting away from your questions a little bit into innate cynicism and awfulness, so I do apologise.

### Interviewer – FQ10

So how might you best overcome all of that?

### Interviewee 6

How might I best overcome?

Well.

So candidly speaking, I really don't know. So we've had a fairly fractious few weeks trying to deliver some of the stuff we've done as a proof of concept nationally and it's not landing well with teams like [redacted – identifies force/agency/body]. But for any number of reasons. So you end up going okay maybe the simplest way to deliver this, is to really bring ourselves in and narrow down and just go right within our threat thematic, we're gonna deliver tools for us.

But you don't perpetuate the same problem, don't you? We've delivered something for us. That's really cool with, you know. And no, you can't, can't minimise that.

There's a little bit of bringing everybody on board nationally from [redacted – identifies different bodies] and go up here, here, we've got this. This would be really cool.

You might just actually deliver something that altruistically works for everybody and you only have to deliver once, rather than, in the inevitable 3 or 4 year's time where someone goes well what have they got over there? That could work. Yeah, I know we had this discussion sometime ago. It, I, I don't know how to do that because you seem to want to go big you, run into all sorts of the obstacles that we've mentioned, you go small to deliver it because you know you can then deliver it, it's just doing the same thing that we've always done and I don't know.

### Q11

### Interviewer

Yeah, OK, no problem at all. So try now to think about something being successful and.

### Interviewee 6

Nah nah nah

### Q11

### Interviewer

So what do you feel needs to be achieved to be able to attain a level of success, whatever that may be, for introducing new technologies?

Interviewee 8

I think.

I think we need, less Teams meetings, less emails, more sitting down with all the right people in a room and just say, right, door is shut until you put the white smoke up to say you've made a decision, you're staying here and you thrash it out because.

I get everyone's busy and, you know, it's um, everyone, everyone I deal with it's it's far more important than I am. So it's it's it's, it's easy for me to say this from the bottom of the pile upwards, but, there seems to be a lack of ability at the top to make a firm decision to say yes, you can do this, you can deliver it.

I I just.

That's made exponentially easier by diary invites and emails and Teams meetings.

Um.

I I returned to right today is the day we are booked out to find the functional way to deliver X.

And that deep, the sole goal of today, is to find that route and to determine who's gonna have ownership of it. And at the end of the day, whichever ranked officer sits there is gonna sign off and say this is the way and make it public.

Yeah, I think would solve a lot of problems.

Interviewer – FQ11

Okay. And do you think there's a time frame with which, um, stuff needs to be achieved for it to be accepted within law enforcement?

Interviewee 8

I think law enforcement are very well used to things being slow, especially in the fallout of of COVID. I think nobody would bat an eyelid if you said in two year's time I will have you this.

But, stick to it. That's the, you know, I I don't think anyone would mock a slow delivery plan as long as when that delivery plan landed, it was delivered and that's, that, I think that's more crucial than needing a defined timeline.

Q12

Interviewer

Okay, thank you. And then the last question really is the the usual catch all of any other bits. So are there any other factors or issues we haven't yet really discussed which you feel are important to successfully implement new technologies for law enforcement?

Interviewee 8

Um.

Not, no, I I mean no, I think.

The the the the conversation speaks about the far wider conversation around territorial policing and and 43 model is is is front and centre of that, isn't it? And until that is solved as an issue, it's always going to be a fight, so not that we haven't touched on.

### Interviewer

OK, no problem at all. Those at the end of the question. So I'm just going to turn off the recording of the transcript.