

Artificial Intelligence in Policing: Community Consultations Report

Prepared by the Governance & Human Rights Committee
Peel Police Service Board

April 2026



Foreword

The Peel Police Service Board is committed to leading a model of policing that is modern, transparent, accountable, and fundamentally grounded in human rights. As technology evolves at a rapid pace, police services across Canada and around the world are grappling with the opportunities and challenges presented by Artificial Intelligence (AI). For the Board, these developments present both an imperative and an opportunity: to modernize in ways that improve service delivery and efficiency, while ensuring that every step forward reinforces public trust, fairness, and dignity.

Through its Governance and Human Rights (GHR) Committee, the Board undertook a comprehensive, multi-session series of community consultations on the potential uses of AI in policing. These consultations were deliberately scheduled at the outset of our work on AI governance, reflecting the Board's belief that community voices must shape policy before technologies are considered, procured, or deployed. The goal was not simply to inform the public, but to engage the public as active partners in determining how police governance can proceed responsibly in an era of rapid technological advancement.

The consultation series brought together a diverse range of participants, including residents, youth advocates, civil liberties organizations, academics, technologists, privacy specialists, and individuals with lived experience interacting with law enforcement. Expert presentations provided foundational knowledge and clarified key issues, while community dialogue illuminated the values, concerns, and expectations that must shape the future of AI in Peel. Together, these contributions demonstrated that effective public safety relies not only on tools and data, but on relationships, accountability, and sustained community engagement.

Across the consultations, participants expressed support for innovation that can improve efficiency, enhance investigative capacity, and free officers to spend more time engaging directly with the community. At the same time, they emphasized that modernization must be undertaken with care and caution. Concerns about fairness, privacy, surveillance, and the risk of reinforcing historical inequities were voiced clearly and consistently. The community made one thing unmistakably clear: technological advancement must never come at the expense of human rights or public trust.

This report reflects the depth and tone of what we heard. It captures a broad range of insights and establishes the principles that will guide the Board's work moving forward. Importantly, it will also inform the development of the Board's policy on Artificial Intelligence in Policing, as well as the corresponding Peel Regional Police Operational Directive that will translate these principles into daily practice, training, and supervision.

Executive Summary

Between September and November 2025, the Peel Police Service Board convened a landmark three-part community consultation series to examine the responsible use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in policing. Hosted by the Board's Governance and Human Rights (GHR) Committee, this series represented one of the most novel and comprehensive public engagements on AI by a police service board. The consultations brought together residents, community organizations, civil liberties groups, academics, youth leaders, technologists, human-rights experts, and frontline practitioners to explore the opportunities and risks presented by emerging technologies.

The objective of the consultation series was not simply to introduce AI as a topic of interest, but to begin a deliberate, community-driven conversation about how police services can adopt modern technologies while upholding the highest standards of fairness, accountability, and human rights. Over three sessions, participants engaged in structured discussions on human-rights safeguards, predictive analytics, privacy protections, data governance, and the appropriate role of AI in public safety decision-making. Expert presentations set the stage for each meeting, but it was the voices of community members that shaped the direction and depth of the dialogue.

A Clear Message from the Community

The consultations produced a coherent and deeply consistent message:

- Residents support modernization and innovation as long as these advancements are introduced transparently, governed responsibly, and implemented in ways that reinforce rather than erode public trust.
- Community members acknowledged that AI-enabled systems may help reduce administrative burdens, enhance analytical accuracy, improve triage of high-volume information, and support more responsive policing in a rapidly growing region. However, they also emphasized that these benefits cannot come at the expense of fairness, privacy, dignity, or accountability.
- Participants across all three sessions expressed a clear expectation that technology should serve the people of Peel—not the other way around. They called for proactive, transparent communication, strong oversight structures, safeguards against bias, and meaningful avenues for ongoing public involvement.

Key Themes and Findings

Across expert testimony and community discussions, several central themes emerged:

1. **AI literacy and transparency are the foundation for trust.**
Residents must understand what technologies are being considered, why they are being explored, and what safeguards protect them. Clear communication is essential to building informed public confidence.
2. **Human oversight must remain integral to all AI-influenced decisions.**
Participants were clear: algorithms should not make decisions that affect people's rights or freedoms. AI may assist with analysis, pattern detection, and administrative efficiency, but ultimate responsibility must always remain with trained officers and supervisors.

3. **Strong privacy protections and bias auditing must be mandatory.**

Predictive models and data-driven tools risk reproducing historical inequities if not governed carefully. Mandatory Privacy Impact Assessments (PIAs), Human Rights Impact Assessments (HRIAs), fairness testing, and clear data-governance protocols are necessary safeguards.

4. **Community involvement cannot end with this consultation series.**

Residents expect ongoing participation, periodic updates, accessible reporting, and continued opportunities to provide feedback as technologies evolve. They stressed the importance of embedding community knowledge into governance, not merely seeking input at the outset.

A Governance Framework Shaped by Community Values

The insights gathered through this consultation process will directly inform the development of a Board Policy on Artificial Intelligence in Policing, a high-level governance instrument that will formalize principles, approval thresholds, mandatory assessments, transparency requirements, and oversight expectations.

Purpose of This Report

This report serves as both a record of what was heard and a roadmap for what comes next.

It captures the perspectives of experts and community members, articulates seven guiding principles for ethical AI in policing, and outlines a path forward for policy development and oversight.

In doing so, it demonstrates the Board's commitment to building a model of responsible innovation—one that is transparent, equitable, accountable, and aligned with the values and expectations of Peel's diverse communities.

Ultimately, the consultations affirmed that the future of public safety lies not in technology alone, but in people-centred modernization that strengthens trust, protects rights, and supports a safer, more inclusive Peel Region.

1. Introduction and Purpose

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is rapidly transforming nearly every dimension of modern life. It is reshaping how people work and communicate, how businesses operate, how public services are delivered, and how safety is understood and maintained. Globally, organizations are exploring how AI might streamline processes, enhance analytical capacity, and provide more timely and accurate information to support complex decision-making.

Policing is not immune to these changes. AI-enabled systems, ranging from automated video analysis and natural language processing to pattern recognition and predictive analytics, are increasingly being explored by police services seeking to modernize operations and respond to rising service demands. These tools offer the potential to improve administrative efficiency, process information at unprecedented scale, and help officers focus more time on building relationships within the community.

That said, the introduction of AI into policing also raises significant ethical, legal, and human-rights considerations. AI systems are only as unbiased as the data that informs them. If historical policing data reflects systemic inequities, AI systems may inadvertently reproduce those inequities rather than correct them. Similarly, if automated systems influence decision-making without proper safeguards, they can obscure accountability and reduce the visibility of how crucial choices are made. For policing, where decisions can affect individual rights, liberties, and community trust, these concerns are particularly consequential.

Because of this, the question is not simply whether AI can support policing, but how it can be used responsibly, transparently, and in a manner consistent with human rights principles. The Peel Police Service Board recognizes that any exploration of AI must be grounded in community trust, clear governance frameworks, and a commitment to fairness and accountability.

A Proactive, Community-Centred Approach

Understanding the magnitude of the issues at stake and the potential impact on Peel's diverse communities, the Board chose to take a proactive approach. Through its Governance and Human Rights (GHR) Committee, the Board undertook a comprehensive, multi-session community consultation process during the fall of 2025. This approach reflects the Board's longstanding commitment to transparency, equity, and meaningful public engagement.

Rather than exploring AI technologies behind closed doors or adopting tools before understanding community expectations, the Board reversed the sequence strategically:

- First: build understanding.
- Second: listen to the community.
- Third: develop policy informed by those insights.

This sequence reflects both best practice and the Board's commitment to ensuring that policing evolves in a way that supports—not undermines—public trust.

What the Consultations Were Designed To Achieve

The consultations were structured to serve multiple complementary purposes:

- Engage residents, service providers, advocacy groups, and subject-matter experts, ensuring that diverse perspectives were included from the outset.
- Build AI literacy among participants, enabling informed discussion grounded in facts rather than assumptions or misconceptions.
- Identify community expectations and concerns related to fairness, privacy, bias, transparency, oversight, and accountability.
- Gather expert insights from leaders in technology, ethics, human rights, academia, and public safety to inform the Board's governance approach.
- Lay the groundwork for the Board's first Policy on Artificial Intelligence in Policing, which will formalize principles, safeguards, and oversight requirements.
- Support the creation of a Peel Regional Police Directive that translates Board-level principles into operational procedures, training, and supervision.
- Advance commitments made through the Human Rights Project, co-developed with the Ontario Human Rights Commission (OHRC), ensuring that AI governance aligns with the Board's larger human-rights framework.

Through this process, the Board sought to ensure that its decisions reflect not only technological possibilities but also community values, ethical principles, and legal obligations.

Purpose of This Report

This report consolidates the insights, concerns, recommendations, and shared expectations expressed during the consultation process. It provides:

- A comprehensive summary of expert perspectives
- A detailed synthesis of what was heard from residents and community partners
- A set of guiding principles for ethical AI use in policing
- A clear articulation of how these insights will shape the Board's forthcoming AI Policy
- An overview of what will be required of Peel Regional Police through a corresponding operational Directive
- An implementation roadmap outlining next steps, timelines, and oversight mechanisms

The purpose of this report is not only to document what was heard but to articulate the path forward. It reflects the Board's commitment to developing a model of AI governance that is responsible, transparent, human rights-centred, and grounded in meaningful community engagement.

As Peel continues to grow and evolve, the Board recognizes that responsible modernization requires both innovation and caution. The insights contained in this report will guide the development of a governance framework that ensures AI strengthens community safety while upholding the rights, dignity, and trust of all residents.

2. Context: AI, Human Rights & Modern Policing

Artificial Intelligence is not emerging in a vacuum. It is developing within a complex global environment marked by technological acceleration, changing public expectations, shifting legal frameworks, and evolving understandings of human rights. For policing, these transformations raise fundamental questions about how technology should be used, who it benefits, who it may inadvertently disadvantage, and what safeguards must be in place to ensure public trust.

This section provides an overview of the global landscape, the human-rights considerations shaping modern governance, and the local context in Peel Region that makes this work both urgent and necessary.

2.1 The Global Shift Toward Data-Driven Public Safety

Around the world, police services are grappling with increased complexity in their work: higher call volumes, rising digital evidence, rapid population growth, increased expectations for responsiveness, and heightened public scrutiny. In this environment, many jurisdictions have turned to data-driven tools and AI-enabled systems to help manage information more effectively and support frontline decision-making.

These technologies include:

- Automated video and image analysis, used to assist investigative workflows
- Natural language processing, enabling automated transcription and summarization of interviews or officer notes
- Predictive analytics, providing insights into patterns within calls for service
- Digital triage tools for case management and investigative prioritization
- Administrative automation, reducing time spent on repetitive tasks

The promise of AI in policing is clear: it has the potential to reduce administrative burden, accelerate investigations, improve analytical accuracy, and free officers to spend more time interacting with the community.

However, the global shift toward AI for public safety is accompanied by caution. International experience has demonstrated that technology alone does not produce better outcomes. Without thoughtful governance, transparency, and accountability measures, AI tools can unintentionally:

- Amplify existing social or systemic biases
- Reduce visibility into how decisions are made, especially when complex algorithms influence outcomes
- Erode public trust if seen as invasive or unregulated
- Increase fears of surveillance, particularly in communities historically subjected to disproportionate policing
- Encourage over-reliance on automated systems, diminishing human judgment and contextual understanding

These risks have led numerous jurisdictions—including the European Union, the United Kingdom, Australia, and several U.S. states—to develop or explore regulatory frameworks governing AI in law enforcement.

Peel's consultations are informed by this global experience. They acknowledge that while AI offers promising opportunities, responsible adoption requires careful planning, community involvement, and a strong commitment to human rights.

2.2 The Human Rights Imperative

Human rights have long been at the core of police governance in Peel. Through its multi-year work with the Ontario Human Rights Commission (OHRC), the Board has undertaken the Human Rights Project, which identified systemic barriers and established a foundational framework for long-term equity work.

Artificial Intelligence intersects with this human-rights framework in profound ways.

Why Human Rights Matter for AI in Policing

AI systems learn from historical data. If that data reflects inequities—racial disparities in enforcement, unequal access to services, or historically embedded biases—those inequities can become encoded and reproduced through automated systems.

Key risks include:

- Perpetuating systemic inequities if historical patterns inform automated predictions
- Obscuring accountability, as algorithmic outputs may be treated as objective or authoritative
- Increasing privacy vulnerabilities, particularly for marginalized communities
- Reinforcing structural biases, if model inputs reflect unequal past practices

The OHRC and other human-rights bodies have emphasized that AI oversight is not optional; it is a prerequisite for safeguarding fairness, equality, and Charter rights.

Human Rights as a Guiding Framework for AI Governance

Human-rights oversight must be embedded throughout the entire AI lifecycle, from procurement to deployment to monitoring. This includes:

- Conducting Human Rights Impact Assessments
- Ensuring fairness and bias testing
- Considering disproportionate impacts on racialized and vulnerable communities
- Maintaining transparency and accountability
- Preserving avenues for redress and remedy

When AI is deployed with strong human-rights oversight, it can support more equitable decision-making. Without such oversight, it can magnify the very inequities it seeks to eliminate.

This is why the Board views human rights not as an additional layer, but as the guiding philosophy for AI use in Peel.

2.3 Peel's Rapid Growth and Changing Demographics

Peel Region is one of the fastest-growing and most diverse urban areas in Canada. This growth brings both opportunities and challenges for public safety, service delivery, and community trust.

A Region in Transformation

Peel's growth is characterized by:

- Significant population increase, placing pressure on emergency services
- High ethno-cultural diversity, with hundreds of languages spoken
- Large newcomer populations, many of whom come from countries with different experiences of law enforcement
- Rapid urban development, increasing the complexity of community needs
- A growing youth demographic, bringing new expectations for transparency and engagement
- This demographic context requires policing that is responsive, culturally competent, and attuned to the unique experiences of communities with varied histories, expectations, and concerns about technology and privacy.

AI's Role in a Growing Region

AI offers potential tools to help manage growing demand and increasingly complex calls for service. It can help:

- Streamline administrative tasks
- Analyze large datasets more efficiently
- Reduce time spent on non-emergency calls
- Improve triage and prioritization
- Enhance investigative capacity

However, these potential benefits must be balanced against the risk of reinforcing disparities or undermining trust in Peel's highly diverse communities.

As Peel continues to evolve, the need for thoughtful, community-informed AI governance becomes even more important.

2.4 Why These Consultations Were Necessary

Given the complexity of AI and its far-reaching implications for privacy, equity, and public trust, the Board recognized that it could not move forward without hearing directly from the community.

The decision to hold consultations before adopting any new AI tools was deliberate, reflecting a commitment to transparency, accountability, and proactive governance. Residents were clear that they want a voice—not a mere update—whenever technologies have the potential to influence policing practices.

The Purpose of These Consultations

The consultations were designed to:

- Build AI literacy, helping residents understand what AI is and how it functions
- Understand public expectations, including where comfort levels and concerns lie
- Identify community concerns related to bias, privacy, fairness, and transparency
- Gather insights from experts, ensuring discussions were grounded in evidence and real-world experience
- Establish foundational principles for ethical and responsible AI use
- Ensure transparency before any deployment or procurement decisions
- Demonstrate leadership within Canada on community-centred AI governance

These consultations are not the end of the conversation—they are the beginning.

They mark a significant step in the Board’s ongoing modernization and human-rights journey, ensuring that Peel builds a model of responsible innovation that reflects the values and expectations of its diverse communities.

3. Expert Perspectives

The consultation series began with structured expert presentations designed to build a shared foundation of knowledge across all participants. Because AI is a complex, rapidly evolving field—one often misunderstood or portrayed through sensational media narratives—the Board made a deliberate decision to begin the dialogue by establishing a baseline of AI literacy, ethical framing, and human-rights context.

These expert presentations were essential. They helped distinguish between legitimate use cases and misconceptions, grounded abstract technological concepts in real-world policing challenges, and clarified where risks arise and how thoughtful governance can mitigate them. Most importantly, they helped participants understand that AI is not a monolithic tool but a set of systems that can be used responsibly—or irresponsibly—depending on design, oversight, and values.

The following sections synthesize the major themes presented by each expert.

3.1 Deputy Chief Anthony Odoardi — AI Literacy, Mindset & Human-Centred Governance



Deputy Chief Anthony Odoardi served as the foundational voice in all three consultations. His presentation provided clarity on what AI truly is, what it is not, and why a nuanced understanding is necessary before evaluating its implications for policing.

Clarifying What AI Really Means

Odoardi underscored that much public discussion around AI mistakenly focuses on one controversial tool—such as facial recognition—without acknowledging the broader universe of AI-related technologies used across industries. He explained that AI encompasses:

- Natural Language Processing, such as automated transcription tools that streamline documentation
- Machine learning-driven pattern recognition, used for identifying trends within large datasets
- Decision-support systems, which present options but do not make decisions
- Automated administrative workflows, which improve efficiency and reduce manual data entry
- Predictive modeling and analytics, which identify patterns that may warrant closer human review

This framing was crucial, as many participants entered the consultations with concerns rooted in narrow or sensationalized depictions of AI. Odoardi emphasized that AI literacy is essential if the public, the Board, and the Service are to evaluate these technologies responsibly.

A Mindset Shift for Modern Policing

To demystify AI adoption, Odoardi drew parallels to how society has historically embraced new technologies. Smartphones, video calling, online banking, and smart home devices were once viewed with skepticism. Today, they are considered indispensable.

He explained that responsible AI adoption requires:

- Intellectual curiosity about new tools
- Willingness to challenge assumptions
- Commitment to continuous learning
- Humility in recognizing what we do not yet fully understand

He stressed that PRP's approach is not one of technological enthusiasm or unchecked innovation, but of careful, deliberate, values-based modernization.

"Human in the Loop" as a Non-Negotiable Principle

Above all, Odoardi emphasized that AI must never replace human judgment.

He framed AI as an assistant—not an adjudicator.

AI can support:

- More efficient workflows
- Reduction of administrative burdens
- More accurate analysis of large caseloads
- Better triage of high-volume information

...but AI must never:

- Make decisions with legal consequences

- Determine liberty or restraint outcomes
- Replace supervisory judgment
- Override Charter rights

This message—human judgment as the anchor—became one of the strongest cross-cutting themes of the consultations.

3.2 Dr. Akwasi Owusu-Bempah — Human Rights, Data & Equality



Dr. Akwasi Owusu-Bempah grounded the discussion in the historical realities of policing and systemic inequality. His presentation highlighted how data—often assumed to be neutral—actually reflects human choices, social conditions, and historical inequities.

Data is Not Neutral

He explained that policing datasets emerge from decades of enforcement patterns, discretionary decisions, and social inequalities. As a result, historical data can reproduce the very disparities communities have long advocated to change.

He summarized this risk succinctly:

“If we feed the past into the future, the future will look like the past.”

Risks of Replicating Inequities Through AI

Owusu-Bempah identified several areas where AI systems, without safeguards, may unintentionally reinforce bias:

- Disproportionate stop or enforcement rates embedded in historical records
- Over-policing of specific neighbourhoods leading to skewed datasets
- Disparities in discretionary decisions, such as who is warned versus charged
- Socioeconomic inequities reflected in calls for service

Without strong oversight, bias testing, and human rights impact assessments, predictive systems may entrench—not correct—these patterns.

The Danger of Disappearing Accountability

Owusu-Bempah warned that AI can obscure responsibility under the guise of objectivity.

If officers treat algorithmic outputs as authoritative or unquestionable, accountability becomes blurred.

He stressed the importance of:

- Transparency about how systems function
- Human rights impact assessments before deployment
- Mechanisms for individuals to challenge decisions
- Public disclosure of tools, risks, and limitations

Owusu-Bempah praised the Board’s decision to conduct consultations before adopting any new AI tools. He described this approach as a model for public-sector governance and encouraged Peel to maintain community participation throughout the lifecycle of any AI system.

3.3 Dr. Kanika Samuels-Wortley — Predictive Analytics, Social Science & Public Trust



Dr. Kanika Samuels-Wortley brought a social science lens, clarifying key distinctions that are often misunderstood in discussions of AI.

AI vs. Predictive Analytics

She explained that predictive analytics relies on past patterns to estimate future trends, whereas AI systems may adapt their methods over time, learning from new data. This adaptability increases potential benefits but also magnifies risks if not carefully monitored.

How Bias Can Become “Invisible”

Samuels-Wortley emphasized that bias can emerge from aspects of model design that are often invisible to the public—and sometimes even to developers. This includes:

- Feature selection
- Data cleaning practices
- Model assumptions
- Weighting of variables
- Methodological choices

Even well-intentioned systems can embed the worldviews, limitations, or blind spots of their designers.

Trust Depends on Transparency

Samuels-Wortley insisted that public trust is not a passive outcome—it must be earned through proactive communication. She urged Peel to provide:

- Clear explanations of model inputs
- Plain-language descriptions of outputs
- Identification of limitations, risks, and uncertainties
- Documentation of human oversight
- Clear assignment of accountability

She recommended integrating communication frameworks directly into policy and practice, ensuring that PRP explains not only what technologies are used, but why and how they are governed.

3.4 Professor Daniel Konikoff — Privacy, Lawfulness & Data Governance



Privacy expert Professor Daniel Konikoff placed privacy at the core of ethical AI deployment. He emphasized that while privacy laws such as MFIPPA predate artificial intelligence, their principles remain highly relevant—and in some ways, more important than ever.

Principles for Lawful AI Use

Konikoff outlined several foundational standards:

- **Lawfulness:** Data must be collected and used in compliance with legislation.
- **Proportionality:** Intrusions on privacy must be minimal and justified by legitimate need.
- **Purpose Limitation:** Data collected for one reason must not be repurposed without consent.
- **Data Minimization:** Only the minimum amount of data necessary should be collected.
- **Transparency:** Individuals deserve to know how their data is being used.

These principles form the backbone of both privacy protection and public trust.

Mandatory Assessments as Safeguards

Konikoff stressed that every AI system must undergo rigorous and mandatory assessments, including:

- Privacy Impact Assessments (PIAs)
- Human Rights Impact Assessments (HRIAs)
- Bias and Fairness Assessments
- Review of individual rights to access and correct data

These assessments ensure that systems are evaluated not only for technical performance but for ethical and legal compliance.

The Responsibilities of Policing Institutions

He emphasized that police services must lead—not follow—in establishing transparent and accountable data governance structures. This is especially important when dealing with vulnerable or marginalized communities, where trust must be continuously earned and maintained.

3.5 Claudia McKoy — Community Co-Design & “Peelin’ Back AI”



Community engagement specialist Claudia McKoy presented her “Peelin’ Back AI” initiative, which was specifically designed to make AI understandable and accessible to Peel residents.

Co-Designing Principles With the Community

McKoy’s engagement sessions resulted in the identification of seven foundational pillars:

- Transparency
- Accountability
- Privacy & Security
- Human-Centred Values
- Fairness & Equity
- Community Well-Being
- Continuous Monitoring

These principles became not only a summary of public expectations but a blueprint for the Board’s policy development. They appeared repeatedly across all three consultations, reinforcing their legitimacy and relevance.

Addressing the AI Literacy Gap

McKoy highlighted the significant differences in AI literacy across Peel’s communities. She noted that many residents were initially unfamiliar with how AI worked or how it might affect policing.

However, after participating in engagement activities and co-design sessions, residents asked thoughtful, rigorous questions—evidence that empowerment through education significantly strengthens public dialogue.

Her work demonstrated that when residents are included meaningfully, they are capable of articulating clear, credible expectations for ethical AI governance.

Community Voices: What We Heard

The heart of the 2025 AI consultation series was not the technology itself—it was the people of Peel. Across three sessions, residents shared reflections that were candid, thoughtful, and often deeply personal. While expert presentations provided important grounding in the technical and ethical landscape of AI, it was the community dialogue that brought the issues to life. It reminded the Board that policing is not merely a matter of systems and processes—it is a matter of trust, relationships, history, and lived experience.

Participants came from a wide range of backgrounds and perspectives, representing the diversity that defines Peel Region. Together, they formed a mosaic of voices that reflected the interests, concerns, hopes, and expectations of a rapidly growing and increasingly diverse community.

Community participants included:

- Residents from across Brampton, Mississauga, and Caledon
- Youth advocates and student leaders
- Community service providers
- Civil liberties organizations and legal advocates
- Immigrant and refugee-serving agencies
- Faith leaders from multiple traditions
- Academics, researchers, and data-ethics experts
- Anti-racism and human rights activists
- Persons with lived experience of policing or the justice system
- Members of the accessibility and disability communities
- Members of Peel’s Anti-Racism Advisory Committee (ARAC)

These voices offered a range of perspectives—some enthusiastic, some cautious, some skeptical—but all grounded in a desire for policing that is equitable, effective, and reflective of the values of the community it serves. Despite differences in experience and lived perspective, several themes emerged consistently across sessions.

4.1 Transparency is the Foundation of Trust

The strongest and most consistent theme was the call for radical transparency.

Participants articulated a clear and simple message:

“Tell us plainly what you’re using and why. Don’t hide the ball.”

Residents emphasized that transparency is not merely a procedural expectation; it is the bedrock upon which public trust is built.

They expressed the need to understand:

- What AI tools might be considered or deployed
- What kinds of data these systems rely on
- How AI influences or informs police decision-making
- How privacy protections are built into the system
- Who is ultimately responsible when errors or harms occur
- How the public can challenge, review, or question AI-driven outcomes

Participants consistently warned against “after-the-fact” communication. Communities want to be informed early, consulted meaningfully, and updated regularly.

Transparency, they argued, must be an ongoing relationship, not a one-time disclosure.

The emphasis on transparency reflects a broader message: people are willing to engage with new technologies—but only if they are respected as informed partners in the process.

4.2 Fear of Bias Being Reinforced

A prominent concern expressed, especially among racialized participants, was the possibility that AI might unintentionally reinforce existing bias.

This fear is grounded not in speculation but in lived experience and historical context.

Participants—particularly Black, Indigenous, South Asian, Caribbean, and newcomer residents—spoke openly about instances of over-policing, disproportionate enforcement, and systemic inequities that have shaped community perceptions of policing. These experiences inform a broader question:

“If the data comes from the past, and the past wasn’t fair to us, why would the AI be fair now?”

Residents articulated specific concerns, including:

- The reproduction of historical enforcement patterns
- Increased surveillance in communities that already feel over-policed
- Algorithmic interpretations that may misunderstand social or cultural context
- Insufficient diversity within data science teams working on AI models
- The “black box” nature of algorithms that hide how decisions are made
- Several participants noted that data collection practices themselves may contain bias, meaning that even well-intentioned AI systems can reflect underlying inequities embedded in the data.

The message was clear: without strong safeguards, AI could replicate systemic discrimination with greater speed and scale.

4.3 Importance of Privacy, Consent, and Data Ownership

Privacy emerged as one of the most deeply felt concerns.

Participants consistently asked probing questions that demonstrated both sophistication and caution:

- How long will data be stored?
- Who will have access to it?
- What happens if there is a data breach or misuse?
- Can residents consent—or decline—to certain uses?
- Are vulnerable groups, such as newcomers or undocumented individuals, protected?
- Do private vendors gain access to sensitive information?

For many residents—particularly immigrants, refugees, and those whose families have experienced state surveillance elsewhere—privacy was not simply an abstract concept.

"Privacy is not just about data. It's about safety, dignity, and trust."

Participants stressed that data governance structures must be transparent, legally compliant, and ethically robust. They also emphasized the importance of limiting data collection to what is absolutely necessary.

Privacy concerns were not rooted in distrust of police personnel themselves, but in the fear that technology could change how information is used, shared, and interpreted in ways that are less visible to the public.

4.4 Accountability and Human Oversight

While participants recognized the potential operational benefits of AI, they insisted that technology cannot dilute accountability.

Residents supported the use of AI for administrative efficiency but expressed firm boundaries, including:

- AI must never be the final decision-maker
- Officers must understand the systems they rely on
- There must always be clear points of accountability
- Supervisors must be responsible for AI-influenced decisions
- There must be mechanisms for review, correction, and human override

As one participant stated plainly:

"A machine shouldn't decide someone's future. A person should."

Residents also highlighted the need for training—not just on how to use AI systems, but on how to critically interpret them. They stressed that over-reliance on automated outputs risks undermining the thoughtful, contextual judgment expected of police professionals.

Accountability must remain human, visible, and reviewable.

4.5 Inclusion and Accessibility

A recurring theme was the need for inclusive, accessible, and ongoing engagement. Participants urged the Board and Service to ensure that AI governance does not become siloed in technical expertise.

They noted that many residents—especially youth, newcomers, and persons with disabilities—want greater understanding of how AI systems work and how they impact public safety. Community members asked for:

- Regular public updates
- Community workshops and learning sessions
- Plain-language and multilingual materials
- Engagement tailored to youth and students
- Collaboration with disability advocacy groups
- Open channels for feedback and questions
- Regular checkpoints, not one-time consultations

Participants emphasized that community engagement must continue throughout the entire AI lifecycle—before adoption, during implementation, and after deployment.

Several speakers highlighted the importance of embedding AI literacy into community outreach so residents can meaningfully assess and understand new technologies.

4.6 Benefits Recognized by the Community

While concerns were prominent, community participants also articulated potential benefits—demonstrating that residents are not opposed to innovation. They simply expect it to be governed responsibly.

Identified benefits included:

- Faster and more efficient response to high-risk incidents
- Reduced administrative workloads, freeing officers to spend more time in the community
- Improved accuracy when analyzing complex or high-volume datasets
- Better allocation of limited police resources
- Enhanced officer safety
- More efficient triage of low-risk calls and non-emergency situations
- Greater consistency in certain decision-making processes

Participants saw these benefits as meaningful if—and only if—technology is deployed with fairness, accountability, and transparency.

As one resident summarized:

"We're not against technology. We're against technology without accountability."

This sentiment captures the essence of the consultations:

Communities welcome modernization but insist on responsible, ethical, and human-centred implementation.

5. Seven Guiding Principles for Ethical AI in Policing

Through extensive expert testimony and deep, honest dialogue with residents, seven core principles emerged that consistently reflect the values, expectations, and rights-based priorities of the people of Peel. These principles do not simply guide the design of the Board's AI Policy—they form the ethical foundation upon which the entire system of AI governance in Peel will rest.

They capture a shared belief that technology must enhance—not erode—public safety, community trust, and human dignity. They also provide a roadmap for how Peel Regional Police must develop, deploy, assess, and continually evaluate any AI or algorithmic system that interacts with the public.

5.1 Transparency

Transparency was the clearest and most consistent theme across all consultations. Residents were unequivocal: meaningful trust requires openness, honesty, and accessible information. People do not fear technology—they fear secrecy.

The principle of transparency requires that Peel Regional Police and the Board make information about AI systems publicly available, understandable, and regularly updated.

This includes:

Core Expectations of Transparency

- A public registry of all AI systems that outlines what tools are in use, what they do, and how they affect policing operations.
- Plain-language disclosure for every AI system, ensuring that community members—including youth, newcomers, and individuals without technical backgrounds—can clearly understand the technology.
- Public explanation of purpose, limitations, risks, and safeguards, outlining both the benefits and the potential harms associated with AI.
- Documentation of all changes or updates to algorithms, datasets, or operational procedures so the public understands how systems evolve over time.

Transparency transforms AI from something mysterious into something comprehensible. It helps demystify complex systems and prevents misinformation from filling the void.

Transparency is the antidote to mistrust.

5.2 Accountability

Community members made it clear that AI systems must never become an excuse for unclear responsibility. Automated tools cannot be permitted to obscure the decision-making process or dilute human oversight.

This principle emphasizes that individuals—not algorithms—remain responsible for decisions affecting rights, freedoms, and public trust.

Core Expectations of Accountability

- Clear assignment of responsibility for each AI tool, including who oversees its deployment, who interprets its outputs, and who is accountable for its outcomes.
- Documented decision-making processes to ensure that all AI-influenced decisions can be reviewed, explained, and justified.
- Oversight by the Governance and Human Rights (GHR) Committee, ensuring an independent governance body is continuously monitoring the use of AI.
- Annual external audits to validate fairness, accuracy, privacy compliance, and human rights protections.
- Meaningful redress mechanisms for individuals or communities who believe they have been adversely affected by an AI system.

AI should improve decision-making—not obscure it.

AI cannot be a shield for poor decisions.

5.3 Privacy & Security

Privacy was one of the most repeated concerns across all three sessions. Residents want assurance that the use of AI will protect their personal information, respect their autonomy, and uphold the highest legal and ethical standards.

AI systems often rely on sensitive data. Therefore, robust privacy and security protections are non-negotiable.

Core Expectations of Privacy & Security

- Data minimization, ensuring only the data strictly required for a legitimate policing purpose is collected or processed.
- Strong encryption and access controls to protect all personal information used, generated, or stored by AI systems.
- Clearly defined retention schedules that honor privacy laws and prevent unnecessary data accumulation.
- Mandatory privacy impact assessments for every AI system before procurement, deployment, or expansion.
- Full alignment with MFIPPA, the federal Privacy Act, and emerging national AI regulatory standards.

Privacy is more than a legal requirement—it is a fundamental human right that underpins trust and community safety.

Privacy is a human right.

5.4 Human-Centred Values and Rights

AI must never become a tool that distances policing from community needs or human values. Technology must always reflect and support the dignity and rights of the people it affects.

This principle ensures that AI systems are designed and implemented in a manner that places human well-being at the centre of every decision.

Core Expectations of Human-Centred Design

- Respect for dignity, ensuring AI tools do not demean, stereotype, or unfairly target any group.
- Compliance with the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, including protections for liberty, equality, and due process.
- Cultural competence, ensuring AI systems reflect community diversity and do not perpetuate harmful assumptions.
- Avoidance of tools that create disparate impacts, unless they are demonstrably mitigated and ethically justified.
- Ensuring AI supports—not replaces—human judgement, preserving the essential role of officers and supervisors.
- Technology should amplify empathy, fairness, and professionalism—not replace them.

People first. Technology second.

5.5 Fairness & Equity

Fairness is essential not only for effective policing but for public legitimacy. The community emphasized that any AI system used by police must avoid disproportionately impacting racialized, marginalized, or vulnerable populations.

Fairness requires active, ongoing assessment—not passive assumptions.

Core Expectations of Fairness & Equity

- Rigorous bias testing, using validated methodologies to detect and mitigate discriminatory outcomes.
- Review by diverse representatives, ensuring that equity-seeking communities have meaningful input into AI evaluation.
- Monitoring datasets for representativeness, avoiding reliance on historically skewed or incomplete data.
- Correcting systemic inequities, ensuring that AI is used to address—not reinforce—longstanding patterns of discrimination.

Fairness is an outcome, not a default.

Fairness must be measured—not assumed.

5.6 Community Well-Being

Community members stressed that technology should contribute positively to the overall health, safety, and quality of life of residents. AI should support—not strain—relationships between the police and the people they serve.

Core Expectations of Community Well-Being

- AI must improve safety AND trust, not one at the expense of the other.
- AI must not increase fear, surveillance, or stigmatization, especially in communities that have historically experienced over-policing.
- AI must prioritize the needs of vulnerable populations, including youth, people with disabilities, newcomers, and marginalized groups.
- AI must support broader community health, including better response times, improved communication, and stronger partnerships with social services.

Technology should be a tool that strengthens social cohesion and enhances community confidence.

Technology must serve the community, not the reverse.

5.7 Continuous Monitoring & Improvement

AI systems are never static—they evolve, learn, and sometimes drift away from their original purpose or performance standards. Continuous monitoring ensures that AI systems remain safe, fair, accurate, and aligned with community expectations.

Core Expectations of Continuous Oversight

- Periodic evaluations of model performance, accuracy, fairness, and operational relevance.
- Public annual reporting to maintain transparency and enable informed public dialogue.
- Model drift analysis to detect when systems begin producing inaccurate or harmful outputs.
- Mechanisms to retire or deactivate harmful systems, ensuring that tools are not used simply because they already exist.
- Adaptive policies that evolve alongside technological advancements, reflecting emerging standards and evolving community expectations.

Governance must be flexible, proactive, and responsive.

Governance is a living system, not a one-time event.

6. From Consultation to Policy: The Path Forward

The insights gathered through the 2025 AI community consultations provide a clear mandate for the Peel Police Service Board. Residents, experts, and stakeholders expressed a shared expectation that any adoption of AI must be governed through strong ethical foundations, transparent processes, and robust oversight. The Board recognizes that governance cannot be left to chance: it must be deliberate, structured, and grounded firmly in the principles of human rights, fairness, and accountability.

To meet these expectations, the Board will implement a comprehensive, two-tiered governance framework designed to ensure that the use of AI in policing is both responsible and transparent. This framework includes:

- A Board Policy on Artificial Intelligence – establishing high-level principles, oversight mechanisms, and system-wide requirements.
- A Peel Regional Police Operational Directive – translating the Board’s expectations into clear operational procedures, training requirements, and supervisory controls.

Together, these instruments create a unified governance system that combines principled oversight with practical, day-to-day accountability.

6.1 Board Policy — Core Requirements

The Board Policy on AI will serve as Peel’s guiding framework for ensuring that all AI-related decisions are grounded in ethical, legal, and transparent practices. It will define the parameters within which Peel Regional Police may explore, test, procure, or deploy AI tools. The Policy will embed human rights considerations into every stage of the AI lifecycle—from concept and procurement to implementation, monitoring, and review.

The Policy will be structured around the following core requirements:

A clear definition of AI and related technologies

The Policy will begin by defining artificial intelligence and adjacent technologies (e.g., automated decision systems, machine learning models, predictive analytics, and natural language processing). Establishing consistent terminology is essential for eliminating ambiguity and ensuring that all parties—the Board, Service, vendors, and public—operate from a shared understanding.

Approval thresholds and governance pathways

Not all AI systems carry the same level of risk. The Policy will therefore establish tiered approval thresholds based on the potential impact of each system—particularly regarding rights, freedoms, privacy, and equity. High-risk systems will require Board approval, rigorous assessments, and ongoing oversight, while lower-risk tools may follow a streamlined pathway.

Mandatory assessments for all AI tools

Every AI system—without exception—will undergo a set of mandatory assessments, including:

- Privacy Impact Assessments (PIAs)
- Human Rights Impact Assessments (HRIAs)
- Bias and Fairness Assessments
- Operational Risk Evaluations

These assessments will ensure that potential harms are identified early, mitigated proactively, and monitored continuously.

Creation of a public AI Registry

Transparency is essential to public trust. The Board Policy will require the publication of a public-facing AI Registry, outlining:

- What systems are being used
- Why they are used
- How they function
- What data they rely on
- What risks exist
- What safeguards are in place

This registry will be updated regularly and presented in accessible, plain-language format.

Mandatory annual audits and ongoing reporting

To ensure accountability, all AI systems will undergo periodic internal and external audits. These audits will assess fairness, privacy compliance, data governance, operational effectiveness, and alignment with human rights principles. Results will be reported publicly through an annual AI Oversight Report.

Continuing community engagement

The Policy acknowledges that governance is not a static exercise. Community dialogue must continue throughout the lifecycle of AI use. The Policy will require periodic engagement with residents to provide updates, receive feedback, and incorporate new insights into ongoing governance.

Vendor transparency and contractual accountability

Vendors supplying AI systems must meet the Board's expectations for transparency, data protection, accountability, and explainability. The Policy will mandate specific contractual clauses—such as audit rights, model documentation, data residency requirements, and limitations on vendor reuse of police data.

Restrictions on high-risk or unacceptable systems

Certain categories of AI—particularly systems with high potential for discrimination, mass surveillance, or infringement of fundamental rights—will be prohibited unless explicitly justified through a rigorous approval process. The Policy will establish a high threshold for these exceptions.

Strong data governance protocols

The Policy will ensure that any AI system complies with strict standards governing data access, retention, minimization, security, and disposal. This includes alignment with MFIPPA, the federal Privacy Act, and relevant international best practices.

Through this Policy, the Board will set the strategic tone and ethical foundation for AI use in Peel. It will ensure that innovation proceeds only where it serves the public interest and strengthens community trust.

6.2 Peel Regional Police Directive

While the Board Policy establishes the overarching principles, the Peel Regional Police Directive will translate those principles into operational practice. The Directive ensures that officers, supervisors, analysts, and technical staff understand exactly how AI tools may be used and what requirements they must follow.

The Directive will include:

Training and competency requirements

Every officer or civilian member who interacts with an AI system must complete mandatory training. This includes understanding the tool's purpose, limitations, appropriate use cases, privacy requirements, risks, and available safeguards.

Required documentation and recording practices

PRP members will be required to document when and how AI systems are used. This includes logging decisions influenced by AI, recording any overrides, and noting circumstances where automated outputs were deemed unreliable.

Supervisory accountability and escalation

Supervisors will be notified when certain AI tools are used, and escalations will be mandatory when decisions involve risk to rights or safety. Supervisors must ensure that human oversight is preserved, that officers do not over-rely on automated outputs, and that any issues are reported immediately.

Compliance with human rights and equity obligations

The Directive will explicitly require alignment with the Human Rights Project, Charter obligations, and fairness standards. Members must consider whether the use of AI may disproportionately impact certain communities or individuals.

Internal monitoring and reporting mechanisms

PRP will implement systems for tracking usage metrics, performance data, false positives, error rates, and community concerns. These insights will inform continuous improvement and Board reporting.

The Directive ensures that AI is not just governed at a high level—but is responsibly integrated into daily practice with the right safeguards, training, and accountability structures in place.

6.3 Public Transparency Measures

Public confidence ultimately depends on openness. Residents made it clear during the consultations that the most important element of AI governance—beyond fairness, beyond efficiency—is transparency.

To uphold this commitment, the Board will implement a series of proactive public-facing measures:

Annual AI Oversight Report

The Board will publish a comprehensive annual report outlining:

- All AI systems in use
- Audit results
- Outcomes of impact assessments
- Bias testing data
- Privacy incidents (if any)
- Community feedback received
- Changes made as a result of oversight

This report will be accessible to Council, residents, community partners, and the public at large.

Quarterly updates to the AI Registry

The AI Registry will be updated at least four times per year to reflect new tools, retired systems, and material changes. This ensures that transparency remains timely—not retrospective.

Proactive reporting of new AI procurements

Any new AI tool under consideration will be disclosed to the public as early as possible in the procurement process. This prevents surprises and allows for meaningful community scrutiny.

Plain-language public communication

The Board will accompany all public disclosures with plain-language explanations, avoiding technical jargon. This ensures that all residents—including youth, newcomers, and those without technical expertise—understand what tools are being considered or used.

Annual community town halls on AI and public safety

To maintain a two-way dialogue, the Board will host annual community sessions specifically dedicated to AI. These sessions will provide updates, answer questions, gather feedback, and ensure residents retain a meaningful voice in guiding the future of technology in policing.

7. Conclusion

The 2025 community consultations on Artificial Intelligence in policing mark an important milestone in the Peel Police Service Board’s ongoing journey toward modern, transparent, and human-rights-centered governance. Throughout this process, residents, experts, and community partners articulated a clear vision for the future of public safety—one where technology serves the community, not the other way around.

Across all three sessions, participants demonstrated a willingness to engage with complex issues, raising thoughtful questions about fairness, privacy, accountability, and the role of human judgement in an increasingly digital world. Their insights reaffirmed what the Board has long understood: that public trust is earned through openness, collaboration, and a willingness to confront difficult questions head-on.

The consultations also underscored that the people of Peel are not resistant to innovation.

To the contrary, participants expressed strong support for modernization when it is guided by clear principles, transparent communication, and accountable oversight. Residents want a police service that leverages new tools to become more efficient, more responsive, and more capable of addressing the needs of a rapidly growing and diverse region. They recognize that emerging technologies—when used responsibly—can help reduce administrative burdens, accelerate investigations, enhance accuracy, and improve community well-being.

But they were equally clear that technological advancement must never come at the expense of fundamental rights, transparency, or dignity. Participants cautioned that AI can reproduce historic inequities if deployed without sufficient safeguards. They emphasized that the benefits of innovation must be balanced by robust governance, independent oversight, and ongoing public engagement. They asked for systems that are explainable, accountable, and accessible—tools that empower rather than alienate the community.

This message aligns closely with the commitments established through the Board’s Human Rights Project and its partnership with the Ontario Human Rights Commission. It also reinforces the direction set by the Governance and Human Rights Committee: that modernization must proceed hand-in-hand with equity, inclusion, and strong ethical foundations. As Peel continues to grow in size, diversity, and complexity, this balance becomes even more essential.

The Board will now carry this work forward by developing a comprehensive Policy on Artificial Intelligence in Policing, supported by a corresponding Peel Regional Police Directive that translates principles into concrete operational practice. Together, these instruments will establish the safeguards, accountability structures, and transparency measures required to ensure that AI is used responsibly. They will mandate rigorous impact assessments, bias testing, privacy protections, and meaningful public reporting. They will enshrine human oversight as a non-negotiable feature of all AI-influenced decision-making.

This report represents not the end of a consultation process, but the beginning of an ongoing dialogue with the people of Peel. The Board remains committed to continued engagement, periodic review, and iterative improvement as technologies evolve. The community’s voice will remain central to this work, and the Board will continue to build mechanisms that ensure residents are informed, consulted, and empowered.

In doing so, Peel advances a model of AI governance that is proactive, principled, and people-focused—one that protects progress while safeguarding rights, and one that reflects the values, expectations, and aspirations of the community we serve.

Ultimately, these consultations confirmed a shared belief: that the future of public safety in Peel must be innovative, equitable, transparent, and rooted firmly in human rights. The Board's next steps will honour that belief by ensuring that AI strengthens—not undermines—public trust and contributes meaningfully to a safer, fairer, and more inclusive Peel Region.

Appendix

Dear Chair and Members of the Peel Police Service Board,

Re: ARAC Input on AI Community Consultations and Governance Framework

On behalf of the Anti-Racism Advisory Committee (ARAC), we respectfully submit our collective input for your consideration following our review of the three community consultations on Artificial Intelligence (AI) held between September and November 2025.

We sincerely thank the Board for providing this opportunity to contribute to the development of the AI governance framework. Meaningful inclusion of community perspectives is not only valued, but essential to ensuring that any AI policy adopted by the Service is firmly grounded in the principles of human rights, anti-racism, equity, transparency, and accountability. ARAC has approached its review of the consultations through this lens and offers the following feedback in support of the Board's continued commitment to informed decision-making and authentic community engagement.

While we acknowledge that the Peel Regional Police Service is implementing AI tools, ARAC believes it is important to articulate areas of concern. The primary concern that requires caution is the use of AI in direct interactions with members of the public. Even when deployed with the best of intentions, AI systems carry the potential for harm—risks that are amplified when applied to engagements involving racialized and otherwise marginalized communities. It is our expectation that the recommendations set out below will meaningfully address these concerns and ensure that potential harm is minimized, community trust is protected, and human rights considerations remain paramount.

1. Prioritizing Community and Human Rights in AI Governance

ARAC firmly believes that the foundation of any AI governance framework must be rooted in the protection and promotion of human rights, with community values at its core. AI systems should always serve as tools to support—not supplant—human judgment, especially in scenarios that may affect Charter rights, personal freedoms, or the trust between police and the community. It is imperative that every application of AI includes meaningful human oversight to safeguard these principles.

2. Mandatory Human Rights Impact Assessments

To uphold the rights and well-being of all community members, ARAC recommends that every AI solution undergo a rigorous Human Rights Impact Assessment prior to being approved or launched. These assessments should examine potential risks of bias, discrimination, and disproportionate effects on racialized and marginalized communities, ensuring that broader human rights concerns are front and center.

3. Defining and Preventing Harm

The Board's AI policy should clearly define what constitutes unacceptable harm, specify prohibited uses of AI, and lay out robust measures for harm reduction and remediation. Ongoing monitoring, transparent reporting, and regular audits are essential to protect the community and uphold human rights.

4. Transparency and Public Accountability

ARAC advocates for the creation of a public-facing AI registry or similar mechanism that keeps the community informed about AI tools in use or under consideration. Such transparency should include details on the purpose, benefits, risks, and safeguards for each tool, as well as outline governance structures and invite ongoing public input, reinforcing accountability to the community.

5. Meaningful Community Engagement

ARAC acknowledges the potential for consultation fatigue and notes the importance of engagement approaches that allow community perspectives to meaningfully inform decision-making. Where appropriate, the board should leverage consultation processes that enable refinement, reconsideration, or alternative approaches that can help strengthen legitimacy, public trust, and alignment with community values.

6. Strong Governance and Oversight

The Board should ensure that oversight of AI governance is clearly defined and accountable, whether through existing bodies or dedicated mechanisms. This structure must be visible to the public, regularly reviewed, and responsive to evolving technologies, preventing fragmentation and maintaining focus on the community's interests.

7. Broad Human Rights and Community Considerations

Beyond direct policing impacts, ARAC recommends the Board to consider the wider human rights implications of AI, including workforce well-being, ethical supply chains, environmental sustainability, and indirect harms. These broader issues are integral to supporting equity and protecting the community.

ARAC presents these recommendations as a testament to the importance of ongoing partnership and shared responsibility. Ensuring that AI use within Peel policing is lawful, ethical, transparent, and guided by the values and rights of the community is essential. We thank the Board for its commitment to community-driven governance and look forward to collaborating further as the AI policy framework moves forward.

Respectfully submitted,

Anti-Racism Advisory Committee (ARAC)
Peel Regional Police

