Security Classification/FoI 2000	**Official**
FoI Requests on rationale	**Yes**
Author	**CC David Shaw**
Force/organisation	**West Mercia Police**
NPCC Coordination Committee	**Operations**
Telephone number	01905 332233
Date created	**23.10.15, updated 08.07.16**

National Use of Force Data Review Project

Report to Rt Hon Theresa May M.P

**Author: Chief Constable David Shaw
NPCC National Conflict Management Lead**

23rd October 2015

Use of force Data Review

Introduction

1. Police *use of force* understandably and rightly attracts considerable scrutiny and attention from the public, Government, independent academics, policing bodies such as IPCC and HMIC, and the Police Service itself.

2. However, what is clear is that there is currently no consistent, comparable data on the different types of force the police actually use.

3. A requirement for international *use of force* reporting systems (AELE 2015; Hall 2009) has been recognised, with a drive for enhanced data collection and analysis in the UK (Payne-James et al 2014). A call has also been made for '*publicly available statistics on the use of force in the UK, for both TASER and other use of force techniques*' (Dymond 2014) to allow for assessments of injuries, and whether the circumstances in which techniques and weapons use have changed over time.

4. The call for accurate and reliable *use of force* data has been echoed by a number of organisations, including Black Mental Health UK, the IPCC, NPCC and various PCC's. The lack of available *use of force* data was also identified by Lord Toby Harris' Independent Advisory Group for deaths in Custody in 2013, and initial work has already commenced to capture data in custody throughout the majority of police forces in England, Wales and Northern Ireland. However, there is currently no system in place for comparing the use and implications of wider police *use of force*.

5. On the 23rd October 2014, the Home Secretary held a joint summit with Black Mental Health UK on Policing and Mental Health, which focused on improving the way the police interact with vulnerable people and Black and Ethnic Minority groups, with a particular focus on black people from African Caribbean communities.
held a Policing and Mental Health summit which focused on improving the way the police interact with vulnerable people and Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) groups. Significant work is being taken forward following this event. However, it is clear that to assess the extent of the issue, and monitor any potential improvements, data and evidence are required.

6. In her speech, the Home Secretary made clear the importance of ensuring accurate and reliable data, asking CC David Shaw to lead a review of TASER and other *use of force* data:

   "...this is not just about mental health – the use of physical restraint and the use of TASER deserve a similar level of scrutiny. TASER is an important operational tactic which can protect the public, but we are right to demand transparency. So I have asked the national policing lead and Home Office officials to conduct an in-depth review of the publication of

TASER data and other use of force by police officers. This will present options for publishing data on how police officers are deploying these sensitive powers, who they are being used on and what the outcome was. Just as with stop and search, we need to bring proper transparency to these powers by improving data reporting".

7. At present, it remains challenging for police forces to compare the efficacy of one type of force against another. Some police forces are unable to state exactly what force is used against what people and thus whether force is used disproportionately against certain groups of people, based on age, sex, ethnicity, mental health or any other factors. All police forces agree that going forward, transparency is vital and that consistently collected, coherent data is an essential part of the process.

8. The opportunity therefore exists to ensure that all of these factors are considered in one project so that data capture can be undertaken consistently and efficiently, in an open and transparent manner across the Police Services of England, Wales and Northern Ireland.

9. Increased transparency will better enable individual uses of force to be placed in context, and provide greater reassurance amongst the public that force, when used, is proportionate, lawful, accountable and necessary in the circumstances. It will also assist in identifying instances where this is not the case.

How has the Review been taken forward?

10. Following the announcement of this Review by the Home Secretary, Chief Constable David Shaw established a formal programme to deliver recommendations on police *use of force* data.

11. A workshop was held on 20 November 2014 which gave an opportunity for stakeholders and interested parties to help identify the problem, and establish the requirements for *use of force* data for the police, the public, and the individual organisational needs.

12. CC Shaw established a programme board comprising of representatives from Amnesty International, Black Mental Health UK, IPCC, HMIC, College of Policing, Scientific Advisory Committee for the Medical Implication of Less Lethal Weapons, Department of Health, Home Office, PCCs, MOPAC and national policing leads. The board have provided expert scrutiny on the process, scope and objectives of the review.

13. A project team was established of subject matter experts including police, Home Office and College of Policing representatives, together with an independent researcher. The project team developed key questions to form the basis of the high level recommendations for improving police *use of force* data:

- What types of force are currently recorded by police forces?
- What types of force should be captured?
- What data is required?
- How should the data be captured & managed?
- How should bureaucracy be minimised?
- How will this be implemented?

14. The project team have developed recommendations on each of these questions, in collaboration with the programme board, relevant subject matter experts from key organisations (such as the College of Policing) and interdependent work being undertaken on the *use of force* (i.e.; the Mental Health Experts Workgroup looking at force in specific settings such as custody and health settings or involving vulnerable people)

Objectives of the Review

15. This project sets out to achieve a number of key objectives:

- Improve public trust and confidence in police *use of force* data through improved transparency.

    The timely, accurate and consistent capture of key metrics relating to *use of force* will allow meaningful data to be regularly published. Whilst recognising that many external elements impact upon public trust and confidence in the police, and that *use of force* is one part of this, having the data in a readily available format will allow comparisons to be drawn and enhance scrutiny and accountability.

- Influence, enhance and improve the effectiveness of future police training, tactics and equipment.

    Good quality, consistently captured data will enable the service to scrutinise its *use of force* by adopting a more evidenced based approach. Meaningful analysis can also be commissioned through the College of Policing to test the impact of training or other interventions, with a view to enhancing both subject and officer safety.

- Collect data on injuries

    Such data, when analysed will improve understanding of which techniques or combination of techniques are more or less likely to result in injury to subjects, officers and possibly bystanders (i.e. the possible side effects of irritant spray). It will also ensure greater accountability for the level of force used by officers, particularly where serious injury occurs.

- Reduce bureaucracy, increase the frequency and accuracy of recording and ensure that only necessary data is captured.

The collection of *use of force* data across the various police services is inconsistent and piecemeal, leading to unnecessary bureaucracy. Unnecessary bureaucracy will be reduced as a result of this project by ensuring that only essential data is captured. Once the new reporting system has been adopted, superfluous data, the capture for which has little or no value, will cease. A simpler, quicker and more meaningful process will encourage greater operational participation, increased accuracy and enhanced datasets.

- <u>Enhance the ability of the service to contextualise *use of force* data and consider it in terms of overall demand.</u>

  As a result of a patch-work approach to *use of force* data collection, the police service has never been in a position to contextualise and robustly justify a particular type of force used, in comparison to another technique or tactic. This work will enable such comparisons to be drawn and will assist senior leaders in explaining why certain uses of force and equipment are used as well as making any policy or procedural changes that may be necessary in light of this work.

- <u>Enable meaningful data analysis.</u>

  The public, academics and external bodies will have easy access to use of standardised force data. The increased consistency and nationally agreed approach will enable more meaningful analysis to be undertaken and will ensure individual forces are held to account where necessary.

Current situation

Data Collected in forces

16. An independent academic researcher was tasked with contacting all 43 forces in England and Wales, as well as forces in Scotland, Northern Ireland, the Crown Territories and some non-geographic forces, to establish what and how data is currently recorded. This work was aimed at establishing exactly what the current picture is with regards to the capture of *use of force* data, the systems used by forces to manage the data and the levels of detail captured. It also aimed to identify best practice which could be embedded into some of the recommendations and future solutions. **The full report is attached – Appendix A.**

17. Of the 34 forces that responded, 25 have some kind of in-house data collection system in place, and there are many elements of good practice that could be built on nationally. However, as forces have independently developed their own systems, the extent and nature of the data collected, the type of data capture systems in place, and how and whether the

information collected is analysed and utilised, varies considerably. This means that whilst significant information is already being collected by forces, there is no consistent approach or ability to retrieve, compare, and analyse such data.

18. Of the 25 forces with an in-house data collection system in place, the majority report the use and drawing of irritant spray and baton, the use of dogs, restraint belts, other fabric restraints and non-compliant handcuffing, as well as empty hand techniques. Most also capture some details on officer perceived subject characteristics, officer characteristics and details of the incident. However there is a lack of consistent data capture around the precise details of the force used, the nature and severity of officer, subject and bystander injuries and few of these databases specifically capture when force is used in mental health settings, or is used to detain someone under the Mental Health Act.

19. There are also some limits to the extent to which the data collected is analysed and fed back into policing practice. At the same time, there is a strong appreciation amongst the majority of the 34 forces responding to the survey of the benefits of *use of force* reporting, as long as this is quick and easy to complete, and is accompanied by useful data analysis.

Data Collected Nationally

20. The Home Office currently publish national statistics on the police use of TASER, and the police use of firearms. Police use of firearms is captured as part of the Home Office Annual Data Return (ADR).

21. TASER data is published using aggregated data collected at force level, which is then collated by the National Armed Policing Secretariat. Additionally, TASER data is collected through the completion of TASER use forms which are submitted to the Home Officer TASER database. However, as referenced in the publication of the *Police Use of TASER Statistics*, the Home Office TASER database contains inaccuracies, and is not of a standard that the Home Office would require from national statistics.

22. The current collection of TASER use data is cumbersome and time consuming for officers. It does not meet the needs of the independent medical advisors on less lethal weapons (SACMILL), and has not been of sufficient standard to provide national statistics, hence why aggregated force data is used.

23. A new, consistent system of data collection for all *use of force* will ensure that all data captured is necessary and relevant.

What types of *use of force* should be captured?

24. From the feedback at the *use of force* workshop, and the Policing and Mental Health summit, it is clear that there is a need for data to be collected across all types of *use of force*, not just TASER and firearms. However, it has become clear that there is no single consistent definition of *use of force* that is used by the police service which can be utilised for data capture purposes.

25. The project team has therefore reviewed various descriptions of '*use of force*', as set out in relevant guidance and documentation, and considered each to establish a meaningful benchmark for the types of force which should be recorded.

26. The College of Policing Public Order Authorised Professional Practice (APP) states that '*the law recognises that there are situations where police officers may be required to use force. The primary responsibility for using force rests with individual officers, who are answerable to the law*'. https://www.app.college.police.uk/app-content/public-order/core-principles-and-legislation/police-use-of-force/?s=force

27. The HMIC's Rules of Engagement Review (2011) also adds value. This sets out the ten key principles governing *use of force* by the police: http://library.college.police.uk/docs/APPref/use-of-force-principles.pdf.

28. The 2012 Personal Safety Manual lists within the various chapters the types of force used by the police. The manual divides the various techniques into the following categories:

    - Unarmed Skills including;
        - Spear
        - Pressure Points
        - Strikes
        - Restraints
        - Take-downs
    - Handcuffing (compliant and non-compliant)
    - Drawing and / or use of irritant spray
    - Drawing and / or use of batons
    - Limb Restraints
    - TASER, AEP, Water Cannon and Firearms (commonly referred to as role specific skills)

29. To enable consistent guidance that cannot be misinterpreted, it is important to provide clarity to police officers on the actual types of force for which they would be expected to record data. The higher level uses of force such as firearms and TASER are easily identified, and in the majority of instances recording such *use of force* would already be routine. However, a less prescribed set of circumstances exists in relation to lower levels of force, where the definitions of what should currently be collected is less clear.

30. The Personal Safety Manual therefore provides an appropriate basis for the types of force for which data must be captured.

31. At present approximately 50% of forces are already collecting some data on a wide-range of types of force, such as those set out above.

32. Additionally, there may be rare incidents where officers have to use tactics or techniques which are not listed in the manual. For example, if an officer was unarmed and attacked, it is possible that the officer would use whatever object was within reach to defend themselves (pen, bat etc). Further work will be required to ensure information from these scenarios will also be captured.

> **Recommendation 1**
> The basis for the types of force which require information to be recorded by the police are set out in the Personal Safety Manual and should be adopted for the purposes of this *use of force* data project.
>
> **Recommendation 2**
> Further work is undertaken to ensure *use of force* data can be captured in instances where officers are required to use tactics or techniques not listed in the Personal Safety Manual. This work should be completed by the 1st April 2016.

What data must be collected?

33. There is a clear requirement that for those types of *use of force* identified, consistent, coherent data must be agreed and collected. To establish the exact data requirements, the project team have considered the key objectives of the review, as agreed with the programme board. The team identified some of the detail and questions that the *use of force* data would aim to answer. This includes:

   - How many times is force used in each police force?
   - What type of force is being used?
   - Where is force being used?
   - Who is force being used on?
   - What significant injuries are being caused by *use of force*?
   - Is force specifically being used in health settings and/or police custody suites?

Core Data

34. To achieve this basic information, the project team, building on some of the best practice demonstrated by forces have set out the core data required.

35. The expected level of core data which will be required to be captured for all incidents involving *use of force* should be:

   - **Day, date and time of *use of force***
   - **Officer details**; Collar number, Surname, Force
   - **Type of force used;** what tactic / technique was employed
   - **Subject characteristics (Visual & officer defined);** Age, ethnicity, sex, disability.
   - **Location of *use of force***; policing area, Borough or Basic Command Unit (BCU)
   - **Type of setting**; Custody, Street, Health setting, Mental health premises, other building
   - **Circumstances of use**; threat to life, threat to officer/s, prevent crime, public order, protect self / others / subject, proactive use, reactive use.
   - **Aggravating factors**; weapons, alcohol, drugs, mental health.
   - **Level of Subject resistance**;
   - **Effectiveness of the use of force**;
   - **Outcome**; arrest, hospitalisation, detained under Mental Health Act.
   - **Injuries to subject / officer / bystanders (officer defined);**

> **Recommendation 3**
> A core set of data is captured for all incidents involving police *use of force*.

Enhanced Data Requirements

36. The project team also considered the need for data which may be necessary in certain situations and circumstances beyond that captured as part of the core data. Such circumstances were identified in consultation with interested parties represented on the programme board and at the *use of force* data workshop, as well as through mapping of interdependent work being undertaken.

37. Where more then one data collection is required for a specific incident, it is important that there is a clear link between the data sets to avoid confusion and/or undue bureaucracy for officers. This should aim to prevent overlapping or duplication of the information captured. It will also provide a clearer process for officers, which shows exactly what data must be reported for any incident, averting situations where key information is not captured due to lack of clarity.

38. Further work will be necessary with key relevant partners to ensure all required data to be captured is identified, and a streamlined, coordinated process is introduced. This could include a 'flag' system where in certain scenarios or outcomes a 'flag' would direct the officer to provide additional / enhanced data.

39. One such enhanced data collection could be for a 'Mental Health toolkit', developed by the Mental Health and Restraint experts working group. As announced by the Home Secretary at the Policing and Mental Health summit, this group aim to respond to specific concerns regarding the treatment of those with a mental health condition. A specific outcome of this work has been the development of a detailed toolkit which records greater detail around instances when a subject is detained under the Mental Health Act.

40. As part of the *use of force* data workshop and in consultation with board members, the project team also identified that enhanced medical data is likely to be required by SACMILL, the Committee responsible for the medical assessment of less lethal weapons requiring authorisation for use from the Home Secretary. Detailed medical data is necessary to allow SACMILL to inform and uphold medical statements. This data would not be captured by the core data requirement.

41. SACMILL has identified possible triggers for when additional data should be captured;

   o Death within 72 hours of a *use of force* incident involving less lethal weapons.
   o Death at any time following a *use of force* incident in which the victim died after hospitalisation which was the result of the *use of force* incident.
   o Serious injury sustained within an hour before, during, as a result of, or in the wake of a *use of force* incident in which a less lethal weapon was deployed.
   o Suspected long term adverse medical effects on any subject against whom a less lethal weapon was deployed.

42. The mechanism for how such enhanced data is 'flagged' when a core data record is completed needs to be developed. To ensure we introduce a streamlined data capture system that does not cause duplication of effort, or confusion, it is important that all additional, interdependent data sets required for incidents are identified.

Recommendation 4
Further work is undertaken to ensure all enhanced data required is identified and the exact data requirements for each is established. This work will include consultation with interdependent programmes of work, and key organisations, such as SACMILL. This work should be completed by the 1st April 2016.

Recommendation 5
A process is defined to develop a 'flagging' system where enhanced data must be recorded in specific instances. This work should be completed by 1st April 2016.

How will this data be captured and managed?

43. To ensure the introduction of new requirements for collecting data are meaningful, it is essential that a system is identified which allows capture, management and analysis of the data.

44. Whilst considering and assessing potential systems, this review has been mindful to balance the financial restraints of the current economic climate, with consideration of more aspirational solutions which mirror the direction of travel for police digitalisation. Considerations include:

- Expand the use of existing systems in place within individual forces for the collection of *use of force* data, and the identification of best practice.
- Ensure forces can collect and manage data recorded and held locally to provide national statistics which allow comparison of the types of force being used by each force.
- Utilise other data collection systems currently being introduced or established for collection and analysis. This includes an assessment of the ongoing stop and search work.
- Implement early solutions to record and publish accurate data as soon as possible, whilst considering transition to a long-term, future proofed, intelligent aspirational solution.

Options

A. <u>Identification of best practice in *use of force* data collection and use local data management systems for holding and managing data.</u>

45. Cambridgeshire Constabulary already has an established system for the collection and analysis of data on *use of force*. Cambridgeshire are currently in negotiation with other forces to develop a single shared mechanism and reporting process.

46. As shown by Cambridgeshire, many forces already collect and store significant amounts of *use of force* data on local systems. It may not be necessary to introduce new data management systems in all forces for the purpose of recording *use of force* data. However, further work will be required to ensure the data collected is consistent, and in a format that is compatible, and will allow comparison and scrutiny.

47. This system could benefit from a lead force acting as a pathfinder for the *use of force* data collection. Cambridgeshire Police is well placed on this project, due to their IT infrastructure and their established *use of force* data collection mechanism.

48. Other forces who have also demonstrated that they collect significant *use of force* data include: Warwickshire Police & West Mercia Police, Thames Valley, Gwent, Surrey, Sussex, Essex, Norfolk and Leicestershire.

B. Introduction of a centralised, national Database through the Home Office Data Hub

49. The Home Office Data Hub collects data from all forces on specific recorded crimes. This information is regularly published and provided to policy leads for analysis. The Hub is reliant on accurate police data entry, but can automatically reject data that is not within parameters, and will provide error alerts on data that is deemed to be anomalous. All data-sets collected require each force to have a data capture system.

50. This data is used to form quarterly crime statistics, but also shared more widely with HMIC, and the MoJ. In the future there are considerations for linking this data directly to PNC and Police.uk.

51. There is potential to add a section to the Hub database, but this would be at a cost of approximately £40k. The work would take three months to be completed by ATOS on behalf of the Home Office.

52. This system would create a section on *use of force* data which would be searchable, but would not create whole comparable tables of data. To create this comparison would place a further burden on police forces and the Home Office due to the required ATOS uplift and an increased data requirement.

C. Hold and publish data through Police.Uk

53. The Home Office has been working with forces to input Stop and Search data into Police.UK.

54. Currently information is still collected on paper forms in some forces, but where local IT capability allows, other forces have started collecting data on mobile devices. Data is mainly input by officers, but in some forces this is delegated to control room staff and administrators. Each force has its own database, which then cleanses the data to upload onto Police.uk.

55. The Home Office and the National Policing Governance Board has been integral in resolving issues and bringing pace to the project.

56. Additional local and national functionality is also being considered within Police.UK e.g. overlaying crime maps with stop and search data; and individuals being able to track their stop and search information and access their paperwork.

57. It would cost approximately £8,000 to publish *use of force* data on Police.uk.

D. Data collected nationally through inclusion within the Annual Data Return

58. The Home Office Annual Data Requirement (ADR) is underpinned by legislation (Police Act 1996 and strengthened by the Police and Social Responsibility Act 2011) and allows for a consistent and quality data collection in a timely manner. The ADR is a list of all routine requests for data made to all police forces in England and Wales under the Home Secretary's statutory powers. Those Acts place a legal requirement on forces to supply crime and policing data.

59. The ADR collects data through various routes including simple excel spreadsheets through to more complicated data hubs (including the Home Office Data Hub – see below).

60. The data can be required on a mandatory basis, or can be volunteered by police forces if they already collect the data and wish it to published. The majority of data is published quarterly by the Home Office, but also shared with Police.UK, IPCC and HMIC.

61. The next potential start date for a *use of force* data entry to the ADR is for 2017/18. However, a voluntary collection system could be introduced to some forces from 2016/17.

E. Further technical scoping option: Home Office Digital

62. The Home Office could assist in the commissioning of Home Office Digital to undertake a scoping and research exercise to understand the technical requirement and potential options for delivering a longer-term suitable IT solution.

63. Further consideration should be given to the potential funding sources for the development of an intelligent, national data management system. Options such as a cloud-base system which can be accessed by all forces, and potentially the public, should be assessed.

IT Solution Conclusions

64. The most realistic system for introducing a process immediately for collecting, managing and publishing data will be a combination of the options set out above.

65. Research on the current position for *use of force* data recording showed that a number of forces are already collecting significant data and managing these using local systems. It should therefore be possible to ensure each force has a suitable local data management system in place to hold all use of force records.

66. For the purpose of ensuring comparable national data is provided and published, the ADR should be utilised. The ADR is a tried and tested mechanism that could be used to collect and publish aggregated statistics from police forces, allowing comparison and analysis of the *use of force* in each force.

67. The ADR will not collect statistics for all core data that must be recorded in each incident. The aggregated data to be requested will need to be defined. However, as a minimum it could include the overall number of incidents by force, the types of force used, and who force is used upon.

68. The earliest potential start date for inclusion of *use of force* data in the ADR would be 2017/18. Each police force is therefore expected to have a system in place for recording all core data required, from which the ADR statistics will be provided, before 1 April 2017. Each police force should confirm their plans for introducing this system with the project team by 1 April 2016.

69. A programme for introducing the new data collection system initially with selected pathfinder forces should be agreed for the year 2016/17. The pathfinder forces should introduce a system for recording all core data, and a system for providing the necessary aggregated statistics that will form the *use of force* ADR requirement.

70. To help establish the exact requirement on forces, a workshop should be considered prior to 1 April 2017, when collection of the data would be mandatory. The workshop should consider how a new system could be introduced in each force, how the ADR requirement can be satisfied, and agree the timing for each force to implement the new system.

71. Further work should be undertaken to establish the best option for an aspirational system for managing and publishing data on police *use of force*. However, it is important to note that this will have costs attached to it which would require exploration. This option could also be some time in development and implementation.

Recommendation 6
A selection of pathfinder forces will begin collection of all *use of force* records on existing, local data management systems by 1 April 2016

Recommendation 7
Aggregated high level statistics will be provided from each pathfinder force in the period 1 April 16 to 31 March 17. The exact ADR requirements should be established before 1 April 16.

Recommendation 8
All forces should set out their plans for introducing a system for recording *use of force* records by 1 April 2016. This system will include the collection and management of all core data, and the submission of aggregated statistics required in the *use of force* ADR requirement.

Recommendation 9
Use of force data should be submitted for inclusion in ADR 17/18 for all forces.

What should be done with the data? Publications, statistical analysis, influencing guidance and policy.

72. When introducing any new data collection, it is vital that consideration is given to what data is being recorded, why, and what will be done with it.

73. As demonstrated at the *use of force* data workshop, there is general agreement that statistics should be published to allow consistent review and comparison of *use of force* data between forces. As described above, we recommend that this is achieved through forces' aggregated statistics being provided to the Home Office as part of the ADR.

74. Much of the data received through the ADR is routinely published. Some collections, for national and official statistics undergo a thorough quality review process after collection by Home Office statisticians.

75. The code of practice for official statistics outlines principles and practices associated with user needs; *Impartiality and objectivity; Integrity; Quality; Confidentiality; Burden; Resources; Frankness and accessibility.* Official statistics are regularly collected, use recognised statistical methods, represent the total population of the entity they cover and provide insight into government's performance and delivery.

76. The UK Statistics Authority expects high profile and regularly publicly quoted key figures on departmental performance to be official statistics. On the other hand, transparency, management information and performance data is more flexible and responsive to departmental and user priorities and often has a lower profile user base.

77. It is vital that if statistics on police *use of force* are to be published, the recognised standards must be complied with to ensure public and police confidence in the process. Consideration should be given to the exact status of *use of force* statistical publications, including consideration of appropriate quality assurance and reliability.

78. As well as the standards of published statistics, it is important that a process is established which provides quality assurance at the point of data being recorded. The current TASER form has an established process for providing quality assurance, with a level of oversight and scrutiny being provided by dedicated officers. A similar approach should be considered to provide such scrutiny over all *use of force* records.

Recommendation 10

Further work should be undertaken to define standards for data collection, management and publication. This should include quality assurance and scrutiny for each incident where core data is recorded, the provision of aggregated statistics for the ADR, and publication standards for national statistics. This will provide confidence to both the public and the police.

---

79. The data provided to the Home Office through the ADR will only provide an overview of the *use of force* statistics in each force. Full core data metrics will not initially be used at a national level.

80. Despite this, the core data records should allow further scrutiny and analysis to help inform police training and guidance, and assist in policy decision making. A mechanism for this analysis should be established. Consideration should be given to individual forces and/or PCCs publishing core data records locally. This would need to be in an agreed format that allows comparison and analysis. Consideration should also be given to who could scrutinise and analyse the data.

81. Analysis and scrutiny of the core data records could potentially provide evidence on:
    - the total number and proportionality of different types of force used by each police force;
    - the scenarios that lead to different types of force being used;
    - the proportionality of uses of force by age, ethnicity, gender;
    - the types of force that cause significant injuries;
    - the locations police are using force, including in health settings and / or custody suites;
    - The type of force used on vulnerable people, and those with health issues.

82. As well as agreeing what analysis should be carried out on the core data recorded by forces, consideration should be given to who carries out the analysis.

Recommendation 11
Further work is recommended to ensure that a system is in place within each force for the analysis of local *use of force* data, coupled with a process by which individual forces publish such data in a consistent format.

Further considerations

83. All programme board members and stakeholders for this review were encouraged to identify what they believed should be in scope, and what gaps existed in current guidance and policy. The project team have considered feedback and identified a number of further issues for consideration, which do not form part of the remit of this review.

84. A more robust process of oversight and scrutiny should be introduced when TASER is used, with particular attention given to its use within A&E departments, mental health settings and custody facilities. Specific

consideration should therefore be given to enhanced post-incident procedures when *use of force* is used within these particular settings.

85. The programme board discussed the capture of medical data on uses of force outside of less lethal weapons. Consideration should be given to what medical data should be collected, what should be analysed and how.

86. In setting out the data requirements for consideration of the medical impact of less lethal force, it was highlighted that a gap in data exists around the longer term medical impacts (both physical and psychological) of different types of *use of force*. This would not be within the remit of the police service to collect this data. However, options should be explored on who could take this work forward in the future.

Recommendation 12
Issues identified which do not fall in scope of this review should be referred to the relevant work groups and bodies for consideration.

Implementation and transition

87. Further work is required to define the recommendations from this report, and to implement a new data management system for *use of force* recording. Early work is also required to understand the transition from existing data collections on TASER and firearms to a new system.

88. The current system for recording TASER data is both resource intensive and not fit for purpose. By continuing to collect this data in its current format whilst initiating the new system, there will be duplication, and unnecessary additional burden put on officers. The project team therefore believe that the use of the existing database should be phased out, as forces move to the new data recording system.

Recommendation 13
The current system for capturing TASER and firearms data will be phased out, as each force introduces a new consistent system of data capture.

---

89. To implement the findings of this report, it is proposed that CC David Shaw continues to chair a programme board to provide oversight and continued engagement. The project team consisting of subject matter experts will continue to support the project, and will establish specific work streams to deliver the detail of the recommendations.

In order to drive forward the recommendations, a number of work streams will be established;

90. **Work stream 1 – Techniques and tactics**
This work stream will consider the existing suite of available police tactics and techniques that are currently recognised, and will report on exactly what types of use of force should be recorded for the purposes of data collection.

91. **Work stream 2 – Core and enhanced metrics**
This work stream will recommend what core metrics should be required (i.e. what will be recorded for <u>all</u> uses of force) and what enhanced metrics will be required (i.e. when an agreed tipping point based on subject injury, location and / or subject vulnerability is reached).

This work stream will also determine the exact tipping or trigger point. At this point, further data requirements will be necessary and this group will determine what those are, in order that more enhanced analysis can be carried out. This work stream will include SACMILL members to ensure statements in relation to less lethal weapons continue to be able to be produced.

92. **Work stream 3 – I.T. requirements**
This work stream will consider the I.T solutions available, to efficiently capture use of force recording in a consistent way across all UK police forces, whilst minimising bureaucracy.

93. **Work stream 4 – Data quality, governance and publication**
This work stream will consider how the captured data should be quality assured and recommend proportionate governance mechanisms to ensure the data is robust and accurate. Finally, the work stream will recommend how publication of the data should be taken forward.

To ensure that the recommendations are progressed through the work streams, a programme manager has been identified and appointed. The programme manager will work directly to CC David Shaw, and funding for this post has been agreed until August 2016.

Implementation Schedule

94. The timetable for introducing a new system for data collection is set out below:

- All work streams report by 1 March 2016 to further define detail of the recommendations, as necessary. This will include agreeing the criteria for core and enhanced data to be established by 1 March 2016.

- A workshop is held In March 2016 to communicate the requirement to all police forces.

- All Forces should set out their implementation plans by 1 April 2016.

- Pathfinder Forces begin collecting all core and enhanced data, managing the records locally, by 1 April 2016.

- Pathfinder Forces provide aggregated statistics to the project team to replicate an ADR collection, by 1 October 2016. This will demonstrate and provide learning for the future mandatory *Use of force* ADR collection.

- All Forces are expected to collect core and enhanced data by 1 October 2016.

- Aggregated *use of force* statistics will be provided to the Home Office from all Forces for the ADR collection 17/18.

- Publication of *Use of force* ADR statistics will be published by the HO in mid 2018, in line with the ADR publication schedule.

95. Additional work will also be taken forward in parallel. This includes:

- Consideration of an intelligent, national data management system as an aspirational future collection tool.

- Agreement on the analysis of core data required.

- Agreement on the standards of data to be published.

Communication and implementation strategy

96. To ensure that the recommendations from this review are understood and accepted by each force, an engagement strategy will be adopted. Findings of the review will be shared and consulted on by programme board members, together with the Chair of the NPCC Operations Coordinating Committee and the College of Policing's Professional Community Chair. CC Shaw will also provide updates to all Chief Constables.

97. Going forward, membership of the programme board, progress of the separate work streams and minutes of meetings should be published, to demonstrate how decisions are being reached and what engagement has been undertaken. This will affirm a commitment to transparency and will ensure that potential FOI requests can be dealt with by having all the relevant information in an easily accessible format.

Summary of recommendations

Recommendation 1
The basis for the types of force which require information to be recorded by the police are set out in the Personal Safety Manual and should be adopted for the purposes of this *use of force* data project.

Recommendation 2
Further work is undertaken to ensure *use of force* data can be captured in instances where officers are required to use tactics or techniques not listed in the Personal Safety Manual. This work should be completed before 1 April 2016.

Recommendation 3
A core set of data is captured for all incidents involving police *use of force*.

Recommendation 4
Further work is undertaken to ensure all enhanced data required is identified and the exact data requirements for each is established. This work will include consultation with interdependent programmes of work, and key organisations, such as SACMILL. This work should be completed before 1 April 2016.

Recommendation 5
A process is defined to develop a 'flagging' system where enhanced data must be recorded in specific instances. This work should be completed by 1 April 2016.

Recommendation 6
A selection of pathfinder forces will begin collection of all *use of force* records on existing, local, data management systems by 1 April 2016

Recommendation 7
Aggregated high level statistics will be provided from each pathfinder force in the period 1 April 16 to 31 March 17. The exact ADR requirement should be established before 1 April 16.

Recommendation 8
All forces should set out their plans for introducing a system for recording *use of force* records by 1 April 2016. This system will include the collection and management of all core data, and the submission of aggregated statistics required in the *use of force* ADR requirement.

Recommendation 9
Use of force data should be submitted for inclusion in ADR 17/18 for all forces.

Recommendation 10
Further work should be undertaken to define standards for data collection, management and publication. This should include quality assurance and scrutiny for each incident where core data is recorded, the provision of

aggregated statistics for the ADR, and publication standards for national statistics. This will provide confidence to both the public and the police.

Recommendation 11
Further work is recommended to ensure that a system is in place within each force for the analysis of local *use of force* data, coupled with a process by which individual forces publish such data in a consistent format.

Recommendation 12
Issues identified which do not fall in scope of this review should be referred to the relevant work groups and bodies for consideration.

Recommendation 13
The current system for capturing TASER and firearms data will be phased out, as each force introduces a new consistent system of data capture.

David Shaw
Chief Constable
National Conflict Management Lead

October 23rd 2015.