

Data Ethics Committee minutes: 3 June 2026

Notes of the Data Ethics Committee (DEC) meeting 3 June 2026 via Teams

Attendees

Presenters

Kirsty Winter (*Digital Asset Management System [DAMS] Product Owner, Kent and Essex Police*)

Observers

Chris Seach (*Strategic Development Officer, Essex Police*)

Ken Neale (*Data Ethics Manager, Counter Terrorism Policing HQ*)

ecda members

Wysh Kanesalingam (*Data Partnerships Officer, ecda*)

DEC members

Katerina D Hadjimatheou (*Chair*)

Alex Fassio (*Vice Chair*)

Sally Messenger

Mackenzie Jorgensen

Apologies

Andrew Knott

Yani Tyskerud

Lucia Hawkes

Karthik Durgaprasad

Anton Beer

Project overview

During this committee meeting Essex Police (EP) and Kent Police (KP) put forward their Axon Draft One project that is being trialled within the force – Kent and Essex Police have collaborated together on this project.

Draft One, developed by the company Axon, is an AI-assisted report drafting tool integrated within Axon's Digital Asset Management System (DAMS), that has been in use in Essex & Kent Police since Sept 2022. Draft One uses audio recordings uploaded by officers on to DAMS, a transcript is produced within DAMS, then from this Draft One generates a draft written report. Currently Draft One is being used for simple officer arrest statements and to speed up reviews of digital material, it is only being tested on test environments and it is not part of content in live case investigations

All outputs are draft versions and must undergo full human review. Notes can be added via voice command to support users with additional neurodiverse needs. Final approval should be authorised prior to submitting the report. The tool does not make decisions or assessments and does not replace professional judgement. Currently it is not being tested on victim and witness materials such as statements, it is only being used for testing for officer generated material.

Conclusions from the Committee discussion

- EP have undertaken significant work with both national and local CPS. The next phase is to expand testing into a live test environment.

The Committee advised that, should Draft One be extended to cover victim and witness statement use cases, further targeted testing and evaluation would be required. This is necessary to fully consider the heightened risks associated with these cases, alongside the implementation of appropriate additional safeguards.

- Committee discussion was limited to non-criminal justice cases. Victim and witness statements- were not covered.
- EP agreed to return to the DEC once live CPS testing is underway. The Committee welcomed this commitment and recommended that this engagement take place at the earliest opportunity, to ensure any ethical concerns can be identified and addressed in a timely manner.

Committee observations raised and responses provided:

- EP confirmed that extensive testing of the transcription tool within DAMS has been undertaken across criminal justice teams in Kent and Essex Police. This work resulted in a significant improvement in transcription accuracy, increasing from 70% to 93%, demonstrating that Axon have been highly responsive to user feedback. Axon also conducts quarterly assessments of the tool to evaluate its effectiveness and ensure continued consistency.

In addition, EP has requested that testing officers complete feedback surveys and participate in debrief sessions, some of which include Axon representatives. These sessions provide an opportunity for officers to raise concerns, receive direct guidance from Axon, and ensure that user feedback is heard first-hand by the developers.

- EP advised that they have been evaluating the tool based on officer feedback, efficiency gains and the identification of any potential hallucinations were regarded as a measure of the tool's effectiveness.

Positive feedback from officers around efficiency were noted, a testing team from the major crime unit have reported 90% time saving compared to manually reviewing footage. No bias or hallucinations of information noted in testing sample. Offender Management team reported 50% time saving in their summary report process.

- EP did also undertake a review involving 20 historic cases from case review teams, requesting Draft One to generate reports. While no hallucinations were identified, the outputs did leave out finer details, such as exhibit references and victim and witness information, where these were not explicitly captured in the audio.

In response to this EP have emphasised that all generated reports must be reviewed and a declaration is included at the end of each report to confirm that this review has been completed by an officer. Given that drafts may contain omissions or missing context, it is expected that every report will require review prior to use.

- Officers do not automatically have access to this system, any officers wanting to use this will have to go through an application process to be granted access and all new officers will be required to undertake DAMS training prior to applying for Draft One access. New DAMS users will be provided bespoke training to train them on the system, as well as being provided a training guide.
- It was noted that EP were the biggest testers of this capability in the UK and feedback given to Axon has been well received with changes being made soon after. EP clarified that they have done extensive testing with 82 testers across Kent and Essex Police working with 560 AI generated reports. A variety of policing teams have been involved from investigative teams, front line officers, to criminal justice teams. However there

has been no testing on live investigative material that is going through the criminal justice process.

- Currently the AI drafts are not retained, EP are working with Axon to change this.
- EP have emphasised that they are not locked in a contract with Axon for Draft One and have been exploring other providers to ensure that they are using the best option for the required work.

Project recommendations

- Committee requested clarification on when the product is to be expanded onto victim statements. While the committee acknowledged testing had been completed within the current use cases of Draft One, additional risks and safeguarding should be considered prior to expansion into live CPS cases. Testing in one area doesn't apply to all.
- Personalising the declaration statement within the report was advised so that officers are more inclined to take personal responsibility.
- It is important to actively engage officers who may be sceptical of Draft One, to support consistent and effective use of the tool. This should include reinforcing expectations around thorough transcript review, ensuring that all users understand their responsibility to verify outputs and address any omissions or inaccuracies. Engagement should also focus on demonstrating how the tool can improve efficiency and contribute positively to their day-to-day role. Increased confidence and satisfaction among officers will support more effective and consistent utilisation of Draft One, maximising its overall value.
- Committee suggested having officers use Draft One on an intermittent basis, e.g. one month on, next month off.
- It was recommended to keep a record of the testing done so far and in the future, to create confidence around the transparency of process, public accountability and produce evidence of changes over time, feedback received, and responses.
- Committee suggested dip sampling and an independent review process, e.g. whereby an officer not involved in the original footage would review the video and subsequently assess the corresponding report. This approach would support the identification of any potential bias in the generated output and provide an additional layer of quality assurance.
- The need for ongoing assurance that the transcription tool remains accurate and fully reflective of all relevant details in the short, medium and long term was emphasised. This includes ensuring that it appropriately captures contextual factors such as emotions displayed, and takes into account variations in accents and dialogue from individuals for whom English is not a first language.
- In addition, the Committee emphasised that outputs should be subject to consistent checks for potential bias, to ensure fairness, accuracy, and reliability across all use cases.
- It was recommended to capture metrics on how often notes are edited, amended, or deleted, as well as instances where AI had missed content or context within transcripts, to better support performance evaluation, amongst other kinds of monitoring data. Capturing this data would support more robust evaluation of accuracy, reliability, and overall performance.
- Committee recommended exploration of downstream implications, how does it influence decision-making- outcomes or impacts for people, victims, officers. Onward use cases.

Data Ethics Committee minutes: 3 June 2026

- Committee also advised further exploration of the risks associated with automation bias. It was recommended that appropriate mitigations and safeguards be developed and implemented to ensure that users maintain critical oversight and do not place undue reliance on AI-generated outputs, including short, medium and long term review to identify impacts on officer work and outputs.