



# Minutes

**Title of meeting** Home Office Science Advisory Council - 11<sup>th</sup> May  
**Date** 11 May 2023  
**Time** 13:00-16:00  
**Venue** 2MS / Microsoft Teams

**Attendees (In-person)** HOSAC Members  
Prof Brooke Rogers (Co-chair)  
Prof Guy Nason (Co-chair)  
Prof David Delpy  
Prof Paul Grasby  
Prof Hugh Griffiths  
Prof Tushna Vandrevala  
Prof Mark Watson-Gandy  
Prof Gabriella Spinelli  
Prof Shane Johnson  
Ollie Whitehouse

Home Office Officials  
Prof Jennifer Rubin [first hour]  
Daniella Pretelt Harries  
Ed Wightman  
Hannah Copeland  
Liz Gray  
Jemima Lomax

**Attendees (Online)** HOSAC Members  
Prof Helen Margetts  
Prof David C Lane  
Prof Tom Kirchmaier

**Apologies** Prof Owen Bowden-Jones  
Prof David Main  
Prof Brian Bell

### **Item 1: Welcome and Updates**

- 1.1 The Chairs welcomed HOSAC members and Home Office officials to the meeting.
- 1.2 Brooke mentioned key updates in HOSAC work over the past few months.
- 1.3 Guy introduced the three main sections of the meeting: HOSAC Brainstorm, HOSAC Spotlights, HOSAC Hosts.

### **Item 2: Welcome and Update from CSA**

- 2.1 CSA welcomed and thanked HOSAC members for attending.
- 2.2 CSA summarised current Home Office priorities and provided an update on her recent work.
- 2.3 Helen said that The Turing Institute is doing briefings on LLMs for Senior Civil Servants (SCS), and she would be very happy to connect and engage The Institute with the CSA and Home Office if needed.
- 2.4 Jennifer said she would like to arrange a briefing on Foundation Models – the sooner the better.
- 2.5 **ACTION RAISED – Secretariat to liaise with Helen to invite The Turing Institute in for a briefing on Foundation Models and how they can be linked to Home Office work.**
- 2.6 CSA thanked all for their involvement in the recent fraud paper.
- 2.7 Shane and Tom raised concerns around access to data from Action Fraud.
- 2.8 **ACTION RAISED – CSA and secretariat to look into accessibility of Action Fraud data and to put Tom and Shane in touch with relevant team.**

### **Item 3: HOSAC Brainstorm – CPIN Methodologies**

- 3.1 Guy introduced the HOSAC Brainstorm session and CSA described CPINs and the methodologies used to create them. The CPIN PID was shared with all members.
- 3.2 CSA introduced the idea of a rapid review and HOSAC members discussed current methodologies and similar reviews

3.3 CSA suggested that a core group of HOSAC members is established to give thought and time over the next few weeks. A reference group should support this and can comprise legal, analytics, decision makers and the International Standards Committee to help inform the review.

3.4 **ACTION RAISED – Secretariat to reach out to all members to confirm involvement in CPIN rapid review and to form a reference group.**

3.5 It is discussed that the initial review will focus on the present but machine-based decision support and digitisation will be important considerations for the future.

3.6 **ACTION RAISED – Members to share any contacts who would be useful additions to the CPIN review with the secretariat.**

#### **Item 4: Further Update from Co-Chairs**

4.1 Brooke moved discussions to further HOSAC updates.

4.2 Bigger conversations around the HOSAC pool of experts to come. This will become a focus over the next few months.

4.3 Other HOSAC activity includes the recent HOSAC Fraud paper, Facial Recognition Challenge Panel and Outcome Delivery Plan.

4.4 Engagement with the workplan and SCS pairing will be a priority over the next few months. Members should be open with any capacity issues as we look to move forward with the workplan.

#### **Item 5: HOSAC Spotlight - Paul Grasby**

5.1 Brooke handed over to Paul Grasby to present as part of the HOSAC spotlight series. Paul was chosen as one of HOSAC's more longstanding members.

5.2 Paul explains how there have been 2 phases of his career – 20 years in neuroscience and then 15 years in counterterrorism (8 years as a senior scientist at HO/OSCT, 7 years in HOSAC/CREST).

5.3 The Terrorism Risk Advisory Board (TRAB) was formed after HOSAC were approached with a problem around low risk groups and how they could be assessed. This led to a HOSAC roundtable and brief that convinced Home Office Officials that a more longstanding relationship would be valuable.

5.4 TRAB work consists of workshops, surveys, and risk assessments.

#### **Item 6: HOSAC spotlight - Gabriella Spinelli**

6.1 Guy handed over to Gabriella Spinelli for her HOSAC Spotlight session as one of HOSAC's newest members.

6.2 Gabriella explained how her background was originally in design and engineering but more recently it has moved towards system analysis and redesign.

6.3 Gabriella's work can be split into two key areas – Resilience, and Healthcare Innovation.

6.4 Her engagement in the Home Office is focused in Home Office Science with specific involvement in the Science Ecosystem Challenge Panel and the Science and Technology Commissioning Hub.

#### **Item 7: HOSAC spotlight - Mark Watson-Gandy**

7.1 Brooke handed over to Mark for his Spotlight Session as an associate member and highlighted desires to involve associate members more in HOSAC activities.

7.2 The Biometrics and Forensics Ethics Group (BFEG) are a non-departmental advisory body that deal with new ethical issues thrown up by emerging technology. They are primarily involved with Data and Identity Policy.

7.3 BFEG have just published general ethical principles to help the Home Office see what ethical issues their project might throw up and are called upon for a great range of Home Office topics. They can also self-commission work.

7.4 Mark explained that BFEG would happily engage with HOSAC for any future conversations around ethics if useful.

**7.5 ACTION RAISED – Co-chairs to have a monthly catch up with associate fellows and to share work programmes to highlight any overlap.**

#### **Item 8: HOSAC spotlight – Hugh Griffiths**

8.1 Brooke handed over to Hugh for his Spotlight Session as another associate member.

8.2 Hugh spent most of his career at UCL as an electronic engineer and now has an interest in technology associated with defense, security and intelligence. His specific expertise is in radar technology.

8.3 As chair of the Defense Science Expert Committee (DSEC), Hugh explained that the main function of DSEC is to approve or challenge defense related policies and ideas.

8.4 DSEC always aim to follow up a year or so later to track the impact of their work.

8.5 HOSAC and DSEC could work together on SQEP and DSEC could share their equivalent of the 'pool of experts'.

### **Item 9: AOB**

9.1 Ollie highlighted the disconnect between policy and analysis in some areas of the Home Office.

9.2 Brooke explained plans for the SCS pairings to include someone from analytics as well as policy which will hopefully help to combat this. Cheat sheets could also be developed to decrease the disjoint.

### **Item 10: HOSAC hosts - National Crime and Justice Lab**

10.1 Daniela introduced the National Crime and Justice Lab (NCJL) and explains that the TORs are negotiable and can be tailored to HOSAC requirements.

10.2 The problem that was found was that there is a lot of police data out there and there is a general lack of capability and capacity to analyse it.

10.3 NCJL would like to create a large database of police data, and wider data, and to link these data sets together where possible to help answer important questions. The focus will be on operational policy.

10.4 NCJL is currently a small pilot and the team want to iron out any problems early so that they can achieve their aims for the lab to become world class.

10.5 It is proposed that a HOSAC subgroup could be formed to act as an academic advisory board to provide oversight of the NCJL.

10.6 Helen, Tom and Shane expressed an immediate interest in being involved.

10.7 **ACTION RAISED – Secretariat to reach out to HOSAC members to gather interest in supporting the NCJL, and to work with Daniela, Brooke and Guy to establish next steps.**

10.8 Ideally the NCJL want to anonymise the data and share with academia further down the line (eg via ONS SRS). Prior to that they hope to have specific research fellows looking into the area.

10.9 Gabriella highlighted an opportunity to map a science to policy cycle around this project and it is agreed that measuring impact can be linked into the group and process.

10.10 **ACTION RAISED – Tushna to work with the secretariat to draw out her contact from the pool of experts to be linked with Daniela to discuss links to healthcare data.**

10.11 Brooke mentioned that PSAC should be involved in the sub-group as well

### **Item 11: Thanks and Close**

11.1 Co-chairs remarked on a productive meeting and thanked everyone for engaging.