

**ETHICS PANEL – Formal Group Meeting**

**Wednesday 4<sup>th</sup> June 2025**

**10:00-13:00**

Meeting held virtually via Microsoft Teams

**Present:**

Marion Oswald	Chair of Ethics Panel
Jonathan Jardine	Chief Executive (OPCC)
Derek Dempsey	Ethics Panel
Anindya Banerjee	Ethics Panel
Claire Paterson-Young	Ethics Panel
Malcolm Fowler	Ethics Panel
Simon Down	Head of Policy (OPCC)
Edward Hunter	Policy Intern (OPCC)
Davin Parrott	Data Analytics Lab (WMP)
Tom Joyce	Chief Superintendent – Birmingham LPA Commander (WMP)
Matt Welsted	Assistant Chief Constable (WMP)
Richard North	Chief Superintendent – Head of Corporate Development (WMP)
Lucia Leon	Senior Project Manager (WMP)
Laura Harrison	Detective Superintendent (WMP)
Nathan Murray	Neighbourhood Policing Superintendent (WMP)

**Apologies:**

Kerry Reidy	Ethics Panel
Tom Sorrell	Ethics Panel

1	10:00	<b><u>Welcome</u></b> The Chair opens the meeting, welcomes members and notes apologies of those absent.	Marion Oswald
2	10:05	<b><u>Update on Terms of Reference and Membership</u></b> The Panel is updated that a final draft of the new terms of reference (TORs) has been completed. The main changes made consist of an attempt to simplify the terms whilst emphasising the panel's focus on operational ethics and policing approaches whilst remaining purely advisory and solely regarding ethics. The new terms also include a more formalised agenda setting process between the Chair, WMP and the OPCC as well as the introduction of an annual report from the panel to go to the Accountability and Governance Board.  The OPCC further informs the panel that a recruitment process for the panel will be taking place over the summer. Memberships will be updated to consist of an initial three-year term which can be extended indefinitely to allow for greater flexibility. Any member's conflict of interest will also need to be disclosed prior to any meetings.	Simon Down

		<p>One member raises that the mention of community representation in the TORs needs to be increasingly emphasised and community knowledge to be expressed as a skill set in order to gain sufficient, necessary and immediate representation.</p> <p>Another member queries whether the TORs mention a process for circumstances in which the panel and WMP disagree over a project. The chair makes clear that WMP would have final say over any project as the panel is purely advisory. A member from the OPCC also adds that the disagreement of the panel would be used to hold WMP to account over the project's use before a member from WMP reassures the panel that WMP would be transparent around any disagreement and any deviation from the advice of the panel would be for sound legal or operational reasons. The first member suggests it would be beneficial to include these comments in the TORs.</p>	
3	10:10	<p><b><u>Productivity Dashboard</u></b></p> <p>The presenter explains that the dashboard aims to be a tool for supervisors and leaders within WMP to help manage effective performance within the force. It aims to provide key performance information in an accessible format to aid monitoring, managing and allowing easier analysis of both the productivity and availability of officers.</p> <p>It will use nine metrics such as response times, arrests, stop and search and use of force to measure productivity. The presenter adds however, that contextual information must sit alongside this. As such, factors affecting availability are also considered, such as: attendance, length of service and core skills.</p> <p>The presenter continues by suggesting it will be used at every level of the organisation and emphasises the transparency of the data. The presenter claims the purpose is to drive improvement and celebrate success but is to be used as an informative guide for improvement conversations not as a definitive measure.</p> <p>As a result of the dashboard bringing together all this information, it is possible to compare the productivity of several teams in a matter of minutes when, in the past, the collection of all this data would have taken hours. This enables the identification of patterns and any correlations.</p> <p><b>Questions and Responses</b></p> <p>A panel member asks for clarification surrounding the definition of a successful stop and search for the dashboard.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The presenter explains that it is a stop and search which results in something being found such as drugs or a weapon.</li> </ul> <p>The member continues by asking if the dashboard accommodates interventions other than arrests such as youth diversion.</p>	<p><b>Tom Joyce</b></p> <p><b>Lucia Leon</b></p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The presenter answers that it does not and explains this is due to the number of variables that could be accommodated in the dashboard are so vast that those few that are most applicable to the broadest array of police officers must be prioritised.</li> </ul> <p>Another member inquires whether the dashboard differentiates between individuals and teams, specifically if it can identify productive officers in unproductive teams.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The presenter explains that as the dashboard is not definitive in nature, it allows for comparisons between members of the same team, between teams, and for counter-narratives. They conclude by emphasising that the tool is to help the team leader understand a team's performance and to manage the team better.</li> </ul> <p>A member asks whether the data will be public or whether there will be levels of access.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The presenter explains that the performance data is subject to access control however, within this, the information is readily accessible to officers of all ranks across WMP. Whereas, the availability data will only be accessible to people with line management responsibilities due to the inclusion of personal data such as sickness.</li> </ul> <p>The member continues by asking how frequently the data is updated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The presenter confirms it is updated every 24 hours.</li> </ul> <p>The member then asks for clarification as to whether the main focus of the dashboard was operational or strategic.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The presenter suggests that it is both to an extent, strategic in so that it prompts discussion around what good performance looks like and operation in that it holds officers and teams to account.</li> </ul> <p>The member further enquiries into references made to automated decision making in the data protection impact assessment (DPIA), asking whether it was monitored by humans who still retained any final decision making.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The presenter explains that no algorithms are used in the dashboard to highlight particular information or level of performance, it simply collects information and presents it in a way that is easier for individuals to view.</li> </ul> <p>The member then asks if the scores the dashboard is presenting have already been used outside of the dashboard.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The presenter confirms the scores have been previously used but simply by another mechanism.</li> </ul> <p>The member then continues by asking whether the individuals whose data feeds into the dashboard have a right to be informed or access to what the dashboard presents and to rectify any mistake in the data.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The presenter suggests that dashboard would not be restricted and whilst mistakes are unlikely, any issues would be addressed.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>The member concludes by suggesting that the DPIA may need to be reworded as a result of their inquiries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Another member supports this suggesting they were surprised that the DPIA listed no ethical concerns with the project.</li> <li>• The presenter assures the panel that a full equality impact assessment was carried out.</li> <li>• Another presenter further clarifies that they will take the DPIA advice back and rework it as the data protection officer (DPO) normally responsible for the assessment was on leave at the time of writing before going on to explain that the dashboard seeks to give a better-balanced look at an officer's productivity rather than focussing on one evidence base such as arrest numbers.</li> </ul>	
4	10:45	<p><b><u>Handling of Digital Evidence and CCTV Registry</u></b></p> <p>The presenter explains that, over the last few years, digital evidence has become increasingly integrated in, and important to, investigations and a highly effective tool in court. The type of evidence concerned can range from audio, video, body-cams, CCTV, forensic photography or the material extracted from phones and devices. The presenter continues by explaining the volume of digital evidence has increased drastically so there is a need to increase capabilities and future proof. As such WMP uses an outside provider to create a digital rather than physical store to hold, organise and use the evidence.</p> <p>The process of initial collection has aimed to remove the need for officer to physically collect footage using a disc or USB. Instead evidence is more commonly being uploaded via a secure link sent to those with the evidence.</p> <p>Documentation and storage have also been overhauled. Previously using physical copies of storage took up a lot of room, left them susceptible to damage or corruption, as well as being lost. The digital storage now is auditable and more easily documented whilst also preventing the duplication of data. This helps to reduce the extent to which officers have to go through hours of evidence, permitting a greater ability to resist narratives and confirmation bias as a result. Therefore, it is more accurate and efficient.</p> <p>The presenter continues by describing an additional benefit of the digital store as the increased capacity to share the evidence with the CPS, experts and labs, helping to build cases more effectively. This process is also less open to access by external actors, upholding data integrity and protection to a greater extent.</p> <p>The final benefit of the store, the presented explains, is that it is easier to present the evidence, having access to it in court allows them to show the jury more effectively and in a more streamlined process which is highly beneficial for cases.</p>	Laura Harrison

		<p>The presenter then explains that body worn video is able to automatically upload into the store but are seeking to automate its organisation in the future, also as this will improve searchability. Specifically, the presenter mentions being able to dive the evidence by type of evidence, where and when it was recorded, and crime type.</p> <p>The presenter uses the WMP CCTV registry as an example of how this organisation is beneficial to investigations. The registry is a scheme whereby the public register their cameras with WMP who can then request the footage from cameras in a particular location at a particular time should they believe a crime has taken place in view of those cameras. This stops the police having to manually seek out cameras at the scene of crimes and the public are able to upload their footage via a secure link that will then filter into the digital store, which is more convenient for both.</p> <p>Whilst the presenter accepts there may be concerns surrounding implications on privacy, they highlight that the footage will only be accessed when investigating a crime and will only look for those believed to be involved. The presenter is keen to emphasise, however, that the registry does not give direct access to public CCTV cameras, it relies on the individual sending it. The registry simply acts as a record and transportation system.</p> <p>The presenter is also keen to emphasise that any personal or identifiable details of the submitter are censored in the evidence. They further explain that evidence is stored for the entire duration of an offender's prison sentence in case of an appeal.</p> <p><b>Questions and Responses</b></p> <p>A member inquires as to whether there is a process of ensuring the reliability of the footage with a focus on deep fakes in particular.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The presenter explains that deep fakes are an increasing possibility but that WMP have software that is capable of detecting it before suggesting that awareness and training amongst CCTV specialists is also essential in this.</li> <li>• The presenter also makes clear that investigations are built on layers of evidence, a video on its own, is very unlikely to lead to a conviction alone. This makes it unlikely that a fake video could influence a criminal justice result.</li> </ul>	
5	11:15	<p><b><u>Victim Insight Platform</u></b></p> <p>The presenter summarises that the victim strategy is based on giving victims the best service possible, being in full compliance with the 12 rights in the Victim's Code, using their feedback to inform practice, and to deliver a service to be proud of.</p> <p>Feedback and insight on the service provided is currently is received through a variety of forms, conversation, stop and search, social</p>	Nathan Murray

	<p>media, email, text messages and more. At present this data is then gathered and collated within WMP.</p> <p>The Victim Insight Platform is seeking to change this and take the data and use it to shape the experience of victims. This involves making it more accessible to staff and embedding a customer experience culture.</p> <p>The presenter explains that this brings additional benefits such as an increased capacity for identifying trends and topic analysis. For example, identifying which crime types or which demographics are receiving a better level of service than others. Another aspect is that it provides real-time notifications which allows WMP to act on feedback instantly ensuring they can better support those who may be in immediate risk or danger. The platform also possesses translation capabilities.</p> <p>The presenter is keen to emphasise however, that the main difference with the platform compared to previous storage is that that the feedback and data will now be directly used in changing how WMP provides that service, it will shape the organisation, and contribute to strategic thoughts going forward in regards to a victim's journey and driving improvement.</p> <p>The presenter continues by explaining that the platform will be rolled out in three stages. Phase one is development and automation in which the platform will be centralised and feedback consolidated. Phase two will ensuring overreach and governance where reporting mechanisms and governance structures will be introduced. The third stage then involves pursuing continuous improvement.</p> <p>The presenter then invites feedback concerning how to prevent the misuse of the system and any necessary checks and balances as well as the appropriate and effective use of data in this.</p> <p><b>Questions and Responses</b></p> <p>A member asks whether this project has been used by other police forces in the past and if WMP is drawing from their experiences.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The presenter assures the member that many forces have been using similar tools and that WMP is in conversation with them and sharing learning.</li> </ul> <p>Another member suggests that the project needs to be accompanied by a management of victim expectations that doesn't become unrealistic and maintains some of the hard truths a victim's journey is likely to involve.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The presenter suggests they will take this on board and that expectations management is indeed important.</li> </ul> <p>A member inquires who is going to have access to the data.</p>	
--	---	--



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The presenter explains that the data will be appropriately shared in accordance with the wider governance structure. The member continues by asking how to insights are generated, specifically if it involves the use of an LLM summarising information.</li> <li>The presenter suggests that this is an opportunity they will seek to explore as the ambition is to collate the data and pull-out thematic issue from it.</li> </ul> <p>The member adds whether the real-time alerting is also to use an LLM or keyword analysis to identify risk.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The presenter explains that it is likely to use LLM for thematic issues but that there is an ambition for the response to be multi-layered with other contributing factors such as answers to simple questions at the point where WMP is receiving the feedback to also play a role.</li> </ul> <p>The same member then asks how this process will be communicated and explained to the public as it is important to be visible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The presenter explains that it all revolves around providing the best policing service possible and one to be proud of and that this is not always going to being exactly what people expected or wanted but is nevertheless, satisfying needs.</li> <li>The presenter continues by suggesting that once that is done and WMP is able to use pure numbers to show is learning and development they will be able to paint a clear picture to the public of their work and process of improvement.</li> </ul>	
6	11:40	<b><u>Break</u></b>	
7	11:50	<p><b><u>Police Use of AI</u></b></p> <p>The presenter explains that the government ambition is driving an increased appetite for the use of AI in policing and for the UK to be a global leader in this. The presenter emphasises the need for responsible AI before explaining that the NPCC perspective is that AI should be used for enhancing productivity, tackling crime and harm, and countering criminal threats.</p> <p>The presenter continues by explaining that both victims and criminals are using AI in their encounters with police. As such it is important the police can accommodate and respond to this by modernising whilst also maintaining public trust and confidence. They add that this is done through transparency, lawfulness and value for money. However, they reveal that a comprehensive assessment of AI in policing has been conducted and called for change.</p> <p>The presenter explains, there is a real interest within WMP to obtain Co-pilot on force devices as part of the Microsoft Suite once it has achieved national assurance. The presenter describes this as a potential watershed moment, being the first time AI would be available on general release to the police. However, the presenter continues by explaining there are very few production level examples of AI in policing, with WMP's Andi-Esra being the most well-known. This is</p>	<p><b>Matt Welsted</b></p> <p><b>Marion Oswald</b></p>

	<p>caveated by the fact that current contracts and suppliers are introducing AI into existing products.</p> <p>The presenter then suggests a discussion on LLMs is particularly needed. LLMs are interesting for policing due to their capacity to summarise and translate information, answer questions, and generate content. Specifically, the efficiency and documentation of data processing and the extraction of insights LLMs permit is of substantial interest due to the savings in officer time it provides.</p> <p>However, the presenter seeks to emphasise safeguards, specifically human oversight of the use of AI. Questions remain however, surrounding the effectiveness or practicality of this oversight with particular concern over cross-referencing information. Other challenges the presenter highlights around the use of LLMs surround privacy, data security, bias, fairness, and potential for over-reliance.</p> <p>The presenter continues by suggesting WMP are in the process of writing a strategy to describe the ambition and process through which AI will be adopted. At the core, the policy will only permit the use of approved AI products, it will be mainly concerned with low-level administrative tasks. Questions remain around whether the policy should permit AI to be used to help personnel develop professionally, produce products, and how officers should be permitted to explore its use. The presenter highlights one further question as to how should AI be credited and to what extent when work, emails and more have been completed with AI assistance.</p> <p>The presenter then concludes by stressing the importance of not becoming over-reliant on the use of AI.</p> <p><b>Questions and Responses</b></p> <p>A member of the panel responds to the questions posed by the presenter suggesting that, being such an evolving technology, no one has all the answers, particularly around how and when to declare it has been used. The member continues by raising an additional concern around LLMs being the fact they are very susceptible to stereotyping, assuming nurses to be female for example. The member does conclude, however, by suggesting it is very encouraging to hear WMP are considering the issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The presenter responds by accepting there are significant issues but that the information available to the police that can be used to train the LLM could help mitigate issues of accuracy.</li> </ul> <p>Another member adds that they don't believe that the AI tools should be used by any officers who do not already possess experience in the matters they are using the AI to perform. This is because unless the officer using the AI has experience of doing the task themselves, such</p>	
--	--	--



		<p>as statement writing or developing a case for example, they are going to be unable to identify the AI's mistakes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Another member supports this and suggests the loss of skill is a real worry around the use of AI.</li> <li>• The presenter concedes this is an issue and suggests the translation ability of AI puts professional translators' jobs at risk.</li> </ul> <p>Another member suggests the OPCC's police and crime plan has made commitments surrounding environmentalism. The member makes the point that AI is known to be environmentally costly and asks how this will be considered in the implementation of AI.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The presenter suggests they don't have an answer right now but assured the panel that this issue will be factored in to the evaluation process.</li> </ul> <p>Another member inquires as to how WMP will define acceptable uses of AI.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The presenter suggests that any aspect in which data needs to be entered is likely to be unacceptable. In summary however, it will be based on a risk vs reward system.</li> </ul>	
8	12:30	<p><b><u>Panel Recommendations</u></b></p> <p><b>Productivity App:</b> The panel suggest that the productivity of teams vs the productivity of individuals is a persistent issue. Despite no decisions being made by the app itself, it is likely to inspire regular disagreements and disputes unless the data is able to be unscrambled between them.</p> <p>A member also raises the issue of how it will be measured and performance attributed. By what metric, data or score will this be shown. They also suggest that dummy data should be run through it to see what results are put out and how the app will work in reality.</p> <p>The panel further suggests that a concentration on purely quantitative data is unhelpful and a degree of quality measures and qualitative data are required to produce a fairer system.</p> <p>One member suggests the lack of officer input around levels of their own satisfaction in the process may be of concern. The member explains that literature suggests it is highly important to know what those who are being appraised think themselves.</p> <p>Issues around how the app may affect cooperation and collegiality between officers are also raised. Grouping people based on their performance could also lead to unintended discrimination should the variance in performance level be due to certain experiences, upbringings or backgrounds.</p>	Marion Oswald

		<p><b>Recommendations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Panel recommends that the performance score and data should be able to be untangled between individuals and teams to offer a fairer reflection of individual officer's performance.</li> <li>• The Panel further recommends that both quantitative and qualitative data should be used in the assessment of officer's performance and presented in the app.</li> <li>• A final recommendation suggests that a measure of the officer's own satisfaction surrounding their level of performance should be introduced into the app.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Handling of Digital Evidence</u></b></p> <p>The Panel highlights the variety of new forms of evidence that are likely to be coming forward in the near future is of note and potential issue for the police. The need for verified sources of information and processes to ensure the validity of digital material is essential.</p> <p>One member raises that the digital evidence store's effectiveness and validity heavily relies upon its safeguards. Having such a large database allows for potential convoy analysis which may mitigate some issues surrounding accuracy, validity and external tampering. On this point however, another member suggests it may also increase the potential that an individual could be tracked on a regular basis which could be concerning.</p> <p>One member adds to this that perhaps a grading mechanism should be implemented to the store as an indication of the validity and reliability of the source of the evidence. The need to avoid miscarriages of justice is paramount.</p> <p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The panel recommends that a process through which the validity of evidence can be assured should be created and implemented.</li> <li>• Along these lines, it is recommended for a grading system to be implemented in the database as an indicator of the reliability of the source.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Victim Insight Platform</u></b></p> <p>The Panel suggests that the project should be accompanied by managing victim expectations so that they don't become unrealistic and the necessary hard truths a victim's journey are maintained as needed.</p> <p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is recommended that the project ensure that communication with the public is effective and targeted, both in terms of informing them of the project and also to ensure their expectations are managed to maximise the effectiveness of the platform itself.</li> </ul>	
--	--	---	--

9	12:55	<p><b><u>Any Other Business</u></b></p> <p>A panel member reveals to the Panel they will be attending a conference about the use of technology and law. They explain they have been invited to sit on a panel at the event and will be briefly discussing the work of the Panel and cover some specific examples that have been brought.</p>	<p><b>Marion Oswald</b></p>
10	13:00	<p><b><u>Meeting Close</u></b></p> <p>Next Meeting: 17<sup>th</sup> September 2025</p>	