**ETHICS COMMITTEE- Formal Group Meeting**

**Wednesday 4th September 2024**

**10:00-13:00**

Meeting held virtually via Teams

**Present:**

Marion Oswald (MO) Chair of Ethics Committee

Malcolm Fowler (MF) Ethics Committee

Simon Rogerson (SR) Ethics Committee

Anindya Banerjee (AB) Ethics Committee

Derek Dempsey (DD) Ethics Committee

Jennifer Housego (JH) Ethics Committee

Jack Tracey (JT) Policy lead (OPCC)

Eliza Ogden Barnsley (EOB) Secretariat (OPCC)

Davin Parrott (DP) Data Analytics Lab (WMP)

Kerry Reidy (KR) Head of Architecture for IT & Digital (WMP)

Tom Joyce (TJ) Chief Superintendent (WMP)

Matt Welsted (MW) Assistant Chief Constable (WMP)

Edward Hunter (EH) Policy Intern (OPCC)

Rachel Noble (RN) Inspector (Hampshire Constabulary)

**Apologies:**

Peter Fussy (PF) Ethics Committee

Tom Surrell (TS) Ethics Committee

Jamie Grace (JG) Ethics Committee

Claire Paterson-Young (CPY) Ethics Committee

Jonathan Jardine (JJ) Chief Executive (OPCC)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1** | **10:00** | **Welcome**  The Chair opens the meeting and welcomes members.  The Chair introduces Rachel Noble (Hampshire Constabulary) who will be observing the meeting in the hope the ethics committee.  The Chair continues by informing the committee that the College of Policing have launched consultation documents relating to data ethics and data driven technologies and are seeking responses and invites members to contribute to these documents. | **Marion Oswald** |
| **2** | **10:05** | **Ethics Committee TORs and OPCC governance**  The presenter proposed updates the TORs due to the potential to broaden the scope of projects that can be brought before the committee to maximise innovation and to ensure the committee is embedded in the wider governance structures that the PCC is creating.  The process for redrafting would be done through a consultation between the Chair, WMP, and the OPCC before being circulated between members for revision. It was also proposed that as part of this work the ‘Ethics Committee’ should be renamed as a ‘panel’ in order to emphasise their advisory role.  The value of the Committee to WMP was reinforced and that this lay behind the intention to expand the committee’s remit beyond data projects. WMP also noted the need to better explain the operational intention behind new projects moving forward so that members can challenge the use of technology in the context of the outcomes it hopes to yield.  The committee agree to the approach to revising the TORs as well as the rationale behind this. | **Jack Tracey** |
| **3** | **10:25** | **Police and Crime Plan Consultation**  The presenter outlined the purpose of the Police and Crime Plan as a statutory document, as well as the consultation process that the OPCC was conducting. To this end, the Committee members were invited to submit responses to the online survey and the open call to evidence.  **Questions and Responses**  A member asks whether the PCP includes any reference to VAWG.   * The presenter noted that there is a specific reference to VAWG under the broader heading of tackling violence and emphasises the topic as a priority.   A Committee member inquired what the main categories covered under business crime were.   * The presenter responded that was outside of his knowledge but that the area he was most aware of was fraud and invited committee members to submit their questions in writing for him to pass along to a different policy officer. | **Jack Tracey** |
| **4** | **10:35** | **‘AndiESRA’ briefing/ update (formerly known as ‘Amy’ 101 voice recognition)**  The presenter explains that AndiESRA is a language understanding model that aims to boost response rates for 101 calls answering non-emergency calls. It does this through three methods:   1. It understands the reason for the call and resolves certain, simple demand types 2. It redirects messages to the appropriate personnel 3. It recognises signs of vulnerability and prioritises those calls   The presenter emphasises that AndiESRA does not expose any data from the crime system.  The presenter continues by expressing his desire for introducing a feedback system regarding satisfaction of experiences, noting so far, they have had no complaints.  **Questions and Responses**  A committee member asks how the system detects vulnerability in the call and how this function is able to be measured.   * The presenter emphasises that the technology is currently functioning as a proof of concept and, as a result, only detects vulnerability through keywords. * There is the potential, in the future, to be able to detect the way things are said and understand context (including around the gender of the caller and which resolution routes yield the highest satisfaction)   A committee member asked how WMP know the system is working without user feedback and asked whether user feedback is part of the future plans.   * The presenter confirms that there is no feedback at present but it is one of the primary future aims. * The system is judged to be working based on the absence of complaints, signs of frustration, and the level of responses to 101 calls rising to 94%.   A committee member asks whether callers are aware they are talking to AI and what percentage of calls are currently routed through the system.   * The presenter assures the committee member that the system introduces itself as an automated assistant. * The system began at receiving 10% of calls initially and has since risen to receiving 50% with the hope that once it becomes a full production system, it will deal with 100% of calls.   The committee member then asks what protocols are in place should the language model fail.   * The presenter clarifies the system has a built-in error-resolution model that refers the caller to a human should it not understand the questions posed to it.   A committee member expresses his fears over the overuse of AI and asks how the system would identify emergency calls that have come through nonemergency conduits. The member also posits the scenario of a denial of service attack, challenging the presenter that AntiESRA wouldn’t be able to identify it.   * The presenter states that AndiESRA will actually prioritise a call judged to be an emergency in a way that the current system cannot * The presenter recognises the real risk of denial of service attacks and assures the member that the current IVR will be kept as a redundancy in case of AndiESRA failing, revealing it was effective in an error situation during the trial.   A committee member asks if any similar tools were in use by any other police force that may already have the feedback WMP lacks.   * The presenter responds that no other police force is using it for 101 calls. The technology is being used in other areas that do not grant comparable feedback for WMP’s application of it.   A committee member raised issues with the potential of AndiESRA to use different gendered voices and the role this could play in reinforcing gendered stereotypes.   * The presenter accepts this challenge and affirms to consider that potential when the trial reaches that point.   The Chair thanks the committee for their challenges and the presenter for the update, asking for confirmation that the detailed evaluation paper on AndiESRA would follow this meeting.   * The presenter confirms that the paper is a priority and would be received by the committee at the next meeting. | **ACC Welsted** |
| **5** | **11:05** | **Break** |  |
| **6** | **11:15** | **Crime desk and Solvability factors in investigations (in principle)**  Project began following HMICFRS inspection looking at the quality of WMP inspections. The project is conceived as a solvability assessment for reported crimes in the context of limited manpower resources and/ or potential lines of enquiry (based on data analysis on the prevalence/ usefulness of lines of enquiry across different crime types).  The project is in an exploratory stage, but the underlying principle is to arrive at a place WMP can confidently say whether there exists the data around lines of enquiry prevalence types which demonstrably yield the greatest chance of success (and if this can then inform WMP’s approach to investigations proportionately).  **Questions and responses:**  A member asked whether the focus would be on particular types of crime or all crime?   * The presenter responded by saying the early stages of the project would look at all crime types in order to see if there are any difference between the prevalence of lines of enquiry for different crime types.   A member asked whether WMP had considered using structured analytical techniques (e.g. pre-mortem analysis) to try and help understand what the unintended consequences of this kind of project could be?   * The presenter confirmed that WMP would be undertaking an extensive literature and take on board any methodological suggestions   A member asked for clarification around i) whether frequency of crime would be looked at, ii) the types of evidence/ lines of enquiry which will be included, and iii) whether this should be a one-off analysis or an whether the analysis should be done on a regular basis if it goes well.   * The presenter confirmed that frequency and volumes would be considered. The presenter also confirmed that all potential lines of enquiry would be considered as part of this exploratory project (as the purpose is to understand which lines of enquiry are most useful for to solve different crime types). * The presenter accepted that, should this project/ analysis prove successful, then there may be a case for it to be an ongoing piece of work which continually informs WMP’s approach to investigations in the context of changing crime.   A member asked for clarification around when WMP become aware of which lines of enquiry become available within an investigation – do some lines of enquiry become clearly and more prevalent after an initial investigation (even in instances where initially there appears to be limited lines of enquiry).   * The presenter conceded that this is a real challenge and needs to be considered as part of this exploratory project | **WMP** |
| **7** | **11:50** | **Future papers discussion**  As previously stated, ACC Welsted confirmed that WMP are keen to broaden the scope of papers to the meeting. These include:   * Operational and tactical ethics (ACC O’Hara) * Organisational behavioural and conduct management * Organisational decision making (including recruitment approaches and public communications) * Ethical leadership structures   The committee approved of this approach and the benefits of thinking in this kind of interdisciplinary way around the ethics of using technology in policing. | **ACC Welsted** |
| **8** |  | **Committee comments**  **Crime desk and Solvability factors in investigations (in principle)**   * The Committee commended the quality of legal advice which accompanied the paper – the 12 points on that advice (in particular the first 2 around demonstrating the link between the analysis and outcomes) are incredibly worthwhile considering. * The Committee noted the potential for unintended consequences around the use of solvability tools and the importance of premortem analysis to try to tease out what those potential pitfalls may be * Whilst recognising that this was an in principle presentation, the Committee noted the potential for this tool to be used on a regular basis in such a way that helped WMP take into account the changing nature of crime and how best to go about bringing investigations to a successful conclusion (taking into account multiple data points, including but not limited to reports directly taken from victims)   **AndiESRA (no formal recommendation)**   * The committee and presenter both acknowledge that as the project remains in a proof of concept stage, formal recommendations are more likely to be discussed at the next committee meeting. * The committee was pleased that a system of feedback and review is a priority for WMP in advancing this project and recommended that WMP ensure the effectiveness of the technology before investing immense amounts of money and time into the project. * The committee recommended that WMP should carefully consider the potential for malicious attacks, whether the system itself needs to be able to identify such attacks or a sufficient failsafe requires installation. |  |
| **9** | **12:30** | **Meeting close (next meeting 4th December)** |  |