1 Tuesday, 25 June 2024 2 (10.00 am)3 LORD BRACADALE: Good morning, Mr Logue. 4 A. Good morning. LORD BRACADALE: May I remind you you're still subject to 5 the oath you took on a previous occasion. Ms Thomson. 6 7 Evidence of JOHN LOGUE Examination-in-chief by MS THOMSON 8 9 MS THOMSON: Good morning. You are John Loque and you are the Crown Agent and Chief Executive of the Crown Office 10 and Procurator Fiscal Service and you gave evidence to 11 12 the Inquiry on 23 and 24 April of this year. That's correct. 13 Α. 14 Thank you for returning to assist us further. You will Q. 15 be familiar by now with the blue folder. 16 Α. Yes. 17 I see you have already opened that up, Mr Loque, and we Q. should find within it a second Rule 8 request that 18 the Inquiry sent to you on 22 April of this year. We 19 20 don't need it on the screen, but the reference number is SBPI 00590. 21 A. That's correct. 22 Q. Is that there? 23 24 A. Yes.

Q. And we should also have your response. This we will

25

1 bring up on the screen, please. Your response is 2 SBPI 00605. And if we scroll to the bottom, please, it 3 appears that both your signature and the date that you 4 signed it have been redacted certainly from this 5 version, but I understand that you signed the statement on 17 May of this year? 6 7 That's correct. Α. And I'm hoping that the copy in front of you will have 8 Q. 9 both your signature and the date on it? 10 Α. It does. And as with your previous Rule 8 response, you concluded 11 Q. 12 at the Inquiry's request with the words: "I believe the facts stated in this witness 13 14 statement are true. I understand that this statement 15 may form part of the evidence before the Inquiry and be published on the Inquiry's website." 16 17 And so you prepared and signed your statement in the knowledge that it would be evidence before the Inquiry 18 and would be published on our website? 19 20 That's correct. Α. 21 Did you do your best when answering the questions that Q. 22 were asked of you to provide a true and accurate response? 23 I did. 24 Α. Q. This is strictly speaking a response to a Rule 8 25

request, but for convenience and by way of shorthand I'm
just going to refer to it as your statement as we go
through your evidence.

You were asked in the Rule 8 request what is your understanding of institutional racism and what makes an organisation institutionally racist and in paragraph 2 of your statement, your Rule 8 response, you answer that question. It's quite a lengthy answer, but what I would like to do is read it out in full and then ask you some follow-up questions. So you say:

"My understanding of institutional racism is informed by the definition sets out in the Macpherson Report 1999 which I regard as the definition adopted by COPFS since it was first published. The report defined institutional racism as follows:

"The collective failure of an organisation to provide an appropriate and professional service to people because of their colour, culture or ethnic origin. It can be seen or detected in processes, attitudes and behaviour which amount to discrimination through unwitting prejudice, ignorance, thoughtlessness and racist stereotyping which disadvantage minority ethnic people. It can be seen from this definition that an organisation can be regarded as institutionally racist if it suffers from such a collective failure to

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

provide an appropriate and professional service to

people because of their colour, culture or ethnic

origin.'

"My personal understanding of this concept was informed by the Jandoo Report 2001 which considered the liaison arrangements between COPFS and the family of Surjit Singh Chhokar what had been murdered in 1998. My recollection is that Dr Jandoo's conclusion that there was institutional racism in Crown Office was a very difficult moment for staff who had, as it now appears to me, until that point focused on racism as a characteristic of individual behaviour and took pride in their own individual commitment to a fair prosecution and death investigation service. It was very challenging for all of us to understand and accept that we were part of an organisation which was institutionally racist and reconcile this with our own personal standards and behaviours. To this day, the concept of institutional racism at an organisational level is not well understood by the public or other organisations, but I am proud that COPFS, led by the then Lord Advocate Colin Boyd, reacted to Dr Jandoo's assessment with openness and a public leadership commitment to transform its approach to tackling institutional racism. This work continues to this day

and has evolved to take account of important 1 developments such as the Equality Act 2010." 2 3 So you explain in this paragraph, Mr Logue, that 4 your understanding of the concept of institutional 5 racism is informed by Mr Macpherson's definition, which you regard as the definition that was adopted by 6 Crown Office and you also say that your personal 7 understanding was informed by Dr Jandoo's report. 8 9 Now, Dr Jandoo didn't adopt Lord MacPherson's 10 definition of institutional racism. He put forward a different definition and for convenience so we can look 11 12 at the two definitions side by side I would like to 13 bring up a slide from a presentation given to the 14 Inquiry earlier in this hearing by a Professor Meer from 15 Glasgow University. I wonder if we can bring up his PowerPoint, which is WIT100 and look at slide 22. 16 17 Sorry, I think I must have the wrong slide number. If we can keep scrolling up and I will ask you when to 18 19 stop. Sorry, down a bit, there we are, thank you. 20 So I'm simply using this slide for convenience so we 21 can see Lord Macpherson's definition and Dr Jandoo's 22 definition of institutional racism side by side, Professor Meer also included Lord Scarman's definition, 23 but that's perhaps less relevant for present purposes. 24 25 So the Macpherson definition is as per that I read

1 out and as set out in your statement. Dr Jandoo's definition is subtly different: 2 3 "Institutional racism occurs wherever the service 4 provided by an organisation fails, whether deliberately 5 or not, to meet equally the needs of all the people whom it serves, having regard to their racial, ethnic or 6 7 cultural background." Now, the Macpherson definition of course dates back 8 to 1999, Dr Jandoo's definition is from 2001, and I 9 10 wonder why it was that Crown Office adopted the Macpherson definition rather than the Jandoo definition, 11 12 given that Dr Jandoo's conclusions were specific to the 13 Crown Office in a way that perhaps Lord Macpherson's 14 were not? 15 It's very difficult for me to give evidence to the Α. Inquiry today about any consideration that the 16 17 difference may have been given by Crown Office in 2001. I think all I can do is assist the Inquiry by giving a 18 personal view that any conversation I have ever been 19 20 involved in in the organisation where we have discussed 21 the concept of institutional racism has always referred 22 back to the Macpherson definition. I have always taken that personally and I regard others in the organisation 23 to have taken it in the same way that that was the 24 definition and until you drew out this distinction for 25

1 me, I am not sure that I could have told you that there was personally a distinction between the Jandoo inquiry 2 3 and the Macpherson inquiry in terms of the definition. 4 I don't remember, as a member of staff in 2001, that 5 any great significance was put on the difference in terms of the information that was given to the staff 6 7 about the conclusions of the Jandoo Inquiry. The significance for staff was Dr Jandoo's conclusion that 8 9 aspects of the service provided to Mr Chhokar's family 10 demonstrated that the organisation had suffered from institutional racism and that was the -- that was the 11 12 critical element for colleagues in the organisation to 13 understand and grasp. Thank you. That's helpful. Seeing those two 14 Q. 15 definitions side by side, to your mind is the material difference between the definitions? 16 So I'm not sure I'm best qualified to explain the 17 Α. 18 significance of any difference between the two, the 19 Macpherson Inquiry definition talks about at the failure 20 to provide an appropriate and professional service, it 21 highlights that this comes through discrimination and the factors that can amount to discrimination and then 22 provides for detail. 23 That to me has always seemed a very helpful way of 24 explaining to people and any time that we -- anytime 25

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- that I have personally spoken to staff about the

 organisation's commitment to inclusion and equality, the

 reference is both to the Chhokar case and the

 consequences of that, but also back to Macpherson to

 route it in a wider UK perspective of an issue that had

 a broader foundation throughout the UK.
- 7 Q. Thank you. It may be that nothing turns on any differences that there may be between the two 8 9 definitions, but I hear you say that your professional 10 experience was that it was Lord Macpherson's definition that was effectively adopted by the Crown Office, and 11 12 when Dr Jandoo's report was published, the 13 Crown Office's focus was on the failings identified, 14 rather than any semantics around the definition that was 15 put forward by Dr Jandoo and how that might have compared to Lord Macpherson's definition of 16 17 institutional racism.
 - A. That's correct, and I think also in preparing to give evidence today, I'm sure the first inspectorate report, which I think might have been 2005, which -- and of course the inspectorate was set up as a result of a recommendation from Dr Jandoo in his report, but I'm sure that report talks about the previous Lord Advocate before Colin Boyd responding to the Macpherson Inquiry, so there was a period of time between the

1		Macpherson Inquiry and the Jandoo Report where the
2		organisation was focused on the Macpherson Inquiry and
3		taking steps to learn the lessons from the findings that
4		Macpherson had found.
5	Q.	Thank you. Can we return to your statement, please.
6		We were looking at paragraph 2, perhaps a little bit
7		further down, please, the top of this page, perfect.
8		Thank you. You explain that:
9		"It was very challenging for all Crown Office staff
LO		to understand and accept that you were part of an
L1		organisation that was institutionally racist and to
L2		reconcile that with your own personal standards and
L3		behaviours."
L 4		Can you tell us a little more about the impact of
L5		Dr Jandoo's findings on staff and staff morale within
L 6		the Crown Office?
L7	A.	Again, I can offer you a personal perspective on that
L8		and my recollection which is that the Jandoo Report
L9		brought home to us and I think made real in a very
20		practical way in the context of our work what might
21		otherwise have been something that was perhaps more
22		theoretical in relation to the Macpherson Report and to
23		deal with something that arises from the work of your
24		own organisation and to have someone then reach a
25		conclusion that the organisation in which you work was

24

25

1 institutionally racist was a very difficult thing, a 2 very difficult time. 3 And staff, including myself, I think struggled with 4 how it could be possible to reflect on your own personal 5 values but then have someone determine that you were part of an organisation that was institutionally racist 6 7 and that I think was a very necessary process to go through, because it did help me -- I can't speak for 8 9 everyone in the organisation -- but it certainly helped 10 me and others that I spoke to at the time. It helped bring home to us and make real in any way, that's 11 12 perhaps the best way I can describe it, what the concept 13 of institutional racism was and how, despite individuals 14 feeling that they in their own actions and values do not 15 act in a racist way, they could be part of an organisation which has practices and policies and 16 17 behaviours which are institutionally racist and so it was very much about that bringing home to us the 18 sharpness of that concept and as a result of that then 19 20 the need to do something about it and not to allow any 21 personal feelings of your own personal values and behaviours to get in the way of on tackling the concept 22 at an institutional level. 23

And I highlighted that in my statement because

I think I see publically still to this day partly media

commentary, partly what I see in relation to other

organisations that others still wrestle with that

difficulty that I remember from that time and so I think

it can be very difficult for organisations to overcome

that what I'm describing at a personal level in seeking

to recognise institutional racism and tackle it.

Q. Thank you. In relation to tackling institutional racism, you were asked in your Rule 8 request about the efforts that have been made within the Crown Office to overcome institutional racism and you give your response at paragraph 3 of your statement. Again, it's quite a lengthy and detailed response. What I would like to do is read it out and then ask you some questions about your response:

"I have described in answer to question 2 the circumstances in which Dr Jandoo judged COPFS to be institutionally racist. This was accepted by the organisation and very significant efforts were made to overcome this through training, engagement with community groups and increased diversity in our work force and structural embedding of practices which are designed to combat unwitting prejudice and bias. COPFS has a very strong and popular set of staff equality networks which raise awareness, promote improvements in our processes and provide direct support to staff. We

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

operate a successful two-way mentoring scheme to allow members of the equality networks to mentor senior leaders on issues associated with their network and, in turn, senior leader mentor the members of the network on leadership and career development. I have been involved in this mentoring for six years and I'm this year engaged in two-way mentoring with a member of a race equality network, which is personally rewarding and instructive. Our annual qualities conference is a very popular event at which we celebrate the success of staff in promoting equalities, review out progress and set challenges for the year ahead. Our public speaking competition for school pupils is always focused on the promotion of equalities and is strongly supported by staff and stakeholders as a visible public demonstration of our commitment in this area. I have always believed these efforts have been successful and that COPFS is a very different organisation. It is now one in which we speak to recruits as part of their induction about the importance of equality, diversity and inclusion, a process in which I personally will remind recruits of Dr Jandoo's conclusion in 2001 and in which we are vigilant to ensure we are never again judged to be institutionally racist. We also benchmark ourselves externally, currently through the Employer's Network for

Equality and Inclusion, ENEI. In 2023 we achieved for 1 2 the first time the gold standard in the ENEI, Talent, 3 Inclusion and Diversity Evaluation (TIDE). This is a benchmarking tool which is used to measure our 4 5 performance in diversity and inclusion across several areas, including workforce, strategy and plan, 6 7 recruitment, training and development and procurement. We were then compared to other organisations taking 8 9 part. Our overall score was 87 per cent, which placed 10 us as tenth out of 171 organisations. COPFS scored particularly high in our workforce strategy and planning 11 12 and leadership and accountability." So here you describe the crown's acceptance of 13 14 Dr Jandoo's conclusion that Crown Office and the 15 Procurator Fiscal Service was institutionally racist and you set out the steps that have been taken in the past 16 17 20 years or so to eradicate institutional racism and they're listed at the top of that paragraph, if we could 18 19 perhaps scroll back up to the top of paragraph 3, 20 please. 21 The first you mention is training, can you tell us a little more about the training? What does it cover? 22 A. I think I spoke a little about this on the previous 23 occasion that I gave evidence, but the training has 24 evolved over time. In the 2000s the training was very 25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

much focused on raising awareness of the concept of the institutional racism and the learning from the Chhokar case, as well as a much broader attempt to raise and promote equality.

And at that stage, my recollection is it was very much focused on the question of race and as we began to prepare for the implementation of the Equality Act in 2010, we then broadened that effort and training took on a broader look at inclusion and equality, not just race, and a range of other protected characteristics in the 2010 Act and it was an attempt to comply with our obligations in the 2010 Act, but also begin to build a much stronger awareness of the need for equality and inclusion in our work and there were elements of that training which were mandatory and, forgive me, I forget the titles of the courses, but they were mandatory training courses at the time for all staff. And as I think I said on the last occasion, they were also training courses targeted at managers and leaders to ensure that they understood their responsibilities to tackle any issues of equality and inclusion which they came across.

- Q. And these training courses include race?
- A. Yes, in the -- my recollection is that in the 2000s
 there was very much a strong focus on race because of

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

- the consequences of the Chhokar case and Dr Jandoo's
 findings and, as I say, my sense is that after the
 Equality Act, we broadened that focus to look at all
 protected characteristics and the need for broader
 inclusion and equality.
- Q. Did the training courses cover Article 2?
 - A. From my own recollection, I can't remember. I would need to check within the organisation on the detail of what was included in the training. I don't know if any of it has been made available to you or not, but whether it was that training or whether it was training through a focus on death investigations, I do remember at the same time a strong focus in the organisation on the consequences of Article 2 for our death investigations.
 - Q. What about Article 14, to your recollection, was that covered in the training?
- I can't -- I can't remember the specifics of the 17 Α. training and the detail of the content, but I would be 18 surprised if it were not covered in the training, given 19 20 that we had very recently also undertaken a very 21 significant training exercise in relation to adoption of the Convention in 1999/2000. Again, all staff were 22 23 trained in a mandatory fashion in relation to the adoption of the Convention and I would be surprised if 24 the equalities training in the 2000s didn't make the 25

- connection with Article 14, but I just simply can't remember personally at this stage.
- 3 Q. And how was the training quality assured?
- 4 Α. That was done through a simple level assessment by 5 everyone who attended the training. There was a strong focus on managers supporting staff who had attended 6 7 training and I think also through a group -- a steering group I think which was led at the time they would 8 9 assess a range of information from across the 10 organisation, such as information from HR about grievances or other staffing issues which might be 11 12 related to questions of race.

13 I can't remember when it started, but every year the 14 civil service across the UK carries out a staff survey 15 in October of every year. I can't remember when that started, but that also has questions in relation to 16 17 equality and it also has direct questions about individuals having suffered harassment or discrimination 18 and that became another dataset which was used to 19 20 evaluate the effectiveness of our overall approach, 21 including our training.

- Q. Thank you. Was this training supported by guidance materials?
- 24 A. Yes, I believe it was.

22

23

25 Q. Would they be on the knowledge bank? We've heard a lot

- 1 about the knowledge bank from your colleagues.
- 2 A. So I think it's important to remember the period of time
- 3 that has passed. The knowledge bank didn't exist in the
- 4 2000s and if we are talking about training delivered in
- 5 the 2000s, that would very much have been delivered
- face-to-face with material provided at the training
- 7 events for individuals, either in advance to read before
- 8 they came to the training events, to consult during or
- 9 to take away for reference after it.
- 10 Q. Turning to --
- 11 A. Just to be absolutely clear, there was -- I should be
- 12 clear, although the knowledge bank didn't exist, there
- was an intranet, an internal website, but it was much
- less developed than it is now and I don't remember the
- 15 knowledge bank being available in the 2000s.
- Q. We've heard that there was a Precognoscer's Handbook,
- guidelines on serious casework I think and the
- Deaths Manual of Practice; are these the sort of places
- 19 that Crown Office staff might have been able to look for
- 20 guidance materials that touched on issues equality and
- 21 diversity back in the early 2000s?
- 22 A. Indeed, in relation to specific tasks and these are
- 23 sources that you're referring to which trace their roots
- 24 back to essentially hardcopy folders of guidance which
- either every member of staff would be given or they

7

8

9

- would have access to within their office and the time
 that you're asking about was a time that we were
 transitioning away from hardcopy, which was hard to
 ensure it was kept up-to-date and we were therefore
 moving to try and digitise as much of our guidance as
 possible.
 - Q. Returning to your statement, in addition to training, you mention engagement with community groups. Can you tell us a little bit more about that?
- 10 Α. I wasn't personally involved in that at the time because of the role that I occupied, but it was very clear to me 11 12 that Colin Boyd as Lord Advocate and his successor as 13 Lord Advocate Lady Angiolini placed great store on 14 procurators fiscal overcoming what you might have 15 regarded as a traditional distance from local communities and overcoming that by engaging directly 16 17 with different community groups and, given the focus on race at the time, a real effort was made to focus on 18 19 local community groups who supported minority ethnic 20 communities in Scotland and to work with them to help 21 them understand the work that we did, to build up 22 relationships with them and that would also allow individuals to answer any the questions that the groups 23 might have. 24

25 We also sought to involve the groups in our work and

- to bring them into the organisation and I remember a very strong focus on the -- at that stage, we were divided into eleven geographical errors with an area procurator fiscal in charge of each one and there was very strong focus on the individual leader of the area procurator fiscal building those relationships and getting to know those groups and so I remember examples in Glasgow and Lanarkshire where that was done quite successfully.
 - Q. Thank you. You mention increased diversity within your workforce, what steps were taken to increase the diversity of your workforce?
 - A. My understanding of that from the time and it continues to this day is very much about raising awareness of careers within the Procurator Fiscal Service, targeting that raising awareness at minority ethnic communities and doing that alongside our other work to give them the confidence that this was an organisation that wanted to change and that prioritised equality and inclusion. So it was very much about trying to engage with people where they were, which would in terms of careers for prosecutors would be at universities, but also going into schools as well at a much younger age and raising awareness and there have been examples over the last 20 years of individuals who have joined the service who

Scotland.

23

24

25

1 have said they had joined directly because of engagement like that. And that's why to this day I mentioned later 2 3 in the statement every year the public speaking 4 competition is targeted specifically on the subject of 5 equality. You say elsewhere in your statement that your data from 6 Q. 7 March 2023 says that 3.8 per cent of your workforce identifies as being from an ethnic minority background, 8 9 which was broadly in line with the census data from 2011. 10 You may or may not be aware that the 2002 data have 11 12 been published very recently and 7.1 per cent of our 13 workforce or people of working age in the UK identifies 14 being from a black or ethnic minority background. Are 15 efforts ongoing within the Crown Office to continue to increase the diversity of its workforce? 16 Very much so and I can perhaps speak about two different 17 Α. aspects of that. So one is the need to move beyond 18 recruitment at the entry levels to ensure that in 19 20 promotion and career development that we continue to 21 reflect at all levels in the organisation, up to and 22 including the most senior levels, diverse communities in

And the second aspect is the continuing focus on recruitment. So the updated census data indicates that

as a proportion of the workforce as a whole, we still have some way to go to match the population of Scotland and that, therefore, will remain a priority for us. But looking at the most recent data in 2022 as a year, taken as a 12-month period, for our new recruits our -- of all the recruits that year I think between 7 and 8 per cent of our recruits that year were from black and minority ethnic communities, Asian minority ethnic communities. For promotion, the most recent data I have in relation to promotion is that in a recent year within the last year or so, 11 per cent of the staff who were promoted were black, Asian or minority ethnical community based on their own self-declarations of course.

So that is I take it to be a positive indicator that while the overall proportion of the workforce continues to change and the most recent data for 2024 is marginally increased on the figures that you have in my statement for 2023, I didn't have that data when I completed by statement, but the figures for the workforce as a whole for 2024 show a marginal increase in the proportion of the workforce and those figures that I have been able to give you today for recent recruitment and recent promotion I think give me some degree of confidence that we are succeeding in our efforts, but still with a long way to go.

- Q. You also mention in your statement the structural embedding of practices designed to combat unwitting prejudice and bias, tell us about that?
- 4 Α. There are different examples. So for example, for quite 5 a long time the organisation has operated in all promotion and recruitment exercises, all details, 6 7 personal details, of candidates are removed from the information which is provided to people who take 8 9 decisions so that we be confident that decisions which 10 are made either at the recruitment stage or at promotion stage are made without any influence of unconscious bias 11 12 or such factors. So that is one example of that 13 structural practice which I was talking about there.
- Q. Thank you. You mention various other initiatives, the
 mentoring scheme, there's quite a lot detail about that
 in your statement already; the annual equalities
 conference and the public speaking competition for
 schools. You touched on that already and you explained
 that it has a particular focus on equalities.
- 20 A. That's correct.
- Q. Can you tell us a little bit more about that competition.
- A. Yes. So the competition I think now has been running

 for almost ten years and I can't quite remember the

 number of schools which compete across the country, but

1 it might be about a hundred. We recently, just in the last month or so, had the final of the competition, 2 3 which is supported, I'm very pleased to say, by the 4 Scottish Court Service and we're able to host the final 5 of that at Parliament House, which gives the opportunity for the children to come and speak in one of the courts 6 7 in Parliament House which they very much enjoy. But each year it's organised through our geographic 8 9 structure, so each of our six sheriffdoms will work with 10 local schools and will run local competitions which I think start around about October, November and through 11

structure, so each of our six sheriffdoms will work with local schools and will run local competitions which I think start around about October, November and through the winter the schools compete in various heats and then work their way through to national semi-finals and it seems to be a very successful event which the schools are very keen to promote and have young people engage in. We set the topic for the debates and the topics are always focused on issues of equalities.

- Q. Does this competition give the Crown Office the opportunity to raise awareness with a young audience, tomorrow's lawyers potentially, that there are careers to be had in Crown Office and that Crown Office is a place that encourages equality and diversity and inclusion?
- A. It's exactly that, yes, yes.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25 Q. Thank you. So you've outlined in some detail in

paragraph 3 of your statement the initiatives, the

efforts made by the Crown Office over the last 20 years

or thereby to eradicate institutional racism. And I

wanted to ask how would these efforts, how did these

efforts -- how would these efforts help a precognoscer

investigating the death of a black man in custody where

race was potentially a motivating factor?

A. So these are very much factors I was describing from the point of view of workforce and employment. You're turning now I think to the question of the actual work which we do and there I think we -- we do benefit from these broader issues because although they are focused on the workforce, I think what they do quite successfully, and I have seen this now particularly at the annual conference, they raise a very broad awareness across the whole workforce of the importance of equality.

The fact that staff are given time to take part in these efforts gives staff the confidence that equalities and inclusion is something that is important to the organisation and, therefore, I think that does provide a general background to the actual casework and the investigative work which I think is important. I think it would have been wrong for the organisation simply just to focus on the technical aspects of how we do our

investigative work or our prosecution work and not have 1 tackled these broader issues within the workforce. And 2 3 it would have been wrong not to try and be clear for 4 everyone in the organisation and for the public about 5 the fact that equality is an important value in the 6 organisation. 7 You obviously then need different approaches in relation do what I'm describing as that technical work 8 9 in relation to investigation and prosecution and there 10 we rely on the fact that we very much since 2010 embedded equalities across all areas of your work and I 11 12 therefore would expect that training in relation to 13 individual aspects of work would be the appropriate 14 place then to highlight important issues of equality and 15 if that is not there, then that would be something that we would have to correct and change. 16 Returning to the questions that you were asked in your 17 Q. statement, you were asked whether Crown Office remains 18 institutionally racist and you give a response at 19 20 paragraph 4. Again, I would like to read it in full and 21 then ask you some questions: "I do not believe that COPFS in 2024 is 22 institutionally racist in the way that it was in 2001, 23 but it is important to stress that the most important 24

assessment of institutional racism for an organisation

25

1	is an external one and the shared priority of our
2	leaders is to do all that we can to ensure that the
3	public, including victims and bereaved families,
4	minority ethnic communities and stakeholders, judge us
5	by our actions and the way in which we engage with them
6	It is their assessment as to whether we are
7	institutionally racist, together with external
8	benchmarking as described above, which guides and
9	motivates us. Our priority is to ensure that we do all
10	that we can to guard against the possibility that the
11	quality of our service we provide to a member of public
12	is impacted by that person's race, culture or language.
13	The ENEI TIDE guidance describes what I believe the
14	approach of COPFS to be in the following way:
15	"'Full inclusion is a temporary state few
16	organisations will ever achieve. However, the best
17	recognise this and understand that a drive for
18	continuous improvement is in the best interests of the
19	organisation, their employees and stakeholders'."
20	So you begin that paragraph by saying:
21	"I do not believe that COPFS in 2024 is
22	institutionally racist in the way that it was in 2021."
23	Just to be clear, are you saying that institutional
24	racism has been eradicated or that it's a work in
25	progress and part of an ongoing drive for continuous

improvement?

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 I'm saying that it's very much the latter point that Α. 3 it's a matter of continuous improvement and vigilance 4 and to work in an organisation which has been previously 5 judged to be institutionally racist I think is such an important reference point for the values that you wanted 6 7 to build in an organisation that I think it would be 8 foolish to say that you can ever eradicate it and that's 9 why I highlighted that quote from the ENEI guidance, because I thought that was quite a good way of 10 11 describing how I personally and how I think other 12 leaders in the organisation feel about it, that I do not believe we are institutionally racist as an 13 14 organisation, but I am not complacent and I'm trying to 15 signal in that answer that actually to some extent my 16 personal view of the view of my fellow leaders is less 17 important than the views that others form of us.

I often share with new colleagues in the organisation my personal view that it's not the results in the casework that we do -- these are not the things by which people judge us. People judge us by the way we treat them as an organisation. They remember how we made them feel and they don't judge us by the outcomes. People understand that we work in a system where it's not our job to guarantee outcomes. And I think that's

1 an important point to stress to particularly new members of staff who join the organisation, because our work 2 3 drives us very much to prepare cases, investigate deaths 4 and to reach a conclusion. And I think if you didn't take steps to guard against, it would be very easy for 5 us to fall into the trap of thinking that the way in 6 7 which we are judged is by the results of those cases or those investigations and I think what comes through here 8 9 in this question is my view that actually what is more 10 important is the way that you treat people when you are dealing with them. 11 12 Q. You quote the ENEI TIDE guidance: 13 "Full inclusion is a temporary straight few 14 organisations will ever achieve." 15 Is that statement essentially a warning against the type of complacency that you have described, a warning 16 17 to remain vigilant? It's very much how I interpret it and it's very much how 18 Α. I see the Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Service in 19 20 2024. We -- I don't see institutional racism in an 21 organisation which was judged to be institutionally 22 racist, I don't see that as being something that an organisation ever says, job done, we're finished with 23 that, we can move on to something else. It has to be 24

something that you are seen to be constantly vigilant

25

- about, paying attention to, learning when you make
 mistakes and you miss things and you get things wrong,
 but learning for the best of reasons, which is that you
 remain committed to getting it right and getting closer
 to that state of full inclusion, as referred to in the
 quote.
 - Q. You say in your statement that your priority is to do all that you can to guard against the possibility that the quality of the service that you provide will be impacted by the person's race, culture or language. In guarding against that possibility, do you continue to develop the sort of initiatives that you set out in paragraph 3 which we've already discussed, training, engagement and so on and so forth?
 - A. Yes, and we have a number of ways of doing that and so we have a mechanism within the organisation to ensured that this issue is constantly being looked at. We bring together the people in the organisation who are engaged in this work, but we're also looking for gaps or new things that we could do either in relation to learning from inquiries such as this or looking at what other prosecution or death investigation services do.

An example of that is after taking up my appointment, I came to the conclusion last year that there is a gap in our organisation, which is that we do

1 not have data to tell us the impact of our decision-making on different communities within Scotland 2 3 and so we do not have data which tells us -- I cannot 4 answer the question, because I do not have the data to 5 tell me whether, for example, a black man is more likely to be prosecuted or not in Scotland. And that to me 6 7 when I realised that last year from seeing some work that had been done elsewhere outside of Scotland, that 8 9 was something that I then started a process to make sure 10 that we could work towards filling that gap and developing that better understanding. 11 12 So I think that continuous improvement, as you've 13 referred to, is something that I think all of the 14 leaders in the organisation understand, look for 15 opportunities and I think we are doing that. The example that you just gave, can you tell us a little 16 Q. bit more about what you're doing to fill that gap --17 18 Α. Yes. 19 -- where the data do not currently exist? Q. Yes, and it's -- unfortunately, it's not an easy thing 20 Α. 21 to fix, because it depends on having data at scale in 22 relation to the race or ethnicity of accused, but also, having discussed it with other leaders in the 23 organisation, not just accused, but we think we should 24 25 also be able to answer these questions in relation to

1 victims as well. Therefore, that data is not widely available, as I understand it, having started to look at 2 3 this, either to the police or to the Procurator Fiscal 4 Service. So that we have started some conversations to 5 work out how we could do this and that would mean some very significant changes. 6 7 Now, an early indication is that with the implementation of the recent hate crime legislation 8 9 there may be a change on the part of policing and I can't speak for them today, but I have been advised that 10 there may have been a change on the part of policing in 11 12 the last year or so in relation to the data which they 13 collect in relation to either accused people or victims. 14 And if that is correct and is of the right sort of data 15 and at scale, then my hope is in the near to medium term we should be able to engage the sort of experts who can 16 17 assess that data and tell us whether or not -essentially tell us what the data shows. 18 19 Thank you. We're going to return to the theme of Q. 20 institutional racism, but at this juncture I would like 21 to ask you some questions about the crown's approach to 22 the precognition process following the death of Sheku Bayoh. 23 Now, do I understand correctly that you took a 24

conscious decision not to watch any of the evidence led

25

31

25

before the Inquiry? 1 2 Yes, that's correct. I have not watched any of the Α. 3 evidence of any other witnesses. 4 Q. That's helpful to know. What I can then do is read to 5 you passages from the evidence before inviting your 6 comment. 7 Firstly, however, can we go back to the evidence that you gave in April of this year. You may recall at 8 9 one stage you were read a passage from the statement of 10 your colleague Les Brown, who was the Solemn Legal Manager in the precognition process, in which 11 12 redescribed an incremental approach being taken by the 13 crown to the precognition process and he said: 14 "In essence, what we were doing here was try to 15 reach as quickly as possible a stage where Crown Counsel were able to exclude and otherwise criminality and then 16 17 allowed wider considerations to move forward in relation to issues that were considered relevant to a fatal 18 19 accident inquiry." 20 So you were read that passage from his statement and 21 you were invited to comment and what I'll do is simply 22 refresh your memory by reading over to you the transcript of your evidence. You made it known to the 23 Inquiry that you had been unaware that this approach had 24

been adopted in the circumstances of this particular

case and when asked to comment on the idea of an incremental approach, you said:

"What I would expect to happen is that an investigation would identify a number of issues which needed to be considered and it was clear to all of us who were involved in those initial days that the question of criminality was an immediate or obvious issue which would need to be explored in the investigation and, in simple terms, was an immediate priority.

"There may be wider issues which relate to broader learning which could came out of a fatal accident inquiry or an inquiry of this nature, but the priority would be to reach a decision on the criminal aspect as quickly as possible. I would not expect that would mean that those individual elements would be isolated off from each other and dealt with one at a time. The investigation would be trying to make progress on all of them at the same time as perhaps identifying particular priorities. I think our approach as much as possible is to progress the whole investigation.

"You wouldn't want a team looking at a criminal investigation and no one else dealing with the broader aspects that I have referred to until that team had finished. You would try to make sure there was sharing

1 of information and progress on all aspects at the same time." 2 3 So that's simply for the purposes of refreshing your memory as to the evidence that was put before you and 4 5 the evidence you gave back in April. Back in April, you were also asked questions by 6 7 senior counsel in response to which you agreed, as all other crown witnesses also did, that the crown 8 9 investigation required to meet the requirements of Article 2 of the ECHR, including the procedural 10 obligations which in turn include adequacy. And you 11 12 further agreed that where Article 14 was also engaged, there was an additional duty imposed on State 13 14 authorities to take all reasonable steps to unmask any 15 racist motive and to establish whether or not ethnic 16 hatred or prejudice may have played a role in events and 17 to pursue that investigation with vigour. So that's my summary of the evidence that's pertinent for today's 18 purposes that you gave back in April. 19 20 Finally, you were also asked by the Chair this 21 question: "In relation specifically to the issue of race, 22 would you agree that in the circumstances of this case 23 the issue of race might have a bearing on the question 24 of criminality?" 25

1	And you replied:
2	"I would agree that you could not consider the
3	question of criminality without considering the question
4	of race."
5	The Chair then said:
6	"So to that end, would you be expecting CAAPD to be
7	investigating the issue of race as part of their
8	exercise of investigating criminality?"
9	And you replied:
LO	"Insofar as it was relevant to the question that
L1	they were dealing with, yes, race was an issue that
L2	would need to be considered at the criminal stage."
13	You were asked:
L 4	"You would have to look at race in order to
L5	ascertain whether there was any evidence that did have a
L 6	bearing on criminality relating to race."
L7	And you agreed. And the Chair then said:
L8	"Would you see that as part of a thorough
L 9	investigation of the kind that you had referred to
20	earlier?
21	"Yes.
22	"And that a thorough investigation of that kind
23	would in turn inspire confidence in the family?"
24	And you replied:
25	"That would be the hope, yes."

So I appreciate I have given you quite a lot information. It's really just for the purposes of refreshing your memory of the aspect of your evidence in April that are perhaps germane to the questions I want to ask you today, the themes that I would like to explore with you today.

So against the background of your evidence and

So against the background of your evidence and particularly your evidence in relation to Article 2 and 14 and your expectations of what CAAPD would have been looking at as part of the precognition process and in particular their exercise of investigating criminality, I would like to share some evidence with you now as to the approach that was in fact taken by those tasked with carrying out the precognition and I do so because I appreciate you haven't watched any of the evidence.

So again, I would like to give you quite a lot information before inviting any comment.

Fiona Carnan was the fiscal depute who was tasked with drafting the analysis and she was asked about the approach that she took to race and she said that essentially it was a two stage process, that she was looking for evidence of criminality as if, and only if, she found evidence of criminality would she then go looking for evidence of a racial aggravation or motivation for that criminality. And in a statement

that she produced to the Inquiry she said this: 1 "If my analysis of evidence had established that 2 3 there was sufficient evidence to support criminal 4 charges against any of the officers, the question of any 5 racial motivation or intention would have been addressed at that stage. Since the analysis of evidence did not 6 7 identify a criminality by any officer, the question of racial aggravation did not arise since no offence had 8 9 been identified." 10 So that was the approach that she took. I then asked her whether she had taken certain matters that may 11 12 have a bearing on race or racial motivation into account 13 given the approach that she had outlined to us and also 14 given the absence of any express analysis in relation to 15 race within the analysis chapter of the precognition. So she was reminded that there was evidence 16 17 available to her at the time that she drafted the analysis that some officers were concerned they were 18 attending a terrorist incident. First on the scene in 19 20 particular were Walker and Paton. Constable Walker 21 said: 22 "It did across my mind he was doing this to get the police there, bearing in mind we're on a severe threat 23 level for an attack on the police." 24 25 And former Constable Paton said:

1	"It also ran through my mind that this male could be
2	part of a terrorist plot."
3	And later in the statement he produced he said:
4	"I kept thinking about the Lee Rigby boy, the
5	soldier who was killed."
6	So Ms Carnan was reminded of what Constables Walker
7	and Paton had said in their statements and then she was
8	asked:
9	"As part of the process you went through in your
10	analysis and in ensuring Article 2 and 14 compliance,
11	did you consider why the possibility of terrorism
12	crossed their minds?"
13	And she replied:
14	"I asked the question, although I think it had
15	already been answered, why they had considered
16	terrorism, because they had a briefing, two briefings in
17	the early month of 2015."
18	She was asked:
19	"Did you consider whether they would have thought
20	about terrorism if Mr Bayoh had been white?
21	"No.
22	"Did you consider whether they thought about
23	terrorism every time they went to a knife call?
24	"No.
25	"And did you consider why Constable Paton thought

1	about Lee Rigby in particular.
2	"I simply noted his position.
3	"You didn't give thought as to why he thought about
4	Lee Rigby.
5	"I didn't interpret it as being influenced by race,
6	no.
7	"Did you consider whether Constable Paton would have
8	been thinking about Lee Rigby if Sheku Bayoh had been
9	white?
LO	"I didn't ask that question.
11	"Did you consider whether there was evidence from
12	which the inference could be drawn that the colour of
L3	Mr Bayoh's skin was relevant to their concern that the
L 4	incident was related to terrorism?
L5	"I did not make that assessment."
L 6	She told us in her evidence that she made no
L7	reference to the use of racial tropes or negative
L8	stereotypes used by the response officers in their
L9	statements, because the use of racial tropes is not
20	criminal and evidence about negative attitudes would not
21	be relevant to the analysis, unless criminality was
22	identified. In her evidence I said to her:
23	"You'll be aware of racist stereotypes in society
24	that black men are more violent, unpredictable,
25	aggressive. You will have come across these, I would

```
imagine."
 1
 2
                 She said "I have". I asked her:
 3
                 "Did you examine the officers' statements for
             language of that sort?
 4
 5
                 "No.
                 "Did you consider patterns of behaviour whether, for
 6
 7
             example, they had used their sprays or drawn their
             batons at previous knife incidents?
 8
 9
                 "No.
                 "Did you consider whether they treated all knife
10
             calls as potentially terrorist related?
11
12
                 "No.
                 "Did you consider looking for comparator evidence,
13
14
             for example looking at history of use of sprays or use
15
             or force involving a baton, whether the officers had
             used sprays or batons before?
16
17
                 "No.
                 "Or whether they had used sprays or batons when
18
19
             detaining a white suspect?
20
                 "No."
21
                 She was asked questions around the speed of the
             incident, did she consider whether the speed with which
22
             the officers elected to use force was because he was
23
24
             black. She said:
25
                 "That wasn't my understanding. I think I have
```

1		explained my understanding of their perception was based
2		on a whole lot more than the colour of skin.
3		"Did you consider whether Constables Walker and
4		Paton opted for a hard stop may have been influenced by
5		race?"
6		And she replied again:
7		"We didn't cross the threshold into criminality so
8		that wasn't a consideration per se."
9		So Ms Carnan was candid in her evidence that these
10		questions were simply not asked by her as part of her
11		process of analysis.
12		Now, Stephen McGowan was taken through these
13		chapters of evidence in his own evidence and his comment
14		was invited and he said these are all relevant
15		questions. The same exercise was carried out with
16		Lindsey Miller and she agreed these were all relevant
17		questions.
18		Would you also agree with that? Is there anything
19		you would disagree with there?
20	Α.	There's quite a lot there, but, no, from what you read
21		out no, I don't there's nothing there I would
22		disagree with.
23	Q.	Stephen McGowan was asked:
24		"With hindsight, did the crown investigation take
25		all reasonable steps to unmask any racist motive?"

1 And he replied: "I think there are further steps that could have 2 3 been taken." 4 Lindsey Miller was asked the same question and she 5 replied: "On the basis part of Ms Carnan' evidence, no." 6 7 Would you agree with their sentiments? It's very difficult for me to answer that question, 8 Α. 9 because, as I think I said on the last occasion, 10 I wasn't involved in the investigation and in preparing to give evidence on the last occasion and today, 11 12 I wasn't asked or directed to that issue in this way 13 and, therefore, I neither have personal knowledge nor 14 have carried out any research in relation to the case 15 which allows me to form a personal view on the appropriateness of the level of investigation. 16 17 But from listening to the factors that you've read 18 out to me, as best as I can remember them, it appears to 19 me that the crown was carrying out two investigations 20 and I think it's always important to remember that in 21 some cases like this there are two investigations and 22 sometimes in our past it has been the practice essentially for the same person to carry out both 23 investigations at the same time is. 24 At this time, because we had developed specialisms, 25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

my understanding, and it is only my understanding, is

that -- because I wasn't personally involved is that

different aspects of each investigation were being

carried out by different people and not in parallel,

they were in sequence, and that's one of the things that

we've changed since the investigation.

I've given quite a lot thought to this, to the extent that it was raised with me on the last occasion, because it seems to me from the text that you have read out that Fiona Carnan was being asked about her consideration. As I understand it, she was part of the investigation considering criminality on the part of the individuals or the police force and she was being asked about her consideration of race as part of that. And it has led me to wonder whether that separation and specialisation is really what is at the root of the way in which those questions were being answered and that what it has exposed is whether or not, in the context of a criminal investigation, some of the factors which might be, for example, might not be admissible evidence in any criminal matter, but may be relevant to the broader questions you've highlighted and would therefore be considered by a death investigation leading to either a fatal accident inquiry or an inquiry like this, that that approach to separation and specialisation did not

1 help us here because these are all things that in my view should have been considered, not least because 2 3 of -- in addition to the question of the evidential 4 value they might have, it also becomes an important 5 factor in building the confidence of the nearest relatives that we ourselves in the way that we approach 6 7 our work understand issues of race and that we understand the importance of the broader question of 8 9 establishing what happened. 10 And so it's -- if I can bring that back to your original question and I make apologies for my lengthy 11 12 answer, but I think it is difficult for me, without 13 personal knowledge or research of the case itself, to 14 give you an answer today which is to say whether I 15 regard the investigation as satisfactory or not. I don't think I can do that. But I think what I can say 16 17 is that there were factors in the way that this investigation was set up and established that may have 18 19 led one part of the investigation not to consider a 20 broader range of information that may have been thought 21 relevant to a separate investigation and I use "separate" in that sense of the way in which we were 22 structured at the time. 23 Thank you. And there's no need to apologies. I think 24 Q. your response was shorter perhaps than the question that 25

1 I asked. You referred to there being two investigation and to them being separated out, that is the 2 3 investigation in relation to criminality and the broader 4 investigation around -- around death. And I think you 5 said that perhaps they were being considered by different people. 6 7 The evidence that we have heard is that there were not two parallel inquiries running here. There was 8 9 simply the investigation into criminality which 10 culminated, as far as the precognition process is concerned, in Fiona Carnan's preparation or drafting of 11 12 the analysis and the idea, as I understand it and I will 13 be corrected if I have misunderstood the evidence, was 14 that after a decision had been taken on criminality and 15 in the event the crown were to turn their minds to whether there should be fatal accident inquiry and to 16 17 begin to prepare for any such inquiry, these broader issues would be considered at that stage. They were not 18 being considered in parallel. It was very much a 19 20 sequential process. 21 Now, nothing may turn on that, but I wondered if 22 perhaps we were at slightly cross-purposes there. A. No, no, I can assure you we weren't. I didn't mean to 23 give the impression that I thought there were parallel 24

investigations. My understanding from the way the

25

questions were asked and my previous attendance at
the Inquiry is that there was a criminal investigation
and then there was going to be a consideration of
whether or not there should be, in the traditional way,
a fatal accident inquiry or something broader and deeper
such as this Inquiry.

Now, so I don't think for the moment that there was a parallel set of investigations here and that also fits with my experience of the time. There came about as a consequence of us having established specialist teams that where an incident gave rise to both a criminal investigation and the need to consider the consequences of the deaths, we did I think adopt a process of perhaps understandably trying to conclude the criminal investigation as quickly possible, but that was perhaps was done to the exclusion of the wider investigation.

And I think that's one of the things that we have changed and learned since 2015.

We now don't adopt that linear approach. We very much try to replicate the benefits that I think I spoke about on the last occasion of the traditional approach where the local procurator fiscal would carry out all aspects of the investigation and, therefore, I think we have tried to recreate that but still maintain the benefit of having specialist teams.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, the difficulty that I've thought about since giving evidence on the last occasion is this question of race that I was being asked about and the extent to which it should be considered in the criminal investigation and that has made me think of, in the context of a criminal investigation, our prosecutorial approach to race has very much been driven I think by the need to prioritise and tackle hate crime. And those are cases in which there is very often obvious evidence of racial hatred either before the incident or after the incident or during the incident and that evidence is admissible and, therefore, the prosecutor can't put it before the court and seek a conviction for hate crime under one of the legislative mechanisms that exists. What I have begun to think about I think since giving evidence on the last occasion is that a death investigation without any criminal investigation may

What I have begun to think about I think since giving evidence on the last occasion is that a death investigation without any criminal investigation may have available to it evidence which doesn't fit that category that I have just described that we are more traditionally used to as prosecutors and that is I think the sort of factors that you were highlighting that were put to Fiona Carnan. And the question that was put to me on the previous occasion was really the extent to which we should use and rely on that information as part of the criminal investigation and I still maintain,

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I think, my answer from the previous occasion that the prosecutors should be looking at that.

There are two reasons for that. One is it is important to build an understanding as to whether or not, in the absence of any of the explicit evidence of racism, whether that information provides a basis for the prosecutor to seek a conviction which has an element of hate crime to it. The second element is the one I have already referred to, which is it's important to demonstrate to the victims or the nearest relatives in a death case that we are not -- that we understand those issues and we have taken account of them. But the difficulty is that that type of evidence and information that you're referring to doesn't neatly fit in in the criminal context into being admissible relevant evidence for a criminal offence and I suspect that is the heart of the issue that was ultimately being explored with Fiona Carnan and, to my knowledge, that question in Scotland is unexplored in a criminal trial, the extent to which prosecutors could bring before the court the type of information that you're talking about and rely on it to seek a conviction, but that doesn't mean it shouldn't be considered for the reasons I have talked about and I think that's, to my mind, the importance of considering it.

- 1 Q. Thank you. That was a very full and detailed answer.
- 2 A. I'm sorry.
- 3 Q. No, please, don't apologise. It's a very helpful
- 4 answer, but, if I may, I'll and some follow-up questions
- 5 in relation to that answer. You gave evidence back in
- 6 April and I reminded you of it this morning that one
- 7 cannot consider criminality without also giving
- 8 consideration to race. And you've given evidence that
- 9 the sort of matters that Fiona Carnan told us she didn't
- 10 consider, the sort of questions that she didn't ask
- 11 herself, were all matters that in your view ought to
- have been considered as part of the process of
- 13 considering criminality, and not parked until such time
- 14 as consideration might have been given to preparation
- for an FAI, and you've put forward two reasons for that.
- 16 First, around building an understanding of whether
- even absent explicit overt examples of racisms, slurs,
- things of that sort, there might be a basis to invite
- 19 the court to convict of one or other of the hate crimes
- and the second reason being that it inspires the
- 21 confidence of the family in the approach that the crown
- 22 are taking and I suppose the confidence of the public
- more broadly.
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. You said too that there may be issues around

admissibility and relevancy. We were looking primarily at things said by officers in their statements and we did have evidence from the allocated Advocate Depute,

Ashley Edwards KC, that she was of the view that the statements would pass the test for admissibility. She took us to a case called Johnstone and said that that was her statement that these statements would be admitted in evidence and that she would always take the crown case at its highest.

So that may or may not have been an issue, but regardless of whether there were concerns around admissibility and relevancy, I hear you say that these were matters that should have been considered as part of the process. And are these matters that you would then have expected not only to be considered in the precognoscers or the analyst's head, but set out in the analysis of the evidence to demonstrate that they had been considered, irrespective of the conclusion reached by the analyst following upon that consideration?

A. Yes, in my experience, all aspects of the case preparation that are considered in that way should be set out in writing, because that is how you reach a well-informed decision for the decision-maker at a subsequent stage because you're describing a process which you and you others but not everyone might

understand that the precognoscer is not the

decision-maker, the precognoscer is the investigator,

and it's their job to gather the evidence, to analyse it

and make recommendations.

So in my view there would be little value in considering something but not recording the different factors that you had looked at, the balancing that you had performed and the conclusion that you had come to and you do that in order to assist the person who then takes the decision in the knowledge that they may disagree with you, but they can only do that effectively if they have had access to your thinking on the matter.

Q. Now, ultimately, it will be for the Chair to the Inquiry to determine whether the precognition process was compliant with Articles 2 and 14, but there is at least a possibility that the Chair may take the view that the crown's approach to race was inadequate.

If the Chair were to take that view, I would be interested in your comments on this matter. In relation to Fiona Carnan, who was candid in her evidence that she simply didn't ask herself any of the questions around use of language, patterns of behaviour, comparators and so on, would you see those failings, if they are deemed by the Chair to be failings, to be personal failings or institutional ones, possibly both?

1 Α. I would regard them as institutional failings, not 2 personal failings and I say that because the individual 3 was working within a system that had been established by 4 the organisation. And given the factors that I have 5 described in my analysis and my thinking of this since April, I think what was being described to the Inquiry 6 7 was something that arises from the way in which the crown was structured to focus on specialism and, 8 9 therefore, it wasn't something about the individual's 10 approach to it. And if there are other factors which led to it, such as a lack of clarity or a lack of 11 12 guidance on understanding the importance of race, then 13 those would be institutional as well, rather than 14 personal. So I would regard it as an institutional 15 matter. And what about the Solemn Legal Manager who ultimately 16 Q. 17 countersigned the precognition, and didn't identify these failings, if indeed they are failings, would you 18 19 see the Solemn Legal Manager's endorsement of that 20 precognition as what might be thought to be an adequate 21 precognition or might be concluded to be an inadequate 22 precognition? Would you see the Solemn Legal Manager's 23 failing in that regard as a personal one or 24 institutional one?

So again, I have to address that I wasn't directed to

25

Α.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I think my answer to that would be the same as in the previous. If it's institutional for one person who is part of a case, then those factors are relevant I think for others. But I think it's important to say that the factors that we're talking about here were not, as I understand it, factors which were ignored altogether and not considered relevant.

Having concluded the criminal investigation, my understanding is that the organisation then -- not in parallel, but then turned its mind to what the appropriate outcome of the death investigation should be. Now, I stand to be corrected, but my understanding is that -- my understanding is that the organisation came to the conclusion, ultimately it would be the decision of Crown Counsel, that a fatal accident inquiry would not be adequate in this case and the reason would be that a fatal accident inquiry would have too narrow a perspective and it was therefore the crown's assessment that an inquiry of this nature was required and, therefore, the crown's analysis in my ways led to the establishment of this Inquiry by, as I understand it, the Lord Advocate making representations to Scottish ministers that the death investigation could not be satisfactorily concluded by fatal accident inquiry.

And I think that my perspective, having thought about these issues that you have highlighted since April, is that they must have been part of that thinking, because what you're highlighting are very relevant factors into the consideration of Mr Bayoh's death, but there was a need for them to be properly explored in detail in a way which could look at the sort of issues that you're describing.

- Q. Again, I stand to be corrected if I am wrong or mistaken in what I'm about to say, but my understanding is that the Inquiry has not heard any evidence of any further consideration being given to these issues or any further analysis of their potential import between the decision that no proceedings should be taken against the attending officers and this Inquiry being constituted.

 I will be corrected if I'm wrong, but that's my recollection of the evidence before the Inquiry to date, that those matters have not been revisited.
- A. So to help the Inquiry, I think there are two factors that are relevant there. One is I am basing my comments today on the way in which the information was put to me, I think on the previous occasion, that it was described by colleagues as being sequential and it was not for one stage of the Inquiry, but it would be for the next.

But the second factor is also that the crown's

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Scottish ministers establish a public inquiry. That was not, as I understand it, what happened. Now, I have to preface that by saying I wasn't involved in those discussions, but my understanding is that the Lord Advocate at the time on the conclusion of the criminal investigation then had to give very, very careful consideration as to what the next steps should be and one of those options would have been a fatal accident inquiry and that was judged to be inadequate, because of the limitations in the legislation and how a fatal accident inquiry works and, therefore, my personal view is the Lord Advocate judged it to be appropriate that there should be a broader inquiry and made those recommendations to Scottish ministers. That, it seems to me, must have been based on a broader analysis than would have been provided for Crown Counsel in the criminal case. Any consideration which I have ever been involved in relation to a death investigation doesn't just look just at the evidence that's relevant for criminality, but looks at a broader range of circumstances. No, doubt the Inquiry, if it deems it necessary and Q. helpful, can explore why the crown took that position

and to what extent the issues that we have been

criminal investigation did not just cease and then

1 exploring our evidence today around language, comparator evidence, patterns of behaviour and so on were relevant 2 3 to that consideration. And I should be very clear, I am not saying that I have 4 Α. 5 personal knowledge that they were, but it seems to me from the way they were described on the previous 6 7 occasion that may have been the intention of what Fiona Carnan was trying to describe. 8 Thank you. But turning for present purposes to 9 Q. 10 consideration of the criminal aspects and the possibility that a view may be taken that the 11 12 precognition process, that is the precognition process 13 that explored the possibility of criminality on the part 14 of the attending officers, was inadequate, we have 15 talked about Ms Carnan, the analyst, and your view is that any failings on her part would have been 16 17 institutional rather than personal and you hold the same opinion in relation to the Solemn Legal Manager. 18 I wonder if we can consider briefly the position of 19 20 the Allocated Advocate Deputy, Ms Edwards KC. She was 21 asked: "When you said here race didn't really feature in 22 the examination of the actual restraint you were 23 focusing on the actions." 24 And she replied: 25

"Yes, the actus reus as opposed to the mens rea." 1 2 She was asked: 3 "Right. So did race feature in the examination of the mens rea, the state of mind?" 4 This is in terms of her own analysis and I should 5 say, before I say anything further, Mr Logue, 6 7 the Inquiry cannot probe the actual decision taken by a Crown Counsel and I cannot and any questions around 8 9 that. 10 Ms Edwards replied: "It did and you have asked me that already and I 11 12 have said absolutely. So the question that I'm asking 13 in my head, why did that officer do that? Why did he do that at that particular time? What I needed to be clear 14 15 in my mind, first of all, was what was that? What was the factual matrix? So once we had that and there might 16 17 have been points where we just couldn't say this happened or that didn't happen, but that's what we were 18 19 trying to get through through the investigation of the 20 actual facts, what could we say were the elements of the 21 actual restraint. "And once that was in place, I could and the 22 question, why did that happen? Why did that officer do 23 that? Why did that take place then? Why was something 24 else not done? Was that reasonable?" 25

1	She was then asked:
2	"And in terms of this, you said it was going on, the
3	thought process was going on in your head?
4	"Yes.
5	"Was there any analysis that we could look at on
6	paper where we could follow that rationale, that
7	process? You have said that you were asking yourself
8	why did the police officer do that? Was that
9	reasonable?"
LO	And she replied:
11	"So the thing that ultimately came to help me with
12	that, when I'm looking at a case, I'm reconstructing in
13	my head, I'm asking questions and if there's a gap where
L 4	I don't know where the answer is, it is either because I
15	am not understandings what's been told to me or I simply
16	don't have that information. That's when I look around
L7	and say, okay, I need further help or information on
18	that or I need an expert to help me."
19	So that was her evidence. If I might read that
20	short, it appears that she was saying that she took
21	took race into account when looking at the case and in
22	particular in her analysis of mens rea, but there was no
23	evidence that this was a matter that was committed to
24	paper in any sense.
>5	And again if the Chair looking at the hymothesis

1 that the Chair may take the view that that process, that approach, was inadequate, would you see that failing as 2 3 being an individual one or an institutional one? 4 Α. I'm sorry. Can you be clear about the nature of the 5 failure that you're describing? Well, the evidence that she gave was that she did take 6 Q. 7 race into account in considering mens rea, but her thought process does not appear to have been committed 8 9 to paper. I suppose that may raise an issue for 10 the Chair as to the extent to which she can be satisfied those matters were in fact taken into account. I think 11 12 you said yourself in evidence there's little value in 13 considering a matter but not recording the factors that 14 you looked at and the conclusions that you came to. 15 If the Chair were to take the view, particularly in the absence of any form of audit trail here, that her 16 17 analysis of race again was inadequate and so to the extent that she failed to take into account to the 18 19 degree that might have been expected the matters that 20 were put to Ms Carnan which we've discussed this 21 morning, would you see that as being an individual failing or an institutional one? 22 A. I think I would need to know more about the 23 circumstances of the decision-making and how it was 24 25 done. Was it done by -- it's difficult to say without

knowing more about the way which the decision was done.

Sometimes these decisions can be informed by very

detailed discussion by all of the people who have worked

on the case. Sometimes they're taken by individuals who

base their decision just on the written material. It's

very difficult to say on this specific example without

being involved or knowing more about it.

Q. I appreciate that and I regret I can't help you further with that because the Inquiry can't probe the decision.

The information that I have provided to you is really the extent of the evidence that Ms Edwards was permitted to give on that subject.

Perhaps finally and for completeness, we should also consider the position of the Lord Advocate here. We've heard evidence from both Ms Edwards and James Wolffe KC that the process that was adopted here was that

Ms Edwards prepared Crown Counsel's instructions in draft which were sent to the Lord Advocate effectively for approval by him. And Mr Wolffe gave evidence that he had a meeting with Crown Counsel at which her draft Crown Counsel instructions were discussed. And he was asked:

"Do you remember preparing for this meeting with Crown Counsel and considering the papers that you had available? Did you notice that there was an absence of

1 analysis in relation to race? Was that something that 2 you were alert to, alive to, when you read the 3 material?" 4 And he replied: 5 "Well, I mean I was certainly alert to the background of race. I mean I cannot now remember --6 7 well, I think perhaps I could go as far as to say I would be surprised if I didn't ask her about her 8 9 thinking in relation to the question of whether race 10 played into the question of criminality, but it would be not fair either to her or to anybody else to put it 11 12 higher than that and, you know, she may have a recollection that I don't have. I think I would be 13 14 surprised and disappointed in myself, if I can put it 15 that way, if I didn't ask her questions about that aspect of the case, because it was clearly a core 16 17 question." 18 Now, with the caveat that the Inquiry cannot probe the decision taken in this case and, therefore, has not 19 20 seen Crown Counsel's instruction, Mr Wolffe doesn't 21 appear to have a clear recollection of a discussion 22 around race and, again, the Inquiry does not have before it any paper trail, any minutes from this meeting, 23 anything that would allow the Inquiry to be satisfied 24 that the issue of race was explored and discussed 25

1 between Crown Counsel and the Lord Advocate. 2 In the absence of any paper trail, it would be open 3 to the Chair to give consideration to the extent to 4 which such a conversation took place and if the Chair 5 were perhaps to conclude that the matter of race was not explored or was not explored adequately as between 6 7 Crown Counsel and the Lord Advocate, then, again, can I invite your views as to whether you would see that as a 8 9 personal failing on the part of the Lord Advocate or an institutional one? 10 I'm afraid my answer to that is very similar to the last 11 Α. 12 one. I wasn't part of the discussion and I don't think 13 I can properly and fairly help the Inquiry by offering a 14 view as to whether I think that would be a fair or 15 proper criticism of the way in which the decision was 16 taken. Q. That's very fair. Thank you. 17 18 Can we just before we conclude, we ordinarily take a 19 break at around about half past 11, perhaps return to 20 paragraph 2 of your statement. 21 In paragraph 2, here we are, you set out 22 Lord Macpherson's definition of institutional racism: "The collective failure of an organisation to 23 provide an appropriate and professional service to 24 people because of their colour, culture or ethnic 25

1 origin. It can be seen or detected in processes, attitudes and behaviour, which amount to discrimination 2 3 through unwitting prejudice, ignorance, thoughtlessness 4 and racist stereotyping which disadvantage minority 5 ethnic people." Now, perhaps leaving to one side Crown Counsel and 6 7 the Lord Advocate, because I appreciate the limitations of the information before the Inquiry upon which I can 8 ask you to express any view, but focusing perhaps on the 9 10 failures or potential failures of the analyst and the Solemn Legal Manager, if the Chair were to take the view 11 12 that the precognition process was inadequate insofar as 13 it didn't consider or did not adequately consider the 14 question of race, do you have a view as to how those 15 failings might measure up when read against the definition of institutional racism? 16 Well, both of those aspects I think would fall to be 17 Α. treated as failures in processes, I think, from the way 18 that we've described them. And I think your question is 19 20 if the Inquiry determines that that -- I think your 21 question is if the Inquiry determines that that amounts to institutional racism? 22 No, sorry. If the Inquiry were to take the view -- if 23 Q. 24 the Chair to the Inquiry were to take the view that the 25 precognition process was not adequate as required by

Articles 2 and 14 of the Convention, insofar as it did 1 not properly consider race or a racial motivation, then 2 3 when we look at that failing against the definition of 4 institutional racism, I'm wondering whether we might 5 find ourselves in the territory of not only an institutional failing but institutional racism? 6 7 It's a very difficult question. It's a very difficult Α. question to answer. And I say that not because of -- I 8 9 say that because, as I mentioned earlier, I wasn't party to the broader consideration that followed after the 10 conclusion of the criminal investigation and I think 11 12 I would really need to know more about that part of the 13 crown's duties really to be able to provide a definitive 14 answer to the question that you're asking, but what I 15 can say is this. That there is no doubt that the factors that I think led to those failings that you're 16 17 describing I think are factors that have been recognised and I think some work has been done and more work still 18 needs to be done to ensure that those -- those are 19 20 institutional elements that I have accepted do not 21 recur. But I would -- I would think it's a very fair 22 question for the Inquiry to consider in terms of this 23 definition and the question of process, the extent and 24

impact of the failures that you have described.

25

```
1
         Q. Thank you. Can you bear with me a moment, please. I'm
             conscious, sir, that --
 2
 3
         LORD BRACADALE: We'll take a 20-minute break at this point.
 4
         (11.34 am)
 5
                                (A short break)
 6
         (11.59 am)
         LORD BRACADALE: Ms Thomson.
 7
         MS THOMSON: Thank you.
 8
 9
                 Mr Loque, I would like to move on to ask you some
10
             questions now about training and guidance and perhaps an
             easy way into this would be to read you a short chapter
11
12
             from Lindsey Miller's evidence. I asked her:
13
                 "Had guidance been published within Crown Office as
14
             to how to recognise racial bias in an investigation of
15
             this sort?"
                 We were concerned with the period during which this
16
17
             precognition was undertaken, so roughly 2015 to 2018,
18
             and she replied:
                 "There's certainly considerable guidance in relation
19
20
             to the investigation of racially motived crime and the
21
             use of the then racial aggravations when preparing cases
             for prosecution."
22
23
                 And I said to her:
24
                 "We have looked at what was chapter 44 of the
25
             Precognoscer's Handbook which deals with section 50(a)
```

1		and section 96, the racial motivation for racial
2		aggravations, so that chapter of the Handbook certainly
3		deals with the nuts and bolts of how to approach those
4		two sections and it explored what the threshold was for
5		each. But in terms of where to look for the evidence of
6		racial bias, how to approach that task, was there any
7		published guidance?"
8		And she replied:
9		"I'm not sure that there is. I might be wrong about
LO		that, but I'm not sure that there is on that specific
L1		issue."
L2		And I said:
L3		"Okay. Do you think that's something that might be
L 4		helpful?"
L5		And she said, "yes".
16		Can you add anything to the evidence she has already
L7		given? To the best of your knowledge was there
L8		2015/2018 and indeed is there now any guidance within
L 9		Crown Office as to how to recognise racial bias in an
20		investigation of this type?
21	Α.	I think you're identifying a gap there in our guidance
22		and, again, this is something I have thought about since
23		I last gave evidence and
24		(YouTube frozen)
25		which relates to the broader understanding of how

1 in an investigation, whether that's a criminal or a death investigation, to identify these broader factors 2 3 that you're describing. And I think what would have to 4 go with that guidance would be an addition to our 5 training on factors that you've identified such as the use of language and such like in the context of an 6 7 investigation. Q. Can I ask you to have a look at some guidelines that 8 9 have been prepared by the PIRC. If we can bring these 10 up on the screen, please, they're PIRC 04724. Now, Michelle MacLeod, who is the Commissioner, gave evidence 11 12 last week and she approved these guidelines and had a hand in the drafting of these guidelines. They were 13 14 published in November of 2021, but they're based on or 15 an adaptation of guidelines issued by the IOPC back in 2015. 16 17 So we see on the first page here: "PIRC guidelines for dealing with allegations of 18 19 discrimination when undertaking investigations and 20 complaint handling reviews." 21 Have you seen these before? 22 No, I haven't. Α. All right. What I would like to do is take you on a 23 Q. whistle-stop tour through these guidelines just so that 24 you have the a sense of what they contain and then 25

1 simply invite your comment as to whether it might be helpful for the Crown Office to consider introducing 2 3 something similar. 4 So I wonder if we can begin -- we can skip through 5 that preliminaries and turn to page 6, please, which is headed up "What is discrimination?" and we can read this 6 7 short, but this chapter begins by looking at the Equality Act which defines unlawful discrimination and 8 9 prohibits discrimination relating to the protected 10 characteristics which are then listed and they include, of course, both race and religion. 11 12 If we scroll to the bottom of the page, this is 13 relevant perhaps more in context of policing, but 14 there's a reference to the standards of professional 15 behaviour required for police constables to the effect that they must not discriminate unfairly. And then 16 17 building on that framework on the next page, that's 18 page 7, there is a heading "Discrimination and human rights" and a paragraph or two on Article 14: 19 20 "Article 14 of the ECHR also provides protection 21 from discrimination. This protection only applies where 22 it is alleged this discrimination has effected a person's ability to enjoy one or more of the other 23 rights set out in the Convention. For example, 24 Article 14 would apply if an allegation was made that 25

1 discriminatory actions led to a death in custody as a 2 death in custody would engage Article 2. For the purposes of Article 14, discrimination is where a person 3 4 is treated less favourably than another person in a 5 similar situation and the treatment cannot be objectively and reasonably justified." 6 7 So this chapter gives the framework around discrimination, the Equality Act, Article 14 and there's 8 a reference too to the standards of professional 9 behaviour that apply in policing. 10 If we move to the bottom of that page, there's a 11 12 section headed "Tests for discrimination" and a definition is given of "direct discrimination" as being: 13 14 "When someone is treated less favorable than another 15 person because of a protected characteristic or characteristics." 16 17 And if we scroll to the top of the page 8, it is 18 said that: 19 "Less favorable treatment suggests a comparison, 20 less favourably than who? The who is a person in the 21 same situation who does not have the same protected characteristic. For example, you might compare the 22 treatment of a black person to how a white person would 23 have been treated in the same circumstances (making this 24 comparison is a key part of the investigation or 25

1	review)."
2	And there's a little text box further down that
3	says:
4	"In determining whether there has been direct
5	discrimination, the question to ask is would the person
6	be treated in this way but for their protected
7	characteristic."
8	If we could perhaps scroll now to page 16, where
9	there's a heading "Understanding the allegation of
10	discrimination":
11	"Discrimination can be overt and expressed as open
12	hostility or use of offensive degrading language.
13	However, it is more than just these things. Direct
14	discrimination includes actions that are informed by
15	biased assumptions or prejudice in respect of a
16	protected characteristic, even if this is done
17	unconsciously."
18	And focus is brought in the next paragraph to the
19	need for an investigating officer to have an
20	understanding of what discriminatory assumptions might
21	be.
22	And if we can just look in passing at the various
23	headings on this page:
24	"The investigating officer should consider what does
25	the complainer say and take time to understand why the

complainer feels he's been discriminated against." 1 2 And I skipped over an earlier passage, Mr Loque, 3 that made clear that in the context of a death we simply 4 substitute next of kin for complainer. 5 There is then a heading: "What do you know? Are there any stereotypes or 6 7 common assumptions made about at the protected characteristic group that you are aware of which might 8 9 be relevant to consider?" Ms Macleod in her evidence last week said that the 10 PIRC recognise that they perhaps should not assume that 11 12 all of their investigating officers will have a good working knowledge of stereotypes around discrimination. 13 14 Her focus of course on race. And I understand that 15 these guidelines are either being reviewed or expanded upon or supplemented in some way and that a list of 16 17 illustrations is to be provided to ensure that it's not taken for granted that investigators will recognise 18 19 stereotypes when they come across them. 20 There's then a heading "What do you need to find 21 out?" and the suggestion is made that: "In more serious cases it may be appropriate to seek 22 external expertise, for example, from an advisory group, 23 a community advocacy organisation or from a legal or 24 academic expert." 25

1 If we carry on a little bit further, there's a heading "Racism": 2 3 "In the context of complaints of race discrimination, it includes any discrimination relating 4 to race, ethnicity or nationality." 5 And an example is worked up involving a black man. 6 7 Let's read it short. It concerns a 19-year-old Asian man who suffers from Asperger's Syndrome and autism who 8 9 says that he was arrested by police and questioned about 10 why he had come to the United Kingdom from Pakistan and was assaulted when he was arrested and he considers that 11 12 the questioning was motivated by racism and that his 13 conditions meant that he was unable to effectively 14 engage with the police. 15 And then the example works through how such an allegation might be handled by an investigator and we 16 17 see that: 18 "The investigator should ask themselves what types 19 of assumptions, prejudices or bias might lead to an 20 Asian man with Asperger's Syndrome and autism being 21 treated differently due to his race and resulting in the use of excessive force. Would a white man with similar 22 issues acting in the same way be treated by these 23 officers in the same way?" 24 And if we move on to the next page, I'm just picking 25

1 out the parts of this example that appear to be 2 pertinent here: 3 "So drawing on background information and the 4 details of the discrimination allegation provided, the 5 investigating officer identifies questions to be addressed through the investigation and these include, 6 7 were the officers aware or could they have been reasonably expected to be aware that Mr A had difficulty 8 9 engaging because of his conditions? What assessments were made to take account of his conditions? How was 10 this reflected in the actions taken? In light of his 11 12 challenges, was it appropriate for him to be arrested and taken to a cell?" 13 14 And again the comparative question: 15 "Would a white man with similar challenges have been arrested in these circumstances? Where assumptions made 16 17 that has behaviour was as a result of drug taking, aggression or criminality, rather than symptoms of 18 Asperger's Syndrome and autism and a reflection of 19 20 vulnerability? Would similar assumptions have been made 21 if he was white? And is there any indication that the officers involved hold negative views of Asian people or 22 that he was targeted because of his race?" 23 24 So these are the sorts of questions that an investigator should look to answer through the course of 25

1 the investigation.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

If we could turn to page 32, which is a section headed "Conducting the investigation." This section highlights the importance of the understanding acquired at the beginning of the investigation and how this will inform key lines of inquiry. And reading short the text that we see on the page here, it stresses the importance of looking not only at the lines of inquiry that you would expect to be followed in any case involving statements, CCTV, and so on and so forth, but to take cognisance on the fact that in discrimination cases there may be little or no direct evidence to support an allegation, particularly the case if the allegation is about discriminatory actions arising from prejudice, assumptions or attitudes and so the investigation will need to consider whether there is other evidence which supports the allegation of discrimination and this might include looking at the officers' complaints history, patterns of behaviour.

I think we can read this short. And over the page, on page 33, there's also a suggestion that:

"Comparator evidence should also be considered.

This will involve comparing how the complainer was treated against a person in the same situation who does not have the same protected characteristic."

21

22

23

24

25

1 And finally, on page 34, there's a section headed "Discriminatory Language": 2 3 "As part of the consideration, the investigator 4 should assess the language used, including language used 5 in any records relating to the incident in question or arising from the complaint investigation. This includes 6 7 any use of obviously discriminatory language, but also more subtle indicators that a person may have acted or 8 9 made a decision based on prejudicial assumptions. There 10 are terms that are commonly recognised as being offensive and officers and police staff members should 11 12 be expected not to use them. However, there are other 13 words and phrases which are inoffensive in themselves, 14 but when heard in context can reasonably be thought of 15 as being discriminatory." So that was a very quick run through the Guidelines, 16 17 but hopefully will have given you a flavour of the guidelines that have been in force within the PIRC since 18 19 2021. 20

And I'm interested to know simply whether you feel that guidelines of this type, not identical guidelines, but guidelines of this sort might help to correct the gap that we have identified in your current training and guidance provision within Crown Office?

A. I do, but I think if I could make a couple of points

just to put it in context.

2 Q. Yes.

24

25

One is that the early part of the guide which you showed 3 Α. 4 me, which I would describe as having very general 5 material, I think is well available to colleagues in the Procurator Fiscal Service in what I would describe as 6 7 our more general guidance and training material in relation to equalities. The more specific parts of the 8 9 guidance, the later part of the document, I think we 10 have begun to take steps to develop and implement quidance of that nature, but I would not describe it as 11 12 complete. So for example, I think I said on the last 13 occasion I gave evidence that there was specific 14 guidance focused on Article 2, but also Article 14 15 I think in relation to some of the more specialist teams that now investigate categories of deaths. So, for 16 17 example, we've established since 2015 a team which deals 18 with deaths in custody and they have -- if I remember 19 correctly, it was back in April I last looked, they have 20 specific guidance in relation to deaths which deals with 21 the issues through the question of the Convention 22 articles. What I think is helpful in this guidance that 23

What I think is helpful in this guidance that

I don't think we have enough emphasis on is the broader

look at, for example, I think it's described as being

1 language which may give an indication, the less overt language and the language which gives rise to 2 3 considerations of assumptions that may be discriminatory 4 of such -- I think I see in this guidance quite a 5 helpful way of linking that to the investigative role and I think in the past I think we have perhaps relied 6 7 too much on it being available as a general source of guidance for all aspects of our work and not focused it 8 9 in this way on the investigative and prosecution 10 functions which we perform. Thank you. It wasn't -- I didn't mean to suggest that 11 Q. 12 you might import these guidelines wholesale. I simply 13 wonder whether guidelines of this sort might potentially 14 inform or inspire bespoke guidance within Crown Office? 15 As I say, I think we started that process. I think Α. these guidelines -- as always when you do something like 16 17 this, you learn from others who have gone ahead of you 18 and you develop your own features and I think there is something here for us to do in that area. 19 20 Q. Thank you. I would like to move on to another topic now 21 and ask you some questions concerning the murder of a 22 man called Simon San. Now, to get our bearings, I'm going to ask you to 23 24 look, firstly, at a review of the way that the police

investigated his murder, but the end point is going to

25

1		be that I will take you to a Crown Office press release
2		that has your name on it and I'm particularly interested
3		in asking a question or two around your knowledge of the
4		press release.
5	Α.	Okay.
6	Q.	And the Crown Office position as set out in that press
7		release.
8		But I wonder if we can begin, largely for the
9		benefit of the public listening to this case, by getting
10		our bearings by going to the Operation Waymark executive
11		report. This is PS18902. And we see this was what's
12		now the legacy force Lothian and Borders Police,
13		Operation Waymark and inquiry into the questions and
14		complaints raised by the San family. This was an
15		internal investigation carried out by Lothian and
16		Borders Police. And on page 3 there is a little
17		background about at the case that will set the scene.
18		We are told here that:
19		"On 11 August 2010, Simon San, a 40-year-old male of
20		Chinese origin, was attacked and assaulted by a group of
21		youths in the street in Lochend, Edinburgh. He died the
22		following morning from the injuries he sustained."
23		In paragraph 1.2 it is explained that he was
24		employed as a delivery driver at his sister's takeaway
25		premises close to the place of the attack.

1 At paragraph 1.4: "On the evening in question, he was working for his 2 3 sister delivering food from her shop and at about 10 o'clock at night, after making a delivery, he 4 5 returned to the shop and parked his car on the road near to the premises." 6 1.5: 7 "Prior to alighting from his vehicle, a group of 8 9 youths, males and females, approached Simon's motor car and started to rock it. As Simon exited the vehicle and 10 telephoned 999, he was attached and punching, causing 11 12 him to fall to the ground and strike his head rendering 13 him unconscious. His mobile phone and car keys were 14 subsequently stolen." 15 At 1.6 we are told that the emergency services arrived, he was taken to hospital by ambulance but did 16 17 not recover consciousness and life was pronounced extinct on the morning of 12 August. 18 19 At 1.7: 20 "Lothian and Border Police instigated a major 21 investigation, Operation Millennium, into the attack. 22 Four males between the ages of 14 and 16 were arrested and reported to the Fiscal and one accused, John Reid, 23 plead guilty to culpable homicide less than two months 24 after the death of Simon San." 25

1 So that is the background. If we might turn to page 4 now, please. Allegations made by the family at 3.1. 2 3 It is said that 39 allegations, all non-criminal, and 11 questions were identified from the initial statement 4 5 noted from the family. For the purposes of the report, they were summarised into areas of concern. And I 6 7 simply wish to note here, the third bulletpoint, the concern raised by the family of a failure by Lothian and 8 9 Borders Police to recognise that at the attack on Simon 10 was racist and denial that that this was a motive at an early stage. 11 12 If we can turn to page 7, this is the outcome of the 13 investigation in this regard. 6.1 "Racist motivation": 14 "The police failings on this specific element 15 throughout the investigation into the attack on Simon have been one of the key sources of distress, 16 17 frustration and anger for the family. The first question asked is why the police are not taking account 18 of the family's perception that this is a racist 19 20 incident." 21 And this was a letter written 12 days after the death. 22 6.2: 23 "The Stephen Lawrence Inquiry report defines a 24 racist incident as being any incident which is perceived 25

1 to be racist by the victim or any other person. This definition was adopted by the Police Service in Scotland 2 3 and guidance for officers had been issued." And at 6.4: 4 "The Complaints Inquiry concluded that Lothian and 5 Borders Police failed to recognise that the attack on 6 7 Simon was racist. This was not only at the outset of the investigation but also as it progressed. Key 8 9 elements contributed to the collective failing included: 10 "A misguided assessment that the motive for the attack was robbery." 11 12 And towards the bottom of the list: 13 "Little emphasis placed on racist language used by 14 the accused shortly after they attacked Simon and not 15 establishing the perception of the family." And if we might look at page 11, please, these are 16 17 the findings in relation to language that had been used 18 by the accused: 19 "The Operation Millennium investigation team placed 20 little emphasis on racist language used by the accused 21 shortly after they attacked Simon. Although several members of the investigation team claim to have read the 22 statements, they state that the statements contained no 23 or only limited evidence or information to suggest the 24 crime was racially motivated. Information from 25

witnesses shows that a short time after the attack on Simon the group responsible were directly referring to him as [and that's a racial term there]. It is crucial to highlight that the group were taking directly about their attack on Simon and the references are made in the presence of independent witnesses.

"The four accused were very quickly identified and all were subsequently traced, interviewed and arrested. An interview strategy was prepared and applied during the interview of each accused. This strategy had a number of questions relating to robbery, but none regarding any racist element or language. There are a large number of references to the term [and it's the same racial slur] being used by the group, several relating to one accused. During his interview he was asked about witness evidence claiming he had used this word. He denied that he would used this word and stated that he knows it to be racist. This is significant and the link between this and the language used by him others does not appear to have been made.

"Following the interview and arrest of the accused, the investigation team continued to interview witnesses and all statements and resultant inquiries were submitted to the Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Service. This included the statements

of the significant witnesses who had heard language used
where Simon was referred to by a racial term. It is

evident that the investigation team placed little

emphasis on the language used by the accused and this

additional information did not feature in the management

policy filed."

And beneath that:

"This lack of emphasis could be interpreted in several ways as a lack of understanding of the importance of language used by the accused immediately after the crime or of the racist nature of the language used or that a single strand of evidence is sufficient to libel a racist aggravation. Whatever the reason, it is clear that this inaction had an impact on the direction of the Inquiry and fundamentally led to a critical failure to meet the needs of the family."

Is this a case that you remember at all, Mr Loque?

A. I indicated I think in the last evidence session in

April that I had a recollection of the case and it was

very general. I remember I think in the summer of 2011

dealing with the consequences, I think, of this report.

I should stress I wasn't asked to address this in my

witness statement either for the last session or this

session, but because it was raised with me on the last

occasion and I mentioned it I have been able to look at

1 a number of documents to refresh my memory of the case. What I would like to do now is take you to the press 2 Q. 3 relief that bears your name. That is COPFS 06498. If 4 we scroll down a little, please, so we see this is 5 dated -- sorry, just up a tiny bit -- Thursday, 25 August 2011 and it's addressed to the Private 6 7 Secretary for the Lord Advocate. And it sets out the detail of a statement issued by the Crown Office on 8 Monday, 23 August: 9 10 "Death of Simon San, HMA V John Reid, statement attributable to a Crown Office spokesperson. 11 12 "Lothian and Borders Police have today apologised 13 for mistakes they have made in this case. In light of 14 this apology, the Area Procurator Fiscal has offered to 15 meet Mr San's family again to discuss any questions which they might now have." 16 17 Am I right in understanding that you were the APF for Lothian and Borders at that time, so that would be a 18 19 reference to you? That's correct. 20 Α. 21 "The crown was alert to the question of racial Q. 22 motivation from the beginning of the investigation and raised the issue with the police at an early stage. 23 After careful consideration of all the available 24 25 evidence provided to the crown by the police,

1		Crown Counsel concluded that there was no evidence to
2		show that the attack on Mr San Was racially motived.
3		For a racial aggravation to be proved there must be
4		evidence to demonstrate the motivation for the
5		commission of the crime. There was no evidence in law
6		to support this and this remains the case. There was
7		evidence of a racial term used by the accused sometime
8		after the crime, but this was not evidence of motivation
9		for the crime. Notwithstanding this, the Advocate
10		Depute advised the High Court when John Reid pled guilty
11		to culpable homicide that it was at the strongly held
12		view of Mr San's family that the offence was racially
13		motivated."
14		And if we can scroll down a little, and there's
15		reference to a further part to the earlier statement
16		attributed to a Crown Office spokesperson:
17		"We can confirm the Lord Advocate will not be
18		instructing an inquiry and is satisfied with the crown's
19		prosecution of the case. Mr John Logue, the area
20		procurator fiscal for Lothian and Borders, has offered
21		to meet with Mr San's family to discuss any questions
22		which they might now have."
23		Now, are you aware of this press release? Do you
24		recall this press release?
25	A.	Only in very general terms. My recollection is

supported by some of the material I have been able to look at since I last gave evidence. And so to put it in context, this was a press release which was issued because there were lots of media questions being directed to COPFS in light of the statement which Lothian and Borders Police had issued about their conclusions about their work on the case and, in light of the media questions, it was felt appropriate after discussion to issue a statement clarifying our position and that's why the statement was prepared.

Q. It's apparent from the Operation Waymark report that we have looked at that Lothian and Borders recognised that their officers had failed to attach sufficient weight to racist language used after the attack and had failed to properly consider the possibility of a racist motive.

It's also clear that the statements that were available to the police were made available to the crown and here we see that the Lord Advocate would not be instructing an inquiry and was satisfied with the crown's prosecution of the case.

I wonder if you can help us to understand, in light of the position taken by Lothian and Borders Police, the crown's reluctance to review its decision-making, its handling of the case, with a view to potentially learning lessons?

Α. I'm not sure that's an entirely accurate way of describing. It wasn't a reluctance to review the matter. It was as a consequence of reviewing the matter that the Lord Advocate reached a conclusion that the scope of the police review was a narrow one. It looked at the police investigation and, as you'll appreciate, the crown's investigation is separate and independent from that and the Lord Advocate was satisfied that the crown had not made the mistakes which the police accepted they had made and that the crown had taken a different approach.

I should stress this was a case which, if I remember correctly the case, Mr San was murdered I think in 2010 or killed in 2010 and I think the criminal case concluded at the end of that year. I was appointed in the early summer of 2011 and first became aware of it I think when this when the then Deputy Chief Constable advised me that he would be issuing a public statement about the conclusion of the police review and, therefore, that was my first awareness of the issue and that therefore allowed us to review the matter.

My memory of it is that we continued to look at the matter sometime after the statement in discussions with Mr San's family's representatives and looked at some detail, for example, in relation to the circumstances in

which the statements of the use of clearly racist

language were used and I have to say that in looking at

it in detail, I do not agree with the some of the

characterisation in the police report about the use of

the language or the apparent certainty. There were -
when one looked at the detail of the statements

available, it was clear that racist language had been

used, but it was clear to us it was not clear

necessarily about the circumstances and precisely who

had used the language, but it was absolutely clear and

accepted by us that the language had been used and that

was taken into account when the decision about

prosecution was made.

There was a prosecution in this case and it was clear to me in reviewing the case over that summer and into the autumn that the crown did not make the same mistake that the police made in discounting the possibility of this being a racially motivated killing. Mr San's family had been very clear with us at the very beginning that they regarded it as racially motivated and my perspective in reviewing it was at that time that we therefore treat it on that basis as a racially motivated killing which needed to be examined and determined on the evidence what could be put before the court and that's what was done.

So this was a case in which there was consideration
of the issues raised by the police and whether they
impacted on the crown's investigation but the conclusion
was that they did not and it was for that reason a
decision was taken not to instruct an inquiry of the
nature that was being sought, but that's not to say that
there was no review and learning from it.

- Q. Your evidence is that there was not a reluctance to examine these issues and there was in fact a review within the Crown Office and so to the extent that the press release says "we can confirm the Lord Advocate will not be instructing an inquiry" to the extent that that phraseology might give the reader the impression that there hadn't been a review and there wasn't going to be a review, is it perhaps misleading?
- A. I will accept that that was not -- that was not issued without anyone considering the case or the circumstances. You would never issue a public statement of that nature without having first considered in some detail what the underlying issues were, but it was quite clear to us that this was case where in all of the meetings that the prosecutors had had with Mr San's family and up to and including the conclusion of the case in court, where I think the Advocate depute represented to the court Mr San's families views, the

1 crown had at the forefront of its thoughts the scope to identify evidence which could identify motivation. 2 3 The issue which was drawn out in the police report is the distinction between evidence which can 4 demonstrate motivation and other evidence which is 5 clearly offensive and difficult to understand, but 6 7 demonstrates use of racist language, but the difficult question at the heart of that is the extent to which 8 9 that can be relied on to demonstrate motivation and that 10 was fully considered in the analysis of the case for the final decision. 11 12 Thank you. Finally, I want to ask you about learning Q. 13 lessons in the context of the death of Mr Bayoh. Has there been a review, lessons learned, debrief, anything 14 15 of that sort following the death of Mr Bayoh with a view to looking at how the case was handled by Crown Office 16 and perhaps learning lessons? 17 So there hasn't -- we haven't commissioned a formal 18 Α. 19 group specifically to do what you are describing. 20 Partly that was because we, as I described earlier this 21 morning, at the conclusion of the criminal 22 investigation, it was very much our view that there needed to be a public inquiry of this nature and, 23 therefore, first of all, that would be our focus in 24 preparing for that and supporting the establishment of 25

1 the Inquiry.

And secondly, I think it's a widely held view that our lessons learned should be informed by the lessons of Inquiry. So there will be, and I am very happy to confirm in my current position, there will be at the conclusion of this Inquiry a much more formal and structured approach to the learning the lessons as identified by the Inquiry, but that's not to say that we haven't since 2015 incorporated changes which I think are informed by our own experience of dealing with the investigation.

So I think those are important and first amongst them would be the establishment of the Death in Custody Unit. That's within the specialised field of death investigations we have identified over a number of years, and Mr Bayoh's case was part of that consideration, that deaths in custody, whether in police custody or in prison, bring very specific challenges and we've therefore established in the last few years a dedicated team which guarantees that all of these cases are going to be investigated by the same small group of people who will then quickly build up their own personal experience, but also, for example, will become very familiar with all the legal issues and have well-established relationships with all of the key

parties. So I think that is one factor that has changed
since the death of Mr Bayoh.

I think we can also point to general work to improve

our deaths investigations. We've since 2019 undertaken a piece of work to try and expedite and reform the way -- expedite the speed with which death investigations are carried out and reform the way in which they are done and that has included the shift away from serial investigations to parallel investigations in the way that I talked about earlier.

So I think those are two factors and then I would add to those the personal I think learning which I have taken from my involvement with the Inquiry thus far and, although I haven't discussed this with colleagues who have given evidence, I suspect they are doing the same, but I know that in giving evidence in April and preparing to come to give evidence today, there are a number of factors which I have begun to think about and focus on which I think the question will be, can we make progress with those in advance of the Inquiry concluding? And I would certainly not intend to wait until the Inquiry is finished before we made progress with those.

- Q. Are you able to share with us what those factors are?
- A. I can share my personal views and I stress I haven't

I think in a death investigation of this nature, while it was obvious to us at the beginning that the need for criminality needed to be considered as a priority, as I have said before, that the question of race was absolutely at the forefront of our minds, I think for me there is something about the way in which we have gone about it and the extent to which we were aware from other jurisdictions, and I'm principally considering England and Wales here, issues which had arisen.

I think I might have said on the last occasion I gave evidence that this was the first case of this nature that I was aware of in Scotland. I think it is clear to me that we could have learned perhaps more by 2015 from other investigations in the United Kingdom. I think the question of having access to an appropriate expert in a death investigation on questions of race seems to me to be an issue that I'm not aware of us -- and I could be wrong about this because, as I say, I'm just sharing personal thoughts at this stage -- I'm not aware of us having done this and if we have, then I'm mistaken in my view, but if we haven't done it then I think that is something we could look at in future.

The issues that we've talked about in terms of having a complete and full understanding of what it

means to be a member of a minority ethnic community in Scotland and all of the ways in which that impacts on your life, I think there is something there we can do to help build up that knowledge and understanding and begin then to also look at another area, which is the guidance issue you have touched on this morning. When I look at the PIRC guidance you should me, I can see how those issues would come together.

So I think I hopefully have been able to explain the context of the way in which we are treating our learning from this and give the Inquiry the confidence that it's both an ongoing process, but one which will be very much informed by the results of the Inquiry.

- Q. You said that at the conclusion of this Inquiry there will be a formal and structured approach to learning lessons. Can you share with us what that will look like?
- A. Yes, well, there are changes underway in the structure of the organisation at the moment but I would intend that the Equality Board, which is chaired by Stephen McGowan who has already given evidence, should directly and formally take on the responsibility for the analysis of the report and providing recommendations to the law officers and myself on what changes are needed and thereafter I would look to all of the leaders in the

1	organisation, not just those involved in the Equality
2	Board but all leaders, to implement the changes which
3	are required. It's very much a similar process to the
4	one that we would use, for example, in relation to a
5	report from the inspector to prosecution, so there was a
6	report in April of this year in relation to domestic
7	abuse and we have adopted a similar structured formal
8	approach which highlights the report to staff, raises
9	awareness of it, identifies of the actions we're going
10	to take and then monitors progress with those.
11	Q. Thank you, can you bear with me a moment, please?
12	I have no further questions, thank you.
13	THE ARBITRATOR: Are there any rule 9 applications?
14	Mr Logue, would you mind withdrawing to the witness room
15	while I hear an application?
16	(Witness leaves room)
17	LORD BRACADALE: Ms Mitchell.
18	Rule 9 Application by MS MITCHELL
19	MS MITCHELL: The questions that I seek to ask this witness
20	relate to the Simon San case. Evidence in relation to
21	Simon San case was disclosed by the Inquiry on Friday
22	and I was able to look at that over the weekend and this
23	morning, so these questions arise as a result of that.
24	Before I explain what the questions are, I explain
25	the reason that it is said that Simon San is important

and it's because this Inquiry has heard that lessons were learnt after the case of Chhokar and that things were put in place to try and ensure that when the crown looked at issues of race they were being properly considered. Mr San's case came only a short period of time, I think a number of two years before Mr Bayoh died in police custody. And at the time Mr Anwar had called upon the crown to have an investigation so that in the future another family is not forced to fight for answers from the authorities. So it's against that background that the following questions are asked in relation to Simon San.

The first is that the evidence that's been heard this morning is that the Crown Office did carry out a review of the matter and as said by the witness the Lord Advocate reached a conclusion that the scope of the police review was a narrow one, it looked at the police investigation and as you'll appreciate, the crown's investigation is separate and independent and the Lord Advocate was satisfied that the crown had not made the mistakes when the police accepted that they had made and the crown had taken different considerations in the analysis of the case.

So firstly what I would like to ask given the date of the report being issued by the police and the date of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the Crown Office saying they weren't going to conduct a review where the same date, what time -- when did this review taken, were they given a copy of this document in advance and undertook it.

Secondly, the document that the crown -- secondly, the document that the crown received the police report indicated that the police had failed to take into account the import of the use of racist language; the history of the abuse that the family had suffered at their place of work and had been reported as racist and also non-racist abuse; previous convictions of the accused and racist sentiments expressed in general terms by one of them; a previous assault of Mr San's cousin -sorry, of his nephew -- at the same place of work; and the view of the family that this was a racist attack. So my question is: did the crown take these matters into consideration and still conclude that the matter was not racist? The reason in particular that I ask this was that it's clear that as a result of the review the police accepted that they hadn't looked into various things that they ought to have looked into and as a result of that, they could not have passed on to the crown the information that the crown would have needed to conduct a review in order that decision could be taken.

1 So that's the second question.

The third question relates to a second press release on the day that the press release comes out which refuted the suggestion made by Mr Anwar that there was evidence of a racial term used by the accused sometime after that night as described by the crown and that press release says that it was not made seconds after the incident as the statement issued by Mr Anwar states and to point out that when the review took place the view of the police in this regard was that the racist language was used by the accused immediately after the crime and asked whether or not any consideration was given to the way the police had described this before releasing that report.

The next question, which would be question number 4, or the next area that I would like to explore with this witness is his view about the difficulty in capturing and presenting evidence of racist motive to the court.

And he mentions that twice in his evidence today where he says:

"The type of information that you're referring to doesn't neatly fit in the criminal context into being admissible, relevant evidence for a criminal offence and I suspect that's at the heart of the issue that was ultimately being explored with Fiona Carnan."

1 And it's to put to him that if the question is one of whether or not there's a racial motive, could the 2 3 crown or should the crown not simply consider raising 4 evidence and taking any -- taking any arguments in 5 respect of relevancy that may arise because if it's relevant it should be allowed and in circumstances where 6 7 they think there will be any difficulty in that regard obtaining expert evidence so expert evidence can be led 8 9 in that way. The fifth issue that I would like to read --10 LORD BRACADALE: That last one is not really related to 11 12 Simon San, is it, it's more related to his evidence? 13 MS MITCHELL: That's correct, as a generality, yes. The 14 fifth matter going back to Mr San is, does he accept 15 that it was in fact the family that first raised and pressed the issue of public inquiry with the 16 17 Scottish Government and that in all the meetings with the family the crown spoke of a fatal accident inquiry 18 19 and never a public inquiry and in that scope of those 20 issues, was the existence -- what was the public concern 21 that the crown had that it thought that a public inquiry 22 was required instead of an FAI if it supported that proposition? 23 Those are my questions. 24 MR DUNCAN: (Inaudible - microphone turned off). 25

```
1
         LORD BRACADALE: Yes, very well.
 2
         MR DUNCAN: Thank you, sir. I have a concern about certain
 3
             of the questions that are proposed to be asked in
 4
             relation to the Simon San Case and in particular
             questions -- the second and the third and the fifth
 5
             questions. The starting point is of course that the
 6
 7
             Simon San Case is not part of the terms of reference
             which are before the inquiry but I accept that there has
 8
 9
             been evidence in relation to that matter and that indeed
10
             your lordship may see some of that evidence as being
             relevant to the issues that he has to consider so
11
12
             therefore the first question it seems to me is
13
             unobjectionable but it does seem to me that the second
14
             and the third and indeed the fifth questions take
15
             the Inquiry towards being -- considering the question
             that the prosecutorial decision and in particular the
16
17
             question of the basis upon which it was taken and
             whether it was soundly taken, which is of course
18
19
             something that is carved out of this inquiry in relation
20
             to Mr Bayoh's death and it really ought not to be before
21
             the inquiry in relation to Mr San's case so I would take
22
             issue, sir, with the second, third and fifth questions.
         LORD BRACADALE: Thank you, I'll adjourn to consider the
23
             these issues.
24
         MS MITCHELL: Sir, I ... (Inaudible - microphone is off)
25
```

1	LORD BRACADALE: Just come to the table.
2	Submissions by MS MITCHELL
3	MS MITCHELL: Sir, the prosecutorial decision had already
4	been made. The question that I'm asking this witness
5	about is the decision which he says was taken of the
6	analysis of not making the same mistakes as the police
7	had so that could only have been done after the
8	prosecution and after the reading of the report.
9	LORD BRACADALE: Very well, I shall adjourn to consider
10	these issues.
11	(12.52 pm)
12	(Luncheon adjournment)
13	(2.04 pm)
14	LORD BRACADALE: In relation to the first matter arising out
15	of today's evidence, namely the approach of the crown to
16	certain evidence which could have a bearing on racial
17	motivation, I do not consider that I would be assisted
18	by further exploration of that matter with this witness.
19	It can be developed in submission. I shall refuses that
20	aspect of the application.
21	All the other issues relate to at the case of Simon
22	San. For a number of reasons, I propose to take the
23	following course in relation to these. Ms Mitchell
24	should submit a written document setting out precisely
25	the areas which she wishes to explore and the reasons

1	for doing so. That will allow me more clearly to
2	understand the issues which are raised, to consider
3	whether I will be assisted by exploration of them and
4	whether there is force in the submission of Mr Duncan.
5	In the event that further evidence will be required,
6	that will be done by issuing a supplementary Rule 8
7	request to the witness.
8	Could we have the witness back, please?
9	(Witness back in room).
LO	LORD BRACADALE: Mr Logue, that completes your oral
11	evidence. If the Inquiry requires any further evidence
L2	from you, it will issue a supplementary Rule 8 request.
L3	So thank you very much for coming back to give evidence
L 4	today. Again, I'm grateful for your time.
15	I'm going to adjourn briefly to allow the next
16	witness to be introduced and you'll then be free to go.
L7	A. Thank you.
L8	THE ARBITRATOR: We'll adjourn briefly for that purpose.
19	(2.06 pm)
20	(A short break)
21	(2.13 pm)
22	LORD BRACADALE: Good afternoon, Dr Jones. Would you say
23	the words of the affirmation after me.
24	
25	

1	Evidence of DR PETER JONES
2	Examination-in-chief by MS THOMSON
3	LORD BRACADALE: Ms Thomson.
4	MS THOMSON: Good afternoon. You are Dr Peter Jones?
5	A. I am.
6	Q. How old are you, Dr Jones?
7	A. 63.
8	Q. And am I right to understand that you are a chartered
9	psychologist and also a former police officer?
10	A. That's right.
11	Q. Before I ask you any questions, can I invite you to open
12	up the blue folder in front of you and within that
13	folder there should a copy of your Inquiry statement,
14	which is SBPI 00526. We'll bring that up on the screen.
15	So here is your statement, the statement of Dr Jones
16	taken on 23 March 2024 and if we can go to the very
17	final page, we should see that it was signed by you on
18	11 April of this year. Your signature has been are
19	redacted from the version on the screen, but hopefully
20	will be showing in the hard copy in the folder in front
21	of you.
22	Your statement concludes with the words:
23	"I believe the facts stated in this statement are
24	true. I understand that this statement may form part of
25	the evidence before the Inquiry and be published on the

Inquiry's website." 1 So you signed this statement. You prepared and 2 3 signed the statement in the knowledge that it would become evidence before the Chair to the Inquiry and that 4 5 it would be published on the Inquiry's website? 6 Α. I did. 7 Did you do your best to answer as fully and accurately Q. as you could all of the questions that were asked of you 8 9 in interview? 10 Α. I did. I want to begin by asking you some questions about your 11 Q. 12 career in fairly short compass. Am I right to 13 understand that you were a police officer between 1979 14 and 2001? 15 A. Yes. And that all of your service was south of the border 16 Q. 17 with England? 18 Α. Yes. 19 Q. And that your rank at the time that you left the police 20 in 2001 was inspector? 21 Α. Yes. Can we look at paragraph 3 of your statement, please. 22 Q. 23 Here you explain that you left policing in 2001 when you 24 got a doctorate and set up your own business, Shire Professional Chartered Psychologists. You spent the 25

- 1 next 22 years mainly carrying out research, training 2 consultancy around implicit bias and working with specialist bias tests, although you also maintain a 3 4 small part of the business relating to assessment and 5 evaluation. 6 So you explain that you got a doctorate in 2001. 7 What was your, doctorate in? It was in psychometric test development. 8 Α. Okay. How long did that take to complete? 9 Q. 10 Α. Four years. Was that a full-time or part-time course? 11 Q. 12 It was two years full-time and two years part-time. Α. Okay. So when did you graduate with your doctorate, 13 Q. relative to when you left policing? 14 15 Α. I graduated in 2000 and I left the following year. 16 All right. So had you taken time away from policing in Q. order to complete your studies? 17
- I worked part-time for two years while I did my PhD 18 Α.
- 19 full-time.
- Okay. All right. And with which university did you 20 Q. 21 undertake your PhD?
- 22 Wolverhampton Business School. Α.
- Q. Can we look at paragraph 4, please. You explain that 23 24 you are professional qualifications relevant to this 25 field of work are that you are a chartered psychologist,

- 1 chartered scientist and Associate Fellow of the British
- 2 Psychological Society. You also have a police trainer's
- 3 certificate and you attended a ten-week residential
- 4 course for police trainers and you're well versed in the
- 5 process of and practices of policing. So these are your
- 6 professional qualifications that sit over and above the
- 7 doctorate that you hold.
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. With your doctorate being a PhD, did you require to do
- 10 undergraduate study and a master's before you embarked
- on the PhD?
- 12 A. Yes, I did an undergraduate degree at the
- Open University and a master's degree at Goldsmith's,
- 14 University of London.
- 15 Q. The Open University degree, what was your subject for an
- undergraduate degree?
- 17 A. Psychology.
- 18 Q. And when did you graduate?
- 19 A. 1993.
- Q. Was that again a full-time or part-time course?
- 21 A. That was full-time.
- 22 Q. Did that require you to take a time away from policing
- or did you have a very busy schedule?
- A. I just had a very, very busy life for seven months.
- 25 Q. Okay. And what was the subject of your master's?

- 1 A. Psychological assessment in organisations.
- 2 Q. And your PhD you said was in psychometric testing.
- 3 A. Hm-hmm.
- 4 Q. Paragraph 5 you say:
- "I retired and closed the business in June 2023. I 5 have continued doing some work in Canada, predominantly 6 7 around bias testing and I still administrator and research around bias testing in the UK. I still carry 8 9 out some work relating to setting testing for one of the 10 big UK police forces and bias testing police recruits in a smaller police force. My work is now exclusively 11 12 around bias testing. I no longer carry out any training 13 or consultancy, but I obviously have to keep my finger
- So after a career of approximately 22 years within this particular field, you've retired and closed your business.

on the implicit bias pulse for bias testing."

A. Hm-hmm.

14

- 19 Q. But it seems you still seem to be doing quite a lot of 20 work?
- 21 A. Nothing that requires travel is my rule there.
- Q. I see. So today I want to focus on asking questions
 about unconscious bias, bias testing and training in
 relation to unconscious bias.
- 25 At paragraph 6 you were asked to explain what

- unconscious or implicit bias is. Are those two terms
 interchangeable, unconscious and implicit bias?
 - A. Implicit bias is the more accurate description. It is the one which is used in the academic world. I think "unconscious bias" was coined as a phrase probably by Harvard University which has sort of picked up its -- the main use is now "unconscious bias" but the correct term is "implicit bias". They are the same thing.
 - Q. Let's look at what you say about the concept in paragraph 6:

"We often talk about it simply being our unintended people preferences, our preference to see particular groups of people positively or negatively. The research on implicit bias goes back to the early 1970s and there is quite a long research history. Fundamentally, implicit bias is about the way we make judgments about people and it is fundamentally embedded in our neurology. The idea is that we have processes in the brain which are fairly instinctive, automatic and which get activated without our conscious control. There are other neurological processes which are the opposite of implicit processes. These processes are conscientious, they're much slower in their operation than implicit processes and require attentional resources. They contrast with implicit processes, instinctive very fast

1 and automatic processes of the brain which are partly based upon our anthropology of how our brains developed 2 3 and all animals have these implicit processes. They are 4 instinctive responses based in the ancient neurology in 5 the brain's amygdala, as the neuroscientists talk about it our fight or flight response." 6 7 So you give an overview in paragraph 6 of what is meant by implicit or unconscious bias and in paragraph 8 and in paragraph 7 you describe these processes as: 9 10 "A cognitive shortcut that allow you to make judgments in the blink of an eye without engaging your 11 12 conscious thinking." 13 Α. Yes. In paragraph 8 you explain that these judgments or 14 Q. 15 decisions can be positive or negative, so you can create either positive of negative attributions to particular 16 17 groups, often based upon experience. And if we look 18 about half way down this paragraph, you say: "Although we might consciously reject a stereotype 19 20 about a particular group, our implicit brain may have 21 already wired and continued to wire that stereotype into our brains." 22 Can you explain a little bit more about that, the 23 24 concept of wiring a stereotype and the competition

between the conscious rejection of the stereotype and

25

1 the implicit bias?

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 2 So repeated exposure to a particular pattern, whether Α. 3 that's from our own experiences or whether it's from the 4 media or whether it's from what society tells us about 5 particular groups, if we get repeatedly exposed to those associates, we start to create a neural pathway in the 6 7 brain between the group and these positive or negative constructs. So even though we believe ourselves to be 8 9 fair and equitable and to reject a stereotype about a 10 particular group, those neural pathways are still there, we still make the association implicitly and 11 12 unconsciously between a positive or negative attribute 13 and a particular group and it's really the job of the 14 conscious to intervene in that and to convert that 15 impulse into fair and equitable behaviours and we have some specialist neurons in the brain designed to do 16 17 that, they are called von Economo neurons, and what they 18 do is stop those waves of impulse that are coming from 19 the amygdala from breaking through into behaviour.
 - Q. Thank you. If we can stroll down a little bit to the top of the next page, the second half of this paragraph, you explain that:

"When we're stressed, when we are rushed or when we are overworked, and that [you note] is the kind of environment a lot of people work in, we fall back onto

these shortcut neural pathways from making the judgments we need to make and that's why implicit bias affects the behaviour that we exhibit and the decisions that we then make."

Why does in happen when we're stressed or rushed other overworked?

A. It's to do with processing capacity of the brain so the neocortex, the new part of the brain that we've developed as human beings, is relatively limited. It's got a fraction of the processing power of our old brain that we've had for millennia. It can only process a certain amount of information at any one time and I often talk about it -- give you an analogy. It processes about 40 bits of information at any one moment. So if I gave you a picture in your head of that as a table tennis ball, I have then equated that to the processing power of the unconscious mind, the implicit, it's a ball about 2.4 metres across, it's about 200,000 times the processing power.

So when we overwhelm the frontal lobes of the brain, they fall back on to this massive resource that they have in the background. The problem with it is is that emotional or cognitive load eats up those resources of the frontal lobe, so when we are stressed, in danger, rushed, we tend then to fall back onto those implicit

1 connections for making the rapid judgments about people. 2 Thank you. I wanted to ask you some questions about the Q. 3 development of training in this area and if we can 4 scroll to paragraph 10, you explain that: 5 "This has been an iterative process. To start with it was very much about awareness. People didn't know 6 7 what this notice of implicit bias was." If we skip a few lines you say: 8 "Within a couple of years people started to say 9 that's really interesting, but so what? How can we do 10 something about it?" 11 12 So should we understand that there was a shift away 13 from a focus on having an awareness of unconscious bias 14 towards what can we do about this? How can we correct 15 this? Absolutely, that shift from awareness to action. 16 Α. You explain at paragraph 11: 17 Q. "I don't think we can eradicate it [that is implicit 18 19 bias] because it's part of that process which we need to 20 live our lives so what we can help people do is mitigate 21 the effects as best we can." So it's not about eradicating this process. On one 22 level is this almost a live-saving in extremis? Is it 23 that part of the brain? 24 A. Yeah, every time we need to make a judgment about new 25

1 people, if we didn't have that capacity to fall back onto those really fast neural pathways, the very first 2 3 person we meet in the day and we had to make a judgment 4 about how they stood, how they dress, their voice, the 5 frontal lobes would be overwhelmed and we would come to a grinding halt. So we pass a lot of that routine 6 7 processing back into the unconscious, into all those wired pathways that we've acquired in the course of our 8 lives. 9 10 Q. Okay. So it's not something that you can eradicate. It's part of the process you need to live your life. 11 12 It's about mitigating the effects of the bias. 13 Hm-hmm. Α. And you explain at paragraph 12, I'll read this short, 14 Q. 15 if we look about halfway down the paragraph. You say 16 that. 17 "If we slow the thinking down by putting little barriers in the way, little pauses in the thinking, we 18 19 can mitigate bias by giving the conscious processes time 20 to engage." 21 Can you say a little bit more about that? 22 Yes. So we know that the unconscious operates somewhere Α. between 30 and 100 milliseconds, which is actually 23 faster than the eyes can even fully perceive the image, 24 but the conscious brain doesn't cut in until about 400 25

24

25

1 milliseconds, four tenths of a second, so we're never 2 able to get in soon enough. So all we can do really is 3 to delay the thinking to introduce those little thinking 4 spaces between the impulse and the action in the hope 5 that we can get people then to rethink the situation. So would I be thinking the same if this person was 6 7 different on this occasion? Am I really thinking about this in the right way? And organisations have worked to 8 9 put those little thinking spaces, even if it's just a 10 three or ten second space into people's thinking. Can you give an example of how an individual might 11 Q. 12 introduce a thinking pause into their day-to-day life or 13 their working life? So if you just take a performance management or 14 Α. 15 recruiting scenario, the little gap might be the next time I am sifting CVs for a job as a junior lawyer, I 16 17 will stop for ten seconds and ask myself the question 18 whether I have allowed the school that they've come 19 from, for example, or I have allowed the university that 20 they have gone to have an adverse impact. So all it 21 does really is give them a bit of a thinking space. 22 And organisations have started just to introduce that little opportunity. I think Oakland Police did 23

something very similar with pursuits where they insisted

on people having the thinking space, so they were not

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

allowed to do a pursuit on foot unless they had another officer with them and that wasn't done just for safety.

It was done to give them the thinking time, so while that officer was catching up, that red mist of the chase was able to die away, but it's just producing those little opportunities.

And I think Jennifer Eberhart, who's the professor of psychology at -- I think she's at Madison now, Wisconsin Madison, she talks about a website which is a little bit about Facebook. I think it's in the UK. I think it's called "Front Door" where people discuss, for example, local crime and she had a problem with racial profiling on that website and you can see it on Facebook groups all the time, can't you? There's some kids hanging around at the end of the road and they start to make assumptions about those people based upon ethnicity, age, et cetera and she suggested that they introduced a little break in that, so before you could post something, you had to answer a couple of questions, which is, is what you're reporting got the descriptions properly and are you being very specific about what it is that they're doing wrong? And she coined the phrase, if you're going to be suspicious, you have to be specific.

And that's something which we try to introduced to

1 police intelligence in one police force by asking them not to pass information, intelligence information, out 2 3 to operational frontline officers without a certain 4 degree of detail, so that you didn't just give people a 5 very vague description, you gave them three or four descriptors, so they would not automatically assume that 6 7 just because that guy was a particular ethnic group that he was the one who must be talked about. 8 9 So those were the kind of thinking gaps that we 10 tried to get them to think and put into policy and 11 practice. 12 Q. You explain, however, at paragraph 13, an irony perhaps, 13 that the requirement on an individual to introduce this 14 thinking gap actually increases the cognitive load. You 15 explained here: "I think one of the issues around the actions around 16 17 implicit bias is that if we heap more load onto individuals, we ask people to be personally responsible 18 for their biases, but it's yet another load. We know 19 20 that emotional and cognitive load causes people to fall 21 back onto their biases." 22 Can you explain a little bit more about that tension between the need to impose the thinking time as a way as 23

way to mitigate bias but that thinking time, or the

requirement to introduce thinking time, actually

24

25

increasing the cognitive load that can lead to these biased shortcuts?

A. Yes. I think the cognitive load comes not necessarily from trying to introduce the thinking time, because that has the opposite effect. It comes from organisations inserting things into process.

The thing that springs to mind in some respects is policing uses a national decision-making model, where it has steps through which the officer is supposed to go when they're making a decision. Well, that just cognitive load, especially when you're making a decision in the blink of an eye almost. You place additional cognitive load onto people then while they're thinking about following policy and procedure, rather than dealing with the situation and hopefully looking to mitigate their biases in the scenario, but, yes, what we do effectively by introducing that is introduce something else for them to think about.

And I think if you're going to do it, what you need to do is to take away some of the other demands from it, so get away from loading people with procedures and policies that they have to follow which are complex, because people do not do complexity well, especially when they're stressed and they're rushed. They fall back onto those implicit biases for decisions.

1 Q. Thank you for clarifying that. That was my 2 misunderstanding. I had understood that it was the 3 requirement to impose a thinking break that was 4 increasing the cognitive load, but it's not the break, 5 it's the procedure that has to be gone through, the 6 following of a process or a policy, that adds to the 7 cognitive load. So what I think you were saying is if this can be 8 9 simplified it's more likely to be effective? 10 Α. Yes, a bit like designing a website, isn't it? Just two clicks, not 22 clicks to get to where you want to go. 11 12 Q. You have spoken about introducing thinking time, is 13 there anything else that an individual can do to 14 mitigate bias? 15 Α. There's actually a host of things. I did a review some years ago with two other psychologists on behalf of 16 17 the -- trying to think of the organisation now --Quality Challenge Unit at the Department of Education. 18 19 And we know quite a bit about what we can do to mitigate 20 things like, you know, not reinforcing stereotypes in 21 the first place, because we know that when people are 22 exposed to stereotypes they tend then to use those stereotypes because it rehearses the neural pathway. So 23 trying not to reinforce those. 24 25 I'll give you a good example of that by the way. I

went to the Metropolitan Police website, and this must be about five years ago now, onto their Twitter feed and I did a very quick analysis, it took me about 20 minutes, of the faces that appeared on the website on the Twitter feed for people who either wanted, who were sought for identification, were missing people and what we found with that was that black people were much more likely to appear on the Twitter feed if they were wanted or committing an offence, disproportionately to the proportions in the population and within the criminal population.

Well, every time my Twitter feed went past, although I reject the stereotype about young black men and crime myself, my unconscious mind is wiring that stereotype into my neural pathways all of the time. And although they didn't like it very much when I pointed it out to them, I have been back since, and I did the same for West Yorkshire Police and Greater Manchester Police, and there was no disproportionality in what they were doing. It was very much in line with their local populations. But that constant reinforcement, we can avoid doing that. And I think the Metropolitan Police have had issues recently with taking down the photographs of gang members, for example, in the briefing rooms, because every time you walk past them your unconscious mind

1 wires that connection between black men and crime into 2 your neural pathways to make them stronger for later on 3 so you end up using them. 4 So I think there's some things which we can do and I 5 did produce a list of, you know, ten things that we can better do, which includes not reinforcing them, creating 6 7 the thinking gaps in it, and other things which we can do which don't require massive amounts of resource or 8 9 time, because that's what people don't have, they don't 10 have time or resource. I think that list might actually be included in a 11 Q. 12 PowerPoint presentation that you prepared for. It likely is. If it not, in the handout that went with 13 Α. the course, yes. 14 15 Q. Perhaps we can revisit this issue then when we go through the PowerPoint, which is something I would like 16 17 to do with you today. 18 So we were talking about the shift in training from 19 awareness to action, as you put it, and you also explain 20 in your statement that there was then another shift in 21 training away from the individual approach to an 22 organisational approach. Can you say a little bit more about that? 23 I think although some organisations wanted personal 24 Α. responsibility to be reinforced with the individual, 25

1 which I think is important, you know, at the end of the day it's down to individuals to try and mitigate their 2 3 biases, a lot of what organisations did and do 4 reinforces that. It creates the systems around which 5 people struggle then to mitigate their bias, whether it's the intelligence system that's deployed, whether 6 7 it's the recruiting process that's being deployed. So organisations have been really slow to do this, 8 because if you have got people who are under a lot of 9 10 load and are falling back on to their biases, one way around it is to take the system that's feeding those 11 12 biases and redesign it not to do it. And I'll give you 13 an example in a simple recruiting scenario. If when 14 you're sifting CVs for a job you take the names off, you 15 are much less likely to see people's gender and race biases coming through in the decisions they take to 16 17 either accept or reject. Now, that's not necessarily 18 within the gift of the recruiter, but it is in the gift 19 of the organisation to say the system that we use no 20 longer has names and dates of birth, for example, or 21 even schools on the CV, because that triggers these 22 biases in people. So that was a kind of organisational fix. 23 But organisational fixes in terms of how they run 24

their meetings, you know, who gets to contribute in a

25

1 meeting was another one. That's systems that said we do 2 not start with the senior person's comment, we start 3 with the junior person's comment and work our way up, 4 because people tend to fall in with the opinion of the senior person. So it's lots of little strategies that 5 organisations needed to build into their systems to make 6 7 it less likely that individual biases would break through into the behaviour and into the decisions that 8 9 were taken. 10 Q. You explain in your statement at paragraph 14 that you then took a final step in the sort of iterative 11 12 development of your training programme and move towards 13 offering train the trainer courses. You explain in 14 paragraph 14: 15 "There was only one me, even though there were other people working in the field. It was quite an expensive 16 17 option to have a subject-matter expert come in multiple times to deliver training across the staff group." 18 So you developed a train the trainers course with a 19 20 licensing arrangement back in 2015 and the idea was you 21 would come in and do three days with the trainers and then go away, you would write materials, context 22 23 specific, and there was a licensing arrangement in 24 place. 25 So that was the sort of the endpoint of the

development of your training package? 1 2 Α. Yes. Okay. I want to ask some questions about evaluation of 3 Q. training. You say at paragraph 15: 4 5 "The one shortcoming I see in the training is that nobody wanted to do the evaluation. Nobody wanted to 6 7 say, well, is this working? What are the processes by which we work out whether that half day of training is a 8 9 good investment? And that's typically what it looked 10 like. It was typically three hours of training. Awareness was about an hour, but the full course was 11 12 about three hours split between application, context and 13 action. I called it the three As; awareness, 14 application and action. There was very little interest 15 in evaluation beyond the simple evaluation sheets at the end of the session, which organisations often hand out 16 17 to delegates. That can be things like was the lunch okay or what was the room like? They didn't often ask, 18 19 well, what have you done? I have seen very little or no 20 robust evaluation." 21 And you go on to say at paragraph 16 that: "Even if you put evaluation into a bid, it will be 22 taken out by the organisation. They want to do the 23 training, move on and tick the box. I think there's an 24 element of saying, oh, unconscious bias training, we've 25

1 done that, we are moving on from that. There has been very little good evaluation." 2 3 And you say elsewhere in your statement that: "Often there's no commitment after an event to 4 5 continuing unconscious bias training. It is to tick box exercise, zero evaluation or desire to see what the 6 7 impact might be." And you conclude later in your statement by saying: 8 9 "You have put this one into the too difficult box, 10 because people just don't put to put money into creating a robust model where you have the data coming in in such 11 12 volumes that you can say something robust." 13 And you suggest that you would need to see hundreds, 14 if not thousands, of the evaluations and there just 15 isn't the interest or the budget for that. So what are the implications of organisations 16 17 choosing not to evaluate the effectiveness of this sort 18 of training? 19 Well, they just keep repeating the same mistakes, don't Α. 20 they? First of all, they have spent an awful lot of 21 money usually in putting their trainer into position. 22 So you would never buy a new fleet of vehicles and not test it out to see if it did the job that you thought it 23 was going to do, but with training we seem quite happy 24 to take the word of somebody at the end of it to say how 25

much they enjoyed the course, how useful they thought it was, as some kind of indication of effectiveness, but we've seen very little in terms of actually following people up after the event.

Because the fundamental of this is, what is it you're setting out to achieve? A lot of training that you see, the short ones in particular, want to do awareness. They want to say you should know a little bit about this because it might be impacting your job, but the really difficult stuff is, well, have we affected behavioural change? Have we made people do and see things differently? And that's a really difficult one to measure and to disentangle from all the other stuff that's going on in an organisation. And if you go back to the kind of academic model, people are asking, well, where's the control group?

And when we actually did have a study some years ago where we started it with a control group where we ran half of them through and half of them not through, and very quickly the organisation decided it was too much like hard work and they weren't going to do it, but that was the basics, you know. People have had the training, people have not had the training, do we see differences in the outcomes later in the day?

And we've got a similar study running at the moment,

1 it's actually within clinical psychology training, where they are not just testing people and giving them 2 3 training, but they're then looking at the outcomes of 4 the selection decisions they made before and after the 5 intervention. But they've really struggled to get people to participate. You know, they only wanted 40, 6 7 I think they got 33 at the last count and it's been two years in the making. It's a really difficult one 8 9 getting people to do really powerfully evaluation, 10 rather than just taking people's word for whether they did or didn't like it. 11 12 Q. You explain at paragraph 17 that you've had two studies 13 in Canada where you've actually bias-tested delegates 14 before and after training and: 15 "It suggests the training does have an effect on people's bias levels. What it does to people's 16 17 behaviour is still a bit of a mystery. I think we have got no firm evidence in terms of behavioural change." 18 Is that because of a lack of data from evaluation 19 20 because evaluation processes simply aren't --21 Α. This is behavioural problem again, isn't it? What's the 22 metric for the behaviour? What do we hope to change? Now, we know the bias test scores have fallen, but has 23 that led to fewer complaints. I think this was actually 24 among -- either a probation or a prison setting. So has 25

1 it led to reduced complaints from the inmates? Has it led to better relationships? Has it led to more women 2 3 being promoted? We don't know those behavioural 4 outcomes. 5 We just know that as a result of the training, with a control group who didn't have the training, that the 6 7 bias test fell in the group who had had the training. Can you tell us a little bit about bias testing, what 8 Q. 9 does that involve? 10 Α. So it's an online test, developed by Harvard originally in 1998, and then we've developed a version in about 11 12 2009 and it's based upon that notion of the association 13 between groups and positive and negative attributes for 14 the groups. 15 So if you take two groups, a black group and a white group, the test throws an individual a series of 16 17 photographs and it asks them to sort them according to a rule. It gives them the rule. So the first rule is if 18 19 it's a black face, hit the right key, sort it right. If 20 it's a white face, hit the left key, sort it left. 21 It then starts to mix words in between the 22 photographs and they're good words, "peaceful, calm, helpful, cooperative, " versus bad words, "aggressive, 23 uncooperative, demanding", and it asks you to sort them 24 and it gives you a rule. It says if it's a good word, 25

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I want you to sort it right with the black faces. If

it's a bad word, I want you to sort it left with the

white faces.

What it then does is when you have done about 60 of those it changes the sorting rule. Now it wants you to sort the good words with the white faces and the bad words with the black faces. It gives you time to adjust for the change over. What it then does is it compares the two halves of the test. It wants to know where did you slow down, where did you make mistakes, where did you speed up, because if you have those positive or negative associations about a particular group and particular positive or negative constructs or ideas, it interferes with your capacity to sort. So you want to put it over there because the rule says so, but your implicit biases are hardwired and what they do is say, they're quicker and faster than the conscious mind, it wants you to put them on the other side and whilst your correcting for that, it slows you down and it makes mistakes so it calibrates that into the likelihood that you would not or wouldn't let those biases impinge on the decisions that you take.

Q. Gosh. And you explain at paragraph 17 that you have two studies in Canada, these studies that you've personally carried out, you have made it clear that you work in

1 Canada as well as in the UK, where you have bias tested delegates before and after training and those studies 2 3 suggests that the training does have an effect on 4 people's bias levels. So should we understand then that there's a 5 difference in the results you got from the bias testing 6 7 before and after the delegates had undertaken training? A. Yes, so there was a significant drop off in the bias 8 9 test scores. I mean they were more neutral after the 10 training than they were before the training. And when they're not neutral, are they indicative of a 11 Q. 12 bias in one direction or another? 13 Yes, so generally speaking, and we have got 120 Α. 14 different bias tests on the platform, the data always 15 tends to be skewed against the minority group. So if it's a black-white test, it tends to be skewed that 16 17 there are way more people with a bias against black people than white people. The gender tests tend to be 18 19 skewed against women. The LGBTQ tests tend to be skewed 20 against LGBT groups and so it goes on. The minority or 21 more suppressed group tends to be the group for whom 22 more negativity is associated. Q. You say at paragraph 17: 23 "What it does to people's behaviour is still a bit 24 of a mystery. I think we have got no firm evidence in 25

terms of behavioural change." 1 2 And elsewhere in your statement, I think at 3 paragraph 29, you say: "We don't know if unconscious bias training works 4 because we have never evaluated it." 5 Is that because of the lack of interest in 6 7 evaluation? A. It's a really difficult one and I mean training is not 8 9 well evaluated generally, is it? You go on the course, 10 they send you a sheet to say what you think of it. Nobody comes back to see if your skill set has improved 11 12 three, six, nine, 24 months later. We just blindly 13 think that since we dedicated half a day to training it 14 will have made a difference, but we don't really have 15 the mechanisms for following it up and we often don't want allocate the budget for following it up. 16 Q. I wonder if we can turn to paragraph 21 of your 17 statement where you talk about the value of training of 18 19 this type of in the context of policing and you say at 20 21: 21 "I have been asked how unconscious bias training functions as a tool when it comes to policing. I think 22 there's two things. The first thing is that there is 23 some research suggesting that awareness of our biases 24 can help us to mitigate their effects. So if I know, 25

1 for example, that I have a particular bias based on race 2 or gender, it gives me the opportunity to create 3 mitigations and barriers. Sometimes it's just a little 4 script in their head which say, would I be reacting in 5 the same way if this was man rather than a woman, a white person rather than a black person." 6 7 And again, is that about building in these opportunities for thinking time? 8 9 It is, yes, but it's one of the simplest checks, isn't 10 it, of any kind of biases? Would I be reacting in the same way if a disabled person had said that? Would I 11 12 react in the same way if somebody from the LGBT 13 community said it? It gives us insight into how our 14 thinking works. 15 Q. Continuing on to paragraph 22 you say: "I think that there's the element of awareness of 16 17 people and certainly my experience of dealing with test-takers is that if you increase their awareness of 18 their biases then there are certain people who will 19 20 reflect and act on that. It actually makes them feel 21 bad as people. There is some research suggesting that 22 about 25 per cent of people, regardless of having insight, will just carry on as normal. I think that we 23 remain positive because about two-thirds of people, if 24

they are given insight into their biases, actually do

25

1 something about it. Whether they do that because they've got some kind of moral compass or whether they 2 3 do that because they know the organisation is very 4 attentive to that aspect and there might be censure if 5 we get on top of their bias, we don't know. They do seem to be able to be motivated. Trish Devine in her 6 7 research talks about it as the motivation to control bias." 8 9 So you're saying here that an awareness plus 10 motivation has the potential to bring about changes in behaviour? 11 12 Α. That certainly seems to be what Trish Devine's work had 13 suggested and I think that the numbers in that 14 particular piece come from an overlaying of 15 Trish Devine's work with some work by a psychologist at Sussex University some years later from the British 16 17 Social Attitude Survey when he asked the question, if 18 you have a bias, are you motivated to control it? And 19 he started to get a picture of what the motivation and 20 control was. 21 So there's about one in four people who even if they 22 know they have a bias, they don't care. As far as they're concerned, they're going to do what they want to 23 do. But most of the people either are already motivated 24 to control their biases or they can be motivated, even 25

1		if that is a threat censure on occasions.
2	Q.	So should we understand that of those who are
3		susceptible to motivation and don't fall within that 25
4		per cent who are not, some might be motived because they
5		have a strong moral compass, so the motivation is
6		internal to them if you like? Others are not so
7		motivated, but external factors, such as the
8		possibilities of sanction or censure, might be
9		sufficient to bring the behaviour back on track?
10	Α.	Yes, and the norms of the organisation are part and
11		parcel of that. It isn't always necessarily they might
12		know that they are not going to be censured by the
13		organisation, but to know that it's not an attitude that
14		colleagues would tolerate, for example, that they will
15		be seen badly by colleagues if they speak in a
16		particular way or say or do particular things.
17		I can't remember the exact numbers, but about one
18		third of people have got an internal motivation anyway,
19		about one thirdly of people can be motivated if they
20		know they have a bias, and it leaves us then within, you
21		know, 7 per cent of people who can be motived by the
22		censure and 25 per cent who don't care.
23	Q.	You explain in paragraph 24 that:
24		"The effect of this motivation can be short-lived if
25		it's not reinforced. If you commit to doing specific

things to mitigate bias and start to embed that within processes, there's a better chance of long-term change."

3 A. Yes.

practice.

- Q. Tell us a little bit more about the need to reinforce?
 - A. This comes from Trish Devine's work, where she bias-tested people, gave them the result of their bias tests and then some of them went through a training package on implicit bias and some of them, I think, were given a health and safety training package and they then revisited them a couple weeks later and they found that there was still a residual for the people who had done the training and had the testing and she could still detect that about two years later. But what she did in the intervening period she actually gave them some diaries to keep, so they had to keep a diary of what they were doing to mitigate their biases and that was what reinforced it. It was that embedding it into

And what we think is that after a while that gets passed back into the unconscious. You no longer have to consciously think about that three second gap. The thinking is doing it for you, but if you just expect people to roll out of the training course and you have inoculated them, I think you're probably on a hiding to nothing.

1 Q. So reinforcement means practice and you explain elsewhere in your statement, I think at paragraph 71, 2 3 that if a person isn't motivated, doesn't practice, then 4 they will revert back to their old attitudes and behaviours? 5 6 Yes. Α. 7 Q. Can we skip back up to paragraph 23, please. You talk here about an awareness at organisational level: 8 9 "Organisations often don't necessarily want to look 10 inside themselves and ask the question about their process. I know there's a lot of discussion about 11 12 institutional racism and chief constables saying that we 13 are or we are not institutionally racist, but I think 14 the unwillingness to looks at our systems and processes 15 is one of the indicators of that institutional racism that we're not prepared to look at our processes, we 16 17 want to foist the problem onto individuals. Whereas in actual fact a lot of it is based in our systems, what 18 calls do we attend, what calls do we not attend, what 19 20 information is an operational officer given in response 21 to a call there's. Quite a bit organisational 22 responsibility there, which often gets abdicated back to the individual." 23

Can you say a little more about that, the concept of organisation responsibility being passed back on to the

24

25

individual? 1 I think there's -- certainly in England the reluctance 2 Α. 3 of chief officers to admit that their force is 4 institutionally racist and I think that they don't 5 really understand it well. They seem to think it's some kind of a personal attack on every single one of their 6 7 officers. In actual fact, what it is it's a personal attack on the systems of that organisation, that we have 8 9 not got the systems in place that don't prevent 10 happening. And the classic example I think of it is and, again, 11 12 this is England and Wales, but I have been monitoring 13 the data in the national recruit process for about 14 13 years. There was adverse impact in the national 15 recruit process every single year and to me, when you're told that of that and you know it and you do nothing 16 17 about it, except blame the communities, which is what they did -- they said, well, you know, it's the Asian 18 community or the Pakistani community don't speak good 19 20 English or there's an educational issue or there's a 21 motivational issue without actually looking inside for 22 the systems that you have that cause that in the first 23 place. And when they finally did it last year, you know, 24

the results show that they narrowed the gap. Not

25

entirely, there were still some groups who were struggling, but the gap narrowed significantly when they actually went through their materials. They have still got the same system, but they actually went through the materials looking for these places, these hotspots, where bias might come back into the process and sometimes it was just nuances of language, it was the way things were structured. And they're starting to do it now with neurodiversity. They are now looking at the recruiting and promotional processes and saying, well, how does a

neurodiversity. They are now looking at the recruiting and promotional processes and saying, well, how does a person with dyslexia or ADHD cope with this process and how we can adapt that? They have never done that, as far as I know, with race or gender.

Q. I would like to ask you about training that you gave to Police Scotland and I suggest that we do this by looking at a PowerPoint presentation that you prepared and delivered in June of 21. And if we could bring this up on the screen, it's WIT00063. There are, I think, 39 slides, so this is going to be quite a quick trot through.

But I understand from your statement and I think what I would like to do, Dr Jones, is just keep the slide show on the screen and if I need to refer back to your statement, I'll give you the paragraph number and

```
1
             I'll read from the hard copy, but you explain, I think
             in paragraph 36, that this came about as a result of a
 2
 3
             call that you received from Inspector David Bradley who
 4
             had responsible for officer safety training within
 5
             Police Scotland at that time and you record that
             Inspector Bradley mentioned the death of Sheku Bayoh as
 6
 7
             being one of the motivations for introducing this type
 8
             of training.
 9
                 You also explain that it was three hours of training
10
             and it was delivered remotely because of the lockdown
             restrictions that were in place in 2021 and a passage
11
12
             from Inspector Bradley's statement was read to you in
             the course of your interview, in which Inspector Bradley
13
14
             explained that the cohort were full-time officer safety
15
             training instructors so that's who you were speaking to.
             It wasn't probationers or constables, it was OST
16
17
             instructors.
                 I'm conscious of the time. I wonder if before we
18
19
             get into the meat of the presentation, if that might be
20
             a good opportunity ...
21
         THE ARBITRATOR: Yes, that's a convenient point. We'll take
             a 15-minute break.
22
         (3.00 pm)
23
24
                                (A short break)
25
         (3.19 pm)
```

1 LORD BRACADALE: Ms Thomson. 2 MS THOMSON: Thank you. I wonder if we can bring up the 3 PowerPoint presentation again, please, Dr Jones. So we 4 see that this was commissioned by -- the training was 5 commissioned by Police Scotland or for their benefit and it concerns the subject of implicit bias in policing. 6 7 There are, I think, 39 slides in this pack, so we won't be able to go through all of them in the time available 8 9 to us, but I'm going to pick out a few and invite your comment on them. 10 Let's look at slide 2, please, the session plan, 11 12 just to see what your training covered. You have 13 explained already this was a three-hour session. So it 14 looked at what is unconscious or implicit bias, how can 15 it affect people, decisions and policing; how might it affect officer decision-making around use the force; how 16 17 might it affect the training we design and deliver, and what does the research say we can do about it in 18 generating actions and advice. Those were the themes 19 20 you were looking to cover in the course of the 21 presentation. 22 There's a nice quote on the following slide, slide 3: 23 "There are no bad people, just bad thinking habits. 24 Unconscious bias is a thinking habit we have learned 25

1

which we can unlearn."

2 Is that a statement that you would endorse? Yes, Trish has denied saying that now, but I now claim 3 Α. 4 that statement as mine so ... 5 All right. Can we go to slide five, please. Can you Q. talk us through this one? 6 7 Α. Yes. This comes from a book called "Thinking, Fast and Slow" by Daniel Kahneman and it explains the principle 8 behind implicit and explicit thinking, conscious and 9 10 unconscious thinking so it's fairly well known I think. The only thing we've done is change it from a baseball 11 12 to a tennis ball for the English and Scottish audiences. 13 But if you ask people to calculate the answer to that question, so a bat and a ball costs £1.10, the bat 14 15 costs £1 more than ball, how much does the ball cost? Most people say that the answer is 10p because it feels 16 17 seems like 10p, doesn't it? But it can't possibly be 18 10p, because if the bat is one pound more than the ball 19 and the ball were 10p, then the bat would have to be 20 £1.10. There is only one correct answer and that's 5p. 21 So the ball is 5p, the bat is one pound more than that, so that makes it £1.05, add the two together and it's 22 23 £1.10. 24 So it's not a surprise when people give that wrong and I have given that, by the way, to professors of 25

1 maths and they sometimes get it wrong as well so don't feel bad if you get it wrong. It's not the fact that 2 3 people get it wrong, because we instinctively it feels 4 like 10p, but the reality of it is, is that even if you 5 say to people it's not 10p it's 5p, they don't seem to able to rethink it. Once they have got that 10p answer 6 7 in their head, they don't seem able to dislodge it from their minds. And that's the thing about implicit 8 9 biases. Not only is it instinctive, but once it has made a decision for you, getting it to unpick and 10 reverse that decision is actually very, very tricky. 11 12 So I use it to basically introduce the idea of 13 implicit thinking and we also then cover the difference 14 between the instinctive fast operating and the slow and 15 conscious mind in terms of the conscious mind will get you the answer to that question and usual engineers are 16 17 quite good at it, because they have got an X minus Y 18 divided by two formula in their head. Most other groups 19 really struggle with it, but it's to highlight the 20 nature of implicit bias and most people get that wrong 21 if they haven't seen it before. This is an example designed to illustrate the difference 22 Q. between the way that the unconscious mind works and the 23

A. Hm-hmm.

24

conscious mind works?

1 Q. Let's look very briefly at the next slide. For the benefit of anyone who might have been struggling with 2 3 this example you have done the sums and set out the 4 correct answer there. Can we skip through to slide number 9: 5 "Implicit biases develop and are maintained from 6 7 your culture, our experiences and from the media we absorb." 8 9 So you're explaining here where these biases come 10 from. Are they learned then essentially our biases? Are we something that we're born with or are they to do 11 12 with our lived experience and our learning through life? 13 Yes, some of them obviously our learned experiences, the Α. patterns that we absorb. So, for example, male leaders 14 15 is a pattern we see in lots of places, women cleaners is a pattern we often see, but the culture also does that. 16 17 It tells us what groups are the valuable groups in 18 society and what groups are the less valuable groups and 19 then, finally, you have got the media themselves. What 20 are the messages that you get from various media 21 sources? The Metropolitan Police website is a classic 22 example of that, how it reinforces those biases. 23 Q. You say: "Being biased is part of who we are. We are all 24 biased and we have a bias blind spot." 25

1 Α. Yes. 2 What's -- sorry. Q. Research would suggest that we -- it's other people who 3 Α. 4 have the biases, it's not us, that we can see it in 5 other people, but we really struggle to see bias and prejudice in our own behaviour, in our own words. And 6 7 it seems to be some kind of defence mechanism that we don't want to be able to see it, so we cut ourselves off 8 from it and we see it as somebody else's problem. 9 10 Q. "Biases are easily triggered under cognitive or emotional load... " 11 12 You spoke about that this morning, but you add: 13 "When tired or deplete of glucose." Yes, so effectively the brain is just a machine, isn't 14 15 it? It runs on glucose, so when the glucose levels fall, we are more likely to fall back onto our bias 16 17 levels and you often hear people talking about them being "hangry" with an H, because they're hungry and 18 19 it's a lack of glucose, which takes away our emotional 20 regulation. 21 The study I often quote for that is a study in 22 Israel with judges and what they found was the decisions that judges made on parole decisions tended to be more 23 harsh just before coffee breaks and just before lunch. 24 As the glucose levels in the brain fell, they tended to 25

- be more likely to refuse a parole application at those
 times.
- Q. Thank you. Can we move on to slide number 14, please.

 Can you talk us through this slide?
 - A. Right. It came about I guess because we were contacted by a police force who had had some problems inside their Professional Standards Department, so these are the people who investigate complaints against police. In particular, one black officer had been suspended for a period of two years on what turned out to be a misunderstanding between him and a complainant. But it got us thinking about the impact on the investigation of complaints against police and internal professional standards investigations.

And if you remember when we spoke about the testing, we talked about groups, black people, white people, men, women, and we talked about the constructs, so what is it that we're associating a group with? And we developed a specific test for professional standards in policing and what we wanted to know was, do investigators in professional standards more strongly associate white people, black people, Asian people, and men or women with some of the more negative constructs around investigation? So do they see them as helpful and cooperative and open and honest or do they see them as

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

deceitful, dangerous, predators, for example?

And we took the test out to professional standards departments in three police forces and what we did we administered them to their investigators and we were interested in, firstly, obviously, the proportions of people who have bias against particular groups, but also which groups they were biased against. And so if you move to the left from right from Asian, what it tells us is that there are a small percentage of people -- and the coloured bars by the way represent the three police forces involved. The reason there's four bars on the right-hand side is we did revisit one force two years later and retest them. And what you can see is there is a small amount of what I'm calling pro-Asian antiwhite bias, so they were more likely to associate white people with being uncooperative, with being predators, with being liars, and a much larger proportions of them, between 15 and 20-odd per cent, more likely to associate Asian people with that.

You see the same but a more pronounced effect where you used the black test and now they have got black and white faces and this idea of whether people were being honest and cooperative and you can see it's even more pronounced. Only two or three per cent of them, which equates possibly to one or two people in each sample,

associated white people with the negative constructs,

but around about one in five associated the black people

with the negative constructs.

And then for gender we see something similar, which is that men are more likely to be associated with the negativity around professional standards. The point I often make is you do not want to be a black man in the professional standards investigation. You get the double whammy of both the race bias and a gender bias and it is fairly consistent across the forces. You know, from West Yorkshire down to South Wales we were getting very similar proportions and we revisited, by the way, on the final bar, which I think is the yellow bar, we revisited one force two years later and retested, not the same people, just the people who worked in the department two years later, some of them maybe the same, and you can see again the results are very similar over time.

- Q. And this bias testing was that the sort of testing that you described to us earlier on with the photographs, so, for example, black and white faces and the descriptive words that either had a positive or negative association?
- A. Yes. All we did was change the words to be more reflective of the investigation process than we did with

1 the original test.

18

19

20

21

22

23

- 2 Okay. You said a moment ago in your evidence that you Q. 3 wouldn't want to be a black man subject to an 4 investigation by professional standards and in paragraph 5 40 of your statement, and we won't bring this up on the screen, I would rather keep the slide show up, but I'll 6 7 read it out to you. You explain this slide and you explain that what really got you into this training in 8 9 the first place was that a number of forces had that 10 disparity in the outcome of their professional standards processes. Black officers were more likely to end up in 11 12 trouble and the National Black Police Association over 13 the years had done research and presented an opinion 14 that black police officers, in particular, are subject 15 to discipline more often and more harshly than other officers might be and so you have developed a particular 16 17 version of the bias test in order to explore that.
 - A. Yes, the National Black Police Association are saying that that's an effect that's merged since the Couzens case where professional standards have started to really crack down on standards for police officers that more black and Asian officers are being put forward for misconduct now than they were and they are saying, well, we're seeing it again now.
- Q. Thank you. I wonder if we can move on to slide 20.

1 This is the concluding slide in a series of slides that came under the heading "Implicit bias and perceptions of 2 3 criminality" and looks to be the conclusions of the 4 slides that precede it. 5 So you have recorded here: "The results of seven studies showed that people 6 7 have a bias to perceive black men as bigger, taller heavier, more muscular and more physically threatening, 8 stronger, more capable of harm than young white man. 9 10 Biased formidability judgments in turn promoted participants' justifications of hypothetical use of 11 12 force against black suspects of crime, thus perceivers 13 appear to integrate multiple pieces of information to 14 ultimately concluded that black men are more physically 15 threatening than white men, believing that they must therefore be controlled using more aggressive measures." 16 17 And does that conclusion come from the study that 18 you refer to in the bottom right or is that the conclusion that you have drawn based on all of the 19 20 research that was listed on the previous slides? 21 Α. That's from the study. 22 That's from the study. Q. That was their conclusion of all the studies that have 23 Α. been looked at, which I then went back and looked at. 24 25 Q. Okay. And we see that this study is reported in a

1 journal called the Journal of Personality and Sociability Psychology in 2017. Can you tell us 2 3 anything about that journal? Is that a UK journal or US 4 journal? 5 It's an international journal. It is one of the more highly regarded journals around personality. 6 7 Q. Okay. I am being reminded by my colleagues that we heard evidence at the beginning of this hearing on race 8 9 from a Professor Meer, a university professor from 10 Glasgow, who I understand also referred to this study in the research paper that he prepared for the Inquiry. 11 12 Now, you give an illustration here, can you tell us 13 about the illustration that you have included on this 14 slide? 15 So at that time PC Monk, Benjamin Monk, was a patrol PC Α. sent with a colleague to deal what effectively was a 16 domestic dispute in terms of Dalian Atkinson, who I 17 18 think people may know used to be a footballer, a 19 professional footballer, I think for Aston Villa in his 20 day. He had been through some difficulties and he had 21 gone to his father's house in Telford and threatened to 22 kill him and PC Monk and his colleague arrived on the scene and Mr Atkinson appeared on the doorstep. 23 And in the evidence given by PC Atkinson at his 24 trial he said "He was enormous." That's not the reality 25

8

9

10

11

12

13

25

- of the physicality of Dalian Atkinson. He was a little
 bit overweight, he was 5'9", he had a heart condition,
 he was far from a being a peek physical subject, but he
 was then subjected by PC Monk to being kicked in the
 head whilst on the floor and being tasered three times
 and he was convicted and sent to prison for manslaughter
 for doing that.
 - Q. Can we move on to slide 30, please. Here you list a number of different types of bias. I wonder if you could perhaps pick out, say, half a dozen of the better known and tell us, just in a few words each, what they look like, how we might recognise these different types of bias?
- I think there's, like, 122 in the literature, but these 14 Α. 15 are the ones which we see most frequently in organisations. The kind of underpinning one is affinity 16 17 bias: if you look like me, sound like me, share my background, share my skin colour, I'm more likely to see 18 19 you as one of those groups positively, which conversely 20 means that people who are not like you tend to be seen 21 less positively and it underpins a lot of the other 22 biases. So the other biases which then come in are driven by affinity bias, the fact that we like people 23 who look like us. 24

Attributional bias is we explain the causes of

behaviour differently. So if somebody who is similar to 1 us has a piece of positive behaviour, we tend to 2 3 attribute that to them internally, so they're a good 4 person. If they do something wrong, we attribute 5 externally, so we blame the situation of the circumstances. People less like us we often see the 6 opposite, which is if they do something good, we 7 attribute that to good luck or the circumstances, 8 9 whereas if they do something bad, we blame them for it. 10 We say it's their fault that they did it. Confirmation bias, we see what we expect to see. So 11 12 we start off with a view of the world and then we seek out information that confirms that view and we ignore 13 14 information that contradicts that view of the world or 15 that set of circumstances. Source bias is an interesting one. So some sources 16 17 of information are regarded as more valuable, so you're more likely to believe information that comes from 18 19 certain sources without challenging it, whereas other 20 sources you will not believe. But the affinity bias 21 sits underneath that, which is if sources are more likes 22 us are more likely to be believed than sources that are less like us. 23 And the final one I think of interest is possibly 24 conformity effects so we often don't want to do things 25

- 1 that are different. We go with the flow, especially if
- 2 somebody more senior is the person who's suggesting it.
- 3 People do not like to be the odd one out, particularly
- 4 when they have a very senior person in the room or in
- 5 the situation.
- Q. What is halo and horns effect?
- 7 A. So people have an attribute that you really like or you
- 8 really dislike and then that colours your whole
- 9 perception of them. So, I don't know, they're a smoker
- and you then attribute that their intelligence is not so
- good or they have poor health or something like that, so
- it effectively colours your whole perception based upon
- one thing that either really, or you dislike. So they
- 14 went to a certain school or university, then they get a
- positive vibe versus a negative vibe from other
- universities.
- 17 Q. If we can move on to slide 32, please, headed up "System
- 18 Actions" and this continues on to the following slide,
- 19 so there are 11 system actions that are put forward for
- 20 discussion in that context of this particular training
- 21 exercise. Again, I wonder if might invite you just to
- 22 identify those which are most prominent or perhaps have
- 23 the broadest application and tell us just a little more
- about them.
- 25 A. I think the first one on the list is know your data.

1 Too often organisations don't know the nature of the 2 problem they have, because they haven't got the data. I 3 will given you an example of that. If you look at the 4 dataset that West Yorkshire Police have got around use 5 of force, it's very, very detailed. You know, they know exactly what force was used against which particular 6 7 people based on gender, based on ethnicity, so they're able to say which groups are more likely, for example, 8 9 to be the subject of Pava spray or a spit hood or 10 something like that. And if you haven't got that data, you really don't know what the problem is. If it's a 11 12 recruiting problem, if you haven't got a problem on your 13 recruiting process of who's getting through who's 14 failing, then you really can't solve the problem, so 15 it's the kind of underpinning one. Reviewing key decision-making processes. I mean 16 17 this example of that is the College of Policing have had 18 a review done and they have unpicked their process and they've -- it goes into number 5 really, looking for 19 20 marginal gains. There's no magic silver bullet in all 21 of this. What there is often is small gains, small 22 tweaks in the system, that little by little erodes the opportunity for bias to actually get into the decision 23 and into the behaviour that people have got. 24

And sometimes just sitting down with those

1 decisions, and I did some work for a large sports 2 company about two years ago where we reviewed, I think 3 it was 60 or 70 job applications, looking specifically 4 for the kind of triggers that might induce certain jobs, 5 putting them through software that could actually identify the kind of words that they were using. Very 6 7 minor changes on occasions, just a word here and a word there, but it's that kind of approach you might not be 8 9 able to find the one of my wonderful idea that actually 10 cracks this, but you can erode it with these little 11 steps. 12 Q. Shall we move onto the next slide perhaps and look at 13 the additional points there. 14 Yes. Α. 15 There's another five points. Are there any there that Q. 16 you would like to highlight? Some of this is actually what we talked about earlier on 17 Α. 18 in terms of things like promoting positive role models, 19 which came to the stereotypes. So when we see a good 20 example, bring it to people's attention, because that 21 tends to erode people's capacity to fall back on to 22 those stereotypes. Avoiding pejorative media releases. You know, the 23 24 Metropolitan Police Twitter feed is a good example of that. There's also a couple of things within this about 25

the perspective that we have. Asking white men to review stuff which is really designed for black and minority ethnic groups, for example, or women is unlikely to come up with the magic answer to it when the perspective is very much that and I'll give an example.

RBS won't mind me saying this. When they were designing their new automatic telling machines, it was somebody who said, what about people with disabilities? Who actually got certain functionality put into it which was not going to be put in, because it was complex and expensive, but that person spotted the glitch in the system that allowed them then to put that right before they installed the machines. That's because they involved the people who were going to be the end users, if you like, in the process and I think sometimes white men design lots of stuff without necessarily asking other people what it should look like.

Q. Let's move on to the next slide. Personal actions. We touched on this earlier in your evidence when we talked about the thinking pauses and I asked whether there were other steps that you could take on an individual basis and you said that there were many and we agreed that we could come back to this because the slide was in the slide show. I'm not sure I can read this, it's very, very small, but can you perhaps talk us through at least

1 a handful of these personal actions.

A. So this is much about what we found out when we did the review. So obviously we've talked about the insight that getting bias tests can do. Once we know what our biases are, if we are motivated to do something about them, we have an opportunity to intervene. Having contact, so this is known as the contact hypothesis, which is the more you have contact with a group for which you have a bias, the less likely you are to be able to maintain that bias because nobody fits the stereotype perfectly. The more people you meet, the more you realise those pigeonholes into which you put groups just don't work and that enables us to break those down.

Use of role models, we touched upon that, didn't we, which is the more that we have people who contradict the role model or are positive role models for a group, the more likely we are to mitigate our biases.

Counterstereotype, so that's the kind of flip side is to say -- there is some slightly perverse research saying by the way that sometimes thinking of counterstereotypes makes it worse not better, but most of the research says that if you think the opposite of a stereotype, saying I'm going to reject that stereotype, then it does have an effect, but you run the risk of

1 triggering the stereotype for use, which is the worry. Perspective taking. So this has been widely rolled 2 out, I think, asking people to stop for a minute and 3 think how would I like to be treated in those 4 5 circumstances? Can I understand why that person is where they are at this moment in time? 6 7 Avoiding reinforcement. We have talked a little bit about that, but even things like jokes. We often say, 8 9 "it's just a joke", but the unconscious doesn't know 10 that, it just wires that joke into the big ping-pong ball of our brain for later use. 11 12 Avoiding reinforcement. We've touched upon that, 13 haven't we, but even if it's a question of making sure 14 that the kind of media that you is not pejorative about 15 particular groups. 16 Avoiding the triggers. So we've spoken a little bit 17 about how things like being rushed and stressed and 18 angry and hungry can cause us to fall back on our 19 biases. We can't always avoid the triggers, but when we 20 can build it in to try not to make important decisions 21 at times when those conditions are most prevalent, that 22 gives us a chance. I'll give you an example. I did some work for one of the ombudsman and what they decided 23 to do was rather than making a complex decision at 24 quarter to 4 on a Tuesday, they would always sleep on 25

it, they would put a delay on the email going out to give them a chance to think it through overnight, and that was just a question of them saying, "You know what, perhaps quarter to 4 at the end of a really long day when people have been shouting at me all day is not a great time for making critical decisions. I'll make that one tomorrow morning when I'm refreshed, when I've had something to eat and I'll get on with some admin for tonight". And that was a simple saying, if we can avoid the triggers. You can't always do it, can you, because sometimes you have got to do it, you have got to do it now, but avoiding the triggers is one thing certainly in a more office-based role is really easy.

Slowing things down. So just trying to create those little thinking gaps along the way. And saying something about it. I thought it was really interesting the other day that people were saying, "Well, I knew that about that guy", but you never said anything, you never did anything in all that time. Nobody ever said "that's wrong". And the research would say that the best person to make a challenge on bad behaviour is a white man, somebody in the dominant, more powerful group, because people don't think that I have got a vested interest, they don't think, ah, well, he would say that because

1 he's gay, he would say that because he's black. So when 2 we say it, (a), because we're the more powerful group, 3 secondly, because we have no vested interest in making 4 the challenge often, then that's why it's more important 5 that people in actual fact step up and say, "You know what, that's out of order, that's not right". 6 7 So I can't see number 10. There's got to be a list of 10 or 11, hasn't there? 8 Q. I think it's actually 9. I have a smaller version on my 9 10 screen. If we scroll down, there we are. I think it is just 9. Thank you. 11 12 You say elsewhere in your statement, I think at 13 paragraph 70: 14 "If you want people to do this kind of stuff and do 15 it instinctively, it has to be easy to implement, it has to be really, really low on demand and they have to have 16 the time to practice it." 17 18 Yes, so we don't really want to be giving people load, Α. 19 extra load, at times when they actually need all of 20 their thinking power to deal with the situation in front 21 of me, but you have to give them the time to practise 22 it, to pass it back. There was a piece of research in the States on the police use of firearms that found that 23 well-trained firearms officers were able to at least 24 25 overcome in part some of the biases around race simply

- because they practiced and practiced and practiced and
 they passed that training back into their unconscious,
 they didn't have to think about what to do now, it was
 automatic.
- Finally, can we look briefly at slide 39, please. So Q. we've looked at the advice that might be given at an organisational level to counteract unconscious or implicit bias, steps that an individual can take and now you have a slide headed "Organisational and Leader Actions". Again, I wonder if you could very quickly talk us through this, perhaps highlighting key points for leaders.
 - A. Yes, I mean leaders are quite good with data, but they have to have the data. They have to gather the data and I know the Bank of England, when they started off on their journey, they spent 12 months just getting the data right before they started to implement anything, they need to have the data. But I often talk to leaders about being brave and not fragile. Sometimes they inside organisations they have got a lot of people whispering in their ears, "We can't do that", "We shouldn't do that". Sometimes they just have to not listen to those people. I call them the boss whisperers. Stop listening to the boss whisperers and get on and do it. So I think that sometimes there is a

1 kind of call to arms for leaders to say, "You're a leader, you're paid to be a leader, get on and do it, 2 3 don't be having this second guessing all the time". 4 Reviewing processes. Usually leaders in 5 organisations, the people who have got the gift, they're the people saying, "I own this process, I can tell you 6 we need to review it". The person operating the system 7 often doesn't. They have just got the front end. 8 9 Using diverse panels and having somebody there to 10 challenge the decision. Sometimes it's just having somebody as the devil's advocate, if you like, to say, 11 12 "Well, can we look at that in a different way? Why are 13 we doing that?" Sometimes just having somebody with 14 that role to push back can stop people doing that and 15 across the organisation that idea of creating the opportunities for the stuff we've said they should be 16 17 doing, rather than making it difficult to do that, having contact, for example. If you make it difficult, 18 they're not going to get the contact. 19 Anything else you would like to highlight from this 20 Q. 21 slide? 22 Right, okay. Α. Building accountability. We're certainly seeing 23 that with the Police Race Action Plan that's going in 24 England and Wales. If the senior leaders are not asking 25

1	people, "What progress are we making? Where are we with
2	it?" nothing gets done. If they don't actually the
3	crime commissioners have not been asking chief
4	constables, "Well, where are we making progress with
5	this?" If nobody is asking if it's getting done, nobody
6	is going to get done. So accountability I think is
7	really important. And there's a system change around
8	things like creating space in the stop-search
9	situations.
10	Q. Thank you. Can you bear with me for just a second,
11	please. I have no further questions. Thank you,
12	Dr Jones.
13	LORD BRACADALE: Are there any Rule 9 applications?
14	Dr Jones, thank you very much for coming to give
15	evidence to the Inquiry. I'm very grateful for the
16	time. The Inquiry is about to adjourn for the day and
17	you'll then be free to go. Adjourn until tomorrow
18	morning at 10 o'clock.
19	(3.53 pm)
20	(The hearing was adjourned to 10.00 am on Wednesday 26 June
21	2024)
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	INDEX.
2	
3	Evidence of JOHN LOGUE2
4	
5	Examination-in-chief by MS THOMSON2
6	
7	Rule 9 Application by MS MITCHELL96
8	
9	Submissions by MS MITCHELL102
10	
11	Evidence of DR PETER JONES104
12	Examination-in-chief by MS THOMSON104
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	