

T.I.E Practice: Terminology, Tactics and Training

Michelle Wright, Senior Lecturer in Forensic Psychology, Chartered Psychologist, Manchester Metropolitan University

Tony Cook, T/Head of Operations, CEOP Command, National Crime Agency

David Pinder, Review Investigator, Major Crime Review Unit, Greater Manchester Police

Adam Gregory, Senior Behavioural Investigative Advisor, Crime Operational Support, National Crime Agency

Gary Shaw, National Interview Adviser, Crime Operational Support, National Crime Agency

Abstract

This article details the findings of research commissioned by the National Policing Homicide Working Group (HWG) to capture current T.I.E practice and identify examples of good practice and areas where guidance and training for SIO's is needed. The research consisted of a Practitioner Focus Group with PIP 3 SIO's, consultation with HOLMES users and subject matter experts: NCA Behavioural Investigative Advisers, Approved Interview Advisers and the HWG. The paper concludes with the recommendation that a change in terminology to Trace, Investigate and Evaluate is required as this more accurately encapsulates what current T.I.E practice entails. In addition, tactical guidance and specific SIO training is needed to enhance knowledge of effective T.I.E strategy and action management.

All correspondence should be addressed to:

m.wright@mmu.ac.uk and tony.cook@nca.x.gsi.gov.uk

Contents

1. Introduction
2. Findings from the T.I.E Practitioner Focus Group
3. Findings from the HOLMES User Group Consultation
4. Behavioural Investigative Advisers Contribution to T.I.E
5. T.I.E Investigative Interviewing Considerations
6. Recommendations for Future T.I.E Practice

Acknowledgments

References

Appendix: Suggested Format for T.I.E Report

1. Introduction

Trace, Interview and Eliminate (T.I.E) enquiries are one of the cornerstones of many homicide and major incident investigations (Stelfox, 2015). The term T.I.E is an abbreviated instruction, a strategy and elimination process aimed at identifying groups of people, who theoretically are likely to include the offender (Cook and Tattersall, 2014). Once T.I.E subjects have been identified, enquiries are focused on eliminating those who cannot be the offender and implicating those who could. Those who cannot be eliminated, are subject to further enquiries aimed at establishing if there is material that would enable them to be raised to suspect status.

Other than enquiries aimed at tracing and arresting declared 'suspects', T.I.E actions tend to be the next most significant in terms of importance to an enquiry. They are also the most intrusive, resource and time consuming (Cook and Tattersall, 2014). It is therefore essential that SIO's have the knowledge and skills to develop and implement an effective T.I.E strategy and communicate this to the investigating officers tasked with carrying out T.I.E actions.

1.1 National Guidance

Major Incident Room Standards and Administrative Procedures (MIRSAP) (ACPO, 2005) sets out national standardised Major Incident Room (MIR) processes and terminology. MIRSAP details the HOLMES elimination recording criteria (Elimination codes 1-6) used to classify the outcome of T.I.E actions. The Murder Investigation Manual (MIM) (ACPO, 2006) and Core Investigative Doctrine (ACPO, 2005) provide generic guidance for SIO's on the T.I.E process. Both these guidance documents emphasise how a TIE strategy should be set by the SIO and explains how it is good practice to regard T.I.E subjects as being either implicated or eliminated from a T.I.E category, not as being the offender.

A T.I.E category is a group of people likely to share common characteristics with the offender. T.I.E categories should be bespoke to each investigation, based on the information available about the nature and circumstances of the offence. The

MIM (2006) states how “being in a T.I.E category does not mean that individuals are suspected of the crime, merely that the group is one which, in theory at least, could contain the offender” (pg 250). To comply with the Human Rights Act 1998 it has to be considered whether categories that lead to the inclusion of individuals as T.I.E subjects and any requirements of the elimination process are justifiable, proportionate and necessary. Cook and Tattersall (2014) therefore recommend that each T.I.E action should have a clear and transparent audit trail back to the information source and reasoning as to how and why the T.I.E action was raised. They also recommend that SIO’s provide inquiry officers with clear instructions as to how to conduct T.I.E actions.

1.2 Why is research on current T.I.E practice needed?

Research was commissioned by the National Policing Homicide Working Group (HWG) to develop an evidence base of current T.I.E practice for SIO’s. The research was needed because:

1. There is a lack of specific national guidance on T.I.E practice.
2. The SIO and training community have identified the need for guidance on T.I.E management.
3. Identifying effective T.I.E practice will assist in reducing investigative costs and resources.
4. The management of T.I.E’s has Human Rights implications (Human Rights Act 1998 - Article 8 right to respect for private and family life).
5. A lack of a national evidence base of current T.I.E practice has resulted in different terminology and processes being used which has implications for linked investigations.

2. Findings from the T.I.E Practitioner Focus Group

A Practitioner-led SIO Focus Group was held in April to capture SIO understanding and experiences of T.I.E management, identify examples of good practice and areas where guidance and training is needed. Representatives from the MPS, GMP, Suffolk, Essex, South Wales, PSNI and NCA attended. All attendees were PIP 3 SIO’s experienced in T.I.E management.

The key findings from the Focus Group related to two key areas:

1. Terminology
2. Process and Practice

2.1 Terminology

The term 'Person of Interest' (P.O.I) has entered the major crime investigation language and in some cases has replaced the term 'T.I.E subject' altogether (Cook and Tattersall, 2014). Discussion of terminology and current practice at the SIO focus group led to clarification of the use of the term P.O.I. There was unanimous agreement that the use of 'P.O.I' means the same as T.I.E as far as the process and status are concerned.

There was consensus that the terms Trace Interview and Eliminate no longer accurately reflect the processes involved. This led to new terminology 'Trace Investigate Evaluate' being proposed which the focus group suggested:

1. More accurately conveys the processes involved.
2. Removes reference solely to interview. The T.I.E process involves more than just interviewing an individual, it involves a range of tactical options and investigative strategies (e.g. search and seizure, taking samples and descriptions etc.) that are available to investigate a specified nominal in an enquiry. The term 'investigate' is more inclusive and covers any essential preparatory work required before any approach/interview is considered such as risk assessment and intelligence checks. The use of the term 'investigate' also encapsulates the range of investigative skills required when conducting T.I.E enquiries.
3. Removes reference to elimination. Current practice suggests that some SIO's are reluctant to set a T.I.E strategy because they have nothing to eliminate against. Elimination remains a vital part of the T.I.E process, however, the process involves more than just elimination. Investigative mind-set needs to go both ways; enquiries should be aimed at either implicating or eliminating a person from a T.I.E category. The term evaluate has a far less narrow-minded connotation (i.e. not just related to an elimination process). The term 'eliminate' is widely misunderstood as

meaning 'eliminated from the enquiry' as opposed to a T.I.E category. Using solely the term 'eliminate' has also caused issues in the past when applying for RIPA authorities on T.I.E enquiries.

4. Emphasises the need to evaluate information gathered from investigations into particular individual(s), which fits with the PEACE model.
5. Aligns with the National Decision Making Model (College of Policing, 2014) in relation to risk assessment and evaluation.
6. Still fits with HOLMES acronym (i.e. T.I.E).
7. Also fits with T/I - which could be changed, subject to the views of the HOLMES User Group, to Trace/Investigate (as opposed to Trace/Interview).
8. Prevents any confusion in future as T.I.E currently has different meanings to some (i.e. Trace Interview and Eliminate or Trace Implicate or Eliminate).

The term T.I.E has not changed in the past 25 years, however, legislation and practices have. An advantage of the proposed new terminology is that it aims to eradicate confusion and enable more effective, comprehensive and focused enquiries. This is vital in the current climate of limited resources and reducing cadres of detectives.

2.2 Process and Practice

There was consensus that T.I.E is a valid and useful investigative process, part of the SIO's toolbox. However, focus group attendees emphasised the need for the terminology and technique to capture current practice. There was agreement that a lack of specific guidance on T.I.E has created some confusion and lack of standardisation in how T.I.E enquiries are carried out both by individual SIO's and across forces.

An issue was identified of SIO's not creating a T.I.E strategy or being reluctant to use a strategy because they have nothing to eliminate against. The focus group attendees all agreed that an SIO still needs to decide whether they need a T.I.E strategy or not. In some cases similar processes are utilised before a formal policy is ever drafted, e.g. in the 'golden hours' period. In others, a

suspect is quickly identified and an arrest made. However, if utilised, the T.I.E strategy needs to be recorded as a policy decision and effectively communicated to the investigation team and should remain dynamic, being updated/reviewed as the investigation progresses. Good practice was identified in ensuring that officers tasked with carrying out T.I.E actions record all relevant information gathered in the form of a T.I.E report. The T.I.E report should be bespoke to the specifics of the particular investigation. A suggested format for a T.I.E report can be found in the Appendix.

Case examples were provided of SIO's going too wide with T.I.E categories and difficulties arising with managing the T.I.E process. The focus group attendees recommended that this was an area where SIO's require specific guidance and training; how best to draw up T.I.E categories and keep them focused enough to avoid having too many T.I.E subjects to manage and allocate for action. The use of a scoring matrix can help prioritise when there are large numbers of T.I.E subjects (see section 4. Behavioural Investigative Advisers Contribution to T.I.E).

The focus group attendees also emphasised the need for legal aspects to be considered. For example, the impact of the decision to include searching the T.I.E's home/car/telephone must be carefully considered by the SIO and their detailed rationale for doing so recorded in the Policy File.

The key findings of the SIO Focus Group were presented to the HWG in July. The HWG were supportive of the proposed change in terminology and agreed further work was needed to capture the views of the HOLMES User Group.

3. Findings from the HOLMES User Group Consultation

A consultation questionnaire consisting of five questions about the T.I.E process and findings of the Practitioner Focus Group was circulated to HOLMES Regional User Group Chairs with a request to disseminate to regional HOLMES users. Twenty responses were received from the following force regions: North East,

North West, West Midlands, Wales, South West, London, South, South East and the Ministry of Defence (MOD). A summary of the responses to each of the five questions is provided below.

3.1 The MPS use the term 'Person of Interest' (P.O.I) in relation to T.I.E strategy. What is your understanding/experience of this terminology?

The responses received varied across force regions, ranging from them never having heard the term before to very different interpretations of what it means. There were a couple of worrying indications that 'P.O.I' is used to denote a potential suspect which SIO's do not wish to formally categorise as such. For example, one respondent commented:

"P.O.I is a term used for a group of subjects concerned in an investigation which the SIO doesn't want to call suspect. Although nominated as being responsible for the offence there is a lack of evidence to make them suspects as defined by law. A misunderstanding of investigation suspect management" (Respondent 4).

Respondents also commented on the ambiguity of the use of the term:

"I try to avoid the term 'P.O.I', as it is a rather ambiguous term and can create misunderstanding. In my opinion the use of the phrase can cause the investigation problems at court with the obvious implications if the 'person of interest' is not completely eliminated because they have not been given the appropriate focus in the investigation" (Respondent 11).

3.2 The consensus of the SIO focus group is that T.I.E remains a valid investigative process. What is your view from a HOLMES perspective?

All twenty respondents held the view that T.I.E remains a valuable and relevant investigative process. Many of the respondents commented on the importance of SIO's carefully managing the T.I.E process.

"I still think there is merit in T.I.E lines of enquiry and wouldn't want us to move away from this. It can be difficult to manage from a HOLMES perspective if the SIO criteria is too general and the parameters too wide. A good office manager needs to get a grip of this from the onset and keep it on track, it can be very time consuming" (Respondent 2).

"From a HOLMES point of view a well worded T.I.E action will negate the need to raise multiple actions in relation to an individual under investigation. The action should reflect the T.I.E policy/strategy as agreed with the SIO and result in a comprehensive report and timeline covering the relevant times" (Respondent 5).

"From a HOLMES and investigation recording point of view there needs to be a clear identity of persons whose identities and actions within the crime must be accounted for, T.I.E does exactly this. Confusion comes from how they are dealt with and is determined by the SIO who decides which tactic is to be used to achieve best evidence. These are policy decisions which need to be recorded and the actions define how the tactics are progressed and managed" (Respondent 14).

One respondent commented how the way in which T.I.E information is translated into HOLMES is not always efficient.

"On smaller enquiries where we don't employ a matrix the SIO will sometimes refer to T.I.E status within their policy logs but do not formally request that this is replicated within HOLMES. This is an identified learning point that HOLMES staff perhaps need to market HOLMES capability to the management team more effectively" (Respondent 17).

3.3 Legislation and practice has changed and the term Trace Interview and Eliminate no longer reflects the complex investigative processes involved. The SIO focus group has proposed a change in terminology from Trace Interview and Eliminate to Trace Investigate and Evaluate. What are your observations from a HOLMES perspective?

None of the respondents raised any HOLMES based technical objections to changing the terminology to Trace Investigate Evaluate. There was, however, a mixed response to the proposal. The majority of respondents thought that it was a valid suggestion with one respondent commenting: *"I like the new T.I.E acronym, it explains better what we do with the subjects"* (Respondent 2).

HOLMES Users also expressed how implementation of the new terminology would make it easier for SIO's to explain the T.I.E process at Court and was demonstrably more proportionate in terms of the Human Rights Act 1998.

'Investigate' and 'evaluate' are much more pragmatic and useful words to use. It is often not practical to interview and if you do you are then faced with the moral or legal dilemma of should you really be affording the individual necessary protections, basically are they a suspect? By using the word 'investigate' instead allows the SIO and investigators to adopt the correct mind-set and once they reach a point where they are able to 'interview' they will be in a better position as to how to treat that individual and not fall into traps that may be present. Finally, 'evaluate' avoids defence barristers love of semantics and prevents the problems that 'eliminate' causes where a person simply cannot be completely eliminated for whatever reason" (Respondent 4).

A minority of respondents expressed the view that changing the terminology was semantic and could add to the existing confusion of Trace Interview Eliminate and Trace Implicate/Eliminate. However, the few respondents which expressed this view emphasised how it was the business process underling T.I.E actions and SIO's understanding of this which was essential with the need for *"a comprehensive report/timeline identifying when an individual can or cannot be alibied and by what method"* (Respondent 5).

Overall, the views expressed were supportive of the idea that 'investigate' and 'evaluate' removed ambiguity and more accurately reflected current practice.

"This sounds good and mirrors in part our current practice whereby a T.I.E enquiry is assessed by the SIO or Deputy with a covering report and a copy file

of all material registered as a Document in its own right with the SIO comments endorsed on it” (Respondent 1).

3.4 Anecdotal evidence suggests that SIO’s are often reluctant to set T.I.E strategies. What is your experience?

There was a mixed response to this question across force regions. Some respondents reported no problems with others stating that SIO's are reluctant possibly as a consequence of not fully understanding the importance of a well-defined T.I.E strategy.

“I agree that SIO are reluctant to set T.I.E strategies, or are not always clear in their T.I.E strategy. I believe this could be because they do not want to eliminate anyone too early from their enquiries. That is why I think evaluate is a better word to use, then the SIO can evaluate the evidence provided by their teams as early as possible in the investigation and may find it easier to set T.I.E strategies” (Respondent 15).

“The current wording ‘Trace, Interview and Eliminate’ does seem to cause some reticence for SIO’s when considering using the T.I.E process. One of their concerns is that there is a belief that by making a person subject of a T.I.E action that they are labelling them as a potential suspect. Then if the case progresses to trial then any T.I.E nominals that have not been fully eliminated will cause doubts in the minds of the jurors” (Respondent 11).

3.5 Any other observations from a HOLMES user perspective on the current understanding and application of the T.I.E process and how it might be improved?

The dominant theme in the responses to this question was the need for national SIO training on the T.I.E process due to a lack of understanding generally of the relevance and importance of the T.I.E and elimination processes, management within HOLMES and current lack of national consistency in the use of T.I.E.

"The issue lies with SIO training and the fact not a lot of SIO's have any HOLMES experience. If they were given a better input on HOLMES and how the room works it might improve the T.I.E situation slightly" (Respondent 2).

"The Murder Manual adequately describes the importance of developing and implementing the T.I.E business process in Chapter 19.3 and 19.4, clearly the SIO Development Programme and National HOLMES Training are necessary to deliver the message" (Respondent 7).

"The T.I.E actions should comprehensively cover what is required and what investigative tools should be used. Simply saying T.I.E an individual is not good enough" (Respondent 5).

"Clear strategies need to be set out with regard to the T.I.E process and this needs to be observed by all police forces so nationally everyone is working the same. As it stands at the moment, if an enquiry were to be linked between two or more Police Forces, T.I.E could be looked at differently by each force, as practices do change as technology advances" (Respondent 15).

To further build the evidence base of current T.I.E practice for SIO's, input was sought from the National Crime Agency (NCA) Behavioural Investigative Advisers (BIAs) to capture their role in the behavioural interpretation of an offence to assist SIO's in generating and prioritising nominals and advice from the nationally Approved Interview Advisers regarding key considerations for interviewing T.I.E subjects.

4. Behavioural Investigative Advisers Contribution to T.I.E

4.1 The Role of the Behavioural Investigative Adviser (BIA)

BIAs have become an integral part of major crime investigation. The role of the BIA emerged from that of the 'offender profiler' and includes the provision of a range of services to major crime investigation (Rainbow and Gregory, 2011).

BIAs are part of the NCA's Crime Operational Support, a specialist advisory team, providing free support and guidance to UK Policing.

In complex homicide investigations, linked series sexual offences and predatory stranger rapes, there will often be a degree of uncertainty, not just in terms of the likely offender and their background, but in the circumstances in which the offence(s) took place, the sequence of events, the underlying motivation and the implications of these for the generation and prioritisation of nominals. BIAs have a key role to play in enhancing the SIO's understanding of the offence and in providing advice as to the most likely characteristics of the unknown offender. Both of these aspects are crucial when considering an effective T.I.E strategy.

The following services provided by BIAs are particularly relevant to the potential contribution of the BIA to the T.I.E process:

- **Crime Scene Assessment** – working out how an offence occurred, the likely sequence of events, decisions made by the offender, the role of the victim and the impact of the environment in which the crime took place. This provides the building blocks to understanding the offence and in turn the offender, from a behavioural perspective.
- **Hypothesis Generation/Prioritisation** – the identification and subsequent prioritisation of possible offence scenarios. Assessing which hypotheses are most consistent with the behavioural interpretation of what has occurred and how.
- **Predictive Profiling** – outlining the most likely background characteristics of an unknown offender based on the findings of the crime scene assessment. Predictions are made based upon an objective interpretation of the available data, a process which combines the experience of the BIA with relevant research and statistical data.
- **Prioritisation Matrices** – converting 'profiling' advice into a simple matrix structure that allows individuals to be ranked according to how well they score across a number of predicted categories, each of which is given a numerical value or weighting. This process is specific to the offence being investigated, with the categories created based on BIA experience and relevant research and statistical data. Aspects such as geographical

association, criminal history and some of the more reliable aspects of physical description such as age and ethnic appearance would be assessed cumulatively to identify those most deserving of further scrutiny. The more points an individual scores, the higher they will be ranked relative to other nominals.

4.2 The BIA perspective on current T.I.E practice

Recent discussions with NCA BIAs has identified a number of common observations regarding the T.I.E process and the potential role of the BIA in this process. These are summarised below:

- A lack of consistency in terms of how many nominals should ideally be generated as T.I.E subjects.
- Difficulties in knowing how to generate nominals who may be categorised as T.I.E's.
- A confusion between the generation of T.I.E categories and the generation of 'nominal pools' from which T.I.E's may be drawn.
- A reticence to generate too many T.I.E's resulting in overly restrictive criteria being used and potential suspects being missed as a result.
- Difficulties in knowing how to prioritise nominals most deserving of T.I.E status.
- A desire to prioritise the T.I.E categories themselves rather than the nominals within them.
- A lack of understanding in relation to how BIA's can assist SIO's in the development of T.I.E strategy.
- A lack of integration of the services and advice provided by BIA's to the T.I.E process.

Fundamental to the T.I.E process is an assumption that T.I.E's will be generated based on them 'fitting' in some way with the 'kind of person' who may be responsible for the offence. Given that BIA's have been specifically trained to understand offending behaviour and make links between this and what it means for the 'type of person' the offender is likely to be, the inclusion of BIA's in the development of T.I.E strategy seems only sensible.

The effective integration of a BIA during the development of T.I.E strategy should help to minimise many of the issues highlighted above. The early invitation for NCA Crime Operational Support to assist an SIO with their ongoing investigation is therefore recommended¹.

Although the involvement of a BIA in the whole T.I.E process (and indeed the investigation more broadly) is advocated as good practice, it is specifically in the areas of nominal generation and nominal prioritisation where BIA's have particular expertise of relevance to T.I.E.

4.3 How can a BIA assist with nominal generation?

From a BIA perspective, effective T.I.E categories should be derived from the proactive identification of groups or categories of nominals within which the suspect is likely to be found, based upon the specifics of the case. This process is dependent on two key elements:

1. An objective assessment of the offence in terms of how and why it has occurred.
2. The accurate prediction of the likely characteristics or background of the unknown offender.

Without these two elements, an SIO is left to rely upon generic T.I.E categories rather than making them bespoke to the specifics of the offence being investigated. The BIA services outlined, specifically Crime Scene Assessment, Hypothesis Generation/Prioritisation and Predictive Profiling are perfectly suited to assist the SIO to develop effective T.I.E categories.

Clarity regarding the nature of the offence itself (emerging from a BIA Crime Scene Assessment) may give rise to T.I.E categories directly. For example, if it is thought that the offender has specific knowledge of, or interest in the victim, i.e., a targeted attack. Or that the offender and victim are likely to be known to each other, categories such as 'males who knew the victim was going to the park

¹ NCA Crime Operational Support can be contacted via the Specialist Operations Centre on 08450 005463

after work', 'previous sexual partners', or 'burglars with line of sight of the victim's address', etc., may be relevant. Other more specific or idiosyncratic aspects of behaviour evident in the offence may lead to further bespoke T.I.E categories being suggested by the BIA, which are unlikely to have been within the scope of the investigation otherwise. For example, the position of the victim's clothing and the potential for the offender to have deliberately posed the body may be suggestive of a sexual element. The location and clustering of stab wound injuries to the victim may be suggestive of military training or may perhaps be more consistent with a delusional belief system indicative of potential mental health issues. The translation of such inferences into related T.I.E categories can often be a fairly straightforward process.

Further T.I.E categories may sometimes be derived rather more indirectly. Broad parameters emerging from the BIA Crime Scene Assessment can often be used to create larger nominal pools, within which a degree of prioritisation can be undertaken in order to highlight a smaller number of actual T.I.E subjects who satisfy multiple criteria. For example, 'all burglars', or 'all males residing alone' within a particular police division could be identified and PNC checks carried out to highlight further salient factors such as other relevant convictions, age, etc.

This indirect approach is particularly important because it eliminates the need for SIO's to set overly restrictive criteria when setting T.I.E categories. Generating larger pools of relevant nominals and then prioritising within them in order to identify those most deserving of T.I.E status minimises the issue of filtering out potential suspects without even subjecting them to the most cursory level of research.

4.4 How can a BIA assist with nominal prioritisation?

An objective way of prioritising nominals is fundamental to the T.I.E process. Recent BIA experience has highlighted how SIO's can sometimes struggle to identify appropriate T.I.E categories. In some instances, the categories will be overly restrictive, generating only small numbers of nominals which may well not include the offender. Or conversely, be too broad, in an attempt to 'cover all bases', resulting in an unmanageable number of T.I.E's. Alternatively, the T.I.E

categories generated may simply not be consistent with a behavioural interpretation of what is most likely to have happened and why, resulting in the identification of groups of nominals with characteristics unlike those of the actual offender.

The involvement of a BIA will assist the SIO in the development of objective and valid T.I.E categories. It will also enable the net to be cast wider initially to maximise the chances of including the offender. BIAs are highly experienced and very comfortable working with large datasets within which nominals of particular interest may be prioritised. Indeed, this is precisely the purpose of the BIA 'Prioritisation Matrix' product described earlier.

BIAs can work with SIO's to agree on potentially large pools of individuals that could be generated. For example, all males aged 18-35 on the estate, all sex offenders in the county, all owners of white vans within 30 miles and so on, on the basis that they will then be prioritised through the use of a BIA Prioritisation Matrix to identify only those individuals who score highly enough to warrant consideration as a T.I.E subject.

An objective matrix based prioritisation of all nominals within all T.I.E categories can also often be achieved in this way, rather than trying to give weightings or some priority order to the T.I.E categories themselves. Giving priority to a particular T.I.E category irrespective of the background characteristics of those nominals within it is unlikely to provide an SIO with the most effective means of differentiation and prioritisation between T.I.E subjects. A more holistic assessment of those individuals within any of the T.I.E categories is more likely to identify those who should be considered as a priority by the SIO.

5. T.I.E Investigative Interviewing Considerations

The views of the cadre of Nationally Approved Interview Advisers were sought at a meeting chaired by the National Interview Adviser, Gary Shaw, in July. The Nationally Approved Interview Advisers are experienced practitioners who

actively advise SIO's on the development of significant witness and suspect interviews. The advisers consist of officers/staff from the NCA, Durham, GMP, MPS, West Midlands, Cambridgeshire, West Yorkshire, Wiltshire and South Wales. They also research and develop contemporary subject matter within the field of investigative interviewing on behalf of the National Investigative Interviewing Group led by Chief Constable Creedon. To ensure effective interviewing working practices, the group circulate advice in the form of positional statements to assist both operational practice and training. These positional statements are disseminated to all forces and are available through the College of Policing.

There was unanimous agreement from the Nationally Approved Interview Advisers that the proposed change to current terminology from Trace Interview and Eliminate to Trace Investigative and Evaluate was an effective way of explaining exactly what the T.I.E process entails.

The Interview Advisers provided several examples of both effective and ineffective practices concerning the management of T.I.E. subjects. The following areas were identified as being worthy of consideration for inclusion in a guidance document to assist the development of consistent T.I.E. practice.

- The need to appoint an Interview Adviser at the earliest opportunity to assist in creating the interview strategy (see section 5.1 Key Considerations for Interviews with T.I.E. subjects) and interview plan for T.I.E. subjects (who are in essence significant witnesses and key individuals).
- The importance of the identification of the relevant time parameters concerning a T.I.E's movements to assist in the interview plan.
- The importance of capturing either a visual/audio recording of the interview of a T.I.E. subject.
- The importance of treating certain significant witness interviews as though they had been categorised as a T.I.E. subject, especially during the early stages of an investigation.

- The importance of clear direction from the SIO about the interview product required.
- The importance of a review of the investigative material gathered during the interview of a T.I.E subject.
- The importance of a review of the final investigative product produced.
- The importance of an effective debrief of the officer/staff who conducted the interview of a T.I.E subject.
- The importance of clearly documented rationale concerning the change of status from T.I.E subject to suspect around the timing of investigative interviews.
- The importance of the need to continually re-evaluate the T.I.E interviews in light of further information as the investigation progresses.
- The importance, in the light of a subsequent prosecution, of the need to review the T.I.E interviews with reference to case presentation.

5.1 Key Considerations for Interviews with T.I.E Subjects

When deciding on the most appropriate course of action in preparing an interview strategy for a T.I.E subject the following are suggested by the Nationally Approved Interview Advisers as key areas for consideration.

1. Interaction with the T.I.E subject from point of initial contact up to the commencement of the interview must be considered because this can prove essential in creating a working environment in which the subject if they choose to do so feels able to provide an accurate and reliable account.
2. The creation of a structured interview plan for use within the interview itself is an integral part of the T.I.E strategy.
3. Identifying the relevant time parameters of the offence and the interview aims and objectives will help in the construction of the interview plan.
4. The appointment of an Interview Adviser to assist in developing and coordinating the overall interview strategy should be actively considered.

In developing an approach to interviewing T.I.E subjects it will prove useful to consider the following:

- **Witness Categorisation** - The category afforded to the witness needs to be established and recorded. This will in turn assist in identifying the interview product that is to be obtained (e.g. visual recording or witness statement). It must be clear that at this stage the T.I.E subject is a witness and not a suspect and therefore there is no requirement to caution them. Similarly, they are not a voluntary attender although they may be at a police station and this process should not be followed. The Achieving Best Evidence (ABE) Guidelines and 2015 guidance on The Structure of Visually Recorded Interviews with Witnesses should be adhered to.
- **Interview Aims and Objectives** - It is essential that the aims and objectives of the interview are clear and are communicated to the interviewers.
- **Timing of the Interview** - When the interviews are to take place must be carefully considered.
- **Location of the Interview** - The appropriate location should be selected in line with the needs of the investigation at the current time.
- **Interviewing Officers** - The identification of appropriate officers in line with the overall strategy needs to be considered.
- **Body Worn Video** - If body worn video footage has been used during the initial contact stage with the T.I.E subject then this must be reviewed at an appropriate point prior to the interview being concluded to ensure that all relevant investigative material has been gathered.
- **Interview Recording** - How the interview is to be recorded needs to be in line with current legislation and national guidance.
- **Fitness to be Interviewed** - Careful consideration needs to be given to the T.I.E subject's fitness to be interviewed. If there are any concerns surrounding fitness to be interviewed advice should be sought and national guidance followed.
- **Interview Supporter** - The role of an interview supporter must be clear to all present within the interview.
- **Legal Adviser** - If the T.I.E subject requests a legal adviser is present at the interview then the exact nature of their attendance and role within the interview must be clarified.

- **Interpreters** - If the services of an interpreter are to be utilised then it is important to consider the exact language of the witness to ensure correct selection of the interpreter. The interpreter should be briefed on what is expected from them prior to the interview taking place.
- **Change in status** - Any decision to change a T.I.E subject's status to that of suspect must be carefully considered and be based on investigative material that has been reviewed to ensure accuracy.

Interview Plan and Strategy

The purpose of the interview needs to be clear to ensure that the identified aims and objectives are achieved. A structured interview plan is essential in the planning and preparation process. In preparing the interview plan, the following areas will assist:

- The relevant time parameters surrounding the commission of the offence will assist in focusing the interview and assist in determining the elimination or otherwise of a T.I.E subject from that category.
- The wider investigative areas that require additional questioning should be established.
- Adequate planning and preparation time for the interviewer needs to be realistic and take into account the needs of the investigation.
- Following on from the discussions and decisions made following these considerations then the appropriate strategies and interview plans can be formulated.

Based on the experiences of the Nationally Approved Interview Advisers, findings from the SIO Focus Group, HOLMES user's responses and consultation with the HWG, the National Investigative Interviewing Group are currently developing a positional statement detailing good practice guidelines for interviewing of T.I.E subjects to support the work being undertaken by the HWG and Homicide Practitioner's Research Group. The positional statement will be circulated to all forces and incorporated in future SIO Training and Learning and Development CPD events.

6. Recommendations for Future T.I.E Practice

The findings of the T.I.E research detailed in this paper highlight how there is a clear need for a change in terminology to Trace Investigate and Evaluate and the development of operational guidance for SIO's on T.I.E strategy and management to bring clarity, standardise the process, increase knowledge and understanding and focus SIO's mind-set on the processes involved. It is, therefore, recommended that this work is incorporated within the ongoing work being carried out by the College of Policing to update MIM and MIRSAP. Ensuring that specific T.I.E guidance is enshrined in Authorised Professional Practice (APP) will provide an agreed national evidence-base from which PIP 3 SIO Training on T.I.E processes and practice can be developed and delivered.

Acknowledgments

Our thanks go to the SIO's who attended the Practitioner Focus Group, the HOLMES Users who provided detailed responses to the consultation questionnaire, the NCA BIAs and Nationally Approved Interview Advisers for their valuable input in developing an evidence base of current T.I.E practice detailed in this article.

References

ACPO (2006) *Murder Investigation Manual*. [Online] [Accessed 12th October 2015]

<http://library.college.police.uk/docs/appref/murder-investigation-manual-redacted.pdf>

ACPO (2005) *Major Incident Room Standardised Administrative Procedures*. [Online] [Accessed 12th October 2015]

<http://library.college.police.uk/docs/APPREF/MIRSAP.pdf>

ACPO (2005) *Core Investigative Doctrine*. Wyboston Lakes: National Policing Improvement Agency.

College of Policing (2015) *Investigation. Working with Suspects*. [Online] [Accessed 12th October 2015]

<https://www.app.college.police.uk/app-content/investigations/working-with-suspects/>

College of Policing (2014) *National Decision Model*. [Online] [Accessed 12th October 2015]

<https://www.app.college.police.uk/app-content/national-decision-model/?s>

College of Policing (2014) *Code of Ethics*. [Online] [Accessed 12th October 2015]

http://www.college.police.uk/What-we-do/Ethics/Documents/Code_of_Ethics.pdf

Cook, T and Tattersall, A. (2014) *Blackstone's Senior Investigating Officer's Handbook. Third Edition*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.

Rainbow, L. and Gregory, A. (2011) 'What Behavioural Investigative Advisers actually do'. In Alison L. and Rainbow, L (Eds.) (2011) *Professionalizing Offender Profiling. Forensic and Investigative Psychology in Practice*. London: Routledge. pp 18-34.

Stelfox, P. (2015) 'The HWG Practitioner Research Group Trace Interview and Eliminate Research Proposal'. *Journal of Homicide and Major Incident Investigation*. Volume 10, Issue 1, pp. 88-102.

Appendix

Suggested Format for T.I.E Report

1. Reason why nominal is a T.I.E

2. Antecedents

- Relevant antecedent history e.g. links/associations with victim, previous similar MO
- PNC/PND Check
- NICHE Check

3. Movements during relevant times and whether verified

4. Association with victim including recent contact

5. Alibi - details and verification

6. Behavioural pattern prior to incident

7. Forensic

- DNA sample obtained
- Fingerprints obtained
- Is there any forensic evidence to link T.I.E with victim, scene?

8. Inconsistencies

- Are there any significant inconsistencies in individual accounts of events prior to, or after the incident?

9. Motive

- Did the nominal have a motive?

10. Opportunity

- Did the nominal have the opportunity to commit this crime?

11. Means

- Did the nominal have the means to commit this crime?

12. Offending History – Number and types of previous convictions

- Brief outline of number and types of previous convictions

13. Conclusion

- Observations on implicating and eliminating factors and verification
- Signed and dated by officer who has completed the report

14. SIO Opinion/Decision

- Elimination codes should be considered once enquiries are completed
- TIE actions should be checked methodically and thoroughly by the SIO and signed and dated.