Leidos and the *New Statesman* gathered experts to discuss policing strategy and new technologies

The evolution of policing

How exactly and to what end policing should digitise has emerged as a key policy debate and formed the basis of a recent round table event, hosted by Leidos and the *New Statesman*. Indeed, what has been used to enable and empower people and organisations equally runs the risk of being exploited. And so a modern police force, the event's attendees agreed, should be invested in and trained accordingly to keep pace with the ever-changing technological and, by extension, criminal landscape of the 21st century.

Simon Fovargue, chief executive at Leidos, said in his opening address that "in the fields of counter-terrorism and cyber security" it is "vitally important" for the police to maintain a "competitive advantage" through

the use of technology. He stressed the need for a "mobile" police force, one that is equipped with "exactly the right information at exactly the right time."

On that score, Ian Bell, chief executive of the Police ICT Company, called for "more collaboration" between the police and other organisations, stressing the value of "shared intelligence". If data has become currency for criminals, Bell proposed, then it could be just as valuable in informing police decision-making, through situational and behavioural analysis. He said: "There is a wealth of data that we would do well to recognise the value of. How do we turn data into an informed police capability?"

Wendy Chamberlain, Member of Parliament for North East Fife, and a former police officer herself, noted that

the roll-out of police technology or use of any data science had to come with a strict code of "ethics". The level of transparency with which something was implemented, she pointed out, would settle whether it sank or swam when it came to public perception. "The central tenet we have to stick to," Chamberlain said, "is policing with consent."

Alex Cummins, head of innovation for the law enforcement team at the Home Office, agreed, adding that the adoption of technology should be premised on "clear user needs". She explained: "In terms of what we invest in, we shouldn't be necessarily pursuing the tech that seems the most interesting or complex, but rather focusing on the technologies that the police actually need to do their jobs better."

Jon Bernstein (Chair)
Sir Steve House
Simon Fovargue MBE

"How will tech keep people safer?"

suggested, should align to overarching policy aims and objectives.

House echoed this point and outlined the need for a clear government strategy by means of a dedicated "department or body" to arbitrate on appropriate digital conduct. As technology can create multiple moral grey areas, he said, an "objective" mediator was necessary. House continued: "We don't want to be feeding the beast, without parliament first saying it's OK. If there is clear guidance and engagement [from the government] on when we might use machine learning, artificial intelligence, or whatever, then at least we will have a point of reference." Hill concurred, noting the need for a "clarity of understanding" amongst "different stakeholders" involved in both the public and private sector.

At a more basic level, House was critical of "too many legacy systems and technologies" still being in place. As a matter of priority for modernisation he pointed towards the existing command control system for dispatching officers. "This is 38 years old, which is baffling when you think about it. What office, in any organisation, should include something that is 38 years old, other than maybe a pen and paper?" Digitising systems such as these, as the Met is currently in the process of doing, House said, would help the police to merge "several databases into one" and facilitate "more intelligent searching".

Chamberlain raised the issue of "digital infrastructure". Representing a rural constituency, she said she was more aware of the "digital chasm" that exists in certain parts of the UK. She explained: "A lot of these new technologies, if they are to work well, will require strong internet connectivity… 5G is still in its infancy. A tech-enabled police force is only possible if we have a good connectivity support across the country."

Public perception of a technology's usefulness, several of the round table attendees proposed, hinged on the police workforce's own level of understanding for a particular service or device. For Chamberlain a lot of police

Sir Steve House, deputy commissioner of the Metropolitan Police Force, said that the enthusiasm for "off-the-shelf technology" that many people willingly welcome into their homes could only be matched by a trust in policing if the government mastered the messaging around it. "For whatever reason, it seems, people treat the public sector with a greater degree of suspicion [than many everyday appliances or social media]. The government has to get better at demonstrating a purpose for technology. How will this actually keep people safer?"

Mike Hill, the director of police and public protection technology at the Home Office, meanwhile, said that any decision over what technologies to pursue must take "competing political priorities into account". Technology, he

Retention is just as important as recruitment

force recruitment is "too generalist". While there is groundswell for "more bobbies on the beat", Chamberlain acknowledged, she said that recruitment needed to become "more specialist", filling key skills gaps with more technical roles, and also upskilling the existing workforce to adapt to modern realities.

According to Simon Daykin, chief technical officer at Leidos, it is imperative that staff at "all levels" of the police force have a grasp of technological trends and any related politics. He said: "All organisations should be striving to be digitally native… Digitisation is here to stay, and awareness across the workforce is crucial across all sectors."

Lawrence Sherman, director of Cambridge University's Police Executive Programme used the example of facial recognition, a technology to which several issues around ethics and accuracy are attached, to illustrate the value in technically briefing traditionally non-technical roles. "The problem we often see is that much of the police workforce doesn't understand the statistical concepts that are necessary for seeing algorithms… It [data analysis] is broadly understood as something done by software people, in the IT department, rather than something built on real-life evidence."

Sherman added: " If you want to get

the public on board [with technologies such as facial recognition], then you need police officers to be familiar with the answers to the questions they're likely to be asked. What is the rate of error? How does it work? What are the realistic chances of people being stopped when they're innocent? If you don't have a police officer on the scene who can explain what's going on, then you're missing an opportunity for clarity."

Ultimately, as Wayne Parkes, chair of the National Police Technology Council, put it: "Digital disruption brings both opportunities and challenges. We see frontline challenges change every day, new crimes and new demands are placed on our police force." And there was agreement around the table that delivering a tech-savvy and cyber-aware police force should represent a rare point of cross-party consensus going forward.

If police technology is to be used effectively as an "instrument of accountability", concluded Sir Thomas Winsor, HM chief inspector of constabulary and HM chief inspector of fire and rescue services, then the government must gain the "confidence and trust" of the public. It can only do that, he said, "by investing in the right technology, and the right people, with the right skills."

THE PHOTO COMPANY / NEW STATESMAN