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Inspector Stephen Goodier
Inspector Stephen Goodier is the body worn camera (BWC) operational lead for Hampshire Constabulary in the United Kingdom. He has been heavily involved with the use and deployment of body worn video since 2007, and is responsible for the deployment of over 2,800 cameras across his constabulary.

Inspector Goodier now finds himself at the forefront of this new technology, assisting Chief Constable Andy Marsh, the national lead for body worn video. Working alongside the College of Policing, Inspector Goodier has assisted in creating a national guidance and the standards for its use in the UK. He has detailed knowledge of the BWC industry, and has influenced the evolution of both the camera functionality and associated back-office software.

He is a regular spokesperson for the effective use and deployment of BWCs both in the UK and internationally. In 2015 Inspector Goodier was invited to the Bureaur of Justice Assistance (BJA) Body Worn Camera Expert panel, and has contributed to the BJA toolkit.

I am Inspector Stephen Goodier. I'm from Hampshire Constabulary. I work for my Chief Constable, Andy Marsh. I probably need to correct that ... my chief has now left for another agency. But he still takes on the portfolio role of the National Policing League for body worn video within the UK.

Like all good chief officers, what they do when they put their hands up, or they get nominated to be a national lead for body worn video and a portfolio lead, they find somebody who does all the work for them. And that's me as an inspector. So he takes all the glory but I do all the work. But I'm fortunate that I can come here, and he hasn't had the opportunity.

So that's who I am. I've been involved in body worn video since 2007. And personally, I'm responsible for a deployment of 2,800 cameras in my agency alone, but also Hampshire, the constabulary that I work for, is also joined with another agency, and I'm helping them, as well. The national role that I take is to try and coordinate best practice of body worn video across England and Wales. So as I mentioned, in the UK, we've been doing it for a number of years, and so much so, we've had the opportunity ... to help the U.S. I've been here for probably a couple of years now, on and off, coming over, doing different conferences and helping, certainly BJA in their infancy when they first got up and running, and I have close contact with them even now, providing them research as, and when, it comes over from the UK.

The European Union— they're probably in the same position where you guys are gearing up for body worn video. Canada— they've been doing it for a little while, but they have some real legislative issues around that. Very complex issues, so it's preventing, at the moment, large-scale deployments. Hong Kong, as well as — close ties with Hong Kong and New Zealand, and Australia, as well — are all gearing up. So Westernized policing is all gearing up for body worn video. So this is a global thing. It's not just the U.S. It's not just the UK. It is a global phenomena, if you can use that word.

Okay. So just say a bit of context in the UK. If people aren't familiar with the UK, the blue area there is 43 police constabulary, as we like to call them in England and Wales. The bit above is Scotland, okay, and Northern Ireland, as you see. Ireland itself is not a part of the UK. But 43 police forces. That's what I represent. Forty-three different police forces doing different things. And my job is to try and coordinate, as far as body worn video, some consistency of use amongst those 43 forces.

As you can see, right at the very bottom is a tiny little island to the south of the UK there. That's actually where I live. It's called the Isle of Wight, beautiful place. So as I mentioned, 2007 was when the UK first started getting involved in body worn video. It's when the UK government gave 3 million pounds in grant funding to kick start body worn video. It kind of failed in 2007. The government just gave money, no support, very little information there. The technology wasn't really capable of supporting a large-scale deployment. The equipment was very uncomfortable, head-mounted, large battery packs, and cables that broke all the time. And police officers just weren't interested in
it. Very difficult. Only a few people that made the equipment work stuck with it.

So that's when I kind of got involved in it. I was an operational sergeant at the time, saw an opportunity for body worn video, and made the equipment work. ... But we accelerate to where we are now, 2015. Well, this financial year, 2016. And what we've seen from, perhaps, less than 100 cameras initially in 2007, then the 3 million pounds came, and we've had further grant funding from the UK government, and this year we're in excess of 50,000 cameras. Front line police officers, so there's about 120,000 sworn police officers in the UK, and not all of them will be front line. So response officers—I would estimate this is probably around about 75 percent of front line responding officers will have access to a body worn video camera by the end of this year.

Okay, so the business case in the UK for body worn video ... why do we have body worn video in the UK? Well, back in 2007, up to around about 2011, the business case for it was evidential. It was all about evidence. Capturing the best evidence. And what we believed [was] that we would see an increase in early guilty pleas if we captured the offense on the camera. It would be unquestionable that the offense took place. And certainly around domestic violence prosecutions, if we're able to capture some sort of violence around domestic violence, that we would see benefits. And that's why we—that's number one. That's a main principle about us for using body worn.

So swifter fair justice for victims and witnesses. Okay, that independent witness—okay, if you captured it on body worn video, it's undeniable. Pretty much what we saw [in] the presentation from Bill Lewinski. It's the camera's perspective still. But pretty much, if an officer's being productive with a camera and they've caught an incident on camera, we expect to see a closing of the justice gap, and swifter, fairer justice. Also we can show the courts real life about what it is police officers have to deal with. And we're able to bring the outside world into the courtroom for the first time in high definition in some cases, and with audio.

So we hope—and we have got examples of this—that we're getting appropriate custodial sentences. And one of the examples that I will show you ... in a short while is just that. So increasing public confidence through transparency of actions, this is less further down the spectrum, but it was around, showing the public what we do on a day-to-day basis, which is kind of where I believe that the U.S. main drive is—around police legitimacy. Clear as well, you've seen it from Rialto—the very well-documented—and Rialto gained a lot of traction in the UK, as well—around the reduction in complaints and the early resolution of complaints, as well. Clearly one of the benefits of body worn video.

Increasing officer safety [is a benefit], as well. Fewer assaults we were hoping, and also ... the identification of training opportunities. And I think we heard that yesterday, as well, that body worn video is a fly on the wall. And if you've recorded it, if officers are using their camera proactively, you will see other opportunities to, perhaps, tweak your policies or offer training to individuals.

So that's the main driver for body worn video, certainly in the early days. And it still stands today, but that was the kind of order in which we saw it at the time. So I'm just going to show you some ... videos now. ... And I'm going to take you through some of the examples about how we used body worn video. And I'll talk through that with you. The first one is an emulation of a stop-and-search. ...

[SHOWS VIDEO. SEE TRANSCRIPT OF THE VIDEO ON PAGE 4]

So that's a typical stop-search. Stop-search in the UK, perhaps like in the U.S., is a highly contentious policing power. We often get criticized for the way we stop and search members of the public. And as I'll explain in a minute, it has resulted in some very, very negative outcomes. But I think you'd agree there, that was a very professional stop-search from the police officer, okay, in difficult circumstances. But that's—[for] any police officers amongst you, that's bread-and-butter stuff. That's what you do every single day, because nobody really likes to be stopped and searched.
And body worn video in this instance, it ... [was] ... really ... able to give us an opportunity to show people exactly what we have to deal with, day in and day out. One of the things that I pick up on that film—initially, when the guy first started swearing, the officer moved his chest around—it's a chest-mounted camera—and said, “Look, there’s members of the public around here that don't want to hear you swearing.” Okay, that's a really proactive use of a camera that I encourage amongst officers ... it's not just hanging on your body armor, okay? It's an officer thinking, actually you know, you need to see that other people might want to see this. And there we see a family, small young children, and you've got this guy f-ing and blinding right next to you.

And we have offenses—I'm sure you do—around using foul and abusive language in a public space. One of the requirements in law is there must be someone of—there must be someone within hearing and sight, [it] all depends which judge or magistrate you get. Sometimes they say to police officers, “I think you're used to being swore at, so we'll let them go.” But clearly there are members of the public in hearing and in sight. If we were going to prosecute that guy, there's our evidence of members of the public, [who] actually [we] wouldn't have the time to go and see. They wouldn't give us their name and address, I would argue, in most cases. But there we have the evidence for that. And that's what body worn video provides us, one of the examples there.

You also heard the officer going through a set speech. It's a requirement in law that we must tell people why they're being stopped and searched. We identify who we are. We then tell them the grounds for the search. That is an area. That is law. We have to say that. Now if people question us, there it is. You've heard it. You've heard we are fully compliant with the law. Body worn video provides that. There's been no other way. Otherwise it's just the officer's word against somebody else.

Clearly, the quality of evidence that you saw there, that's a high-definition camera. That's very, very good quality. You know, you were right there with the officer. You can make your own decisions, so much so, we now share that video—all stop-and-search videos—with our independent advisory groups. I say “we all,” certainly within Hampshire, and it's moving from force to force.

Independent advisory groups are civilians that have access into police premises and to see a person's sensitive data. And they— their jobs are to review our use of this particular power stop-and-search. Before we had body worn video, all they would have is a stop-and-search record, where the officer would make a declaration that they were compliant with the law, and the grounds for the search, which is small sheet of paper that big with loads of questions and tick boxes. And really all the
independent advisory group [was] able to do, [was] just have a look at it. Was the form was filled out correctly? Really, that's the only objective assessment they can make.

When body worn video—the first thing they asked was can we see the video, okay? Now within my agency it's a fully personal issue. We have a policy that ... once you have a body worn video, every single stop-and-search will be recorded on body worn video. We'll touch on when we use body worn video and how we use it in a minute. But in relation to stop-and-search, in my agency, everyone will be recorded on body worn video. That is a separate policy outside of our body worn video general policy. So they love this. Again, so this is the public scrutinizing our behavior, seeing it for real life, and it has proved very, very effective building that public trust.

Okay, my next video—I think it's going to work—is around domestic violence, okay? It's a case study so it's a bit longer. These case studies—I've got a couple that I'm going to show you—are what we used to try and teach officers, try and break down some of the barriers about how effective body worn video is. So this is a training tool that we use. It's one of the methods. It's a good example of how body worn can be effected in domestic violence. So there's actually a prosecutor on there giving an opinion. ...

[SHOWS VIDEO. SEE TRANSCRIPT OF THE VIDEO ON PAGE 5]

I think you'll agree, a very brave woman there, and she's very grateful that we're able to show that video. So much so that she actually is—there's a whole program if you're familiar with the program, the UK program called Panorama. She did a whole half-hour piece around domestic violence. Very, very powerful, powerful program around the 20 years of abuse that she suffered at the hands of her 70-year-old husband. If you picked up on that—just her submissive behavior—she's almost unconscious in some sense, but she sat there with a cup of tea on a chair.

The police officers comment all the time, “I've never seen injuries on someone who wasn't dead.” And there's this lady, so used to being battered by her husband over 20 years. Very, very powerful. We just searched Panorama, domestic violence—you'd see the whole incident there. Couple of things, so we share video like that. We get a consent from the victim, providing they have it, then we share and show the public the material that we hold and how we've been successful with it. So domestic violence very, very powerful body worn video. We're able to use in some instances body worn video for victimless prosecutions.

You know, we've had many occasions where again, not quite like that lady what she did, was willing to support
in the end because she saw we had the quality evidence of her injuries, and the whole story. But sometimes we meet victims that initially call us because there’s something going on, but then somehow they change their mind. But they’ve disclosed to us on body worn video straight away the type of behavior that they’ve just suffered at the hands of whoever, and then they withdraw it.

Now the UK law in general, is that if we don’t have a victim, okay, we don’t have a prosecution. But law has changed recently in the UK, and if we have disclosure—we have compelling evidence—that the state actually can prosecute on behalf of victims. And body worn video time and time again over the last 18 months, two years,... we’ve [been] able to help domestic violence victims, mainly women, [see] that their offenders [are] being prosecuted. But that’s some very, very good examples of that.

That particular incident, he got 10 years for that. He probably won’t leave prison alive. That was quite an unwell man, but very, very powerful footage, I think you’ll agree.

So I’ll just explain to you about the evidential value of body worn video and about how what I believe is what body worn video’s all about. It’s about capturing best evidence. The traction for body worn video, unfortunately, was very slow. We won’t [be] getting a lot of money to help do that. And agencies had to use their own money to try and implement it. So it was very, very small scale initially.

But it all changed in 2013-14 as far as the UK was concerned, and the incident was called Plebgate. And if you aren’t familiar with the term pleb it’s a UK— it’s an Old English word. It means a member of a lower class or society. So this particular incident was a member of Parliament exiting Westminster, where our government and its police surround it. Very high security. And he wheeled his push-bike outside of the security. And the police officers there said, “Sir, would you mind getting off your bike while you go through security?” And it’s alleged that that a member of Parliament called a police officer a pleb, a member of a lower class society.

Well, that was a national scandal, I tell you not, research it, right? We spent—UK government spent, a number of million pounds identifying if a member of Parliament called a police officer a pleb, all right. Shocking. But it did actually start the real debate about body worn video. I mean the evidential value of what we’re trying to do—domestic violence and all the things I’ve just shown you—were just trickling along.

This thing propelled this into full-blown debate at the highest level. And what you had is another end piece there. Police officer should wear cameras and microphones to record all contact with the public amidst others’ ethics. That was about an MP so not just general man of public. This is an MP. This is how crazy it was at one point.

What I would like to say, that running in parallel with that, that there was an inquest. At the same time, a judge ruled on an inquest that happened in relation to a Mark Duggan. It was a fatal shooting in London against a gangster, Mark Duggan, who had a weapon. And the debate was, did the police officer shoot him while he was holding the weapon or while he’d already thrown it away?

And inquest said, “Well, ... we will never ever know.” But if the firearms officers were wearing body worn video then we might have known. The tragic consequences—not only the fact that someone died—this sparked the London riots of 2011, if everyone’s familiar with that. Tens of millions of pounds worth of rioting damage in London and which spread into other cities, okay? That was all off the back of the shooting of Mark Duggan.

The argument was if we’re able to show the public straight away an incident like this, to quell any unrest, that this guy did have a gun, and it was a completely lawful legitimate shooting, then we wouldn’t get the riots. And I think, very much so, you’ve experienced that yourself most, you know, recently in the last few years.
But these two events actually propel body worn video into where we have it now in the UK. So what you have now—our home secretary, all officers walking the beat who wear body worn video cameras, the chief police officer for London Met—which is one of the largest policing agencies in the world—agreed, and our prime minister. As a result of that, they did actually make quite a substantial amount of money available for policing agencies to purchase body worn video.

My … large deployment was pretty much funded off the back of the two incidents that I've just described to you. [As] a result, ... I was plucked out of front line policing and told to try and write some national guidance along with the College of Policing. College of Policing is an agency that stands alone within the UK policing, and it helps support all 43 police forces or constabulary in best practice. So we do— we're quite lucky we're able to kind of coordinate at a national level. Not many of our laws and legislation are at national level. But we can have policy and guidelines.

So this is our policy around body worn video. I just wanted to touch on a few points, see what time is like, on the sort of seven key principles that are in there. I won't bore you with it too much.

Principle 2: All the information that we have around body worn video must be managed in accordance with our management of police information, okay? It just means that our data must be securely held and managed appropriately. It speaks for itself really.

Principle 3 really is every activation—sorry, the normal use of body worn video in relation to this policy document will be the “over use” of the camera. So it's a camera that is over— worn on the front of a uniform or on a head. And members of the public will know they're being recorded. So it's only an over use. It's not a covert use of the camera.

Every activation—Principle 4—of the camera must be proportionate, legitimate, and necessary. We have no indiscriminate recording of body worn video. So we do not turn it on at the beginning of a shift and then turn it off at the end. [For] every activation there must be a thought process about why we are turning that camera on.

Which kind of bleeds into Principle 5: Every incident will be incident-specific, and officers will use common sense and sound judgment when they turn it on. So we're given the guidelines, but Principle 5 means that it's actually still down to their discretion.

So we are not rigid with our policy. It's high expectation. I talked about the stop-search policy. There is a caveat on that. There is a high expectation if you've been given a body worn video camera that it will be turned on. And why wouldn't you turn it on in that sense? However, we still give them ... one of our wiggle room, use discretion because in certain situations, the turning on of a camera may not be appropriate, okay. If there is serious risk to an officer, you know, we're not— we don’t use firearms, okay? Officers are just generally [have] their verbal communication skills and some very basic hand-to-hand skills to try and get themselves out of situations.
Only limited people have Taser and other forms of self-defense weapons. So first-hand experience, it’s not always appropriate to turn on the camera, okay?

Principle 6: Really body worn video does not actually circumvent conventional forms of evidence gathering. It supplements it. We know that it can be, if caught— absolutely, body worn video has caught an incident. But what we heard from Bill [Lewinski], it doesn’t detract away from what the officer’s perception was. And we need to base that decision sometimes on what the officer has seen, or believed at post, which is what the camera has told us.

Also, as well, in current UK law, we can’t use body worn video to record suspect interviews or record statements, okay? We have to have a written statement— signed written statement—to prosecute currently in UK law.

And the last one is that all forces, before they implement body worn video in the UK, must consult with their community. You must have a proactive program where you engage with the community and tell them what you’re doing, and explain to them what it is that the cameras are doing, and how you’re going to manage their evidence. And we have something called a Privacy Impact Assessment, which I’ve not heard of anyone even trying to adopt that within the U.S. But the Privacy Impact Assessment, virtually, is a document that every agency has on their Web site. And it explains in plain English what it is they’re doing, has a picture of a camera on it, says you’re going to see officers wearing this camera. This is the back-office management system that we use and this is how we maintain the integrity of the data. It’s in really plain English, okay? And that’s one of the requirements. It’s not law. It’s a requirement from our information commissioner that says you need to be open and transparent when you use these types of devices. And I’ll just throw that out there. It’s actually a very useful tool for us. We talk about discovery and about how our policy— it’s almost like disclosing your policy document. But we put it in plain English so members of the public can understand it.

The evidence base around body worn video is growing, as well. The College of Policing is big on evidence-based policing. So we’re not actually just throwing cameras out there and not having any evidence to support it. This particular one here was Operation Hyperion. There’s a link to it underneath, Portsmouth University. It’s a very good university within the UK that provides research and works hand-in-hand with policing agencies.

This was a research project that I’d actually undertook on the Isle of Wight. An initial one was personal-issue versus pol-issue of cameras. I’m a big advocate— if you’re going to give someone a piece of equipment, from a practical point of view, then let them own it and account for that piece of equipment.

Personal-issue, what we actually found is if you give a camera to an officer and make them responsible for it and own it, they’re 25 percent more likely to turn it on in situations that actually provide an outcome. So just by that argument alone, you know, personal-issue for me is the way to go. [From] a practical point of view, trying to manage pol-issue cameras [is] flawed with problems. Police officers don’t look after it. So in the UK, if it’s broken, they’ll go, “it wasn’t me that broke it. I’m not going through the process of reporting it and swapping it out.”

If it’s personal-issue, you don’t get all these problems. Even a really, really simple example of why pol-issue for me was a real issue was the battery life. Police officers are just creatures of habit. We have a bank of cameras. No matter how many times you tell them, “only pick up a camera that’s got a green light on it to show that it’s charged,” they will just go for the red one. “I like red.” Or “I’m right-handed,” so they’ll just— or left-handed. They’ll just grab the first camera they see.

And that camera there, in that bottom left-hand corner, is being used 24/7. And they moan at me, or they did— they said, “it’s got 10-minute battery life.” Because it’s being used constantly. The camera in the top left-hand corner is perfect, all right? But, it’s really, really,
really simple things like that actually cause you lots of problems. So just get every one a camera. That's the way I—that's my belief. And we're seeing that in the UK now.

The Metropolitan Police of London have just signed a deal with an American company that you've heard of, named a few times, for 22,000 cameras, by far the largest deployment in the world.

There's also another one I'll just kind of mention here. You're familiar with the research by Chief Farrar and Inspector Darren Henstock. They worked with ... Barak Ariel from Cambridge University, the same one that Chief Farrar did. And ... [they did] some more research within the UK. This one was around assaults on offenders and on officers. And what we actually saw was the amount of offenses against offenders dropped from 46 to 16 over the reporting period.

So the fact is this— the argument that, "put a camera on a police officer they're going to be more professional" okay? They're going to up their game. So we talked about the cameras [having a] civilizing effect on members of the public. If you have the camera, you notify them. Tell them that the camera's operating. But also it has a professionalizing effect on a police officer. I think we kind of all get that, certainly in the U.S.

And also, as well, we also found that it actually gave officers the confidence to actually report assaults against themselves. Clearly, if an officer's being severely assaulted you're going to know about it. But, you know, all police officers amongst you, we've all taken a few for the team where you just get donkey kicked in the back of the shins and you're, "hi, you bugger," right? And you think, "I can't be bothered to go through the paperwork to report that because I know you're going to get nothing for it because he's up for a— some other offense."

But actually— what we're actually doing is—because it's simple on body worn video and what we are allowed to do in the UK is, if you've captured that incident on camera then you don't have to do a written statement with it.

If you've caught the points to prove the offense on camera then we just submit that as evidence-in-chief. So officers kind of like that, less paperwork for them to do. So we saw an increase, again, of officers going, "well I've had enough. You're going to be charged for that minor offense against me."

Well, I would say back to Operation Hyperion, which is the first one. We did a large public survey. Ninety-six percent of the public supported our use of body worn video. And that's been replicated across the country now. Very, very high public support for it. In relation to criminal offenses, we grouped a whole bunch of offenses that we thought body worn video could have an effect [on], so public order, officer led-type offenses where officers are dealing with public order situations.

We saw a 17 percent drop in those types of offenses compared to the rest of my agency that saw an increase. And we also saw the classic one, a reduction in complaints. We saw 11 percent reduction in complaints, whereas the rest of Hampshire, the rest of my agency that didn't have the cameras at the time actually, went out during the same reporting period. So it kind of all proves the point that the body worn video is something that actually is a viable product for us. There's lots more research in the UK. Actually, BJA, their Web site has all of the research from the UK in there, as well. And there's more and more, literally coming month by month.

So just want to show you a couple more videos now— just want to remember which one's next. This one is probably my most compelling video. And I use this to— well, we shared this video, parts of it—with the public, again national in fact it spread international, actually around the assault on an officer. But it kind of bleeds on from what I was saying about how powerful body worn video is to protect the officer. And his call on camera is absolutely undeniable. So I'm going to leave you this one. It's quite shocking in some sense, ways. In some sense it is shocking what the officer happened to ... So ...

“... All forces, before they implement body worn video in the UK, must consult with their community. You must have a proactive program where you engage with the community and tell them what you're doing, and explain to them what it is that the cameras are doing, and how you're going to manage their evidence.”
I responded to a burglary. At the same time, the rest of my team were committed elsewhere. I arrived at the address and found the homeowner actually talking to the male who was apparently trying to break in. I think it became clear quite quickly he was just very drunk and forgot where he lived. I ended up putting this man in handcuffs and put him in my police car, having arrested him for drunk and disorderly. Initially he was calm, polite, no problem at all. Didn't anticipate there being any issues. And then he became quite aggressive verbally.

MAN: You may as well fucking be a crook right now.

OFFICER: Okay.

MAN: Actually fucking may as well be be a crook.

OFFICER: Okay.

MAN: No, seriously. Love, that gal is getting beaten the fuck out of in that house.

OFFICER: Okay, you know, we’ll go and check on her in a minute. But at the moment you’re under arrest and I can’t leave you.

And I just intended at that time to just keep him talking to me even if it was abuse.

((Crosstalk))

MAN: Just because you are a strong lady, she’s fucking not.

OFFICER: (Unintelligible).

MAN: She is fucking not a strong lady ma’am. Go— go check on the house. Go fucking check on the house. I’d fucking love you to. And you see how many fucking black eyes she’s got.

OFFICER: I’ve got (unintelligible).

I started to feel a bit concerned that he was going to cause me a problem. So I asked the control room how long my backup was away.

RADIO: (Unintelligible).

OFFICER: Zero five thank you, soon as, please.

Ah, and they said a couple of minutes. I intended just to try and keep talking to him until that point, keep him calm, if I could. And then suddenly out of nowhere ...

OFFICER: Yes, for now.

((Crosstalk))

We struggled, went down to the floor and whilst on the floor he took the opportunity to pick my head up off the ground and smash it off the ground a couple of times.

RADIO: (Unintelligible) all units 4343 (unintelligible).

Until I blacked out, I could hear everything but nothing else was working.

RADIO: (Unintelligible).

And he ran off. A member of the public, I could hear them, cop come to my side having a guest dialed 999 asking for assistance. It’s quite sobering hearing your caller number being given over a 999 call.

RADIO: (Unintelligible) stand by (unintelligible).

MAN: Copy. So I’ve got police coming. I’ve got an ambulance coming for you.

OFFICER: (Unintelligible).

MAN: No, no, just leave it like this.

RADIO: (Unintelligible).

MAN: (Unintelligible) officer’s down. She’s on the floor.

OFFICER: (Unintelligible)?

MAN: I don’t know.

RADIO: (Unintelligible) stand by (unintelligible).

MAN: (Unintelligible) she’s conscious. She’s just laying down. She’s laying on the floor (unintelligible).

OFFICER: My head. My head.

MAN: (Unintelligible).


OFFICER: Smashed my head over the floor.

MALE OFFICER: Okay, okay sweetie, it’s okay.

MAN: Can we have a blanket or something?

OFFICER: (Unintelligible)?

MAN: It’s okay. It’s okay. (Unintelligible) right here. Yes.

That body worn video meant that he was charged with the right level of assault and the evidence was very good that was put in front of the judge. And she was able to see him for who he really was that morning and not the polite well-dressed individual standing in front of her in court that day.

So I knew body worn video was going to be really useful for detecting, helping to detect burglaries and other crimes and get witness accounts, et cetera. But I didn't have any idea how useful it would be to me personally in helping me process what happened. I had a head injury so some of the details were sketchy. Being able to watch the footage cleared up that area for me so it helped me get on with things really. I’m— yes, I’m back on front line duties and I’m still hyper vigilant that we’ll get there.

—END VIDEO—

The body cam footage of this attack can be seen at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6hhvsEh3-E
So that’s UK policing for you—a single-crewed female officer at 5:30 in the morning with no backup around. That’s the reality of the UK policing, certainly with the cutbacks we’ve seen since 2008. So we don’t have weapons. Hey, there’s some learning from that, you know, handcuffing to the front, you know, very much. But I think you’d agree, quite shocking. And I think the term that she used, you know, in court—the judge was able to see the person in the morning, not the well-dressed individual that was presented in front of her that day.

So three-year sentencing in the UK, that’s the result, right? That was the result. Three years. Because if it wasn’t for the body worn video, you know, she didn’t receive any real physical injuries. It wasn’t—you didn’t—she didn’t have a large bruise. It wasn’t, you know, certainly nothing like the domestic violence one. But there was a lot there, you know?

By the time the police officers [came] out, she’d regained consciousness to some extent. She was clearly still shocked by it. But the officer then didn’t have to write notes based on what she can remember, probably quite sketchy notes on it, and it wouldn’t be very impactive.

Three-year sentence— we got that because of body worn video. We wouldn’t have got that without it. We would have probably seen a condition on six months conditional discharge for that because he didn’t have any prior history of offending. So that was a result.

Clearly learning there, talked about the handcuffs. I want to pick up on another thing as well. You—we had a really great view of what the offender was doing. So some police officers might be thinking about well, all the warnings signs were there really. All the—we know he was going to do something the way that his eyes were looking.

But in the point before he made strike, she wasn’t really looking at him. The camera was looking at him, she wasn’t. She didn’t see that coming. So I’m just going to point that out that that was the camera’s perspective, but it wasn’t her perspective. She was actually looking over the top of the car on her radio or maybe even making some notes in a pocket notebook.

I just want to touch on training then. So how do we train people in all that? You’ve seen some of my case studies, right? Really powerful. Really kind of breaks down some of the objections that we see. Some of the old and bold police officers amongst us that don’t want to use technology, but if they see videos like that they kind of get it.

We use e-learning, as well. We use e-learning generally just to get through the legality side so they understand the legal issues around body worn video and how they must retain it and use it. And also I’m just going to show a video—it’s a trailer actually. It’s the part of a 15-minute video that I’m happy to share. If anyone wants to use it. Again it’s very—obviously very British, and might not be too translatable over here. But it’s just a one-minute clip about our training video. And I’ll just talk you through some of the points that you see through on this in a minute. This is only one-minute long.

[SHOWS VIDEO. SEE TRANSCRIPT OF THE VIDEO BELOW]

VIDEO 4

WOMAN: I’m a single-crewed officer in a grade one response to a domestic in front (arrest).

WOMAN: Come up facing front and center.

MAN: No, no, no, you can’t film me. You can’t film me without my permission.

WOMAN: I’m lawfully allowed to record you while I’m carrying out my duty. (Unintelligible) October. Hello, it’s the police.

MAN: We had an argument, that’s all. You’re doing this on purpose.

—END VIDEO—
So let me say, I have to try and—but how do you break down the culture? How do you try and really get a message across and try and make it in a succinct way because you can bore the hell out of police officers in eight hours’ worth of front face training. So it’s got to be short and sharp. So this is one of the ways that I came up with it, 50 minutes.

Couple of points that I want to take you through there. What we encourage officers to do the minute they get a deployment to a job, we say turn the camera on because you’re starting to create a record, because you’re going to hear information coming over the radio. It starts to build up your information, and your risk assessment, and your decision-making. So we encourage officers to verbalize some of their thought processes, get it?

You know, you’ll be asked some of that: Why did you do this? Why did you do that later? if it’s turned into more of a serious situation or you document it. Talk to the camera. And when you see a video played back, when you’ve got an officer giving you a kind of, almost a running commentary, well. I think you did see on one of the earlier clips around what he was doing at a crime scene—a lot more of a controlled situation. But we encourage that: tell me what you’re thinking. Tell me what you’re going to do. And again, it sets the scene. And when people want to judge a police officer based on what they knew there and then, when they made that decision, they can do it. You know, single-crewed police officer goes into a domestic on their own, that’s what we depict there.

She— the film goes on where other crews call up say, “I’m still 15 minutes away.” You know, she says “I’ve got a duty of care. I have to go to this address,” and then she turns up. And so she runs through this commentary. So that’s what we encourage, all right?

But we encourage that: tell me what you’re thinking. Tell me what you’re going to do. And again, it sets the scene. And when people want to judge a police officer based on what they knew there and then, when they made that decision, they can do it. You know, single-crewed police officer goes into a domestic on their own, that’s what we depict there. She— the film goes on where other crews call up say, “I’m still 15 minutes away. You’re going to deal with this job on your own,” You know, she says “I’ve got a duty of care. I have to go to this address,” and then she turns up. And so she runs through this commentary. So that’s what we encourage, all right?

It’s some people just don’t get it, okay? But when you play it back. When you hear officers that do get it, and then you listen to their video, you go, “well that’s great,” especially when you’re dealing with complaints. If you’ve got an understanding—if you understand the context in which the officer turned the camera on, and what they’re dealing with, you can dispel a lot more complaints really quickly.

Then the video then carries on. We show the— an officer—we’ll take a camera off. Yes, we use a vendor that’s out in the front: Reveal Media. It’s a front facing screen. I’m a big advocate of that. Because if you’re going—you know, you don’t take a photograph and just randomly guess where you want to take a photograph, do you? You use the view finder. So why not use the view finder of the body worn video?

Take it [the camera] off. In our case, we can rotate the head round through 180 degrees and then we can frame the shot, then maybe run a commentary if I need to just capture something. And when we look at that in the future, as well, when we talk about the live streaming sort of things that may come online, you know, it’s perfect. Encourage the officers to become a little bit of a director. Exactly the same when it’s on the officer’s uniform.

As a supervisor when I used to be out, I’d be standing back. The officers— I’ll be directing officers to do something. I’d make sure the camera— and I would turn myself into a director. I would maybe add a commentary: “What you’re seeing now is a use-of-force technique.” Okay, “I’ve just authorized the use of fast wraps,” you know, the Velcro for the legs? I’ve authorized that. And I talk through why they’re doing it and I talk through what they’re doing. I’m the one that’s filming it. I maybe rotate myself around the incident and the containment of that individual. And I’m describing it.

So the other officers may well have their cameras running, okay? But you’re going to get buttons and shirts and nostrils and a whole lot of—and especially if you’ve got some of the good quality sound you’re just going to get muffled. So I would turn myself into director and I would film the scene, if it’s appropriate. Again, if you see that and play that back really, really powerful.

Then the video then goes on about how to be compliant within the law, and
the legislation about how to use a back office system correctly. We talk—it’s very British in the sense that it’s our laws and legislation, clearly that we go through. But we have to try and remind officers these are the laws of the land. This is how you have to be compliant. And so it’s 50 minutes long. You’re welcome to it. The first half of it might be more relevant than the second half.

Okay, just going to wrap up. I think I’ve got the last few minutes really. So what have we learned in the UK, really just to summarize some points to you, it’s not just about the camera. Still hearing it really in the U.S. a little bit, “it’s about a camera.” We talk about the back office system now, as well because, you know, we’re here with the prosecutor saying well, I’m not actually too fast about a camera. It’s what you do with it downstream is what I’m more interested in.

But it’s not just about the camera. It’s a lot broader now. I’ll even take it even further going back to my very first video: that a body worn video program should be looked as a more holistic approach to the digitization of the criminal justice system. We talk about cloud. We’ve touched on cloud. Well, there’s a lot more. You could have a whole day on cloud and the benefits of that and about the cost benefits are now.

But also if you’re a larger agency and you do have access to funding, if you think about body worn video and you’re thinking about, I’m going to have cloud, cloud is very scalable. It’s, you know, I want 100 terabytes today. I can have 200 at the flick of a switch, and obviously a check to the company. But I can have that tomorrow.

So we talk about that we have an obligation to gather all the appropriate evidence. If there’s an incident happening here, I can tell you that there’ll be a whole bunch of people [who will] be filming it with their smart phone. How are we going to retrieve that? If we do find a way of retrieving it, then we’re going to have to ingest it. And you don’t want another system, another logon, another process to go through, to get some mobile phone information that I’ve got.

So the vendors that I see now are catching on to this. So I’ve named the ones that do it. I think we all probably know is they’re not just body worn video digital evidence management systems, right? They are digital evidence management. So they can ingest any type of digital evidence and present it in a single, standard format that you can do something with it. So it’s not just about the camera. It’s about the end-to-end product, and I say the capture to conviction. And the video that you saw at the beginning is the kind of the whole holistic digitization of policing.

Any successful body worn video project, to me, is being one that’s operationally led. LAPD—I think they’ve gone now—but you got an operational sergeant leading it the way. The ones that are IT led and it’s just an IT project start, get dumped, and they’re gone, okay? And then who managed—if you all talked about the officesr[ing] around, they get promoted, they go on, no one actually takes responsibility for it. If you want one to work it should be operationally led.

Don’t forget your criminal justice partners. Clearly we’re here, okay? I’ve heard it. I’ve just started to listen to the conversation now—again from being here two years ago. I said, “prosecutors why aren’t you getting a grip of this? This is coming. Get your agencies together and tell them what you want.” Because police officers, generally we like to be told, really. Someone can take the thinking away for us. We like to be told.

Okay, I’ll ask that one then. Is that where you’re all at then? But I think you [have] a real opportunity here, still where you have large agencies that aren’t using body worn video. Find out what your neighboring agency is using. We haven’t talked about interoperability here today. We haven’t talked about economies of scale. You have the vendors here.

I can tell you in the UK we have 43 police forces. The vendors that we—they dealt with—deal with 43 different police forces. Good God, it’s probably 17,000, whoever it is that you have here, you know, from a 10-camera deployment to a 30,000 deployment maybe, NYPD.

"What we encourage officers to do the minute they get a deployment to a job, we say turn the camera on because you’re starting to create a record, because you’re going to hear information coming over the radio. It starts to build up your information, and your risk assessment, and your decision-making. So we encourage officers to verbalize some of their thought processes."
Why aren't you getting together? Why aren't some of the local policing agencies going, “Well I'm going to get a better deal if I team up with you.”

And then if you do cross-border—we cross-border, I'm sure you must do the same—where an incident will happen and you may get responders from other agencies. Well, if you've got disparate systems that aren't talking to each other, how can you be really effective? Do you have to drive all the way back, burn a DVD off, then drive all the way back, and hand the DVD to your policing colleague?

I'm working with the two largest suppliers in the world for body worn video ... you probably already know one of them and another company out here. And they—the two CEOs—have agreed that they will [work] together because they're the two suppliers—the largest suppliers in the UK. And they will work together and their systems will be interoperable.

So London Met has one supplier. Yes, when it all goes wrong in London we always go and help. What a nonsense if we have to go to the four corners of the UK to burn disks and bring it back on. I want to be able to integrate with their system and ingest my video if it's a different camera. And they've promised me—I have it in writing—that they are—I do know—they are working together. And by April, I hope ... that we will have a system where we can be interoperable with two of the vendors.

We have vendors here now, so I'll point to them, as well. If you want to be serious about giving product to us [in] policing, then work together. Give us a solution that is interoperable. Okay, and prosecutors you, just need to— you need to be on in a bit more. You really do need to get in charge of your policing agencies and get them to all group together so, economies of scale, you get one system, because you have six logons in one particular—it must be a nightmare. It must be a nightmare.

We have the Crown prosecution service in the UK, and they will not receive a digital file from us yet. They will only receive a DVD. They're holding back this whole tidal wave where we've got terabytes and terabytes of body worn video data. But there's a huge program of work going on about how we do give them the ultimate digital file.

So within the next six months we will be able to send our body worn video and our other digital evidence because it's—we do not use the term just body worn video in the UK now. It's digital evidence because it could be anything. But how would I receive that in one way because it's one agency. They want it—they don't want it 43 different ways. So they're holding back, okay? So it's quite difficult for them. They're getting a lot of DVDs and it's causing a lot of problems.

But we're holding back. We've got government funding and we're giving one solution. Part of the solution is the vendors. They vendors have to provide an API, okay, a standard API. Do you know what—I don't know what an API stands for, but it's programming interface. So they have to adjust their software to give us that standard API that our Crown prosecution service will receive in a standard way.

You guys [have] to get together [and] tell the vendor what you want, okay? They—we shouldn't be just expecting them and give—them giving us products. We should be telling them what product we want. That's the way of what I've been tasked to do within the UK is to tell the vendors what we want. I'm lucky enough within the UK that we are more central. I work with the central applied science and technology that assesses all of the technology, and we tell them what's good and what's not good. ... That's just an observation here.

I think you're in a really great opportunity here to kind of carve your own path, and not just let it happen around you. I think you should try and make it happen for you, and get together. Economies of scale. You could save a whole lot of money.

Understand your infrastructure. We touched on that earlier, okay. It's not just about the camera. It's about the infrastructure that supports it. Come back to my point. The digitization of policing with the criminal justice system requires investment in your infrastructure. We're talking bandwidth, we're talking pipes, okay, cloud investment.

I'm a big supporter of cloud. We are moving from our siloed systems into cloud at the moment. We're going through—there's some very, very good technologies on the horizon. We've only just touched on some of the points here today. But to be able to get 200 terabytes instantly if you have a critical incident in a larger agency, and you need space and capacity, then your IT department can't just give you 200 terabytes, yes? The big providers will—you can just scale it up, scale it down, whenever you want.

And actually it doesn't cost that much. And when you really, really look at the true costs of doing it in-house, compared to cloud, then the argument's won every time. But is it—it is an investment so it's not just about a camera. It's about your infrastructure that supports everything, as well.

And don't forget the wider training issues. You know, we—I think Mike was talking about it earlier. It's a fly on the wall. You will see things that you don't believe. Officers are really doing that? Their policies and—you policies and procedures, what it looks like, what it translates to in real life is something that's not quite how you expected it.

Well, a classic example for us as soon as body worn video came out our detectives are saying, “officers are rubbish,” “body worn video are rubbish.” We're losing prosecution cases because body worn videos are showing what officers are doing and talking to witnesses. Body worn video is showing how police officers are talking to witnesses. But we really need to know that, don't we? Because if officers don't know how to talk to, certainly vulnerable victims, then we need to address the issue and retrain officers about how they elicit information or what they don't illicit ... from vulnerable victims or witnesses at the scene, because we have detectives, we have interview suites, you have professionals that can illicit the information correctly from vulnerable children. Certainly around sex crimes with children, we've got horrendous
examples when you have a 6-foot-8 police officer that size asking intimate questions of a child victim the minute they walk in the door, all right? That was the reality.

So we had to just come straight back and just redirect training. And that was at a national level, okay, because that's what body worn video was doing. And we had to change our policy and remind people that the use of body worn video in certain circumstances actually isn't appropriate. And that was one of the examples.

So that's me. I could go on all day to be honest, but that's what I do. But if you've got any questions, I know I'm bad on time. Anyone got anything? How about it? I'm sorry? Yes sir?

MAN: When you have an officer-involved shooting, do you allow the officer to review the video before the interrogation of the officer?

STEPHEN GOODIER: So yes. Great question and it's a topic that has caused a great debate in the UK. When body worn video came out —and the policy document that I referred to does not include issuing a body worn video to firearms offices. It's only been in the last few weeks that senior leaders in the UK policing have agreed, after a great deal of research, working with the Home Office Center for Applied Science and Technology, and with our lawyers, about this whole question: Can officers view body worn video if they're involved in a lethal shooting?

So the first way we go around, is we don't give them to firearms offices. Now we have agreed that we'll give them to firearms offices, and it's been agreed about what the policy is. So if you're involved in a death, or serious incident, and you wear a body worn video camera you will not view your body worn video prior to giving an initial account, okay?

An initial account could be just a verbal account immediately to a supervising officer that turns up and says, “what happened?” If that officer is given an account about what they did—or it could be a short, pocket notebook description—then they are not to view body worn video. Prior to making a detailed statement, their evidential statement, which we call a Stage 4, then body worn video is allowed to be viewed. Only the officer's own body worn video is allowed to be used.

And again, that initial— that evidential statement will be taken roughly 48 hours afterwards, giving them time to get over the incident, and then they're allowed to view the video and then provide a detailed statement. If there's any discrepancies between their initial account and a detailed statement, they need to qualify that in their statement.

General policing, every day policing, officers can view their body worn video. And it's one of the things that I'm passionate about—certainly my chief officer is—that if you use body worn video correctly, I think the term that was coined by Professor Lorraine Hope and that you saw the film clip of Professor Hope yesterday from Portsmouth University—Bill Lewinski has been working with her. She coined the phrase “cognitive extension.”

So body worn video, in her words, is cognitive extension. We talk about that—talking to the camera. So you can turn on the camera and think, I'm not going to remember everything here. There's an awful lot going on. Well, just brain dump. Brain dump into your camera exactly what's going on. “Who's there? I need to speak to that person in the red vest. Don't let me forget that. I need to speak to that person,” and just brain dump it. Cognitive extension. Use the camera as a memory-recall tool. That's how she saw it. That was her advice. So officers, if they've used the camera in normal placing, then they should be able to.

One distinction around firearms, though, is we're very clear about what is the status of the officer after death or serious incident? If they are suspected—because it's not, if an incident happens, it's not a murder investigation straight away. It's—if it's an officer involved shooting and there is any suggestion there hasn't been any wrong doing or if it was an unlawful shooting. If there is a suggestion it was an unlawful shooting.
or wasn't appropriate, then the officers status changes from being a significant witness to a suspect. And if they are then a suspect, they get arrested and they have all the safeguards that a normal suspect would have in the laws of the land.

If they are treated as a significant witness, which is what they hope they always will be, unfortunately, that's not always the case. If they're treated as a significant witness, and they go through their post-in procedure, they view their video after what we call Stage 4, which is prior to providing their detailed statement, to answer your question.

... 

MAN: ... Do you release any of the videos when the media asks or when you think you need to because of an incident or other situations?

STEPHEN GOODIER: So Freedom of Information requests and subject access requests are the two mechanisms in which we would release the video. In general, it's quite difficult to get a video from us. If you're an individual, and you believe that you've been caught on body worn video, then you are entitled to a copy of that video. But you're only entitled to a copy of you on that video, okay? And we're entitled to show you it. We're not entitled to give you a copy of it. And you have to provide me with the relevant information — for me to be able to retrieve it. It's not, "go and get me every bit of video that I'm on." So what incident you're referring to, officer location for us to be able to find it. So in reality we're not seeing — we suspected that we would see a huge influx of subject access requests and Freedom of Information requests. In reality, we haven't seen that.

Freedom of Information — if it is a significant amount of time for us to be able to retrieve the information, then we're not — the law doesn't allow us to share it. So we don't get this sort of fishing trip from media saying, I want every single body worn video that you've got. Actually it will take us far too long, and this other consideration is if it's an active trial or it's part of this piece of evidence, we will never hand it over.

Clearly, if it's been used in court, it then becomes a public record. And anything that's in in court is then available. If it's been shown in court.

MAN: What about a critical use of force, a fatal use of force that does not result in prosecution, and the media wants to show what the officer did?

STEPHEN GOODIER: Right. So, that would be our decision okay? And we would have to weigh up the benefits for doing or not doing it. I would like to think, in a situation like that, then we would disclose that. But we're not obliged in law to do it.

It would be a case-by-case basis. And we are very, generally, very transparent in ... what we do. We have a very good relationship with the media and we share content that we want to get across and help prove our point. So it would be a case-by-case basis.

The Mark Duggan incident would be a very sensitive one. Clearly that would be subject to — and the officers, in fact, were treated as suspects in that one, I believe. It would be a very interesting conversation by very senior people about the disclosure of that. Clearly, we wouldn't want to see the reoccurrence of the large-scale riots.

Okay, thank you.