

“Carry on Recording”

Why police stops should still be recorded

May 2011

- Should people who are stopped or stopped and searched by the police be told why they have been stopped?
- Should senior police officers be able to monitor and supervise front-line officers’ activities to ensure that they are using their powers appropriately and in accordance with the law?
- Should the police service be accountable to the community for the use of stop and search powers?

We believe that in a democratic country the answer to these questions has to be yes. Recent changes made by the government make the police less accountable for who they stop and why. This opens the way for greater abuse of police powers and threatens to do real damage to police – community relations, further harming public trust and confidence in the police.

In March 2011, the government introduced changes to the Police and Criminal Evidence Act (PACE) Code of Practice A, which governs the use and recording of stop and search. These changes threaten to undermine established monitoring structures and erode long-fought for mechanisms of accountability. Police forces have been given the discretion to choose whether or not to record ‘stop and account’ and to reduce the recording of stop and search. The changes were made with little consultation and police forces are now undertaking consultation before implementing the changes. This briefing seeks to answer some of the key questions around the recording of police stops.

Stop and account

The changes remove the requirement for the police to record all stop and account. Previously, police officers were required to make a record when they stop a person in a public place to ask them to account for themselves.

Police forces may reinstate the recording of stop and account when there are local concerns about disproportionality, but the decision rests entirely in police hands, denying local communities a role in decision-making. If stops are not recorded communities will never be able to prove that there is a problem or demonstrate concern to require police forces to reinstate recording. There is the danger that this provision will result in a post-code lottery, with different levels of service to communities in different policing areas.

Stop and search

Under the changes police officers will no longer be required to record the following information:

Name of the person stopped: This is problematic because it makes it impossible to measure repeat stops and harassment. There are long standing concerns about the use of stop and search to target certain individuals or communities without collecting name data it will be difficult to assess the validity of these concerns. This undermines the applicability of the Equalities Act to stop and search as outlined in the PACE revisions as individuals will not be able to prove that they have been repeatedly stopped. For police forces, it makes it impossible for them to determine whether they are targeting their stop and searches on the right people.

Whether any injury or damage was caused as a result of the search: This is problematic because it makes it impossible to measure any misuse of force. It also leaves the police open to complaints about use of force or malicious damage that cannot be substantiated.

Whether anything was found as a consequence of the search: This is problematic because it makes it impossible to measure the effectiveness of stop and search use.

The following information will still be recorded: Date; Time; Place; Self-defined ethnicity; Object of search; Ground for search; and Identity of officer carrying out the stop and search.

The changes only restrict what information is recorded on the stop and search form and used for internal and external monitoring not what police collect. When police officers conduct stop and account or stop and search they usually conduct a check on the Police National Computer (PNC check) to identify the person stopped and check whether they are wanted in relation to outstanding crimes. The PNC checks are recorded. Police officers also often make intelligence logs, which may still contain the name and address of the person stopped. Hence, the personal data will still be recorded by the police; it will just not be available for stop and search monitoring.

StopWatch recommends that:

- 1. All police forces keep the requirement to record stop and account.**
- 2. All police forces keep the following requirements in relation to stop and search: the names of those stopped and searched; whether any injury or damage was caused as a result of the search; whether anything was found as a consequence of the search.**
- 3. No further reductions be made to the recording of stop and search. Emphasis should instead be put on improving the efficiency of current data collection systems with the ultimate goal of full electronic recording.**

What are police stops?

The police have legal powers to stop and search members of the public who they suspect may have committed or be about to commit an offence. These powers to stop and search are contained in various pieces of legislation that are regulated by the Police and Criminal Evidence Act (PACE) Code of Practice A. The vast majority of stop searches are carried out under the auspices of three Acts - PACE 1984 (section 1), Misuse of Drugs Act 1971 (section 23) and the Firearms Act 1968 (section 47), though there has also been a substantial increase in the use of exceptional powers such as Section 60 of the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994 and Section 44 of the Terrorism Act.

Excluding the exceptional powers, the vast majority of stop and search require that officers have reasonable suspicion before they can conduct a stop and search¹. Reasonable suspicion must be

¹ Some powers do not require any form of suspicion such as section 47 of the Terrorism Act 2000, section 60 of the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994, which allows police to stop individuals without reasonable

based on objective and individual grounds and can not be based on generalisations or stereotypes about groups of people who are thought to be more likely to be involved in crime. Since 1984, when it was introduced, PACE has also required that the police make a record of the encounter and offer a copy to the person stopped 'unless there are exceptional circumstances which make this wholly impracticable'. Among other things the record indicates the power under which people have been stopped and the grounds for the stop.

Not all police initiated encounters result in a search. 'Stop and account' refers to those encounters that fall outside the statutory stop and search powers, where police officers detain members of the public and ask them to account for their actions, behaviour or presence in an area but do not go on to search them. Since April 1 2005, the regulatory framework governing stop and search has been extended to cover stop and account. As a result police officers have been required to provide people who they stop and ask to account for themselves to with a record of the stop.

Why is recording important?

The police have lost the automatic trust of the public they once enjoyed. Since the 1970s we have seen 'the catastrophic deterioration' of relations between the police and the black community². More recently, levels of confidence have fallen most sharply among white people who, if anything, now have less confidence in the police than black or Asian people³. For much of this period a lack of adequate accountability⁴ was a major factor undermining public confidence in the police.

Police stops are a highly influential point of contact between the police and the public. When members of the public are treated rudely and unfairly, trust and confidence in the police suffers. When members of the public are treated fairly and with respect, they are more supportive of the police and more respectful of the law⁵. Recording stops is important precisely because it promotes fairness and confidence by reminding police officers of their legal duties (not to discriminate on the grounds of race, colour, ethnic origin, nationality when using their powers, for example) and by ensuring that their actions are subject to scrutiny, both by their supervising officers and members of the community. Without these important safeguards officers will be less accountable for their actions and the public less protected.

Stop and search

The recording of stop and search under PACE was introduced in 1984 on the back of long standing anxieties about the unfair use of these powers. The "sus" laws (the informal name for a stop and search law that permitted a police officer to act on suspicion, or 'sus', alone) contributed to the Brixton riots in 1981 and provided a clear demonstration of how unfair policing can contribute to the breakdown of community trust and confidence.

suspicion 'in anticipation of violence' and schedule 7 of the Terrorism Act 2000, which allows stops in ports and airports for counterterrorism purposes.

² Reiner, R. (2010) *The Politics of the Police*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 94.

³ Bradford, B. (2011) 'Convergence, Not Divergence?: Trends and Trajectories in Public Contact and Confidence in the Police', *British Journal of Criminology*, 51(1): 179-200.

⁴ By accountability, we mean police officers being responsible for their actions; having to account/ answer to the public they serve for the activities that they undertake.

⁵ Sunshine, J. and Tyler, T. R. (2003). 'The Role of Procedural Justice and Legitimacy in Public Support for Policing', *Law and Society Review*, 37, 3, 513-548; Tyler, T. R. (2006) 'Legitimacy and Legitimation', *Annual Review of Psychology*, 57, 375-400; Tyler, T. R. and Fagan, J. (2008). 'Legitimacy and cooperation: why do people help the police fight crime in their communities?', *Ohio State Journal of Criminal Law*, 6, 231-275; Hough, M., Jackson, J., Bradford, B., Myhill, A., and Quinton, P. (2010) 'Procedural Justice, Trust and Institutional Legitimacy', *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice*, 4: 203-2010.

PACE covered the country as a whole and was partly introduced to end the "postcode lottery" that saw wildly varied powers and recording standards used by different forces. The safeguard of reasonable suspicion was introduced along with minimum recording standards to provide a basic guarantee to all, regardless of where in the country they lived. The process of recording stop and search was designed to make officers consider carefully their grounds for stopping people and to inhibit them from stopping people in an arbitrary fashion. Recording also allowed for the monitoring and publication of search statistics and provided a management tool for supervisors to identify where officers might be incorrectly using their powers.

The problems that led to the introduction of PACE have not gone away. Almost two decades after the Brixton riots, the Macpherson Inquiry into the death of Stephen Lawrence recognised that institutional racism was evident in the extent to which stop and search was disproportionately focused on minority ethnic communities. Whilst acknowledging the complexity of the issue, the inquiry instated that there remained "a clear core conclusion of racist stereotyping."⁶ The recent Home Affairs Select Committee report on progress since the Lawrence Inquiry noted that minority ethnic people remain "over-policed and under-protected within our criminal justice system".

According to the latest figures for England and Wales, black people are stopped and searched by the police at seven times the rate of whites, while Asians are stopped and searched at more than twice the rate of whites⁷. The disproportionate focus on black and minority ethnic groups is even more marked in relation to exceptional powers: the rate of section 60 stop and search – which allows police to stop individuals without reasonable suspicion "in anticipation of violence" (introduced to help police deal with, among other things, group violence between rival football fans) – for black people is 27 times the rate for white people, and for Asian people it is six times the rate for whites.⁸

The rate of arrests resulting from stop and search is 10 percent – only one in ten leads to an arrest. For section 60 stop and search the arrest rate has remained consistently under four percent. The arrest rate resulting from stop and search is similar for all ethnic groups.

Being stopped and searched publically can be an embarrassing, frightening, inconvenient and potentially humiliating experience.⁹ Research shows that unsatisfactory contacts between the police and the public has a negative impact on public confidence in the police, not only for the individual directly involved, but also for his or her family, friends, and associates.¹⁰ Many young men, particularly those from black and Asian communities, feel they are being stopped and searched simply because they fit a general stereotype, and this is fueling anger and alienation amongst some communities¹¹.

⁶ Macpherson W. (1999) *The Stephen Lawrence Inquiry*. Report of an Inquiry by Sir William Macpherson of Cluny, (Cm 4262-1). London: The Stationary Office, 6.45.

⁷ Ministry of Justice (2010), *Statistics on Race and the Criminal Justice System - 2008/9*, London: Ministry of Justice.

⁸ Ministry of Justice (2010), accompanying table S3.05a 0809. Population data taken from previous year: Ministry of Justice (2008), *Statistics on Race and the Criminal Justice System - 2006/7*. (London: Ministry of Justice).

⁹ Stone, V., and Pettigrew, N. (2000), *The Views of the Public on Stops and Searches*, London: Home Office.

¹⁰ Miller, J., Bland N., and Quinton P. (2000), *The Impact of Stops and Searches on Crime and the Community*, Police Research Series Paper 127, London: Home Office; Weitzer, R. and Tuch, S. "Determinants of Public Satisfaction with the Police," in *Police Quarterly* No. 8 (3) 2005: 279–297; Rosenbaum, D. Schuck, A., Costello A., Hawkins, D., and Ring, M., (2005) "Attitudes toward the Police: The Effects of Direct and Vicarious Experience" *Police Quarterly*, No. 8 (3): 343–365.

¹¹ Sharp, D., and Atherton, S. (2007) 'To Serve and Protect? The Experiences of Policing in the community of Young People from Black and Other Ethnic Minority Groups', 47(5): 746-763

As well as damaging police – community relations, inappropriate stop and search is counter productive in terms of the fight against crime. Solving crime often relies directly on the willingness of community members to co-operate with the police, as witnesses or victims of crime, and to pass on information. Unfair use of stop and search drives a wedge between the police and communities, jeopardizing public support of the police and reducing the availability of valuable intelligence.

Recording stops serves a number of valuable functions. It ensures that people who are stopped are told why they have been stopped and reminds police officers of their duties under the law. It provides a resource which supervising officers can use to check that individual officers are conducting themselves appropriately and are operating within the law. Recording also means that statistics can be compiled which show whether certain groups, such as black and Asian people, are being stopped at a disproportionately high rate. In some areas, such as Suffolk and West Yorkshire, stop records are directly scrutinized by members of the community, giving local people the power to hold individual officers to account for their actions on the street. Other forces should be encouraged to follow this example.

Stop records can also be used to promote operational effectiveness. In West Yorkshire, stop and search activity is mapped and compared to local crime patterns. This helps to ensure that the police are most active when and where crime is most prevalent, allowing much greater targeting of stops and search. As the government provides more information about crime patterns through on-line local crime maps it is essential that communities have sufficient information to be able to judge police performance in response to that crime.

Stop and account

The police carry out more than two million stops every year and Ministry of Justice data has consistently shown disproportionate rates of use in many forces, with people from black and minority ethnic groups being stopped more frequently than white people. The revisions to PACE remove the requirement that the police record stop and account incidents and provide a copy of the record to the person stopped. Police forces may reinstate the recording of stop and account when there are local concerns about disproportionality, but the decision rests entirely in police hands, denying local communities a role in decision-making. If stops are not recorded communities will never be able to prove that there is a problem or demonstrate concern to require police forces to reinstate recording.

The recording and monitoring of stop and account, including the reason for the stop and the self-defined ethnicity of the person being stopped was recommended by the Inquiry into the death of Stephen Lawrence. This recommendation was made in response to long standing community concerns that stops were being used disproportionately against minority communities and to circumvent the safeguards that had been put in place governing the use of stop and search. The recording of stop and account was subject to widespread consultation with community groups and was extensively piloted before being made a national requirement through a 2004 amendment to PACE Code A.¹² At the time of its introduction, the Home Office acknowledged the importance of the recording as a means of promoting “trust and confidence in the police by providing transparency and accountability on the spot at a strategic level, for police initiated non-statutory encounters.”¹³

¹² Quinton, P. and J. Olagundoye (2004). *An evaluation of the phased implementation of the recording of police stops: in response to recommendation 62 of the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry*. London: Home Office; MORI (2004) *The Views of the public on the phased implementation of recording police stops*, London: Home Office; Shiner, M (2006) *National Implementation of the recording of police stops*, London: Home Office. The amendments were introduced in August 2004, to be implemented by all forces by 1st April 2005.

¹³ Home Office (2004), *Recording of Stops Implementation Guide: In Response to Recommendation 61 of the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry Report*. London: Home Office, at 7.

The importance of recording stops was again raised by Sir Ronnie Flanagan in his independent review of policing in 2008. His report recognised the importance of recording stops in promoting community trust and confidence and recommended that the recording process be made less burdensome. Sir Ronnie “remained convinced that there is a need for officers to demonstrate accountability to individual members of the public” and agreed with community representatives that “building a national picture of our behaviour and actions as police officers is crucial”. Further, he considered that stop and search figures ought to “be given the weight they deserve at force level.”¹⁴

Recording stop and account has many of the same benefits as recording stop and search, reminding officers of their legal duties and ensuring that they are accountable to the people they stop, to their supervising officers and to the wider community. The recording of stop and account also plays another vital role – providing an important indicator for assessing whether stop and search powers are being used fairly. The disproportionate rate at which black and Asian people are stop and searched is often ‘explained’ away as being a side-effect of recording procedures, whereby police officers are said to be more likely to complete a record when they stop someone from a black or minority ethnic group for fear that they will complain (in this way police officers are said to be ‘covering their own back’). Another common justification for disproportionality is provided by the suggestion that black people are more likely to be stopped because they are more “available” on the streets where stop and search is taking place.¹⁵

Stop and account records help us to assess whether these claims hold up. Disproportionality is much less marked in relation to stop and account than stop and search. Since recording requirements and conditions where stops and searches take place are the same as with stop and account, the difference in disproportionality rates shows that police decision-making forms a key part of the process driving disproportionality in stop and search.¹⁶ In other words, this tells us that, once they have stopped someone, police are more likely to search a black person than a white person. Despite this, forces have failed to use stop and account data to shed light on why disproportionality is taking place.

Recording stop and account should not be considered in isolation. It adds value to the recording of stop and search, providing an important source of information through which the police and the community can develop a better understanding of police stops.

Is recording police stops unnecessarily bureaucratic?

Opponents of recording often argue that this is an unnecessary form of bureaucracy which prevents the police from getting on with the ‘real’ job of fighting crime. Such arguments simply do not stand up to scrutiny. Establishing positive community relations, building trust and confidence, promoting accountability and establishing legitimacy is real police work. In the current climate, the real question is whether the police can afford not to invest in such activities?

A certain amount of bureaucracy is necessary to ensure that the police are accountable, effective and transparent. The forms only take a few minutes to complete and arguments about bureaucracy have been fuelled by political point-scoring rather than a realistic desire to save police time. Recording stop and account or stop and search rarely takes more than 5 minutes. Published figures indicate that, on average, operational officers conduct fewer than two ‘stop and accounts’ per month or approximately 15 per year and less than one stop and search a month or approximately eight in the year¹⁷. The

¹⁴ Sir Ronnie Flanagan, *The Review of Policing: Final Report* (February 2008), Paras. 5.56 - 5.63.

¹⁵ Shiner, M. (2010), “Post- Lawrence Policing in England and Wales: Guilt, Innocence and the Defence of Organizational Ego”, *British Journal of Criminology*, Vol. 50(5): 935-953.

¹⁶ Shiner (2010); Sanders, A. and Young, R. (2006), *Criminal Justice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

¹⁷ This figure has been estimated on the basis that there were 143,770 full-time equivalent police officers in the

amount of time that reducing the recording of stop and search and abolishing stop and account would save is, therefore, minimal – we estimate that, on average, savings amount to a matter of minutes per officer per month and no more than 10 minutes over a year.

Recording can be made more efficient by embracing electronic recording, as many forces have, using Airwaves, Smartphones or other handheld devices. In this way the paperwork associated with stop forms has been cut without undermining accountability.

Real time savings can also be made by ensuring fewer, but more effective, stops. Analysis conducted by the Equalities and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) noted that in 2007-8, there were 145,000 excess stop and searches conducted on black people and 43,000 stop and searches on Asian people in England and Wales¹⁸, This tells us how many more stops and searches are conducted on black and Asian people than would be the case if they were stopped and searched at the same rate as white people. Reducing excess stop and searches, eg. searching black and Asian people at a proportionate rate would result in saving police time. Yet, real change cannot be achieved without rigorous oversight and scrutiny however, and this cannot be achieved without recording.

What role can communities play in monitoring stop and search?

Community monitoring of stop and search is vital. Internal police safeguards are necessary but insufficient to ensure effective regulation.¹⁹ External scrutiny reminds the police that they are accountable to the public and encourages them to take account of community experiences and local priorities.

Innovative forms of external monitoring are being developed which empower local communities to monitor the use of stop and search, promoting trust and confidence at a local level. In most police forces quantitative stop data is reviewed by Police Authorities and most have community monitoring groups in some form. Good practice highlights the usefulness of both quantitative and qualitative indicators, with statistical information being scrutinised alongside detailed records of individual stops and other sources of information, such as complaints, feedback from community organisations and satisfaction surveys. Examples from the West Yorkshire Police and the Suffolk Constabulary highlight good practice in monitoring stop and search.

The West Yorkshire Police were the first force in the country to develop scrutiny panels that examine both the investigation of hate crime and the use of stop and search in each district. Panels meet monthly and consist of 10 to 20 members from other public agencies and local communities, with at least one police officer of Chief Inspector rank. Each panel meeting examines at least ten stop and search forms; five of ethnic minorities and five selected from all available forms. Forms are randomly selected by community members in advance with all personal information removed. The officers who conducted the stops are asked to supply a photocopy of their pocket book or supplemental report giving fuller information about the circumstances around each interaction. Panel members examine the data, ask questions, determine whether the forms have been completed correctly, and whether the grounds for the stop were adequate and consistent with PACE.

police forces of England and Wales as at 31 March 2009. See Mulchandani, R., and Sigurdsson, J. (2009) Police Service Strength, England and Wales, 31 March 2009, Home Office Statistical Bulletin 13/09 (London: Home Office). If we include the 16,507 FTE police community support officers, who also conduct 'stop and accounts' any savings per officer become even more modest.

¹⁸ Equalities and Human Rights Commission (2010), Stop And Think: A critical review of the use of stop and search powers in England and Wales (London: EHRC).

¹⁹ Delsol, R. and Shiner, M. (2006), "Regulating Stop and Search: A Challenge for Police and Community Relations in England and Wales," *Critical Criminology*, Vol. 14: 241–63.

West Yorkshire Police recently introduced an electronic stop and search system, which allows stops to be recorded on a “Blackberry” mobile device. This creates real time data on stop and search and allows it to be actively compared to local crime maps. This system has just been rolled out and scrutiny panels are in the process of working out what data they need for effective monitoring and how best it can be displayed. The panels are also given data based on local community satisfaction surveys, which feeds into their scrutiny. The scrutiny panels are organised by the police, which means they are embedded within institutional structures and thus more likely to feed into operational decision-making. There is clear evidence of police commitment to the panels and willingness to respond to problems raised.

In 2008, the Suffolk Constabulary formed a stop and search reference panel. This resulted from research conducted by the Ipswich and Suffolk Council for Racial Equality, which found that in Suffolk black people were stopped at nine times the rate for white people and in some rural parts of the county this increased to rates as high as 22 to 1.²⁰ The research prompted the development of a stop and search scrutiny panel organised by the Equality Council, which sits outside the police. The group scrutinises district-wide performance, looking at all stops and searches of people from black and minority ethnic backgrounds. Forms are reviewed in advance of each monthly meeting by the Equality Council and a number are brought forward to the police for discussion at the meeting. The Police provide information on the stops to the group which is then discussed. The panel also discusses stop search complaints brought to their attention via third party reporting, monitors the impact of the use of stop and search in the community and contributes to the forces’ stop search policy, procedures and training.

The Suffolk scrutiny panel has wide community participation. The independence of the Equality Council promotes transparency and meaningful scrutiny, while also encouraging trust and diverse community participation. Meetings are challenging and provide a real opportunity to hold officers to account for their actions as the community members have a good understanding of the law and context surrounding stop and search practice. The police are currently exploring how to share quantitative stop and search data with the group and feed discussions into operational decision-making.

If the stop and search is not recorded will the police still have personal information?

The changes to PACE only affect information recorded on the stop and search form and used for internal and external monitoring. When police officers conduct stop and account or stop and search they usually conduct a check on the Police National Computer (PNC check) to identify the person stopped and check whether they are wanted in relation to outstanding crimes. The PNC checks are recorded. Police officers also often make intelligence logs, which may still contain the name and address of the person stopped. Hence, the personal data will still be recorded by the police, it will just not be available for stop and search monitoring.

Changes to the recording of police stops - the details

a) The removal of stop and account recording

The changes to PACE Code A remove the requirement for the police to record all ‘stop and accounts’. Previously, police officers were required to make a record when they stop a person in a public place to ask them to account for themselves. The changes allow individual police forces to abolish the recording of stop and account and reinstate recording of stops when there are local concerns about disproportionality, but the decision rests entirely in police hands, ignoring community concerns about stop and account and failing to give communities a voice in local decision-making on policing.

²⁰ Ipswich and Suffolk Council for Racial Equality (2008) *Stop and Search in Ipswich*, Suffolk: ISCRE.

We have already seen a large number of forces move towards abolishing stop and account recording and only a handful of these have undertaken any serious attempt to consult local communities about this decision. There is the danger that this provision will result in a post-code lottery, with different levels of service to communities in different policing areas. It also likely to cause confusion amongst members of the public who might be stopped in one area and get a receipt and then travel over police boundaries and be stopped and not get a receipt.

b) Reduction of information recorded on the stop and search form

The changes to PACE Code A reduce the requirement to record 12 pieces of information on the stop and search form to seven pieces of information. Individual police forces are free to choose whether they record more than the mandatory seven pieces of information.

The changes mean that police forces can choose to no longer record the following information:

i. ***Name of the person stopped:*** Without name data it is impossible to measure repeat stops and harassment. There are long standing concerns about the way stop and search is targeted at certain individuals or communities. Without collecting name data it will be difficult to assess the validity of these concerns.²¹ This undermines the applicability of the Equalities Act 2010 to stop and search as outlined in the PACE Code A and compromises the complaints process because individuals will not be able to prove that they have been repeatedly stopped. For police forces, it makes it impossible for them to determine whether they are targeting their stop and searches at the right people.

ii. ***Whether any injury or damage was caused as a result of the search:*** Not recording this information makes it impossible to measure and investigate any misuse of force. It leaves no record of injuries and damage and so leaves the police open to complaints about use of force or malicious damage that cannot be substantiated.

iii. ***Whether anything was found as a consequence of the search:*** Removing this information makes it difficult to measure the effectiveness of stop and search. It will no longer be necessary for officers to record whether the stop and search has resulted in arrest or other positive outcomes such as seizures or fixed penalty notices (FPN). The Code requires that a note of whether an arrest was made as a result of the stop and search be made in custody suites at police stations but it is unclear how this information will then be linked back to stop and search data. There is no provision for seizures or other positive outcomes to be measured, so this information will be lost. Analysis of what is found during a search and the outcomes of stop and searches serves to determine whether officers' development of suspicion was correct and the objects recovered match what was being searched for. Losing this information makes it difficult for supervising officers to establish whether stop and search powers are being used appropriately and compromises the ability of external monitoring groups to determine whether stop searches have met the requirements of PACE. Local communities must be provided with information about police performance and what activities are undertaken by the police in their local areas, with what purpose, and to what effect.

The following information will still be recorded: Date; Time; Place; Self-defined ethnicity; Object of search; Ground for search; and Identity of officer carrying out the stop and search.

²¹ See for example, Cohen, D. and Lydall, R. "Black Met adviser stopped and searched more than 100 times," *The Evening Standard*, 16th October 2009.



StopWatch is an action group formed of leading organisations from civil society, the legal profession and academia.

StopWatch aims to ensure the fair and effective use of stop and search powers to promote safety and positive police community relations.

Further information can be found at: www.stop-watch.org