

I am concerned by the plan to change the current arrangement where trained firearms officers are specifically authorised to attend incidents. Although the report mentions challenges with deploying Tasers, the statistics show that when firearms officers were deployed the vast majority of incidents were resolved peacefully. Why is there a need to change the status quo if the current arrangements are clearly working? The comments by the City of London police mentions the 'current threat climate' - what does this specifically mean in relation to Jersey?

This proposition would be more palatable if:

Use of a taser on anyone under 18 should be prohibited

Any officers armed with a taser to have a working body camera enabled at all times (this is not mentioned the report but is an important point) and where a Taser is used, video footage to be logged at the same time as 'use form' is provided

Officers should still call upon specially trained firearms officers in the first instance wherever possible - this means there would only be a few rare instances where a non firearm officers would ever need to deploy their Taser.

I hope these points will be considered.