

## Police Accountability and Legitimacy Group (PALG)

Police Headquarters

11 September 2019

### MINUTES

#### Attendees

---

#### Police and Crime Commissioner's Team

Lee Jones - Chair (LJ)	Chief Executive (Interim)
Hannah Jenkins-Jones (HJJ)	Strategic Lead for Scrutiny, Assurance and Equality
Sarah Mahon (SM)	Engagement and Assurance Officer
Jackie Trow (JT)	Strategic Lead for Quality, Standards and Compliance

#### South Wales Police

Inspector Jeff Burton (JB)	Specialist Operations
Superintendent Martyn Stone (MS)	Head of Local Policing & Assurance
Martyn Jones (MJ)	Equality Diversity & Inclusion Manager

#### PALG Members

Steve Bartley (SB)	Older People Wales
Helen Gardiner (HG)	Thrive Women's Aid
Jasmine Jones (JJ)	Gypsy Traveller Wales
Reynette Roberts (RR)	Oasis Cardiff
Holly Taylor (HT)	Welsh Refugee Council
Emma Tobutt (ET)	Sport Wales
Steve Warner (SW)	Plafform
Elena Williams (EW)	South Wales Victim Focus

### 1. Minutes and Actions

The minutes from the previous meeting were agreed as a true record.

JT provided an update in relation to the complaints feedback gathered from the last meeting. JT informed the group that a report summarising the feedback and next steps was currently being finalised and would be shared with PALG once completed.

LJ provided an update in relation to the judicial review of South Wales Police's use of automated facial recognition (AFR) technology. LJ noted that PALG had previously discussed AFR and that the scrutiny and oversight was given due regard and referenced as part of the case. He advised that as the AFR technology continued to be developed, PALG members would be invited to share their views on South Wales Polices' proposals. LJ also noted that an invite to view the AFR technology remained open, if anyone was interested in understanding more about how the technology worked.

### 2. Scrutiny and Accountability Board – Stalking and Harassment

LJ invited HJJ to provide an overview of the Commissioner's stalking, harassment and coercive control deep dive report, which was presented to the Scrutiny and Accountability

Board in September. For the benefit of new members, HJJ provided a generic overview of the Commissioner's scrutiny process and PALG's involvement in the scrutiny programme.

HJJ summarised the deep dive report and highlighted key findings based on the feedback gathered from victims, partners, police officers and staff. HJJ noted consistent issues where victims had expressed dissatisfaction at lack of contact and updates from officers. It was clear that this had impacted on victim experiences, especially vulnerable victims, who felt more vulnerable and frightened. There was also a feeling from victims and partner agencies that officers needed to have a greater understanding of emotional vulnerability in relation to stalking, harassment and coercive control.

HJJ noted that a number of partners had indicated that coercive control was less understood by the public and required greater awareness raising to ensure that victims were made more aware that they could report to the police. There were also a number of suggestions to share and promote successful cases, in order to assist with increasing confidence to report and provide reassurance to victims that they would be listened to and taken seriously by the police.

HJJ advised that following the scrutiny meeting in September, a number of recommendations had been agreed to address the issues identified. The recommendations had been grouped into three key themes, which included internal communications and training, service provision and external communication. HJJ noted that the force was expected to provide regular updates against each of the recommendations. HJJ encouraged PALG members to ask for updates in relation to any of recommendations agreed throughout each of the deep dive topics.

SB referred to the complex dynamics of coercive control and the importance of understanding the different behaviours that older people may experience. Raising awareness of the subtleties in controlling behaviours was key in order to encourage victims to recognise the signs. HJJ referred to the older people objective in the Commissioner's and South Wales Police's Joint Equality Plan and suggested that this could be considered through the delivery of that objective.

HT referred to the difficulties of getting these messages out to migrants and enforcing the fact that coercive control was illegal in the UK, regardless of their culture. HG informed the group of ongoing conversations with Welsh Government regarding acquiring funding for migrant women who were unable to gain access to public funds.

The group discussed the importance of ensuring all officers received regular training on stalking, harassment and coercive control. HJJ advised that the Commissioner's team were satisfied that adequate training packages were in place for new recruits. However, there were concerns over how refresher training was being provided to officers who had been in post for a number of years. MS informed the group that the force was committed to ensuring that additional training and enhanced packages were in place for officers. The force was currently reviewing how annual force training days could be utilised to embed targeted messaging to existing officers.

The group discussed the scope in which the force works with others sectors and professionals who come into contact or have a relationship with victims. HJJ referred to some existing partnership projects, which the Commissioner had commissioned with third sector organisations. AG informed the group that ABMU were running an 'Ask and Act' programme, training all staff across the health board, in order to encourage staff to look out for the signs of domestic abuse. HJJ welcomed feedback on how a unified approach to address the issues discussed could be adopted in partnership.

**ACTION – Commissioner’s team to consider how coercive control could be included in the delivery of the older people objective in the Joint Equality Plan.**

### **3. Stop and Search**

LJ invited JB to present an update in relation to stop and search, particularly the use of Section 60. JB provided a brief overview of the history of stop and search and informed the group that the powers were brought in as a preventative tool. JB informed the group of the key changes to stop search powers, which were recently amended by the Home Office in response to the increase in violent crime. JB provided an explanation of the use of Section 60 and referred to specific examples where Section 60 had been exercised by the force. In the last 5 years, the force had authorised Section 60 powers on 5 occasions.

The group discussed the targeting of individuals when Section 60 had been authorised. The low number of searches under Section 60 suggested that the force remained selective over who was searched. JB advised that there still remained a high degree of intelligence led targeting under Section 60 and that officers were still expected to apply a common sense approach to the use of the powers. Under Section 1 of stop and search, police officers would need reasonable grounds for a search of an individual. However, Section 60 enabled a wider remit of searching. A number of PALG members were surprised to see that the use of Section 60 had been used so infrequently. The perception appeared to be that it was used more frequently than it was in reality.

The group discussed the increase in Section 60 use in 2019. JJ queried whether the force anticipated the numbers to continue to increase and whether Section 60 would be used more in the future than it had been historically. JB advised that in light of increases in violent crime, particularly knife crime, he anticipated the rise in the number of stop searches as well as the use of Section 60 would continue. MS noted that whilst the force were stop and searching more people, the grounds for search were strong and the force remained confident that the powers were being applied ethically, fairly and reasonably.

The group discussed the recent Pontypridd incident, where Section 60 was authorised following reports from the public of a large-scale disorder amongst young people. LJ informed the group that this particular case was also discussed at a recent Scrutiny and Accountability Board meeting and that the Commissioner’s team were pleased to understand that the use of the powers were taken seriously, with community impact at the forefront of the decision.

ET asked whether the force tested understanding amongst the public, to gauge perceptions and understanding of the powers. ET suggested that it would be useful to explore capturing feedback online via Twitter polls and surveys as a baseline. HJJ informed the group of the

Commissioner's plans to conduct community perception research, which aimed to test understanding, perception and experience, especially amongst young people. HJJ also informed the group that the Commissioner's team had also developed leaflets, informing communities about their rights to being stopped and searched. HJJ also welcomed opportunities for the Commissioner's team to promote this information via partners. RR suggested that it would also be useful to consider developing other accessible options for people to access this information, such as animations or videos.

The group discussed methods in which the force could better publicise the use of Section 60 in order to help increase understanding amongst the public. EW suggested that PCSOs would be a great tool to utilise, as they are a familiar face within the community, who would be ideal in assisting with building understanding. The group agreed that this would be a positive approach and MS agreed that briefings could be developed for PCSOs, making them aware of opportunities to raise this in the community. JT suggested that it was also worth considering the timings in which communication could be 'drip fed' to the public, such as the lead up to the summer months.

The group agreed that it would be useful to revisit this agenda item in a year's time, to review the figures and trends. The data could also be better scrutinised when a greater dataset was available to review.

**ACTION - Commissioner's team to consider developing accessible formats of stop and search information.**

**ACTION – Martyn Stone to develop Section 60 briefing for PCSO to utilise in the community.**

#### **4. Future plans for the group**

LJ informed the group of the Commissioner's team plans to include independent advisors on the membership. This would enable additional viewpoints. LJ also advised that they were considering providing the opportunity for the role of chair to be passed over to a PALG member, however, the secretariat would remain with the Commissioner's team. LJ noted his commitment to ensuring that the group retained its ability to be independent and a critical friend. The group welcomed the proposals to include independent advisors.

LJ reiterated the importance of the group and noted that the profile of the group was increasing and was highly regarded across the force as well as being referred to by the Police and Crime Panel. LJ advised that terms of reference differentiating the difference in role of independent advisors and organisational representatives would soon be developed. Once the proposals had been completed, they would be circulated to the group.

**ACTION – Commissioner's team to share Independent Advisor proposals with PALG members.**

## Action Table

Action	Description	Person Responsible
1	Commissioner's team to consider how coercive control could be included in the delivery of the older people objective in the Joint Equality Plan.	Hannah Jenkins-Jones
2	Commissioner's team to consider developing accessible formats of stop and search information for the public.	Sarah Mahon
3	Consider the best methods for communicating purpose and use of Section 60 to the public.	Martyn Stone
4	Share Independent Advisor proposals with PALG members.	Lee Jones/Hannah Jenkins-Jones