



Security Classification:	OFFICIAL
Contents may be seen by:	
Author:	DC Grant Wilson
Organisation:	OCCTU
Telephone:	01236 818536
Date Created:	5 September 2018

Digital Triage Device (Cyber Kiosk) Reference Group

MINUTE OF THE MEETING

DATE: Wednesday 5 September 2018

LOCATION: Nellis Conference Room Scottish Crime Campus, Gartcosh

CHAIR: Richard Whetton (Head of Partnership and Collaboration, Police Scotland)

**SECRETARIAT/
MINUTES:** DC Grant Wilson

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Richard Whetton	Chair
DCS Gerry McLean	(GM) Police Scotland, Head of Organised Crime and Counter Terrorism Unit
DSU Nicola Burnett	(NB) Police Scotland, Head of Cybercrime
Ms Scarlet Kim	(SK) Privacy International (VTC)
Dr Duncan Campbell	(DC) Advisor to Open Rights Group
Dr Megan O'Neill	(MO) Dundee University
Dr Liz Aston	(LA) Edinburgh Napier University, Director of SIPR (Scottish Institute for Policing)
DC Grant Wilson	(GW) Secretariat

1. INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME

Chair opened the meeting and thanked members for their attendance at this meeting of the Cyber Kiosk Reference Group.

The Chair initiated round the room introductions.

2. VALUES STATEMENT

Chair reiterated the values of Police Scotland to the group stating, *Integrity, Fairness and Respect are the values of Police Scotland. All decisions which we make must reflect our values and be able to withstand scrutiny when judged against them. Accordingly, our values will be the touchstones in all decisions we reach within this forum.*

3. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from the following members;

DCI Brian Stuart, Police Scotland CyberCrime
CI Iain Moffatt, Police Scotland, Strategy and Innovation
Mr Aamer Anwar, Aamer Anwar and Co
Ms Millie Wood, Privacy International – Represented by Ms Scarlet Kim

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Chair proposed the minutes of the previous group allowing an opportunity to raise any amendments on each page of the published minutes, no objections or amendments were raised by the members.

5. ACTION LOG

Chair provided members with an overview of the current outstanding Actions seeking and update from action holders.

Action 1/18, NB updated that engagement had been undertaken with CI Lyn Ross at the Police Scotland Stop Search team to understand the Codes of Practice for Stop Search and how that had come to be in relation to how this could translate into the document set for Cyber Kiosks.

NB added that the COP for Stop Search had been authored by an external group separate but connected to Police Scotland, with a move for the Codes of Practice for Stop Search to be enshrined in Legislation to provide accountability.

Cyber Kiosks want to provide something similar, outlining the principles to be adhered to but the Code of Practice language used wouldn't allow the progression of this in relation to Cyber Kiosks. **NB** added that the view of COPFS at the Cyber Kiosk Stakeholder Group was to progress the preparation of a document that was not a Code of Practice but has the same aspirations to provide audit and assurance.

Chair asked, in terms of this document is it on-going to develop Principles and not full Codes of Practice? Adding that this should perhaps be with slightly different language, **Chair** highlighted the Toolkit, Public Information Leaflet and Principles of Use documents that have been prepared and circulated to the group would be a good start.

DC asked **MO** if the Stop Search Group was one that **MO** was involved in.

MO added both **MO** and **LA** were involved in the stop search group in a wider capacity not just the codes of practice.

GM highlighted that it would take a legislative change to have a Codes of Practice, **GM** highlighted work would continue to explore regulatory principles to attach to.

Chair highlighted that MR Aamer Anwar was keen on a Code of Practice, enquiring if discussions have been undertaken.

GM added that Mr Anwar accepts the challenges and recognises that achieving a Code of

Practice may be beyond our reach at this stage.

GM added to look specifically at Kiosks as Code of Practice may be too nuance but to look at data wider may be more appropriate.

MO enquired if Code of Practice always link to legislation?

NB from COPFS understanding in England and Wales is that Codes of Practice support legislation and in Scotland it would also be to support legislation, highlighting the concern remains that referring to a Code of Practice may be misleading.

DC asked if it would be wrong to have an aspiration that is not at this time named a code of practice would aspire to be a code of practice.

GM stated that is reasonable.

ACTION 002-18 was addressed in the main body of the meeting with the update **GM** - the secretariat should not be a specific person and should be changed to reflect Police Scotland shall support this function. **Chair** highlighted that for all he was happy to continue as chair it is the aspiration that the chair is independent from Police Scotland completely.

DC suggested circulating non police members to be discussed out with the group and return with our nomination for chair. (**New Action Raised – detail in body of minutes**)

6. DOCUMENT SET

Chair highlighted the document set that had been circulated ahead of the meeting adding his thanks for the document received from **DC** with observations and also the email from **SK**, stating these had been very helpful.

Chair informed that it was his intention to go through the document sets provided in the following order;

Public Leaflet
Principles of Use
Tool Kit
DPIA
EqHRIA
Revised TOR
Time line (PDF)

GM interjected raising a point of discussion on the adopted minutes seeking agreement in terms of transparency and visibility for Police Scotland's request to publish the minutes on the Police Scotland Publication Scheme through the Police Scotland public facing Internet page, should the members be in agreement.

Chair asked each member to provide their view on the proposal, confirming with each individually around the table and on VTC.

All members agreed with the proposal and highlighted that this was good for accountability.

Chair provided an overview of the stakeholder's group meeting which had sat for the benefit of **SK**.

Chair ensured that all members had seen the circulated Public Leaflet, seeking feedback.

MO stated that it utilised good clear language. **MO** raised two points for consideration;

- Informed Consent, stressing the requirement to ensure people understand exactly what it means.

- Social Media is not mentioned, people need to be clear that social media accounts may be accessed.

GM highlighted that on page 3 in the section titled, "What does Police Scotland do with my mobile device" specifically the reference to "Live Data" a point of correction is required, it's not Live Data and should be clearer for the reader.

LA added in relation to discussions round applications it's difficult to provide enough information but does require to be clearer.

GM highlighted that the examination would cover 'live' or deleted data however, live in terms of what is on the phone. Highlighting that the term 'Stored Data' is the term that should be used rather than live.

MO added that that it was necessary to highlight the topic of self-incrimination and the document needs to make it clearer that this is could happen.

DC added that he wasn't quite as happy with the leaflet highlighting that it is written from the police officers perspective not for the public to understand.

DC also highlighted the use of the term Live.

DC highlighted that it was his understanding that the kiosk process was very limited and could be limited further and is being adopted to reduce the cybercrime burden. Adding that the document needs to make it crystal clear what the process is and what is involved, detailing what a kiosk does as opposed to what the cybercrime hub does.

DC added that the impression given is that unskilled officers would be having fun and harvesting / capturing data of suspects, but the reality, when explained, is totally different the non-retention of data in relation to cyber kiosks is highly significant.

DC added that the document needs to be made a customer leaflet and be drafted from that perspective. The public will be anxious around collateral intrusion of the device data and any embarrassing data being viewed by an officer, **DC** added that there is a need for assurances on the leaflet that this will not happen.

DC added that there was a need for the language to move away from live data to just files, data and deleted items.

DC in terms of social media and emails this is likely to cause the most anxiety in relation to how that is going to be handled. The reality for the public is on looking at the phone through the kiosk there are 2 possible outcomes, Minimal intrusion or being sent to a cybercrime hub.

DC added that the introduction of the password section was unclear. What powers are being relied upon if the data is encrypted would that require a sheriff's order?

NB explained that a password wouldn't be required on all occasions admitting that the author had been mistaken on that point.

GM informed that it would be unusual to have stored data encrypted, adding it would be more likely to be encrypted in terms of social media.

GM added, if under legal power we have the power to explore it but if this presents an issue then a technical solution would be sought. **GM** added that better wording is required in relation to this section.

DC added that the leaflet needs to be fully informed however highlighted that to an anxious person this may be a detail too far. Adding, if it was a serious case and serious encryption on

the device then legal progression would be required.

GM stated that the section needs re worded and brought back to the members.

LA added that the voluntary position needs to be covered also and not just when seized. **LA** added that she has an iPhone that she believes is encrypted which would require her permission to access.

DC added that it needs to be clear that the process will not change any data in the device, security and handling of the device will be important. **DC** added in terms of giving passwords what is the level? What is the law?

LA added it is like stop search, “can we stop you, can we have your password?” is there a perception that if I say no then there will be pressure. This needs fully informed consent in relation to the risk of other information being discovered.

DC asked, is it the proposal to record consent given?

MO asked, signature to agree?

DC added that it protects everyone if recording of informed consent.

LA stated people need to be fully aware of what giving your password means.

Chair sought the view of **SK**.

SK highlighted that the wording needs to be clear where the authority is being drawn from.

SK highlighted that some areas of the leaflet are too vague and there is a requirement to think from the public’s perspective. What are the consequences for not giving your password?

SK added that there must be a clearer explanation of what data that can be and will be accessed. Consideration should be given to highlighting an inventory of what shall be accessed. **SK** highlighted that most people don’t understand what is on their phone, to provide an inventory could be mutually beneficial, if someone understands what will be examined then they may be able to assist.

SK highlighted that there is reference to limited and full examinations but no explanation of what that is.

SK reiterated that the headline is that there is a requirement to pinpoint legal authority, specifically bearing in mind what the person subject to the seizure should know.

LA added that the introduction should say either ‘You have volunteered or it is seized.’ There is a need to distinguish between them both. **LA** added need to think about the logical steps on the journey to make it clear.

ACTION – POLICE SCOTLAND TO REDRAFT THE PUBLIC LEAFLET IN LINE WITH THE FEEDBACK PROVIDED HIGHLIGHTING SPECIFIC POWERS, PROCEDURES AND PROCESS WITH THE FOCUS FROM THE CUSTOMER PERSPECTIVE.

7. PRICIPLES OF USE

Chair ensured all members had received the principles of use highlighting the revised version which was circulated at the meeting. **Chair** confirmed that **SK** had received the electronic version.

NB informed that the circulated document was an inject to the Principles of Use document that

had been completed this afternoon prior to the meeting, on the back of initial review of the original Principles of Use document.

NB informed that the Principles of Use document is to set out the principles and standards we want and will adhere to if we triage via the kiosks and then form the document to support audit and governance in the future. Providing benchmarking and giving assurances on Police Scotland practices.

GM added that this was the first opportunity that he had had to see the updated version adding initial observations that the introduction needs to point towards the Human Rights responsibilities.

GM added that there is an opportunity to rely and outline the values and code of ethics of Police Scotland.

GM added that having read over both versions of the document the solution likely lies between them both but the lack of information and detail highlighted in the public leaflet also applies to the revised Principles of Use. There may be an opportunity to use hyperlinks to provide links to further information and legislative responsibilities.

GM added that there is an opportunity to outline what actually happens to the devices and the expectations. Further stating that this is an early draft for discussion, most areas are considered however needs further work, highlighting that this is not a criticism and **GM** fully appreciates the work that has been undertaken to produce the initial drafts of the document.

NB stated that the desire from the meeting and proposal of these documents was to gain an understanding of if Police Scotland are going in the right direction with these documents. **NB** stated that the documents still needed work on the content but asked if the 3 document set was the best way to achieve the desired outcomes. Highlighting the 3 documents as Principles of Use, Toolkit and Public Leaflet.

GM explained, the Toolkit is more of an internal document in relation to processes. The Principles of Use is designed to be an outward facing document demonstrating the standards we want to uphold and the Public Leaflet is the first point of contact.

LA enquired if the additional circulation was to add to the first draft?

NB explained that they were 2 drafts to promote the discussion of what is required to be contained within the Principles of Use document.

MO confirmed that this is being described as Principles of Use and not Codes of Practice?

NB yes, the aspiration is to move to a Code of Practice at a later date but this is a Principles of Use to outline the standards.

MO highlighted observation on the draft Principles of Use documents, highlighting

- a requirement to be more specific on what can be accessed,
- Explanation that there is a possibility of self-incrimination
- Requires an explanation of voluntary vs. compelled.

LA added there is a requirement to clearly outline the legal basis.

NB enquired if there would be an expectation of commonality of language between the Principles of Use and the public leaflet?

LA informed that it may be useful in relation to some of the terms used however the language might be more formal in the principles of use document. Adding there may be a need to bring

someone in to ensure the simplest language possible is used.

GM stated that all feedback will be welcomed. **GM** added that it was about ensuring policing provided the best possible service to the public through the changes in technology.

GM explained it was a modular approach to build on in the future and as the landscape changes then the option of a Code of Practice would be explored in the future. **GM** stressed that how law enforcement handles peoples data is a key concern.

GM requested that all members review the Principles of Use and feedback any observations to allow its development.

ACTION - ALL MEMBERS TO REVIEW THE CIRCULATED PRINCIPLES OF USE DOCUMENT AND PROVIDE ANY FEEDBACK TO ALLOW FOR THE MATURATION OF THE DOCUMENT.

MO enquired in relation to the second draft of Principles of Use, page 3 refers to 'we will not consider' there is a section on production sin relation to child abuse images is that bypassing the kiosks?

NB yes

GM highlighted that the terminology may need to be more inclusive in relation to evidence rather than productions.

LA added that there may be a consideration to dividing into 'what we will consider' and 'what we won't consider' and differentiating between the two.

LA highlighted that the second draft is a lot briefer than the first and not sure if it shall contain enough information.

DC added that the trio of documents is helpful to understand, Principles of Use, Toolkit being the how to manual and the public leaflet. However the public document is a bit of a misnomer as everything should be public unless anything pertinent comes up. **DC** added that this should be clarified as a subject information sheet.

DC highlighted that there was a large amount of documents circulated late without proper time to fully read. It broadly seems right it's not for the subjects it's the principles of duty for the Police service, first draft seems OK.

DC added that Code of Practice is sensible however may need work to include in the Principles of Use document things that would appear in a Code of Practice document.

DC highlighted point for clarity; 5.5 (version 1) Job Logs, 'cybercrime management may use data' may need clarity around the management functions.

DC further highlighted the need to drill down on the process, highlighting that the job of the supervisory officer is a difficult one, fundamental issue is around the supervisory officer training in order to maximise evidence but minimise collateral damage but with a recognition that you won't always get it right.

GM apologised to members for the late circulation of the papers.

GM explained that the author of the document tried to address what we would want to see but agreed that the document required redrafting.

GM thanked **DC** for the consideration around two stage processes stating it was helpful and keen to adopt, accepting that the points made were relevant.

DC added in relation to the toolkit this has use not just in the police service but also in the trial and defence solicitor process. Adding it may be of use to link the public leaflet to sites to find further information. It may be useful to view the toolkit through how court staff and defence staff may look at it.

Chair thanked **DC** for his views and asked **SK** for any feedback.

SK highlighted that she hadn't had the opportunity to view the toolkit prior to the meeting.

SK re-iterated the requirement to outline where the legal authority was coming from. Highlighting that Police Scotland use of the kiosks needs to be acceptable to the public so it needs to clearly outline the authority.

SK highlighted that the language in the document needs tightened up.

SK highlighted the requirement for proportionality, stating the intrusion needs to be the least intrusion necessary.

SK enquired if there is a way of obtaining the evidence without taking the phone.

GM accepted the points made by **SK** and explained that the court shall always look for the best evidence time stamped and dated. The Court would expect the Police to have explored all options to gain the best evidence and acknowledge that there is a right to privacy however there is also the right to a fair trial.

NB added that this would be a good point to take to the stakeholders group as COPFS are represented and seek their view.

GM highlighted that this issue could be challenging as each case is different.

GM further acknowledged **SK** point on better detailing the legal basis and agreed that this should be done.

GM highlighted his caution around the term informed consent as that is too close to Stop Search, we discussed it with COPFS and there is no statutory power to take item as evidence if taking the device as a witness, however the Police in Scotland have the Common Law power to take as it may have evidential value. **GM** stressed that he cannot envisage ever seizing devices without any power.

MO explained that the reason for that term is in research terms participants have to complete an informed consent form. **MO** added that it may be useful to have 2 public information leaflets one for voluntary and one for compelled suspect highlighting the different circumstances.

NB stated that that required to be articulated better, explaining that it will usually be as a result of something happening and an investigation and not just a random seizure.

LA added if voluntary then needs the information but now understand that it would be on a legal basis.

SK explained that the informed consent issue is not an area she is clear on however would seek the advice of Ailidh Callander as that is more within her area of expertise.

SK highlighted that the focus was on authority for seizure rather than a voluntary submission, highlighting that Data Protection laws may be relevant to voluntary circumstances.

GM highlighted that there was a need to be explicit that the Police are empowered to take that device and this needs to be detailed in the Principles of Use document. **GM** also highlighted the

requirement to explore storage and management of data within the Principles of Use Document.

SK explained that she would have meeting at this time and thanked members for inclusion in the meeting.

GM highlighted prior to leaving the meeting that he would be keen to work with **SK** further around the observations on the EqHRIA.

SK stated that she was keen to help. **SK** dialled out of the meeting.

LA stated that the term voluntary may be misleading, if there is a power to take the device then how voluntary is it?

GM stated that there is a duty to inform the individual, Police have a responsibility to Justice and evidence and the decision around retention would sit with COPSF. **GM** highlighted that there is a requirement to be more explicit on what we are requiring.

Chair summarised the feedback received as the approach being taken is good but requires some re-drafting.

DC added further considerations around return of the devices seeking further explanation in relation to;

- How long for?
- Who give the device back?
- Who do the public go to to ask for it back?

DC further enquired around the possibility of having a sign off and return of device once the required evidence was obtained.

GM stated that this would have to be worked through with the stakeholders and COPFS in relation to any possibility of certification of devices to allow their return.

LA stated there is a requirement to provide realistic timescales and expectations.

MO provided the example of a domestic violence incident, where there are restrictions in place on the subject, the victim hands over their phone and the subject returns leaving the victim with no phone to call in.

ACTION – POLICE SCOTLAND TO SEEK A SOLUTION FROM COPFS THROUGH THE STAKEHOLDERS GROUP AROUND THE TOPIC REQUIREMENT TO RETAIN DEVICES OR POSSIBILITY OF CERTIFICATION OF DEVICES

Chair asked members to give consideration to the next agenda item of Data Protection Impact Assessment and EqHRIA. **Chair** informed that **SK** had provided comments by email prior to the meeting.

8. DPIA

Chair enquired if the group had had an opportunity to examine the DPIA.

LA informed that they hadn't yet had the opportunity.

DC stated that he had also not had the opportunity to fully examine the document.

GM stated that we were looking for feedback from the group on the document.

Chair observed that a lot of work had been put into the DPIA and reiterated that he welcomed

feedback.

GM highlighted that the Justice Sub Committee had enquired if the documents are complete; the answer is yes however they must remain as live documents throughout the roll out.

Chair clarified, is this internal Official document?

NB yes

GM asked if this is appropriate?

MO asked is there sensitive information not to make it open to the public?

Chair added that a view could be taken to produce a redacted version.

LA enquired is this a draft or the final document? Stating that they should be public when complete.

GM agreed with this point highlighting that they are not the finalised document at this time.

DC stated that if someone was seeking to view or challenge the impact assessment would object to the redactions highlighting there is nothing sensitive in the documents and the fact that Police Scotland are undertaking the process of seeking advice to ensure transparency including public and academic review of the documents in working towards the publication.

9. EqHRIA

Chair highlighted to the members the email submitted by **SK** providing comment specifically around the level of depth in the impact assessment and providing a number of helpful reference points to assist in the development.

GM agrees that there is more work required.

ACTION - POLICE SCOTLAND TO WORK WITH PRIVACY INTERNATIONAL AND PARTNERS ON THE REDEVELOPMENT OF THE EQHRIA

ACTION – MEMBERS TO REVIEW THE DETAIL OF DPIA AND EQHRIA AND PROVIDE FEED BACK TO SECRETARIATE BY 28 SEPTEMBER 2018.

Chair stated that it is clear that lots of work has been undertaken

LA added that the three documents make sense adding a consideration may be to link across all three documents and provide explanation of each.

10. TERMS OF REFERENCE

Chair asked the group if they had a chance to look at the documents.

GM added an observation on the TOR, the secretariat should not be a specific person and should be changed to reflect Police Scotland shall support this function.

LA highlighted that there had been a lot of long documents circulated before the meeting.

GM agreed that it was important to give time to review the documents.

MO clarified, this group is not reporting to the stakeholders group.

NB confirmed it was not.

Chair highlighted the issue of chairmanship of the reference group. **Chair** highlighted that for all he was happy to continue as chair it is the aspiration that the chair is independent from Police Scotland completely.

DC suggested circulating non police members to be discussed out with the group and return with our nomination for chair.

ACTION – POLICE SCOTLAND TO CIRCULATE TO MEMBERS THE DETAILS OF NON POLICE MEMBERS TO ALLOW DISCUSSION AND PROPOSAL OF INDEPENDENT CHAIR

DC stated that Police Scotland would require to maintain the administration support function to the new chair.

LA asked in terms of membership whether it would be useful including forensic services, digital forensic and SPA.

NB highlighted that they were represented in the stakeholders group.

LA added that Edinburgh Napier University was the correct title and could also reflect the fact that **LA** is director of Scottish Institute for Policing (SIPR)

NB asked if anyone else should be included?

Chair highlighted that victim support were on the invite list.

DC asked if representation would be provided by victim support to future meetings?

NB updated that contact shall be made again.

ACTION – WRITE TO VICTIM SUPPORT FROM THE CHAIR OF THE REFERENCE GROUP TO EXPRESS THE DESIRE OF THE GROUP TO HAVE VICTIM SUPPORT REPRESENTATION.

11. ROLL OUT TIME LINE

Chair highlighted that the timeline circulated clearly shows an aspiration to have kiosk users trained by October.

GM Updated that an overview had been provided to the Justice Sub Committee that we were undertaking a period of consultation before-hand to consider the wider impact and what assurance measures are in place. The Justice Sub Committee accepted that consolation was required to ensure effective delivery.

GM added that the intention would be to aim for the end of 2018, to ensure that all checks and balances are in place, thereafter it would be an incremental roll out starting in the East of Scotland.

GM informed that this would include a training programme including mandatory specialist training and only when that are has met the required standard and assurances are in place that it is fit for purpose will the trainers move onto the next area.

GM highlighted the intention to publish data sets however would look for guidance on what they shall look like or what is required in the data sets. **GM** informed that the data sets would look to capture and inform learning and training and may be published quarterly. **GM** updated that he would seek the Business Assurance team to become part of that roll out journey.

GM asked when the process of the roll out could begin and further what the members would require assurance wise before the start of that journey?

GM highlighted that the aspiration was to provide best service to officers at the front end. Currently 1000 devices a month are received and it takes a long time with on average less than 10% of those submitted being relevant. **GM** added currently the process is far more intrusive than it has to be with 900 extra devices a month that we don't need.

GM added that start the roll out process may allow greater scrutiny in relation to lessons learnt from practical roll out and use.

MO observed that it is a difficult balance between commencing the roll out prior to the documentation being finalised however recognised the additional burden and intrusion currently of 900 extra devices a month that are not needed. **MO** added that we need to get this right and the documents currently need redrafted. **MO** highlighted that 1 October to start the roll out is ambitious.

MO highlighted that the timeline doesn't indicate when this group sits, adding it may be useful to reflect the meeting dates alongside the training and roll out.

LA agreed that the documents were required prior to the roll out.

GM asked at what point in the journey is enough assurance provided to start the roll out?

LA informed if you take the learning from this meeting to the stakeholders meeting with a view to having feedback by 28th September and documents re-written thereafter have other meetings to ensure understanding of the documents set, but there comes a point where you have to say this is the best we have just now but with a view to improving.

MO added we still need to understand if there is a process that will allow you to get the data without taking the phone.

NB added that would probably have to be viewed as an ambition as that will not happen quickly as it need COPFS and Lord Advocate approval of the proposal.

DC asked what are the letters?

NB informed that they are the police Divisions.

DC asked what are the dotted lines?

NB informed these are an indication of the timeline.

DC added there is mention of internal review of SOPS, in **DC** view he would prefer this wasn't internal and would like to be involved.

NB informed that that needs updated as its no longer a SOP it is now the three documents presented today. **NB** added that the documents would be progressed and recirculate but shall ensure that they remain under review as training is rolled out.

LA asked if a local police officer is currently sitting on the stakeholders group.

NB informed that there was no local police officers on the group.

LA added that it may be a consideration.

NB updated that the Police Federation are on the stakeholders group as representation.

GM added that it may be a distraction to bring officers onto the stakeholders group at this stage, but the intention is to continue a process of active learning and continuous improvement and we

shall employ debriefing team at each stage to capture the learning.

DC highlighted that he was more relaxed around roll out timeline as he is in agreement of the benefits to the public in the reduction of the number of phones seized and the reduction in inconvenience of the phone being away from the owner.

DC added it was a balance of going to first stage with working developing documents. Highlighting the greatest impact is on the supervisory officers. **DC** highlighted he was more relaxed around the delivery of training to the operatives.

DC highlighted that the trio of documents would be on the table as guiding principles to operatives but most of how to operate is technical through the training. **DC** raised a consideration of what restrictions are going to be placed on what can be browsed in the kiosk process.

GM informed that there is an opportunity to address that and the push is to develop the document sets.

LA asked if the officers engaging the public would be the ones carrying out the analysis.

NB informed that it would be independent properly trained officers.

GM added observation, no substantive points to stop the roll out apart from getting the document sets to ensure proper awareness of principles but nothing on the equipment.

LA stated she would rather have all that.

MO agreed

LA highlighted that she understood the need to push on, highlighting again the figure of 900 extra devices a month that are not required.

Chair summarised that the documents need to be in a good place to progress.

Chair suggested that feedback should be provided by the latest 28 September if not before with a view to having another reference group meeting mid-October to further these elements and any views from the stakeholders group.

GM highlighted that an audit/dip sample process would be established following roll out to provide assurances of the operation.

12. AOCB

Chair invited any AOCB matters from the members. No items of AOCB were raised at this time.

13. CLOSE

The Chair thanked Members for their attendance and contribution to the meeting.

14. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Chair informed that the next meeting shall be set and circulated in due course however shall be mid-October.

OFFICIAL: NONE

OFFICIAL: NONE