

MINUTES

Stop and Search Reference Group Meeting Minutes

Date | time 7/28/2021 4:00 PM | *Meeting called by* SSRG | *Venue:* Online (Microsoft Teams Meeting)

In Attendance

Phanuel Mutumburi – Chair Georgia-Mae Chung Liz Harlaar Luke Hall Julie Baker Sue Wardell Lee Simons Philip Welham Simon Mills Kerry Treharne Tom Potter David Brown Tim Passmore Robert Jones Roger Salmon Audrey Ludwig Sharon ODonnell Vivian Mushati Sean Reynolds Stella Frangleton Crispian Reynolds Elisha Soanes	
---	--

Welcome and Introductory Comments

Chair welcomed all and informed everyone present that the meeting was going to be recorded. He speaks about how we have circulated the agenda and the minutes. He reinforces that the meetings are community led meetings and it is members of the public who are using the opportunity to share experiences with the police and share some feedback to improve the way that stop and search powers are used. He addresses the recent announcements that have been made about plans to widen the way that Section 60 can be used.

He speaks about how we are going to be redacting and sharing the SSRG minutes on the website.

He then addresses the minutes from the last meeting and action points that have arisen from them:

- Police looking into their data to find out what percentage of stop and searches was related to different classes of drugs: RS spoke to Natalie Bland who does a lot of analytical work around this. Her response was that it was not an immediate thing they could do. The data they obtain when doing a stop search does not require an officer to put what they are searching for. The best option is to go into those forms and do a deeper dive to find out what the intention was from that. Based on the arrest they could then identify what they are searching for. Only 12% of the forms there had the object as controlled drugs so they would only get a small picture of the percentage there. Could also do key word searches on forms but there is lots of disparity there. She says she has tried to achieve something akin to that in the past but it is a massive use of resources to get anywhere near to the answer to the question and even then there is

margin for error. Puts the question back to the group about how much the information might determine something out of it.

AL: Wants to draw attention to the report by the inspectorate constabulary from earlier this year which looked at searches that were undertaken for possession rather than evidence of supply. Given that we are interested in that aspect that might be a useful halfway house as a metric that people are interested in nationally and that could be used as a halfway point between what Fran is asking for and not providing the information at all.

SM: Points out that, in that document, Suffolk were highlighted as a really good force for dealing with possession with intent as opposed to possession only offences. Agrees with Audrey that it would be a halfway house and looking at how it is scrutinised nationally rather than the types of drugs that were located.

RS: When we ask the officers to input the stop search and the stop search is for drugs there is a drop box to select whether it was for possession or possession with intent to supply which was the reason for the stop. However, Fran specifically wanted class determination, which we don't put in for reasons such as that the public may phone and say they have witnessed a drug deal and not know what sort of drug it is. Therefore, they don't know what sort of drug they are looking for at this point, they just know that it is a controlled drug.

Conclusion: The data that Fran has asked for is not retrievable.

- Report: Chair says there was a report and one of the highlights was the statistic on the subject we are talking about. *He reads a paragraph from the report showing findings that in all forces except for Suffolk possession only searches were more prevalent. Findings also varied a lot between forces: Suffolk lowest for possession only with 48%.* We have been challenging a lot around the deployment of resources by the force with the number of possession drug searches that we saw in the meeting. Suffolk is doing better than other places in focusing on supply type searches rather than just possession. We want it noted as a positive thing but we are still talking about 48% of the searches. There is more that can be done to try to improve that situation.
- Electric scooters and how they might be being used for drug dealing: RS did some research into this, and he recognised that there were other areas of the country where they may be used to deal drugs. The tactic does not appear to have landed in Suffolk at this time. This has essentially negated the query.

The Chair says information is shared by the police in confidence, so we urge people not to screenshot and share the information that is shown in the meeting.

TP: Talks about the Save the Streets fund for Ipswich essentially for the Westgate Ward area. There are going to be more of these funds going through and he thinks it would be a good idea if everyone was aware of that. He says Chair's views and ideas would be very welcome.

Chair: Says that ISCRE did see that. It is positive because it is resources for the county and particularly Ipswich. I heard people asking about an understanding of how those pieces of work are informed. Is it the constabulary who puts the application in or is the idea informed by the community?

TP: In terms of what is included, there is constabulary data on crime and anti-social behaviour but there is also other evidence from within the communities as well and it is fair to say it is both the borough council and some impact from the county council today. The more wide ranging evidence there is the more helpful it will be. SO police and community data is helpful. If the programme does continue to develop people at the meeting have knowledge and ideas that can be contributed. Chair and TP agree to meet up and talk further about this.

PW: Asks if the money is for paying police officers more and what form this would take.

TP: Says it is not about that but things like improving CCTV and individual property security. From a community perspective these initiatives are supposed to help reduce crime. Although he has had to

sign off on it, the vast majority of money goes to local authorities and helping them to set up community groups and so on. But no money for extra patrols and things like that.

Review of Forms

Form 262044 – GMC: Points out overreliance on the smell of cannabis and the shortness of the grounds. ISCRE hadn't got any feedback from the supervisor and they wanted to clarify whether there was any action on that.

RS: Location is right on the Suffolk border with Norfolk, and it is actually a Norfolk officer who has completed this form who has dynamically come over the border with that incident and conducted the search. We are collaborative with Norfolk, and we do have joint protocols over the borders so albeit our supervision isn't directly line managed to that individual officer. We linked in with my equivalent in Norfolk to take that forward in terms of development that needs to happen with that form. Norfolk is developing their training programme and using some of the good practice that we have worked up over the years to improve their own development. We all acknowledge the form isn't enough but this has been fed back.

Chair: We do quite a lot of work with Suffolk Constabulary trying to support you with issues around community, informing training and things like that. Incidents like this will happen because of the way you work and the concern from people who live in those areas is whether that be used as an excuse to say we can't do anything about it because it's Norfolk officers and they will be crossing over? We maybe need something rather than just leaving it.

RS: Norfolk have now linked in with us about our training packages around stop and search to essentially upskill their areas. The officer did feedback that the vehicle was also of interest intelligence wise with possible links to cannabis supply.

SM: I sit on the joint coercive powers board, which is the meeting that Chair and Audrey have been invited to before. Learning and development sit across both forces anyway. We will eventually get to a common ground with our delivery of stop and search alongside all the other coercive powers. But we will probably see this happening quite frequently along the border.

Chair: We will be reassured if we know that Norfolk is performing on the same level as we are. The issue with the smell of cannabis in vehicles is something that we have discussed at length but there are instances where we have been seeing a lot of that. Questions generally (not necessarily related to this form) around the smell of cannabis being a sole ground on a form and how that was picked up on a car that may have been on a motorway.

JB: Points out that the College of Policing's professional practice says stop and search for the smell of cannabis alone is not enough as reasonable suspicion and this applies to all counties.

Chair: Asks SM if this could be feedback to Norfolk officers.

SM: Says yes and says that he has invited a representative to attend an SSRG meeting. Says he will feed it back through the coercive powers board.

AL: Has had discussions with opposite numbers in Norfolk and there are significant concerns relating to a range of issues with stop and search practices in Norfolk with regard to lack of scrutiny and disproportionality. She is concerned about the police officers from Norfolk coming into Suffolk and not adhering to the standard the scrutiny group have come to expect from Suffolk. Our profile of stops and searches are very different from Norfolk and a lot of that will likely be down to the work we and the police have done together. There needs to be pushback on Norfolk to show they need to adhere to best practice.

Chair: He reads a comment that LukeH put in the chat. Chair says while we understand that it is difficult sometimes to find the circumstances for supply rather than supply searches, if we are saying we would like to utilize our resources better to target supply then it is what we need to do.

AL: It is also a case of better drafting of grounds. If they are suggesting possession is some kind of indicator of potential supply then the reasonable grounds for suggesting that need to be reported. The

officers need to reflect what their thinking was in undertaking the searches. We have no sense from these grounds of whether it is possession or supply.

TP: we have a collaboration meeting in the Autumn with Norfolk and if it is a standard form that is being used then I can't see why there shouldn't be feedback. We can take this forward, and I can follow it up later in the year.

Chair: RJ has also put a comment in. We do concur as a group to say tackling drug abuse is a priority and people are concerned about it. The focus needs to be on the supply side though.

Form 262691 – GMC: Although the grounds talked quite a lot about intelligence and what was seen before, they didn't transition into anything that goes to describing why the person in question was later stopped and searched. They don't link them together and it is not obvious from the form that it is the same person in question.

RS: Said there was a specific description of the people in question and thinks there is a clear implied perception that they were the same males matching the description but agrees that it isn't clear just on a reading of the form.

GMC: Agrees and says we need to look at this from the perspective of the average layperson.

Chair: Stresses the importance of providing that clarity. We would want to see the direct link and that needs to be articulated in the grounds.

Form 262502 – GMC: Picked this one as an example of a good form that related to Class A drugs. Mentioned how they observed the whole chain of events and gave detailed descriptions of the person they were pursuing. Talked about how the two officers gave chase separately and they make the link between the two to show that it is the same person.

Chair: Notes that sometimes we see one or two lines and one of the arguments in the past has been that it is a small space which doesn't allow people to articulate the circumstances a lot. But we can see that it is possible from this form to put in all the detail that can provide the reasonable grounds.

LS: Says it depends on the circumstances because you have to input it while you are speaking to the person and it all depends on how that interaction is going. I think the grounds are getting better but during that interaction they may not be the friendliest and you have to complete the form there and then and you can't wait until you get back to the station. I think sometimes that is an issue.

Positive feedback to be provided to the officer

Form 262586 – GMC: Was looking at the supervisor's feedback and it pointed out that they probably should have just arrested the subject rather than doing a stop and search on them. It stated that they had used the wrong power in the circumstances. Are people being too trigger happy with stop and search when it isn't necessary? She noted it may not have made a difference to the outcome here because they were arrested anyway.

RS: It is reassuring that the supervisor has picked up on this and provided the feedback and the officer who did the search has fully acknowledged that what was said. At the time they were less than a year's service, so they are still learning. *Explains the circumstances of the stop and search*. Learning has been taken out of it and we got to the same outcome, as GMC noted.

Form 262868 – GMC: Says she didn't have an issue with the substance of the grounds. But wanted to flag them up because, as the supervisor's comments said, they talk a lot about the operations in the grounds, but it is not clear to the average person what that means and how it adds to the grounds. We want to make the grounds so that if a member of the public looks at it them, they can recognize the sequence of events.

TP: Agrees.

SM: Agrees it is a fair point but says that when officers are trained they are trained within the language that we use in policing and there is no expectation that these forms will be given in a public domain except in the scrutiny side. It is not a requirement under the legislation to do it in plain speech.

AL (supported by GMC): There is a requirement because the forms are meant to be available to the person who is stopped and searched too. It is part of the evidence that someone understands the grounds on which they are stopped and searched and use of plain English is very helpful in that regard.

SM: Agrees with the point. Asks for consideration that officers are taught the language and to try to detain them of that is difficult, particularly when they have to do it in the street.

AL: Says she isn't sure that the sentence describing the operations is even needed. That could make up part of the training.

SM: Agrees we have discussed this previously where there is too much information in the form.

AL: If we are getting to the point of this level of nuance that is something to be quite pleased about. It is much better compared to a couple of years ago and there is real progress. We are talking about officers who have been trained really well.

Chair: We are looking at the question that follows up saying to the individual do you understand the grounds of the search? In this instance, they have said yes so you can say they did in this circumstance. But there is always opportunity to improve.

RS: Agrees that they are not bad grounds and you can get an idea of what has happened. In relation to the form we had previously, the police officer who wrote them English is not his first language. The fact the form is well written like that shows the effort we are putting in to help diversify the workforce.

Forms 263059: GMC: It is a bit too vague and again you can see what they are trying to get at but we shouldn't be having to read into it at this level and more detail is needed.

RS: Agrees and gives an update on what has happened. *Explains the supervisor's comments and says it was a lawful search even though it has not been written up well*. Member of public has seen individuals trying car doors and CCTV has watched this happen. They were then arrested for vehicle interference despite the fact the search was negative as such.

Chair: At this point in the process we would not be expecting to see this low level of detail. It is unclear what the sentence that makes up the grounds actually means and there are lots of questions that could arise as a result of that. I think we could do better, and we probably need to provide feedback that we could do better and we need to move on from this level.

Chair: We are bringing forms that will have a certain theme. The forms GMC presented today are not the only forms we have concerns about, but we have tried to bunch them into themes and there are a number of forms where we would have a similar discussion but in the interests of time we have limited them. But RS would have received all the questions and feedback for the other forms and will have provided some responses. Stresses the learning is not just limited to the forms presented today.

Update from RS around the complaints

RS: We had some complaints mentioned previously and there were a number under investigation and either with the professional standards department or the IOPC and they have now been finalized. Out of the two complaints that were outstanding one was not upheld at all in any way. The complaints were about officers saying things and being inappropriate and the officers have looked at the body worn video and it has been shown to be the other way around.

But there was something upheld in one complaint where it was said, separately to the search, that the complainant had been denied a telephone call whilst in custody and there was in fact a delay in providing that telephone call.

We haven't had any complaints since then with the exception of one. It is a complaint about a search involving a Felixstowe-based officer where it is alleged that they did not search him despite smelling cannabis and they snatched documentation from him, questioned his mental health and harassed him and the officer left what he was doing to deliberately target the subject. The officer involved provided a rationale for not searching. At the time, it was established from speaking to the subject and the occupants of the car that the smell was most likely secondary smoke from the previous evening so that the officer felt that he did not have reasonable grounds to suspect possession. They have reviewed the body worn video which supports what has been said to have been taken place and that the officer's decision being sound. They have used their discretion to not search someone based on smell.

AL: SLC have had some complaints and there is one which we cant go into details of but it is with professional standards and she thinks there was an element of stop and search in it. It also concerns discrimination. It had been passed to an area inspector for investigation and it was not being investigated in accordance with the IOPC guidance on investigating discriminatory matters, so we have had to make a complaint about the investigating officer to professional standards.

JB: Confirms that there is an element of stop and search in it. The subject has been stopped in person and his flat has been searched on many occasions with the inspector that was investigating it as a complaint showing bias and prejudice towards this client, so we have referred it back to professional standards to reallocate. Hopefully it will go to the IOPC where they will follow the discrimination guidelines. This came up in a complaint of mine six months ago that the professional standards department at Suffolk and Norfolk are not following the discrimination guidelines set out by the IOPC.

SM: Asks whether it was East, West or South of the county.

JB: Bury St Edmunds.

SM : He is happy if they want to provide him the details and he will speak to PSD directly because they attend our internal groups.

AL: We have already put a complaint into PSD about the allocated investigating officer and they have asked that the matter be looked after by the IOPC.

JB: She has written to the head of professional standards (Darren) directly and she hasn't had a response yet. She has had a response from professional standards to say that they are looking into the matter.

SM: He will link in with Darren anyway to see if he can provide any further information. RS has contacted professional standards to make sure all the stop and search complaints do come to RS and SM in the future.

TP: There is a further back up that PCCs can look into complaints if it is going through the system, as an extra safeguard. If it goes to IOPC they would handle it but if they then send it back to say it is local resolution, then the offer is there should they need it.

PW: What TP has said is not true because it is his chief executive who is delegated to look at complaints (Christopher Jackson). He has two different letterheads, one in the name of Jackson Christopher and one in the name of Christopher Jackson. So, he has one letterhead for TP's department and one for the Chief Constable. The person who is investigating the complaints is the one who is advising the Chief Constable and he has two jobs. How can that be fair? It is a conflict of interest because he is not going to find anything wrong with his own legal advice.

TP: Says he understands PW's point of view but feels that he is conflating one or two issues. Yes, if there is a complaint about the chief constable, he has to look into it and that is the way that it has always been. But with the new system that came in in around February of last year, here is an extra methodology that you can use, and he would be dismayed if there was something of serious concern that wasn't reported to him.

PW: What is the new system of complaining to the PCC called?

JB: It is a review instead of an appeal. Previously an appeal would go to the IOPC but now it is a review to the PCC of the relevant police force.

TP: Says they have upheld one or two complaints, so it is not just a waving it through process.

JB: Extremely serious cases would go to the IOPC.

TP Agrees and says it is only on the odd occasion that they might send it back. It is like an extra layer that can be used if it has gone through the other system.

Discussion Of Central Government Announcement on Relaxation of Stop and Search Rules, Particularly on Section 60

Chair: He and RS have exchanged emails about this. There has been some feedback that we have picked up from communities where people are concerned about use of section 60. In Suffolk, section 60 is rarely used and in instances where it is used we do liaise with the police and they contact ISCRE in advance. It suspends the need for reasonable suspicion which for us are the checks and balances in terms of the deployment and use of this power. The direction the government is talking about is concerning particularly for those communities who are traditionally targeted or impacted negatively by the wrongful use of stop and search. We wanted to hear feedback from Suffolk to establish what the implications are of the announcement yesterday and what difference we are going to see as a result of the announcement.

TP: Doesn't see any big change in Suffolk because if they continue to build up the community relationships that they need to do then things will be positive. He does not see why there would be any more use of section 60 when it is rarely used anyway. Whenever it has been used, he has seen it done in a way that maintains good communication. Most of the things that he has discussed with police officers is already being done in Suffolk anyway. He does not think that there is any need for concern because Suffolk's track record is good. This group is an example of good practice and there is no need for that to change. The levels of county lines that we know of has drastically reduced around here which is a credit to multi agency working over the past few years. We know there are still areas for improvement. He is happy to put a statement out from his point of view to reassure people.

PM: Says that is reassuring and he hopes this is something that can be picked up by members of the community so we can provide that feedback.

LizH: agrees it is used in limited ways in Suffolk. Reminder that it can be used by British transport police around railway stations, and it is not just Suffolk police who can do it.

SM: Thinks this will stay as the status quo in Suffolk. When the changes came into place a few years ago there wasn't a decline in their use of section 60 because they used it so rarely in the first place. Thinks it is right that they can use section 60 sometimes when required, which is intelligence led. But when they do impose section 60 it is important that the local inspector who has made that decision undertakes a community impact assessment. That will be documented and that is how they have multi agency discussions about the length of time section 60 will be in place for and the impact on the community. I see ISCRE forming part of that process. There will be a need for us to relook at the section 60 policy because that is what is required but I cant say we will see a massive increase in its use.

Chair: The important thing is, yes, it is a tool and the government is saying we need to use it, but we also need the communities to be alongside us and to help us with policing. We benefit more from having the communities beside us and helping us. Blunt tools like section 60 can do harm by alienating people who we can benefit from help from in terms of intelligence. He can see that RJ agreed with SM's comment.

Rules of Engagement Project

Chair: This is a project that we are doing with Suffolk Constabulary. This is something we have talked about extensively at this group and we have been doing it with the communities and the police for quite some time. The project emanates from the feedback from this group. We have noticed the interactions particularly between the police and young people, mainly from minority ethnic communities, have not always been positive. The police have come to us and said they want more positive interactions and to build good relationships with young people. Talking to young people there were issues such as people saying they have never been stopped and searched but they are scared or worried if they meet a police officer. If you hear a young person saying this, it isn't acceptable and it shouldn't be happening.

We then said how do we make this happen and how do we bring people together? We are now quite happy with the progress we have made. We noticed uniform was not necessarily helpful with this. We worked with Andy and asked for certain officers to be identified who can work with these young people. Chair wants to show a video that is a rough draft and then create a more formal video later. In a short space of time, we could see that by bringing people into a safe space we have more in common than we think. We had the police and young people at this event and by the time it finished no one wanted to leave. Afterwards, outside, people were doing things like spoken word and rap. We want to continue doing events like that.

Shows video of young people and police officers in rules of engagement clothing talking about what positive/good things they have learned from the event and what they want to see change regarding interactions between young people and the police.

There was some work taking place prior to that, some of which they had captured and he thinks it would be useful to show some of those interactions. The one thing everyone has agreed is that not only is this going to be made a permanent exercise in terms of us continuing to meet but they have started talking about some fascinating things about writing scripts and doing activities. The officers had some links and common interests with young people and there were positive interactions that you couldn't get when a police officer in uniform meets a young person in the street. Once we capture all the stuff, we will be sharing it. But I just wanted to give a snippet of the work. Grateful to TP and Suffolk Community Foundation for supporting this. You will probably be seeing officers and young people out there with Rules of Engagement clothing and accessories and we are going to be creating more events. It is all informed by the discussion in this group and we are very proud of it.

TP: This all comes from our joint youth intervention fund. If there are perceptions and barriers to overcome this is about engagement, mixing with people on their own or neutral territory, talking to them and listening exercises. Then you start to build trust and understand people and you can become friends. When you start to build up those relationships it is easier to gain trust. He says he is committed to building and supporting that kind of work. If anyone has any ideas of what we can do better or differently or new initiatives please let us know. Says well done to everyone involved.

Chair: We have shared this with Andy Martin so he has a copy. The final copy will be shared with the police too. We are planning and talking to AM and the team we worked with on this with to do some more work going forwards.

SM: Has had the feedback in advance of today although this is the first time he is seeing the video. There was lots of good feedback and he thinks that if other members of the police saw that video it would be a really good communication tool.

Chair: Says every young person he has worked with on this, or their parents, have given signed consent and they know they will be using the material with the police and in public spaces. Once it is finalized, ISCRE will be sharing it with the police. He took away an interesting comment from one of the officers who said the day has been really special, they have worked with the force for some time but they were not aware that they could do something like this. He thinks it is something to reflect on. There is a perception out there where they don't even know they can do something like that. To get to that point of the event we had about 4 or 5 meetings with AM providing him with reassurance the officers were going to be fine and it wouldn't just be a space to be negative about the police. Even on

the day of the event we had to have another meeting and provide that reassurance. There is some hesitance, but we need to be brave to create the change we need.

SM: It is interesting because he thought the hesitance would be with the young people. It is good feedback for members of staff.

RJ: Is really glad it went ahead but he thinks the hesitancy might have been about the potential of misusing social media commentary on the wearing of the shirts so it wouldn't have been about the reaction of the young people as much of a freeze-frame of one of the officers wearing a Rules of Engagement t shirt and how that would be seen. Officers can be subject to nasty stuff on social media and it can be a safety issue too so the reticence may have been about how this would look. But it is worth exploring further. Any future things shouldn't be an issue anyway now everyone is talking positively about it.

Chair: They are valid points.

Any Other Business

PW: Speaks about section 60 and how we haven't mentioned the numbers of stops and searches carried out in total. You had the prime minister using the term chain gangs yesterday so we have him plugging stop and search. As a mechanism of coercive power there is no link between crime reduction and stop and searches because most of them are negative results. The salesmanship of stop and search as a positive tool is not representative of any crime reduction so I think you are more likely to make the streets more dangerous by drawing young people into gangs. Stop and search is also incredibly expensive and time consuming, the police could be using their resources differently.

Chair: Says PW makes some valid points. Part of the reason why we are in this meeting is the recognition particularly around the disproportionality in the stop and search and the impact it has. We are coming together to ask how we get improvement on that. As a group we are not saying we want total abandonment of that tool but we say it needs to be intelligence led and it needs to be used appropriately but also it is how people are treated during that process when people are treated with dignity and respect. We have members of the public who have had a positive interaction with stop and search but most of the statistics we have seen have shown you are likely to have no further action ("NFA") more than you are likely to have positive outcomes. We recognize that and hopefully, working in spaces like this, we can work through things and drive positive change. Maybe we will start to see more positive outcomes than no further actions. At the moment for Suffolk constabulary, I think we are talking about 60% of outcomes being NFA.

LS: Takes issue with the negativity around stop and search. He took a knife out of someone's waist band last week who was a drug dealer. He did similar about 8 months ago and it was on a recent tv series. He agrees with PM's comments. He takes issue with the suggestion it is not a useful tool, but it has to be used properly.

JB: We should just keep an eye on use of section 60. Although Suffolk constabulary say it is hardly ever used she thinks we have to keep an eye on the data and if it continues to be sparsely used then that is fine but if there is a rapid increase then that is something we can discuss in due course.

Chair: Agrees it is something we need to note as a group because our communities have already expressed concern. We will be keeping an eye on this.

PW: The number of searches being carried out for weapons are a tiny fraction. The police publicize it every time and continually talk about taking weapons off the streets but they are not doing searches for weapons in the first place. There is a large amount of NFA and it is just drawing people into gangs. It just changes the way people use weapons e.g. they are now being put in planters. He asks if they have the figures for the amount of searches that are being carried out in Suffolk and details of whether they are increasing.

Chair: We do have reports on the Suffolk constabulary website which check that. In the last report he thinks there was a decline, but we are probably talking about the 2019/20 numbers and we may need to check the latest reports.

SM: In his previous role he was responsible as thematic lead for proactivity across the force. One of the things they were trying to reinforce was that stop and search is just one tool amongst many that can be used. The press have made a big deal following the central government's announcement in saying that stop and search does not reduce crime. Actually, to some degree, if we are going to do intelligence led searching, most of that crime has already taken place and we are responding in some way. It is about visibility. I think it is important we don't lose stop and search because what can it be replaced with? As long as it is used correctly. He notes the point that PW made about it being expensive, but a lot of it is also about visibility to members of the public. He thinks we just need to be proportionate in this. PW is right that during covid our officers did have an opportunity to be more proactive with stop and search. It is intelligence led which is why there was quite a high proportion of finds for us. We have now returned to what we call "normal crime demand" and we have seen some of that proactivity reduce, meaning stop and search to some degree is reduced as well.

Chair: Two years ago we celebrated our tenth anniversary of this group. There is recognition of the importance of this, and we can all keep an eye on it. There are a lot of NFAs and it is important for us to recognize that stop and search is not the sharpest tool in the box and it can have a negative impact when it is not used properly.

AL: Is conscious that because of Covid we haven't done any body worn video inspections for over a year and she wanted to ask when it would be resumed.

SM: Thought we were ready to go and we were waiting for Rocky to be available to do that.

RS: Rocky is lined up ready to recommence so he will ask him to get in contact.

SM: Covid restrictions prevented us from doing it and we are now happy to go ahead. Rocky changed roles for a period of time which might have impacted his ability to do it but it will be in place by next month. He updated one of the area commanders today that it was starting to take place next month too.

JB: Last time I spoke to SM he spoke about the upgrade of body worn video capacity. Is there an update?

SM: The new body worn video is being rolled out to our roads and armed policing teams. It has meant there are spares available to be redeployed back into local policing. The only downside is it is the same kit going into local policing which has issues. But there is a push around that project and getting it delivered.

Chair: Closes the meeting. For the agenda for the next meeting, he would like us to discuss the ride along programme.