

## **DORSET POLICE and CRIME PANEL – Scrutiny Review of Body Worn Video**

### **1. Introduction**

1.1. Dorset Police and Crime Panel (PCP) have a statutory responsibility, under the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 to scrutinise the Dorset Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC), to promote openness in the transaction of police business and also support the PCC in the effective exercise of his functions (s.28(2)). This responsibility can also include carrying out 'investigations' into topics of particular interest, or public concern (s.28 (6)). The guidance to PCP's (Local Government Association and Centre for Public Scrutiny, Police and Crime Panels Guidance on role and composition, October 2011) suggest that there should be two types of scrutiny. The first is reactive scrutiny, which 'looks at how services have been delivered in the past, learns and applies lessons from that experience to the future'. The second is proactive scrutiny which 'engages in current policy development, influencing decisions before they are made'.

### **2. Context**

2.1. As part of the PCP responsibilities Dorset PCP have introduced a work programme to provide structure to how scrutiny is managed (<https://www.dorsetforyou.gov.uk/article/423508/Dorset-Police-and-Crime-Panel-Work-Plan>) and have agreed with the PCC to complete 'scrutiny reviews' on agreed areas of business.

### **3. Process**

3.1. The PCP agreed for the Independent Member Iain McVie to complete the work on behalf of the PCP and agreed a set of key lines of enquiry at its public scrutiny meeting held on the on the 1<sup>st</sup> February 2018 (<https://dorset.moderngov.co.uk/documents/g1287/Public%20reports%20pack%2001st-Feb-2018%2010.00%20Dorset%20Police%20and%20Crime%20Panel.pdf?T=10>)

3.2. The PCP were provided with extensive information from the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC) providing background information, meeting minutes (decision making), policies and responses to the key lines of enquiry.

3.4. Also used were national documents including the current Home Office (2007) and Policing College (2014) guidance on use of body worn devices plus reviews of these devices by Devon and Cornwall Police and Police Scotland.

3.5. To then test this information and ensure the PCP met its statutory requirements to scrutinise the PCC, Iain McVie met with representatives of the PCC (OPCC) and Dorset Police at Police Headquarters on 17<sup>th</sup> May 2018. This took the form of a structured meeting where the PCP representative was able to clarify, question and investigate how the PCC/OPCC was, and is, ensuring that Dorset Police introduce an efficient and effective body worn device that contributes to keeping Dorset safe and providing value for money. Additionally Iain McVie visited Bournemouth Police Station on 23<sup>rd</sup> July 2018 to observe the one day training session that all users of body worn devices must attend.

3.6. This constitutes the final report for the Police and Crime Panel to be provided for the September 2018 panel meeting.

### **4. Key lines of enquiry (KLOE) scrutiny findings**

#### **4.1 What is the current position (baseline) / history (trend)?**

Body worn devices have been in use to varying degrees across the police service since before 2005. In the last five years forces have adopted a co-ordinated, focused and evidenced based approach to the provision of body worn devices or video (BWV). Dorset Police has been one of the last to take up the force-wide use of BWV but has taken advantage of this position, by utilising the lessons learnt from other forces (robustness of camera, ease of charging, and the storage/retrieval of data). It should be noted that all firearms officers currently do use a BWV device. There is now a clear policy, project programme and review process in place. The project is a Strategic Alliance rollout with Devon and Cornwall Police. Implementation is in three phases and currently the force is training the first batch of

police officers. Phase 1 operational rollout is November 2018 with phase 3 being January 2019 and the project completing by June 2019. Across the two forces there will be 3500 users of which 2000 officers will have personal issue.

Evidence – Research documents, Minutes Ethics and Appeals Committee, PRISM Board Minutes, OPCC response, Force response, structured interview and officer training day.

#### 4.2 Is the system efficient and effective, in particular usage, storage and retrieval of data?

There is a clear policy with an efficient and effective process in place for the management of personal issue and shared issue of the devices. The cameras are the most up to date available in the UK and the force has ensured the downloading, storage, retrieval, disclosure and associated paperwork is managed utilising the NICHE system and currently DEMS but in the near future the force wide metadata system called DEMS360.

Evidence – OPCC response, Force response, structured interview and officer training day.

#### 4.3 What's helping and hindering the use of BWV?

There was delay of a number of years previously, but the scrutiny review found clear evidence of the PCC and his office holding the force to account to ensure that the funds allocated to the force for this project have been and are being used efficiently and effectively. Despite these delays in the early stages the force has adopted an evidenced based approach including the completion of a pilot scheme that has provided good baseline data that will be tested by a follow up survey once the BWV's have been operationally in use force wide. The project is adhering to the agreed timeline and the OPCC through the PRISM Board is holding the force to account. Across the two forces there is a highlighted issue concerning network coverage but there is a clear plan in place and this is included within the force RAG (Red, Amber and Green).

Evidence – Research documents, Prism Board Minutes, RAG, Evaluation/Survey document, OPCC response, Force response and structured interview.

#### 4.4 Is use of BWV making a difference?

There was clear evidence both nationally and locally, from the Dorset pilot that the use of BWV does impact on prevention and detection of crime, nuisance and disorder. That the evidence obtained does assist in the prosecution process, which will be further enhanced once CPS are able to file share digitally. There is also national evidence of a reduction in police complaints although the local pilot was not sufficiently large enough or long enough to show this clearly. There is though clear evidence of improved interactions between public and police.

Evidence – Research documents, Prism Board Minutes, RAG, Evaluation/Survey document, OPCC response, Force response and structured interview.

#### 4.4. Is investment in BWV delivering Value for Money?

In total the project is costing £6.2m with the PCC allocating £1.9m as the Dorset contribution. There is clear evidence of the force being held to account for how this money is spent. There was a competitive tendering process for both the equipment and software with REVEAL and DEMS 360 being respectively awarded the contracts in 2018. At this point in the implementation programme it is too early for the value for money question although the spotlight scrutiny identified excellent operational and public confidence benefits to this investment by the PCC for the police.

Evidence –OPCC response, Force response, Meeting minutes, training day and structured interview.

#### 4.5 What additional information / research is needed?

The planned post implementation survey is crucial and will provide the PCC with information as to the effectiveness of the use of BWV and value for money.

Currently there are no structured plans to train and make available the equipment to special constables. There are obvious logistical issues the most pressing being how to train special constables given their availability and the required length of the training delivery.

Evidence – OPCC response, Force responses, structured interview and officer training day visit.

4.6 Who are the key partners we need to be working with?

The PCP scrutiny role has been met by this spotlight work with the OPCC and the police. There are no future or ongoing partners for the PCP to work with.

Evidence – OPCC information and data, police provided information and structured interview.

4.7 What could work to turn the trend in the right direction?

This original key line of enquiry was shown not to be required during the scrutiny exercise. And is therefore discharged.

Evidence – OPCC information and data, police provided information and structured interview.

4.8 What is the PCP's role and specific contribution?

The PCP scrutiny role and legal requirements have been met during this spotlight initiative

Evidence – Force website, PCC website, HMIC Inspection, Force response and Structured Interview.

**5. Observations for future spotlight scrutiny**

5.1. None

**6. Scrutiny observations for the PCC to consider**

6.1. That the PCC provides an update to the PCP post implementation, including the key findings from the proposed survey from users, at an appropriate date in the 2019/2020 policing plan year.

6.2. That the PCC establishes how special constables will have access to BWV in the future when performing their operational duties, to further maximise the benefits available to the force and public.

**6. Conclusion**

This is the second time I have, on behalf of the PCP, completed a scrutiny review of this type and I have utilised the lessons learnt from the first process. Overall it is considered this was a worthwhile scrutiny activity that has provided both reassurance and highlighted two areas for the PCC to consider in the future.

This report is forwarded for the Dorset Police and Crime Panel to consider at the next full public meeting.

IJ McVie

Independent Member

Dorset Police and Crime Panel