NORTHERN IRELAND POLICING BOARD

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE PERFORMANCE COMMITTEE HELD
8th October 2026 at 9:30am

PRESENT:		Mr Gerry Kelly, Chair
	(7)	Mr Les Allamby, Vice Chair*
		Ms Cheryl Brownlee
	(5)	Mr Trevor Clarke
	(6)	Ms Nuala McAllister*
		Mr Thomas O'Reilly
	(6)	Mr Colin McGrath*
		Mr Frank McManus*
	(5)	Mr Peter Osborne
		Ms Deirdre Hargey
POLICE SERVICE OF NORTHERN IRELAND IN ATTENDANCE	(4)	Deputy Chief Constable Bobby Singleton
	(3)	Assistant Chief Constable Melanie Jones
	(1)	Chief Superintendent Gary McDonald
	(2)	Chief Superintendent Stephen Murray
	(1)	Superintendent Marty Reid
	(1)	Superintendent Daniel McPhillips
	(2)	Superintendent Andrea Hill
	(3)	3 other PSNI Staff
OFFICIALS IN ATTENDANCE:		Ms Sinead Simpson, NIPB CEO
		Mr Adrian McNamee, Director of Performance
		Mr Aonghus Kelly, Human Rights Advisor,
		7 Officials

*Attended via video conferencing
(1) Attended for Item 6.1 only
(2) Attended for Item 6.3 only
(3) Attended for Item 6.2 only
(4) Attended for Item 6.1 to 6.3
(5) Attended from Item 6.1
(6) Attended up to Item 6.5
(7) Attended up to Item 6.6

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Patrick Nelson.

The Committee agreed the agenda for the meeting.

The Chair asked Members to advise of any items they wished to raise at Item 9 under "Any Other Business". None were advised.

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

No conflicts of interests were declared.

3 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The Committee considered the draft minutes of the Performance Committee meeting held on 10th September 2026.

Following discussion Members: -

AGREED

Officials to write to ACC Beck regarding the publication of the Langdale Report **(AP1)**.

Members also: -

NOTED

That Minutes of the Performance Committee meeting on the 10th September 2026 were agreed.

4. UPDATE ON ACTION LOG

The Director of Performance provided an update on the open actions listed on the Action Log.

The Director provided an update on AP1 from the meeting held on 12 February 2026 – Officials to write to the PSNI to request a copy of their internal guidelines in respect of use of Covert Human Intelligence Sources (CHIS). A response from ACC Beck was provided at the Committee meeting in May. The Human Rights Advisor provided an update following his meeting with PSNI to view the draft guidelines and dip sample cases. The Human Rights Advisor confirmed he had had the opportunity to sample two cases so far and would move on to others once concerns regarding one of the sampled cases had been resolved. Members expressed concerns with the guidelines being followed by PSNI and still wish to see these. The Human Rights Advisor confirmed the guidelines were close to finalisation and had been reclassified for Members to view. He hoped to be able to share the guidelines with Members at Novembers Performance Committee.

The Director provided an update on AP6 from the meeting held on 16 April 2026 – Human Rights Advisor to provide an initial impression on oversight and accountability gaps for Members. The Human Rights Advisor is continuing to work on this report and will bring it to a future Committee meeting.

The Director provided an update on AP1 from the meeting held on 14 May 2026 – Human Rights Advisor to clarify with ACC McNally how automation software is used by the PSNI. The Human Rights Advisor confirmed he had received a draft document outlining uses of automation software by the PSNI and this information on PSNIs current use of AI/Automation software was shared with Members at Item 4.1 on today's agenda. The Members were content with the response, and this item is now closed.

The Director provided an update on AP3 from the meeting held on 11 June 2026 – Officials to request further detail from PSNI on whether cyber work could be done internally within PPB with extra training to reduce the backlog to the cyber centre. Officials wrote to PSNI on 15 June 2026. PSNI yet to respond.

The Director provided an update on AP6 from the meeting held on 11 June 2026 – Human Rights Advisor to investigate statistics on destruction of property due to sectarian hate crime data. The Human Rights Advisor will consider this within his next thematic report on race and hate.

The Director provided an update on AP1 from the meeting held on 10 September 2026 – In relation to officers and staff with no line management, Officials to seek clarification from PSNI on how these officers and staff are currently being managed. Officials wrote to PSNI. PSNI response was included at item 4.1 of todays agenda. The Members were content with the response, and this item is now closed.

The Director provided an update on AP2 from the meeting held on 10 September 2026 – Officials to request information from PSNI on Stalking Prevention Orders. Officials wrote to PSNI on 11 September 2026. PSNI have yet to respond.

The Director provided an update on AP3 from the meeting held on 10 September 2026 – Officials to request from PSNI and share with Members a copy of the draft strategic framework relating to VAWC and an update on the outstanding 21 actions from the Year 2 VAWG Action Plan. Officials wrote to PSNI on 11 September 2026. A copy of the VAWC strategic framework is included at Item 4.1 of todays agenda. Officials are currently awaiting a response on the 21 actions from the Year 3 VAWG Action Plan.

The Director provided an update on AP4 from the meeting held on 10 September 2026 – Officials to request further information from OPONI on the categorisation of complaints leading to a 90% increase in complaints on Police enquiries and details in relation to recommendations made to PSNI (PSD). Officials wrote to OPONI on 16 September 2026. A response was received on 5 October 2026 in relation to recommendations made to PSNI and included at Item 4.1 of today's agenda. Currently waiting a reply from OPONI on the categorisation of complaints leading to a 90% increase in complaints on Police enquiries.

It was: -

NOTED

Members were content with the responses received.

5.0 CHAIRPERSON'S BUSINESS

The Chair confirmed that there were no other items of business.

6. ITEMS FOR COMMITTEE BUSINESS

6.1 Policing Plan Indicator 1.5 – Victim Satisfaction

Board Officials presented a paper providing Members with an analysis of PSNI's Performance to date in relation to Indicator 1.5 – Victim Satisfaction with progress measured through the impacts identified within the Policing Plan 2025 to 2030.

The Chairperson welcomed the PSNI to the meeting. He invited them to brief Members on the work relating to Policing Plan Indicator 1.5.

The PSNI presented information through an OBA Report Card and provided a statistical commentary of their performance against Indicator 1.5 and discussed with Members the work carried out in key areas including:

- Baselines, quantitative data and key impacts;
- Qualitative data including; recruitment plan for additional call handlers, increase in number of questions of Victim Satisfaction survey to align with Victims Charter and work with DoJ to enhance needs assessment service; and
- The reasons for the PSNI's self-assessment of "adequate progress" including sustained delivery of strategic and operation improvements to improve victim satisfaction.

Members engaged in discussion with PSNI and sought clarity on a number of issues including: -

- A Member referred to communication with victims and the ten-day timeframe to provide victim updates and queried if this was ten working days for the case officer (disregarding any leave or other absence) or ten days in general.
- A Member queried whether PSNI kept data on referrals to Victim Support and how PSNI ensured referrals were being made where appropriate.
- A Member referred to the results of Question 2 of the Victim Satisfaction Survey relating to how well victims feel they have been kept informed about their cases progression. They expressed disappointment at the results and suggested that performance in this area was closely linked to the availability of adequate numbers of personnel and resources and how the PSNI planned to improve this in the future given limited resources are likely to be an ongoing issue.

- A Member referred to the PSNIs self-assessment score of “adequate progress”. They queried how PSNI justified the score given the lack of positive improvement and asked if a score of “limited progress” might have been more appropriate.
- A Member referred to the Victims Advisory Board and queried why this wasn’t established.
- A Member asked for a status update on the forty new call handlers being employed and queried when these would be in post.
- A Member referred to PSNI Connect and asked about level of uptake.
- A Member referred to the recently released Victims Commissioner Survey and asked what the difference was between this and the PSNIs survey. The Member also queried what the relationship between the PSNI and Victims Commissioner was.
- A Member referred to the Virtual Officer Attendance Team (VOAT) and SMS updates. They queried what type of incidents will be included and if it will include sexual/domestic abuse victims considering potential privacy issues. They also asked for information about who will be doing the video calling.

The PSNI provided the following responses: -

- In relation to the ten-day victim update timeframe, the PSNI informed Members this referred to a general ten-day window from the day of the crime/incident and emphasised that officers are expected to provide further updates of any meaningful change in the case even after ten days.
- The PSNI informed Members they do retain data on Victim Support referrals and would provide these to Members. They further informed Members that victims are automatically referred unless they formally op-out of a referral. PSNI also stated they also refer to other services such as advocates or legal services depending on case requirements.
- In relation to Question 2 of the Victim Satisfaction Survey, the PSNI highlighted to Members that the figures in the report card are a snapshot

of current position after four months and that this usually levels out throughout the year as more victims complete the survey. They also emphasised that even if the figures rebound, they are not satisfied. The PSNI informed Members of several projects they hope will improve victim satisfaction including; embedding principles of updating victims in the new generation of sergeants coming through, changes made in processes to improve communication between video attendance team and local investigators and a pilot of a victim contact module on the PSNIs NICHE system.

- In relation to the PSNI self-assessment score, the PSNI acknowledged the challenge and highlighted to Members that they don't have annualised data yet and expect some of the scores on the report card to improve. The PSNI did however inform Members of a range of initiatives aimed at improving performance in this measure including; the My PSNI online portal, a live chat service in development, SMS victim updates and a new witness appeals module.
- In relation to the Victims Advisory Board, the PSNI informed Members they had looked at it as an option, however they decided that hosting a REAL in-person event would be more inclusive and allow a greater range of opinions to be heard and receive stakeholder feedback. They stated that their previous event had over 100 different people and organisations represented and highlighted the planned change to the Victim Satisfaction Survey to increase from four to eight questions came out of this event. The PSNI also informed Members their next event is due to take place in the coming months.
- In relation to new call handlers, the PSNI informed Members that a dozen new call handlers had started in the last week with another 24 are due to start. They also informed Members of a new facility opened in Garnerville to allow more handlers to be trained. They plan to recruit further in 2027.
- Regarding PSNI Connect, the PSNI advised Members that a successful pilot had been completed in two districts. They did not yet have the figures

available but advised that although in its infancy they had high hopes for the initiative.

- In relation to the difference with the Victims Commissioner survey, the PSNI survey is a rolling SMS text survey whereas the Victims Commissioner runs once a year and is online. The PSNI advised Members they have a strong working relationship with the Commissioner.
- In relation to VOAT and SMS updates, the PSNI confirmed that when a confirmed victim of crime is identified an SMS is sent with a link to an online reporting portal. They confirmed that this service is not live for domestic abuse at this time. The PSNI did inform Members they are currently working on a way to include victims of domestic abuse in partnership with colleagues in Police Protection Branch with a view to developing a pilot programme. They have discussed a range of safeguards to protect domestic abuse victims during reporting including; quick-exit features, geolocation, safe words, built-in software safeguards, ability to choose a date and time that suits and clear appointment times. The PSNI informed Members the video calls will be conducted by a mixture of local officers and detective constables, all of whom will be PIP 2 accredited. They assured Members there would be a clear line of ownership in all cases.

The Chairperson thanked the PSNI for their attendance and briefing and they left the meeting.

Following discussion Members: -

AGREED

Officials to request stats from PSNI on the percentage of cases which are referred to Victim Support. **(AP2)**

6.2 PSNI Response to HMICFRS Inspection Report

Board Officials presented a paper informing Members of the recently published HMICFRS inspection report for 2025/26. The two areas the inspection focused on were:

- Attracting, developing and retaining the workforce and creating a diverse and inclusive workplace.
- Using powers fairly, appropriately and with justification.

The inspection graded PSNI as adequate in both areas. The paper also identified the next steps to fulfil the Board's legislative remit in relation to this report.

The Chairperson welcomed the PSNI to the meeting. He invited them to brief Members on the HMICFRS inspection report.

Members engaged in discussion with PSNI and sought clarity on a number of issues including: -

- A Member referred to the new Task and Finish Group (TFG) which PSNI established in response to the inspections recommendation to improve recording of Use of Force (UoF) to provide supervision and scrutiny in stop and search (S&S) cases where UoF was used. The Member queried whether the TFG would look at the wider culture and attitudes of officers.
- A Member referred to the UoF cases and queried if there was a mechanism which would automatically trigger a check on a particular file if UoF was present.
- A Member referred to the issue with IT system recording UoF cases and queried if PSNI has stopped using the technology causing the undercount.
- A Member referred to the inspection recommendation that PSNI progress the implementation of their new professional development review system and suggested there was a strong linkage between Professional Development Reviews (PDRs) and outcomes.

- A Member raised concerns around supervisors having enough time to carry out the PDR and one-to-one obligations and queried how the PSNI would ensure that managers have proper training and time to tackle professional development issues.
- A Member highlighted that 270 officers do not currently have a line manager and expressed concerns this means they are not being managed or supervised in terms of professional development.
- A Member referred to the inspection's recommendation that the PSNI should assess psychological risks associated with its roles and introduce a screening programme. They queried what was being done and the expected impacts of these changes going forward. The Member also asked whether there were incentives or support that could be offered to high-risk staff members or work areas.
- A Member referred to the inspection recommendation that the PSNI required more accredited detectives and needed to provide officers with specialist skills required for investigative work. They queried what progress was being made in this regard.
- A Member asked for an update on PSNIs Operation Akarpos.
- A Member referred to high levels of claims for Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) and trauma from PPB staff and queried how the PSNI would futureproof themselves from legal action in the future and whether it would be a good idea to liaise with legal colleagues; and
- A Member queried whether there should be a limit on the length of time an officer could remain in a high-risk/stress department such as PPB due to the increased likelihood of this type of work taking a toll on wellbeing in the longer term.

The PSNI provided the following responses: -

- PSNI confirmed the TFG would aim to address attitudes and culture. To illustrate this, they informed members of plans to improve the issue of UoF undercounting. Members were informed that there has been an issue with undercounting cases of UoF caused by a poorly designed proactive

process which meant that all officers attending an incident involving UoF must complete a UoF form and submit to an IT system even if they have not been directly involved. This resulted in an undercount of forms. PSNI informed Members that they were the only UK force who had a proactive process in place and were working with Bedfordshire Police (graded "good" in this area) to see how their process is done and take learning from it. PSNI informed Members of plans to implement comprehensive training for current and student officers to embed understanding of UoF and to promote cultural buy-in, with the long-term goal of removing the proactive process causing the undercount.

- In relation to discontinuing use of technology causing the UoF undercount, PSNI informed Members that they intend to embed the additional training and improve cultural buy-in before removing the technology.
- In relation to PDRs, the PSNI provided Members with an update on their new PDR approach called PDRChat. Chat stands for Coaching for performance, Health and wellbeing, Ambition and Tenure. The PSNI informed Members that the new approach came out of consultation with third party stakeholders. They updated Members that they currently have a 68% completion rate of the new process and will take approximately a year to get all officers through and is based on officers start date. The PSNI informed Members they have conducted dip sampling to quality assure the process. They also said they are developing one-to-one reporting via digital and physical journals, with further communications on this due in mid-October. The PSNI also highlighted to Members that officers temporarily promoted to line management receive leadership training. They stated their fundamentals of management course has been extended to three in-person days from the previous one in-person day and webinars. The PSNI also updated Members on a new staff induction programme. The PSNI stated that PDR should discuss career progression opportunities with staff.

- I relation to supervisors having adequate training and time to fulfil management engagements, the PSNI conceded that 68% completion wasn't high enough in their view and want to see compliance moving towards 100%. They highlighted that this process is a journey and it will take time to reintegrate management and development principles in the organisation. They stated the new system is user-friendly, however, it will take time to familiarise staff with the new system and embed meaning. They suggested that more clearly linking PDR with promotion and pay awards will improve motivation to engage. With regards to supervisor training the PSNI informed Members that they have introduced a two-day supervisors training course for sergeants and inspectors. Also, they have instituted a new leadership pledge which all line managers make to reinforce what is expected from management. They have also made changes to their line management course, utilising smaller groups to facilitate better opportunity for in-depth discussion.
- In relation to officers with no line manager, the PSNI agreed that this was an issue. They informed Members that this disrupts the chain of reminders to arrange one-to-one meetings. They are working with Human Resources to tackle this.
- In relation to psychological screening of staff, the PSNI provided Members with an update on their plans. They informed Members that they had delayed launching a screening process until they were sure that the infrastructure was in place to do so. This included employing cognitive behavioural therapists to their health and wellbeing services team. The PSNI emphasised the risk that implementing a mandatory screening process has the potential to lose trust and confidence of staff if poorly managed. The PSNI informed Members they have started a pilot programme covering the Digital Forensics team and Public Protection Branch staff. They began with 10 staff members and are onboarding 40 additional people per month, it is expected all staff will have had their initial screening within six months. There will be an annual screening process

after the initial screening. The PSNI also informed Members a highlight report will be issued to Assistant Chief Constables monthly to update on progress and identify issues and that HR have been engaged with closely to plan for "what if" scenarios in preparation for any potential issues which may arise.

- In relation to accredited detectives and investigative skills training, the PSNI informed Members that they had instituted a peer mentoring scheme and devolved training budgets to departments to provide timely access to specialist training. The PSNI also said they were liaising with colleagues to direct development of required courses.
- In relation to Operation Akarpus the PSNI informed Members this was an operation to investigate police staff working from home who were not fulfilling their duties. PSNI stated they used strategies borrowed from other forces approaches including keystroke monitoring and reviewing performance material and that twenty individuals had been investigated at present. PSNI highlighted that this operation was intended to draw a line in the sand and prevent any level of recurrence. They have placed an emphasis on supervisors' responsibility to effectively supervise their staff and were planning to revisit the PSNI working from home policy.
- In relation to claims for PTSD and trauma, the PSNI agreed levels of Ill-Health Retirement (IHR) and claims are high. That critical infrastructure in place now was previously not in place. PSNI informed Members that their legal team are made aware when cases are raised. They highlighted that the premise of the current screening programme is early intervention and would formalise processes which had been ongoing informally. They stated the programme will take approximately three years to develop and embed fully and also emphasised that responsibility for wellbeing is shared with staff who need to avail of available support. Although PSNI acknowledged that litigation would never fully go away, they were hopeful that this would place PSNI in a better position going forward to defend against future litigation.

- In relation to limiting tenure in PPB, the PSNI stated that the screening programme should help to identify officers who may be struggling or at risk of burnout. They said they would use data gained from the screening programme to develop an evidence base to inform the best approach.

The Chairperson thanked the PSNI for their attendance and briefing and they left the meeting.

Following discussion Members: -

AGREED

Officials to ask PSNI to share the final report of the Task & Finish Group investigating the HMICFRS findings regarding the accuracy of recording the number of times officers use force on members of the public. **(AP3)**

6.3 Policing Plan Indicator 3.2 – Police Conduct

Members were provided with a paper providing an analysis of PSNI's Performance to date in relation to Indicator 3.2 – Police Conduct. Members were provided with a copy of the PSNI Professional Standards Annual Report 2025/26 which included some key issues that they may wish to raise.

The Chairperson welcomed the PSNI to the meeting. He invited them to brief Members on the Professional Standards Report 2025/26.

The PSNI provided a statistical commentary of their performance against Indicator 3.2 and discussed with Members the work carried out in key areas including:

- Breaches of Code of Ethics
- Allegations, Hearings and Misconduct Meetings
- Vetting, Criminal Convictions, whistle blowing and Business Interests.

Members engaged in discussion with PSNI and sought clarity on a number of issues including: -

- A Member asked for an update following the outcome of the recently concluded Ursula Merrick employment tribunal and any learnings which had been taken from this case.
- A Member queried whether PSNI felt they had gotten the balance between management advice and action right or if there were lessons to be learned.
- A Member referred to an officer who was still in the PSNI five years after PSD expressing lack of confidence in the officer and queried why they were still in their role.
- A Member referred to the issue of officers beginning vetting process during training and this continuing into their probationary period. They queried if the PSNI planned to change this.
- A Member highlighted the length of time it took disciplinary cases to be resolved and asked if new regulations would resolve that.
- A Member referred to the 29 Anti-Corruption Unit (ACU) investigations relating to theft/fraud and asked for more information on the type of theft.
- A Member asked when the new PSNI Code of Ethics will commence.
- A Member referred to an IT issue relating to multiple breaches of the Code of Ethics and asked if this could be fixed in time for the new Code of Ethics being launched.

The PSNI provided the following responses: -

- In relation to the Ursula Merrick case, the PSNI informed Members that the Chief Constable had met with Ms Merrick recently and a were preparing a report on the learnings arising from the case.

- In relation to management advice/action, the PSNI stated that management action goes beyond PSD into local districts. There will now be a record of this being worked on by the officer and their supervisor and will be linked to the officers PDR. They also stated they had taken learning from other UK police forces in terms of implementing reflective practice processes.
- In relation to the officer still in role, the PSNI informed Members that this individual was subject to another gross misconduct investigation and this needed to be concluded before they were removed.
- In relation to vetting of new officers, the PSNI informed Members that they would use the existing process under Regulation 13 pertaining to an officer being physically and mentally capable of doing the job to remove any officers who failed vetting in their probationary period.
- In relation to disciplinary proceeding timeframes, the PSNI reported they were making use of special case hearings to try and speed up process. However, they emphasised that this can be challenging as there are cases where the special case evidential threshold isn't met until after criminal proceedings have been concluded, which can take time.
- In relation to theft/fraud investigations, the PSNI informed Members that many of the fraud cases referred to fraudulent overtime and data breach claims.
- The PSNI informed Members that the new Code of Ethics would launch later this year.
- In relation to the IT issue relating to Code of Ethics breaches, the PSNI informed Members that Centurion, the system used nationally is expensive and they are working on an internal fix within their existing NICHE system.

The Chairperson thanked the PSNI for their attendance and briefing and they left the meeting.

6.4 Draft Human Rights Annual Report 2025/26

The Human Rights Advisor informed members that following consideration of the first draft Report at the Performance Committee in September 2026, the Human Rights Advisor and officials have sent the draft Human Rights Annual Report 2025/26 to relevant branches in PSNI, political and independent Members requesting feedback.

Amendments and corrections have been received and have been incorporated into the report to ensure accuracy. The Human Rights Advisor requested any further amendments be forwarded to him as soon as possible. Members identified a number of areas where changes and amendments were required including to the draft recommendations. Following discussions, Members agreed the next steps in this process as follows:

- Final comments from Members are welcome from Members up until Monday 19th October;
- A final draft Report will be collated by the Human Rights Advisor and brought back to Members for consideration at the November Performance Committee meeting.
- The Final Draft Report will then be included in the Board papers for the 10th December Board meeting.

Following discussions it was: -

NOTED

Board Members to submit final comments and amendments on Draft Human Rights Annual Report. Officials will collate and issue a further draft to Members for the November Committee meeting.

6.5 Human Rights Advisor Update

The Human Rights Advisor (HRA) provided Members with an overview of areas within his current work programme during the period September / October 2026 including; work on the Human Rights Annual Report 2025/26, meetings with Angus McCullough, with Jonathan Hall KC and National Crime Agency (NCA) in London, research and consideration of oversight and accountability gaps and how the Board can obtain assurance on PSNI's use of Covert Human Intelligence Sources. Attended Conversation with Purpose Events at University of Ulster and PSNI's Race and Ethnicity Action Plan Update, Belfast. The HRA also informed Members of meetings held with various stakeholders.

The Human Rights Advisor also outlined his work plan for October / November 2026 including attending the Board and Performance Committee, drafting, fact checking and cross referencing of the Human Rights Annual Report 2025/26. Meeting with Sir Brian (Lord) Leveson along with the Board Chair, Deputy Chair and Chief Executive, attending Omagh Inquiry, meeting various PSNI officers and stakeholders, attending Mid and East Antrim PCSP, meeting Jonathan Hall KC in Belfast and attending quarterly meeting with DCC and ACCs on Human Rights issues.

Members engaged in brief discussion.

Following discussion Members: -

AGREED

Officials to write to the Minister for Justice regarding:

i. Independent Custody Visitor access to data

and

ii. The Appropriate Adult Scheme for strip searching of children. **(AP4)**

And;

Members to submit comments on the Human Rights Advisor's draft terms of reference on the race/hate crime report. **(AP5)**

Members also: -

NOTED

Members were content with the Human Rights Advisors Update Report and the remaining schedule of work for October 2026.

6.6 Privacy Round Table Event – Discussion and Next Steps

The Director of Performance provided Members with an update on the Board's Privacy Roundtable event held on Tuesday 15th September 2026 and focused on three areas, namely:

- PSNI's latest developments on its development of a Digital Action Plan;
- An update from PSNI on Live Facial Recognition; and
- Current use of Artificial Intelligence by PSNI.

The event offered those present an opportunity to discuss potential governance structures that may be needed to be put in place. PSNI provided an update on their current and planned future use of Artificial Intelligence (AI). Attendees had the opportunity to hear from two guest speakers, Professor of Artificial Intelligence Professor Michaela Black, to discuss generative artificial

intelligence, data bias and public sentiment on AI in Northern Ireland and Mr Scott Ross from Scottish Police Authority (SPA) to discuss digital governance in Scotland, their oversight, accountability and work to build public trust.

The Director of Performance informed Members that all present agreed that the Roundtable was important in the continuing discussions surrounding AI and new technology. The Director also informed Members that the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) on a shared framework for engagement and communication between the Board and PSNI where new or emerging Technology or Digital Transformation is likely to give rise to significant public interest has now been agreed and signed.

Members engaged in discussion:

- A Member suggested further roundtable discussion with stakeholders and consideration of the Data Ethics Strategy, recommendation 4 in the Human Rights Review of Privacy Report[1] and
- On the proposed PSNI Live Facial Recognition (LFR) pilot Members discussed costs and lack of business case, the need for a governance framework and Board scrutiny in the absence of framework.

Following discussion, it was:

AGREED

Officials to seek clarification from PSNI on the following issues:

i. Storage arrangements for data gathered electronically, or by AI/automation tools.
ii. The timeframe on development of a business case and proposed launch date of Live Facial Recognition pilot.

[1] https://www.nipolicingboard.org.uk/publication/human-rights-review-privacy-and-policing

iii. Clarification on the governance framework regarding use of AI in PSNI. (**AP6**)

Members also: -

NOTED

The overview of the Privacy Seminar and information provided by PSNI, Professor Michaela Black and Mr Scott Ross.

6.7 NIPB/OPONI Memorandum of Understanding Update Oct 2026

Officials presented a paper providing Members with details of proposed amendments to the current Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Board and the Police Ombudsman of Northern Ireland. Members were requested to approve the proposed draft amendments to the current MOU and recommend to the Board to approve the updated MOU.

Following discussion Members: -

AGREED

the draft amendments to the Memorandum of Understanding and

RECOMMMENDED

The updated MoU for Bard approval.

7. QUESTIONS FOR THE CHIEF CONSTABLE

7.1 Members wished to ask the following question to the Chief Constable;

To ask the Chief Constable – If PSNI policy on Spit and Bite Guards advises '*If officers are aware or believe that the subject has mental health or another debilitating condition, which the use of a Spit and Bite Guard could exacerbate, the presumption will be that a Spit and Bite Guard will not be used.*' Can the Chief Constable account for the reason why between 1st October 2024 and 31st September 2025, 37% of Spit and Bite Guards are deployed due to Mental Health as an impact factor?

8. COMMUNICATION ISSUES

There were no communication issues arising from the meeting.

9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

No Items of any other business were raised.

10. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

It was agreed that the next Performance Committee meeting would take place on the **Thursday 12th November** at **9:30am**.

Meeting closed at 13:42pm.

PERFORMANCE DIRECTORATE

8 October 2026

____

Chairperson