

London Policing Ethics Panel Minutes of Meeting

Monday, 10 November 2025

Membership

Professor Suzanne Shale (Chair) (Apology)
Professor Jyoti Belur
Professor Ben Bradford
Professor Jennifer Brown (Deputy Chair)
Abdul Hye Miah

Observers

Natasha Plummer, MOPAC (Apology)
Chief Inspector Ben Smith, MPS (Apology)

Ethical Hazards and Opportunities in Implementing AI for Policing in London

1. The Panel discussed MOPAC's draft discussion paper on AI. The paper summarises MOPAC's understanding of:
 - the purpose of AI in policing;
 - national endorsement of AI use in policing; and
 - the MPS's and other forces' current use of AI and digital technology.

The document then poses issues for MOPAC to consider including strategic direction and governance; legal, ethical and human rights considerations; data security and information assurance; operational integrity and risk management; transparency and public trust; and procurement and vendor ethics.

2. The Panel noted that there are many sources providing principles and guidance on the use of AI. This included the College of Policing, The Alan Turing Institute, the National Police Chiefs Council, and the Bioethics and Forensic Ethics Group, as well as academics. An assessment of these documents by the Panel identified:
 - 20 principles had been set out
 - Equivalent concepts are not always expressed in the same terminology
 - There is variation in the definitions offered by different authorities when using the same term
 - There are some common principles identified such as robustness and transparency
 - There are also unique core principles such as granularity, independent oversight, environmentally responsible, but their meaning can often be found embedded within different core principles of other formulations
 - Different supplementary concepts are included within a core principle
 - Specification of principles are set at a high level
 - It is difficult to see how the principles can be applied to test an application

- Overall, there is a confusing picture which would greatly benefit from greater clarity.
3. The Panel observed that key questions were who would be assessing adherence to the guidance, how it would be assessed, what would any sanctions be if guidance was not followed and who would apply those sanctions.
 4. The Panel discussed its next steps, confirming that undertaking a pre-mortem on two AI modalities would be a useful exercise to identify potential points of ethical failure.

The Panel's next meeting will be on 8 December 2025