

Police Use of AI | Oversight Group Meeting #3

Minutes

Details

Date: 30.1.25

Time: 15:30 – 17:30

Location: MS Teams

Chair: Dr. Natalie Byrom

Attendance

Oversight Group

- Andrew Stafford (Research and Innovation Network Manager, Office of the Police Chief Scientific Advisor)
- Ellen Lefley (Senior Lawyer, Justice)
- Dr. Felicity O’Connell (Researcher, The Police Foundation)
- Prof. Lewis Griffin (Professor of Computer Science, University College London)
- Prof. Shane Johnson (Director of the Dawes Centre for Future Crime, University College London)
- Lewis Lincoln-Gordon (Chief Staff Officer to Alex Murray (NPCC AI Lead))
- Scott Morgan (Senior Research Officer, College of Policing)
- Steve Barnabis (Founder of Project Zero, Project Zero)
- William Noble (Policy Assistant, Association of Police and Crime Commissioners)

Home Office

- Sally Halls (Head of CoLab, Home Office CoLab)
- Fiona McCallum (Policy Lead for Police Use of AI & Automation, Home Office)
- Charlotte Moore (Principal User Researcher, Home Office CoLab)

Sciencewise

- Daisy Thompson (Program Manager, Sciencewise)

Thinks Insight & Strategy

- Lucy Farrow (Partner)
- Paul Carroll (Director)
- Jonny Harper (Director)
- Josh Cohen (Research Lead)
- Emily Cowles-Naja (Senior Research Executive)
- Louis Mylne (Research Executive)

Independent evaluator

- Sophie Reid

Apologies

- Zoe Amar, (Director, Zoe Amar Digital)
- Tim Davies, (Research and Practice Director, Connected by Data)

Minutes

Item 1: Welcome

- Chair welcomed members to the meeting.
- Apologies were made for Zoe Amar and Tim Davies.

Item 2: Introductions

- Chair introduced William Noble (Policy Assistant, Association of Police and Crime Commissioners), who has replaced Alex Campbell (Senior Policy Manager, Association of Police and Crime Commissioners).
- Thinks ran members through the session agenda, inclusive of the purpose of the session, to consider materials ahead of the deliberation.

Item 3: Workshop and session structures

- Thinks ran through the interactions held with the public, including:
 - Online activities where participants will be introduced to the background to the deliberation, what a deliberation is, and why it matters. This session will also involve their responding to specific questions around AI in policing, accompanied with definitions to ensure understanding.
 - Participants will convene at in-person sessions across three locations. The purpose of this will be to introduce them to the deliberation and to each other, discuss materials from the online activities, and be further introduced to the three use cases by experts.
 - Following the first in-person session, participants will move to an online forum, where they will consider these use cases further, with additional complexity added, and consider the potential impacts of the use of AI in these cases.
 - In the final stage, participants will reconvene at their in-person locations, where they will develop the key principles of acceptability for these use cases, and AI within policing in general.
- Members were split into two breakout groups in order to discuss this plan, and provided the following feedback:
 - Members felt that the structure of the engagement was appropriate.
 - Members noted the importance of including information related to the police's duty to protect certain rights, such as privacy and

non-discrimination, in background reading to ensure this is considered.

- Members also noted the importance of explaining to participants why the police want to introduce AI in the first place, as well as why decisions are being made in the way that they are.
- Members also noted the need to include information around AI training data, and ethical use of AI within background reading to inform any debate around bias.
- Members discussed the presentation of a second perspective of those accused of crimes, as it was felt that participants may struggle to relate to this perspective naturally. Members stressed that it is deeply necessary that this perspective is considered within the deliberation.

Item 4: Use cases to be taken forward to sessions

- Thinks provided an overview of the three use cases to be taken forward for deliberation:
 - Call handling
 - Predictive policing
 - Summarising information
- Thinks provided an overview of the 'call handling' use case.
 - Thinks noted contentiousness of acceptability of this use case uncovered in evidence review, and expressed the intention to tease out differences in opinion within the deliberations. Thinks talked through both basic, and complex versions of this technology.
- Members were split into breakout groups to discuss the call handling use case in detail, and provided the following feedback:
 - Members expressed the importance of bringing these technologies to life, so participants can understand what the experience of interacting with these technologies would be like.
 - Members noted that there is likely to be a mid-point between basic and complex versions, and this may have to be considered as well.
 - Members discussed including information around the onwards routes of decision making that AI could execute within this use case. It was suggested that a distinction should be made between an AI that simply runs through a series of questions (to perform 999 triage), to one that could facilitate a full conversation.
- Thinks provided an overview of the 'predictive policing' use case, including an overview of base and complex versions.
 - Thinks noted that this use case in particular was intended to provoke conversations around the risks of bias, which would be given plenty of space in conversations.

- Members were split into breakout groups to discuss the 'predictive policing' use case in detail, and provided the following feedback:
 - Members agreed that this was a rich area to explore, but noted that it will be essential to include information as to what data is driving prediction, as well as the types of data on offenders that would be used.
 - Members noted the importance of considering participants' baseline knowledge, as there may be assumptions about how policing currently operates.
 - Members stressed the need to encourage participants to consider who in particular may be impacted by this use case, as well as the perspective of offenders and communities that see high levels of policing.
 - Members noted that it will be important to consider whether there is an alternative to AI tools in this setting, and the extent to which an AI may be allowed to make decisions about resource allocation and criminal outcomes.
 - Members also stressed that it was necessary for participants to consider who might be harmed, vs. who might see a benefit.
 - Members noted the fact that these separate use cases rely on different data, and it's important that participants understand this, as this can have significant implications for the extent of bias in the training dataset.
- Thinks provided an overview of the third use case, 'summarising information', including both base and complex versions.
 - Thinks noted evidence that public may feel more comfortable with admin tasks like this, but also that this needed to be tested.
- Members were split into breakout groups to discuss the 'summarising information' use case in detail, and provided the following feedback:
 - Members noted that this use case may feel potentially less relevant to participants, as well as less contentious and engaging, than others. Members emphasised the need to bring it to life for participants, and made suggestions as to how to do so.
 - Members noted the need to highlight the risk of hallucinations/inaccuracies within the AI's outputs.
 - Members noted the various types of evidence that this use case may have an impact on, and their admissibility in courts. In this vein, members also stressed the need to acknowledge the potential impact of bias in this use case, or the implication that workload may be created by AI outputs needing to be verified by a human.
 - Members acknowledged a point, general to all use cases, that it should be noted that there is an opportunity cost to not introducing these use cases.

- Members shared information with Thinks that they felt may help participants contextualise their understanding of this use case.

Item 5: Information provision

- Thinks provided an overview of information provision to participants within the upcoming sessions, including the plan to provide them with:
 - An overview of what AI is
 - A selection of news headlines related to the topic
 - Operational practices within policing at present
 - Police operational structures
 - Accountability and oversight of these technologies within policing
- Thinks noted the importance of ensuring that this information is accessible and limited, i.e. to prevent participants from feeling overwhelmed.
- Members were split into breakout rooms to discuss the provision of information to participants. Members provided the following feedback:
 - Members noted that AI's capabilities only make up a small part of this information, and that more may need to be made of it to ensure understanding of its capabilities and capacity.
 - Members stressed the need to provide information about how AI would function within these use cases, and what it might be like to interact with it.
 - Members noted the importance of discussing scrutiny and oversight, and stressed that should be brought up early in discussions.
 - Members discussed the inclusion of the Covenant for Using Artificial Intelligence in Policing early on in the deliberation to provide context to participants.

Item 6: AOB

- No AOB was raised by members.
- Chair thanked members for their participation and engagement with the process so far.
- Chair concluded the meeting.