

[REDACTED]

**Fourth meeting of the Scientific Advisory Committee on the Medical  
Implications of Less-Lethal Weapons (SACMILL)**

**Ministry of Defence Main Building**

**11:00-16:00 Tuesday 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2014**

**Present:**

**Independent Members of SACMILL Technical Committee**

Name	Affiliation	Area of expertise and role
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Pharmacology SACMILL Chairman (independent)
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Theology and Ethics SACMILL Independent Member
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Clinical Toxicology SACMILL Independent Member
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Emergency Medicine SACMILL Independent Member
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Criminology SACMILL Independent Member
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Clinical Neurophysiology (retd) SACMILL Independent Member
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Forensic Medicine SACMILL Independent Member

**Ex officio members of SACMILL Executive Committee (non-independent)**

Name	Affiliation	Area of expertise and role
<i>None present</i>	-	-

**Present at the invitation of SACMILL**

Name	Affiliation	Area of expertise and role
[REDACTED]	Secretariat, Surgeon General's Department	SACMILL Secretary
[REDACTED]	Dstl Porton Down	Dstl Fellow – Injury Modelling
[REDACTED]	Dstl Porton Down	Physiology/pharmacology Human effects of LLWs
[REDACTED]	Home Office Public Order Unit	Policy
[REDACTED]	Home Office Centre for Applied Science and Technology (CAST)	Capability Adviser Public Order
[REDACTED]	Secretariat, Surgeon General's Department	Observer

**1 &2) Welcome and Apologies for Absence**

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting of SACMILL. The Secretary conveyed apologies for absence from SACMILL Independent Members [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], and from ex-officio Members [REDACTED] (Home Office Public [REDACTED])

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Order Unit), Air Marshal [REDACTED] (MOD Surgeon General), and [REDACTED] (Dstl Porton Down).

3) **MOD housekeeping matters**

The Secretary outlined the procedures in the event of a fire alarm and other local protocols.

4) **Approval of Minutes**

[REDACTED] stated that his affiliation had now changed from [REDACTED]

The Minutes of the meeting held on 26 March 2014 were agreed to be a true record of the meeting.

5) **Actions from March 2014 Meeting**

a. Secretary to seek advice from ACPO on drafting of minutes

The Secretary reported that, following discussions, it was decided that the current SACMILL process was fit for purpose, and no change was required (i.e. to keep meetings closed and to redact – for example, names and ongoing activities – where necessary).

b. Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC)/Home Office consultation on data sharing

An update was provided at Item 9.

c. Subject/clinician information sheets

Revised drafts had been produced, and these were circulated by [REDACTED] [REDACTED] for review. Members agreed on the importance of capturing medical issues and providing the right advice and information, for the benefit of both the subject and the police officer concerned. A few small revisions were suggested, mostly with the aim of improving presentation and readability, but also with the addition of some aspects such as infection control, excessive bleeding, retained barbs and communication with subjects. [REDACTED] agreed that these would be incorporated and recirculated.

**Action:** [REDACTED] to circulate revised information sheets for discussion at meeting on 26 March 2015.

[REDACTED] suggested that SACMILL might consider making recommendations on how the data collected could be collated and used. He agreed to look at the issue.

**Action:** Committee to discuss progress on 26<sup>th</sup> March 2015.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] also raised the point that these documents had the potential to be so significant that they should be reviewed formally and endorsed at a SACMILL meeting.

d. Taser-specific Force Medical Examiner (FME) forms

Some discussion was held on the two draft Taser-specific FME forms. It was noted that the number and quality of FME reports that had been seen by DOMILL in the past were of variable quality (mostly little detail and often barely legible). The initial principle behind a Taser-specific FME form was that it would guide clinical assessment in line with the types of injuries associated with use of Taser and would provide the committee with consistently presented and relevant medical data should SACMILL require to see it for individual cases of concern. Two draft versions of the form have been produced for review by DOMILL and now SACMILL, but these have not progressed beyond drafts.

**Action: SACMILL to arrive at a decision at its 26<sup>th</sup> March 2015 meeting on how to progress, perhaps involving recommending a limited pilot of the two forms in one or two large police forces.**

e. Triennial Review of SACMILL

As recommended by the Triennial Review, drafts of a Framework Document and an Annual Report were being prepared by the Chair and SACMILL Secretariat, with the aim of agreeing them with the Surgeon General later in the year.

**Action: Chair to update at next meeting.**

f+g. Taser use statistics – see Item 10 below.

h. Taser Product Change Notifications

No further action.

i. MPS Taser Reference Group

The Chair sought Members' views on whether there was a need for permanent SACMILL representation on the group. [REDACTED] noted that there were a number of groups discussing similar issues, and it would be helpful to know what they were, in order to consider whether SACMILL had a role to play.

6) **Other Matters**

a. Update on Framework Document and Annual Report

See 5e above.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

b. Terms of Appointment

SACMILL Members had been elected for three-year terms, which would expire at the end of March 2015. The Chair advised that proposals to re-appoint or retire would have to be approved by the appropriate MOD Minister. The Chair would make recommendations, and the Secretariat would submit these to the Minister.

**Action: Chair/Secretariat**

7) **Requests for evaluation received and other correspondence**

a. Interim evaluation of water cannon data

The Chair reported that he had written back to the Home Office on 2<sup>nd</sup> June, and had yet to hear back from them. [REDACTED] (CAST) noted that the Home Secretary had not made a decision yet, and was presumed to be waiting until testing and evaluation of the vehicles had been completed.

**Action: Chair to await further HO communication.**

8) **Updates**

a. Less-Lethal Technology and Systems Strategic Board

[REDACTED] (Dstl) and [REDACTED] (CAST) had attended the April meeting. They reported that nothing had been raised that was of particular significance for SACMILL, although there had been some interest expressed in the issues of Acoustic Hailing Devices (AHDs). [REDACTED] noted that if SACMILL were asked to assess these, it would need to co-opt an audiologist (which it is able to do). [REDACTED] noted that AHD's main potential seemed to be for use by RN ships as an anti-piracy measure, and the main issue may be ensuring the safety of operatives.

b. Meeting at CAST, April 2014

The Chair reported that this had been a useful event, which looked at ongoing work on a range of devices, including Attenuated Energy Projectiles (AEPs), AHDs and the new Taser X2 and X26P devices. The Committee noted that it would need to review its advice if the police wished to introduce the latter into service.

c. London Policing Ethics Committee 6 May 2014

The Chair had been invited to attend. He noted that discussions had focussed on the differences between the potential use of water cannon and other less-lethal weapon options. In particular, it was noted that there were concerns surrounding:

[REDACTED]

- [REDACTED]
- i. Whether the Water Cannon used in diffuse mode could suffocate (drown) people?
  - ii. How Water Cannon would be used in (and explained to) different communities?
  - iii. Where the Water Cannon lay in the less-lethal spectrum?

There was also a request for data on the use of Water Cannon (how often it is likely to be used, etc.).

d. National Less-Lethal Weapons Working Group 13 May 2014

[REDACTED] (Dstl) had attended. The main issues of interest had been the [REDACTED] a discussion of Taser statistics and the use of cameras by police Taser operators.

e. Public Engagement Meeting 15 May 2014

This had been hosted by Dstl in response to a request from [REDACTED] [REDACTED] who had an academic interest in the use of Taser and less-lethal weapons in general. The meeting had covered a range of less-lethal weapon issues and appeared to have been well-received. The Committee agreed that such exercises were worthwhile, both as a means of educating interested individuals and in demonstrating government's willingness to engage with them in an open manner.

f. FOIA request for copies of SACMILL water cannon advice

The Secretary reported that this had been dealt with in liaison with the Home Office, on the basis that relevant information would be placed in the public domain once a decision on the water cannon's use had been made. Some redacted SACMILL meeting minutes had been released as a result of the FOIA request.

g. Upcoming events

Dstl reported that there were three; the National Less Lethal Weapons Working Group (Edgbaston, 25 September 2014); the International Law Enforcement Forum (Northern Ireland, Sept 29 – Oct 1 2014); and the LLT&SSB (London, 9 October 2014).

9. **SACMILL/IPCC Data-Sharing Agreement**

The Chair reported that a draft agreement had been produced, which he would agree with the Surgeon General. It was also suggested that MOD's legal branch should be asked to look at it and confirm they were content. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] reported that the meeting with the IPCC in Manchester had gone well, with both sides recognising the need to set in place a workable agreement.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

10. **Taser Issues**

a. Taser Injury Statistics

The Strategic Board Chair had replied (on 1<sup>st</sup> April) to the SACMILL Chair's letter, acknowledging the issue over ensuring SACMILL was kept informed of Taser use and injury statistics, and promising to keep the Committee in the loop in future.

b. Taser use statistics

[REDACTED] (Home Office) reported that the HO was currently looking at the Police returns. There were some technical issues with the database, but progress was being made.

[REDACTED] (Dstl) stressed that SACMILL needed to receive enough information to enable it to identify and then explore interesting cases. Previously, there had been a full-time member of staff at CAST looking after the database, but a new automatic system had been introduced at the Home Office that was unable to readily extract the information SACMILL needed.

Members of the Committee expressed their concerns that this was making it difficult for SACMILL to operate effectively. It was noted that because the police were not medically trained, they would not always record the data that SACMILL needed. It was therefore important for SACMILL to be able to liaise directly with medical personnel.

[REDACTED] said that the Home Office wanted to carry on publishing data, but acknowledged that there needed to be discussion about what format this should take. He suggested that the IPCC may be able to play a role here, as it already collected details of serious incidents.

[REDACTED] and [REDACTED] agreed to discuss the issue outside the meeting.

[REDACTED] suggested that SACMILL might need to request ACPO formally to establish the necessary procedures to capture the right data. This could be done through contact with [REDACTED] ([REDACTED]) including possibly inviting him to meet with SACMILL.

**Action:** [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]

c. X26P and X2 testing

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] would report back to SACMILL in due course.

**Action:** CAST

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

d. Medical Implications of CEDs

[REDACTED] said that Dstl was yet to start work on its report, but would report to SACMILL in due course. Dstl's report will review the medical implications of CEDs with a focus on the new Taser so-called 'smart weapons', the X26P and the X2.

**Action: Dstl**

e. Taser Publications to note

[REDACTED] reported that there were no significant publications to note.

11. **Water Cannon**

[REDACTED] (CAST) reported that the three vehicles were undergoing extensive testing at [REDACTED]. The German machines had been modified to meet the different UK standards, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]. He expected the data to be complete by late November.

**Action: CAST to formally report findings of its technical testing of the water cannon**

12. **Discriminating Irritant Projectile (DIP)**

[REDACTED]

13. **Attenuating Energy Projectile (AEP)**

[REDACTED]

**Action: Dstl**

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**Action: CAST to update SACMILL at its meeting on 26<sup>th</sup> March 2015**

c. Reporting of AEP data

[REDACTED] reported that unfortunately, owing to serious staffing issues, CAST had insufficient resources at the moment to do the work necessary to obtain the data.

**Action: HO and CAST to update SACMILL at its meeting on 26<sup>th</sup> March 2015**

14. **Incidents involving the use of LLWs**

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

The Chair said that he would write to the Home Office, setting out the Committee's concerns about the lack of data available for it to review. The Committee agreed that SACMILL needed to continue to raise the issue if it felt it was being prevented from doing its job effectively. The increased use of Taser and the consequent generation of more and more data meant the issue was becoming both more complex and more important.

**Action: Chair to write to Home Office.**

15. **LLWs in the pipeline and under consideration**

CAST reported that there were no issues to discuss.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

16. **Excited Delirium Syndrome**

In view of time constraints, it was agreed to hold this item over to the next meeting.

17. **Any Other Business**

There were no other items of business.

18. **Future dates for SACMILL meetings**

The Chair said that once the water cannon tests were complete, the Technical Committee would need to meet to consider a final Statement for the Home Office. He would let the committee know as soon as this was required. The next scheduled general meeting of the Technical Committee will be on 26<sup>th</sup> March 2015.

19. **Meeting of Technical Committee *in camera* [if required]**

There was no need for an *in camera* meeting.

[REDACTED]

**SACMILL Secretary**

[REDACTED]