

GPMS	Official - Sensitive
Suitable for Publication Scheme	No
Title and Version	Facial Recognition Technology Strategic Board
Chair	Lindsey Chiswick, Director of Intelligence
Summary	Meeting Minutes
Minute Taker	*****
Author of document (warrant/pay no.)	*****
Creating Branch	MO1
Date created	06/10/2021
Review Date	06/01/2027

Facial Recognition Technology (FRT) Strategic Board
Wednesday 6th October 2021 1000hrs - 1130hrs
TEAMS / Room 1.1 NSY

Attendees

Lindsey Chiswick – MO1 (Chair)

LC

Catherine Roper – CPIE

CR

Aimee Reed – Data Office

AR

Apologies

Introduction

- 1. Meeting opened by Chair.

Minutes & Actions

- 2. Minutes accepted. Actions reviewed and action tracker updated accordingly.
- 3. In respect of action number 74 and the discussion around public engagement and the potential media interest, an additional action was created
Action Meeting to be held to discuss lines that will be available to release to press as interest in RFR grows – *****

Retrospective Facial Recognition (***)**

- 4. A meeting was held with NEC UK on 05/10/21 to discuss the contracts. NEC are now happy. The draft contracts are due to be with the Met today (06/10/21)
Action On receipt of contract, copy to be sent to Lindsey Chiswick and *****
- 5. There will be oversight from NEC AM (America) where aspects will be built / developed. It has been confirmed that there is no clash with the Connect project.
- 6. ** discussed the timeline implementation slide (copy circulated). The contract was awarded on 23rd August 2021. The prepared timeline shows completion of the project in August 2022. It was explained that due to some of the outstanding milestones there might be a delay in the timescale.
- 7. The key items within the timescale are the fundamental High Level Design (HLD) and the MPS suppliers, Cap Gemini for the service support structure and Siam Towers.

- 8. The timeline for Siam Towers is currently unknown, as they will not do their work until the HLD is complete. The technical solution includes HLD, infrastructure and security.
- 9. The Technical Design Authority board is on 23/11/21. All new designs in the MPS are required to go through the board for review.
- 10. Digital Policing BA resource has been assigned to the project and are looking at the current practices and beginning to look at new workflows for business groups. A meeting is due to be held W/C 11/10/21 to discuss deliverables.
- 11. LC advised that it would be ****, **** and **** policing who would have initial delivery.
- 12. The discussion was had in relation to the importance of data privacy and any responses in respect of FOIA requests. It was recommended for the development phase that a publication strategy ways adopted with the MPS committing to public documents at the point of operational use.
- 13. It was confirmed that there was a project board but the attendees would be reviewed to ensure all pertinent areas have a representative. ** confirmed that he does attend.
Action: Name to be provided to ** of a Data Office representative who will be able to attend the DP project board on the implementation of RFR – Aimee Reed.
- 14. ** asked if LPEP had been considered to look at the wider considerations, especially taking into account of the media interest and questions raised through Mayor’s Questions directly to the ethics panel. LC highlighted that this was still at the very early stages and although the media may take interest in the contract award, it will take time for things to be completed. LC ***** are scheduled to meet with LPEP on the 11th October to discuss FR.
- 15. *****

- 16. LC asked if ways of condensing the timescale had been explored.
- 17. It was mentioned that Management Board recognised the importance and benefits of RFR. ** advised the primary drive for the MPS was the suppliers, Siam Towers, so once the HLD was approved the next phase could be reviewed. There was a 6 – 8 week timeframe for the draft proposal then a timeline would be devised with the supplier. ** agreed it would be good to have a prioritisation plan and identify opportunities to move at pace.
Action: Meeting to be held offline between LC, ***** to discuss the project board – *****



- 18. ** confirmed that the next deployment was still looking to go ahead W/C 18/10/21. A review was currently taking place of the intel case though to ensure it remains justified. The relevant BCU are in full support of any deployment.
- 19. There had been some technical issues with the NEC upgrade but this has now been resolved.
- 20. It was agreed that a week ahead of the deployment the relevant documents, including the terminology document should be re-published on the website and the deployment highlighted via social media platforms. Press lines will be in place.

- 21. It was said that the publication of the documents may create interest from privacy groups and the media but was important that we did not lose sight of potentially deploying. It was also mentioned that by having as much information available as possible, it would assist with the potential increase in FOIA as people could be referred to the website.
- 22. It was agreed that the Community Impact Assessment (CIA) needed to provide a higher than normal confidence and is well received.
- 23. LC advised that LPEP provided 5 conditions for deployment of LFR. The Mayor has been written too and advised of how we have satisfied those points at the time. An update will be sent to MOPAC to highlight the changes in the new MPS documents.

STAR Bid – Demographic Differential Testing (***)**

- 24. The commercial framework suggested for this procurement was sent to *****
- 25. LC advised that following the successful bid of £250k the relevant paperwork had been sent to MOPAC to draw down the funds.

AOB

- 26. Nothing raised

Sensitive Equities Sub-Group (SESG)

- 27. To the extent there was a requirement for ‘need to know’ discussions, the SESG was convened in line with its agenda and will be subject to separate minutes.



Date of next meeting:

Thursday 4th November 2021 1000hrs – 1130hrs.

TEAMS / Room 1.1 @ NSY