

# POLICE BODY- WORN CAMERAS

## *The Prosecutors' Perspective*

Kristine Hamann



a

s police departments across the United States embrace the use of police body-worn cameras (BWCs), the cameras inevitably will capture a great deal of evidentiary material that will be useful in every type of criminal prosecution. As a result, most prosecutors support the use of BWC. However, the impact of this new source of evidence has yet to be fully realized. It is clear that systems

**KRISTINE HAMANN** is the founder and executive director of Prosecutors' Center for Excellence. She works with prosecutors nationally on best practices to improve the criminal justice system and emerging issues. She can be reached at [khamann@pceinc.org](mailto:khamann@pceinc.org). In writing this article, the author received excellent assistance from Jessica Trauner (PCE attorney), Lindsey Dennis (Georgetown Law student), and Jeremy Apple and Micaela Glass (associates at White and Case, LLC).

and policies must be developed to ensure that the evidence is properly captured and delivered to the prosecutor in a timely and usable way and that the prosecutor has the resources to review and assess the evidence. This can be a daunting task.

This article outlines the complex issues prosecutors face when implementing a BWC program. (For information on the technology behind BWCs and how they work, please refer to the originally published paper by PROSECUTORS' CENTER FOR EXCELLENCE (PCE) & WHITE & CASE, LLP, POLICY BODY-WORN CAMERAS: WHAT PROSECUTORS NEED TO KNOW (2017), at [http://pceinc.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/20180301-Police-Body-Worn-Cameras\\_What-Prosecutors-Need-to-Know-White-and-Case-and-PCE.pdf](http://pceinc.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/20180301-Police-Body-Worn-Cameras_What-Prosecutors-Need-to-Know-White-and-Case-and-PCE.pdf).) Because the law governing the use of BWCs and BWC recordings may vary by jurisdiction, this paper does not offer legal advice for any specific jurisdiction.

### WHO HAS A BWC?

It is not uncommon for a prosecutor to belatedly learn that a police department in his or her jurisdiction has acquired BWCs. Without coordination, police departments in the same county may purchase different technologies, implement different policies, and store the data in different locations. To start, the prosecutor should reach out to the local police departments to determine whether they are planning to implement a BWC program. If a police department already has a program underway, it will be advantageous for the prosecutor to become involved in developing the program and in coordinating with other police departments in that jurisdiction.

### MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

In the early stages of developing BWC protocols, prosecutors should consider entering into a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with their police departments to clarify issues that affect prosecutors and police alike. Resolving these issues early in the development of a BWC program can reduce confusion and conflict in the future. Topics that benefit from early discussion and resolution include standards for identifying evidentiary recordings, designating a department liaison, developing a process for delivery and retention, coordinating Freedom of Information Act requests, allocating redaction and transcription duties, and creating protocols for releasing videos to the public. Not every issue can be resolved at the beginning of a BWC program and any MOU will develop over time; however, written protocols should be the goal.

### IDENTIFYING A BWC RECORDING

Prosecutors and police departments must create a process for identifying when a BWC recording exists for a particular case and how the prosecutor will get access to that recording. The most basic way a prosecutor learns of the existence of a BWC is a notation in the police report, or in the police department's record management system, indicating that a police officer wore

a BWC. The prosecutor also may be provided with a list of officers who wear BWCs that can be compared to new arrests. With more sophisticated systems, the prosecutor will know there is a BWC recording when a link to the recording is received through proprietary software. Regardless of the system used, when interviewing an officer, the prosecutor always should ask the police officer whether a BWC was worn by the officer or by any other officer at the scene.

Another essential source of information is the police department's BWC liaison. The appointment of a liaison is a critical component in facilitating the proper flow of information from the police to the prosecutor. The liaison can perform a variety of tasks that range from reviewing, categorizing, and auditing videos, to ensuring that the videos are properly identified and sent to the prosecutor.

### TAGGING BWC RECORDINGS

Because law enforcement agencies and prosecutors' offices do not have the resources to review all BWC recordings, police officers and prosecutors must have the ability to quickly identify the relevant portions of a BWC recording. A BWC upload may contain hours of irrelevant footage captured throughout an officer's shift. To identify the evidentiary portions of a recording, most BWC systems allow officers to "tag" the recording and provide additional information such as crime type. The tags also will determine how the recording is stored and retained; for example, a recording that is tagged as a felony will be retained longer than a recording tagged as a misdemeanor. In addition to tags, a BWC recording also may have imbedded metadata that provide additional information such as date, time, BWC number, and sometimes geocoding. Prosecutors should provide input on what is considered to be of evidentiary value.

Especially in the initial stages of a BWC program, there may be instances when there is no tagging on the BWC recording or the officer has incorrectly tagged a recording. This creates a significant burden on the prosecutor, who must attempt to connect a recording with an event. The prosecutor should establish a protocol for dealing with this issue. Some departments have short retention periods for BWC footage that is not considered evidence, so a recording that is not tagged as evidentiary may be destroyed before the prosecutor realizes that it existed.

### PROVIDING THE RECORDING TO THE PROSECUTOR

Once the prosecutor has determined that there is a BWC recording associated with a case, there are a variety of ways that the prosecutor receives the recording. Often in smaller jurisdictions where the BWC recordings are stored on a local server, a prosecutor simply may be provided a DVD with the BWC video footage. In some instances, recordings from the officer's entire shift will be on the DVD, requiring the prosecutor to find the relevant recording. In other instances, the police department will copy only the relevant sections onto the DVD. Some police departments also may create DVDs for defense counsel.

In larger jurisdictions where there is a high volume of BWC recordings, most police departments have chosen to store their

recordings with private vendors in the cloud. Thus, rather than receiving a DVD, the assigned prosecutor is given a link to a proprietary system and granted access to the location within the cloud where the recording resides. In prosecutor offices with their own BWC liaison, the link is sent to a central location and the liaison will forward the link to the prosecutor who is handling the case.

### TECHNOLOGICAL CAPACITY WITHIN THE PROSECUTOR'S OFFICE

A prosecutor must assess the office's capability to adequately handle a BWC program. Before the BWC program begins, the prosecutor should determine if the office is capable of receiving the recordings in the format provided by the police. For example, some prosecutors have received DVDs from the police without having a compatible DVD player. (*See Dist. Att'y's Ass'n of State of N.Y., Testimony Before Assembly: Police Body-Worn Cameras Show Great Promise, but Issues Must Be Resolved Before Program Goes State-wide* (Dec. 8, 2015), <http://www.daasny.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/DAASNY-Body-Worn-Camera-Press-Release-and-Testimony-12.8.2015.pdf>.) In addition, the prosecutor's own computer system and network must be robust enough to handle the large amount of additional data generated by BWCs. BWCs create large files that can easily fill up a prosecutor's hard drive and negatively impact the office's network as files are being downloaded from the cloud. (Joel Nihlean, *Looking Through the Lens of Body-Worn Cameras: A Full Picture Approach*, 28 CNTY. (Tex. Ass'n of Cts.), no. 1, Jan./Feb. 2016, at 22. [https://www.county.org/magazine/CountyMagazinePDFs/CountyMag\\_JanFeb2016.pdf](https://www.county.org/magazine/CountyMagazinePDFs/CountyMag_JanFeb2016.pdf).) Where an office's Internet bandwidth is insufficient, it can take hours to download BWC files, consuming the office's bandwidth and slowing down the office's entire network. (CBP BODY-WORN CAMERA WORKING GRP., U.S. CUSTOMS & BORDER PATROL, BODY-WORN CAMERA FEASIBILITY STUDY REPORT 12 (Aug. 2015), <https://www.cbp.gov/sites/default/files/documents/body-worn-camera-20151112.pdf>.) Even with adequate bandwidth, downloading hours of video will take time and expend resources.

If a private vendor owns the cloud storage system used by the police, the prosecutor may need a software license to use the system. This will typically involve a fee, such as a one-time purchase or a subscription. (One vendor provides prosecutors free access to the cloud; however, it is possible that fees will be charged in the future. (*See, e.g., Evidence.com for Prosecutors*, AXON, <https://www.axon.com/products/evidence-prosecutor> (last visited Feb. 27, 2018).) If police departments within a prosecutor's jurisdiction use different private vendors, the prosecutor may need to purchase separate licenses for each type of BWC program. Where licenses are required, the prosecutor's office must decide whether to purchase a license for each prosecutor or to purchase licenses that can be shared.

Redaction of BWCs also requires robust computer power that may not be available in some prosecutor offices. If redaction is done on the cloud, there may be additional charges for proprietary redaction tools. The number of licenses needed will depend on whether the redaction is done in a centralized location or by the assigned prosecutor.

Prosecutor storage of BWC recordings is another challenge. The BWC footage received from the police can be stored on a DVD, remain in the police department's cloud, be saved on the assigned prosecutor's computer, or downloaded to an electronic case file on the prosecutor's office server. Each method presents its own technical issues and expenses. Importantly, in addition to the file originally received from the police department, the prosecutor must save any portions of the BWC recordings that are introduced at trial, redacted or enhanced in any way. Ideally, the BWC recordings should be stored with the related case file and with all other digital evidence associated with the file, such as crime scene photos and surveillance videos. Separately storing BWC evidence and other digital evidence from the rest of the case file will make it more difficult to find years later, if needed.

A BWC program may be the impetus to upgrade a prosecutor's technological capacity because it cannot function efficiently without a robust network, ample server space, and up-to-date computers.

## REDACTIONS

Prosecutors will need to redact BWC recordings for a number of reasons, including witness protection, court orders, freedom of information requests, and creation of excerpts for trial. If an individual's identity or image is to be protected from dissemination, then redaction of the face or other identifying features is required for each frame, by "black out" or "pixilation." (Steven M. Clem, Wash. Ass'n of Prosecuting Att'ys Comm., *Use of Body-Worn Cameras by Law Enforcement: Considerations, Issues and Concerns* 11 (June 2, 2015), <http://pceinc.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/Washington-Link-1.pdf>.) Additional redaction methods include making the entire recording fuzzy, snipping out sections, or automated redaction that can assist with recognizing, following, and redacting a face or object. Many types of redaction systems are available; however, they may require a license and staff must be trained in their use. Prior to purchase, the prosecutor's office must make sure that the software is compatible with its existing systems, network strength, and storage capacity and that the program keeps track of all changes made to the original file.

Redaction is extremely time-consuming. The average BWC video is 13 minutes long and it takes a trained person approximately one hour to review and redact information from a recording of that length. (James R. Benjamin et al., *Mayor Rawlings-Blake's Working Group on the Use and Implementation of Body-Worn Cameras: Draft Recommendations* 24, BALT. CITY MAYOR'S OFFICE (2015), <http://mayor.baltimorecity.gov/sites/default/files/20150218BWCWorkingGroupRecommendations.pdf>; QueTel, *Body-Worn Camera Video Redaction—More Than It Seems*, POLICEONE.COM (Oct. 4, 2016), <https://www.policeone.com/police-products/Video-Redaction-Software/articles/227786006-Body-worn-camera-video-redaction-more-than-it-seems/>.) Once the recording is redacted, additional time is necessary to render or "finalize" the file, which can take anywhere from the real-time duration of the recording to up to one and one-half times the length of the clip. Depending on the redaction system, the computer used may be otherwise unavailable during the rendering process, thus requiring a dedicated computer. (See GLOBAL JUSTICE INFO. SHARING INITIATIVE, BUREAU OF

JUSTICE ASSISTANCE, U.S. DEP'T OF JUSTICE, VIDEO EVIDENCE: A PRIMER FOR PROSECUTORS (Oct. 2016); MICHAEL D. WHITE, OJP DIAGNOSTIC CTR., DEP'T OF JUSTICE, POLICE OFFICER BODY-WORN CAMERAS: ASSESSING THE EVIDENCE 34 (2014), [https://www.ojpdagnosticcenter.org/sites/default/files/spotlight/download/Police\\_Officer\\_Body-Worn\\_Cameras.pdf](https://www.ojpdagnosticcenter.org/sites/default/files/spotlight/download/Police_Officer_Body-Worn_Cameras.pdf).)

The redaction process is expensive in terms of the staff, resources, time, and technology required, and there may be much debate between police and prosecutors regarding who is responsible for this task. One study projected that redaction costs would consume as much as 21 percent of its BWC budget. It is estimated that, even if the process were to be outsourced to a third party (which still will require a frame-by-frame review by the prosecutor), video redaction still would cost an estimated \$50 per hour. (Benjamin et al., *Mayor Rawlings-Blake's Working Group, supra*, at 10.)

Enhanced technologies, such as facial recognition software, may simplify the redaction process in the future; however, there will always be a need for double checking each frame of a recording to make sure that the redaction was complete and properly made. (Karen Weise; *Could Face Recognition Be on Police Body-Worn Cameras by 2017?*, PLANET BIOMETRICS (July 20, 2016), <http://www.planetbiometrics.com/article-details/i/4766/desc/could-face-recognition-be-on-police-body-worn-cameras-by-2017>.)

## STAFFING NEEDS FOR PROSECUTOR'S OFFICE TO MANAGE BWC DATA

Properly implementing and overseeing a BWC camera policy will require additional staff for a prosecutor's office. These significant personnel costs are usually not included in the initial planning for a BWC program. When a police department begins its BWC program, it is important for funding authorities to know the substantial staffing implications for prosecutors.

Ideally, a prosecutor's office should have a legal liaison and an administrative liaison to manage the BWC recordings. The legal liaison can develop policies and protocols, address discovery issues, coordinate with the courts and defense, and oversee freedom of information requests. One important policy that requires legal input is the retention time for the recordings. This demands coordination between the police and the prosecutor to ensure that relevant recordings are maintained throughout the case and possibly also the appeal. Finally, the legal liaison can collect BWC recordings that are useful for training by the police or prosecutors and any recordings that demonstrate a need for disciplinary action.

The prosecutor's administrative BWC liaison can be responsible for an array of technical and logistical issues. These include receiving the recordings, tracking outstanding requests, sending recordings to the assigned or reassigned prosecutor, associating untagged recordings with cases, storing BWC recordings, addressing redaction issues, and coordinating transcription of BWCs. The administrator also will have to keep track of available licenses and passwords. (Damon Mosler, *Considerations for Policies on Body Worn Cameras in Prosecutor Offices* (May 2016) (unpublished paper on file with author).) In a large office, many prosecutors may have passwords for BWC reviewing systems; keeping track of the passwords as prosecutors

leave the office or change positions within the office can be difficult. The administrative liaison also may have to burn DVDs of BWC recordings for defense counsel or to introduce in court.

BWCs place a significant drain on the time of the assigned prosecutor. Viewing a BWC recording is far more time-consuming than reading a police report that summarizes an event. If there are multiple officers at a scene, viewing time will be increased further as the recordings of each officer may have to be viewed. For example, a one-hour event could result in five hours of viewing if five officers with BWCs were at the scene. In contrast, before BWCs, this same event may have been summarized in a one-page police report that could be read in five minutes. One prosecutor explained the impact of BWCs on a prosecutor's office by saying it is as if every police report increased from four pages to 60 pages. (Telephone Interview with John Haroldson, Dist. Att'y, Benton Cnty., OR (Apr. 14, 2017).)

To assist with viewing BWC recordings, some vendors have developed an accelerated fast-forward function that allows the video to be viewed quickly. Some BWC systems utilize technology that allows for simultaneous review of multiple recordings in a split screen. (See *Evidence.com for Prosecutors*, *supra*.) The disadvantage of these methods is that it is easy to miss something that may be significant, particularly because any sound on the recording will not be heard when viewing in an accelerated or multiple-recording mode.

A prosecutor's office should implement policies for when, and if, the BWC footage must be viewed. This policy will directly impact the number of additional prosecutor work hours that are needed as a result of a BWC program. In offices where prosecutors are not required to view every recording prior to discovery or plea, the staffing needs may be less. However, regardless of policy, there is no doubt that BWCs inevitably will increase the amount of time it takes a prosecutor to thoroughly investigate a case.

In addition to needing staff to redact recordings as discussed previously, staff also may be needed to transcribe BWC recordings that are introduced in court. Some states, such as California and Minnesota, require a transcript to accompany any recording introduced as evidence. (See CAL. R. CT. 2.1040(b) (2016) (stating transcript of video recording must be provided before recording may be entered into evidence); MINN. R. CRIM. PROC. 26.03(16) (stating that provision of transcript is optional prior to introducing video recording into evidence).) Transcribing a recording is time-consuming and requires staff. Some BWC system vendors offer related online transcription services that may reduce the time and personnel needed for audio-video transcription. (See, e.g., *SpeakWrite for Axon Evidence.com Platform*, AXON, <http://speakwrite.com/axon>.) However, outsourced transcripts always must be checked by prosecutor staff to verify their accuracy. If the recording is in a foreign language, a translator will be needed in addition to transcription services.

Qualified IT staffing is a critical component of a BWC program. Given the many technological challenges of a BWC system, it is essential to have competent and reliable IT support. Some prosecutor offices depend on centralized, countywide IT support. An office's ability to adjust to a BWC program can be significantly impacted if the county's IT support has other

priorities and cannot attend to the prosecutor's office.

Training also is needed for prosecutors and support staff to teach them how to deal with BWC issues, including office policies, access to the recordings, redaction, discovery, transcription, and introduction of the evidence.

In sum, the amount of digital evidence used in criminal cases is exploding and is significantly increasing the staffing needs of a prosecutor's office. Prosecutors and their staff must be trained and ready for a variety of challenges related to this evidence, including collection, viewing, redaction, storage, editing, discovery, and introduction of the evidence in court. (See GLOBAL JUSTICE INFO. SHARING INITIATIVE, VIDEO EVIDENCE, *supra* (providing guidance on using video evidence in the courtroom).)

## VIEWING BWC RECORDINGS AND DISCOVERY

Once a prosecutor has received a BWC recording, it will be subject to the same rules of discovery as other information received from the police. Ideally, a prosecutor should view all recordings in the early stages of a case and prior to turning it over to the defense. The recording may reveal useful evidence to support a prosecution or uncover information that exonerates a defendant. It also may expose issues that require additional investigation and assessment. As with any evidence, prosecutors must be mindful not to release information that could put a witness's safety at risk. Similarly, issues regarding privacy or confidential police tactics may prevent the release of some information contained in a BWC recording. Though early viewing of BWC recordings is a laudable goal, cost and staffing considerations may make this extremely difficult, if not impossible.

If it is not possible to review every BWC recording before discovery, prosecutors may need to focus on certain types of cases where the police report or the BWC tags suggest a higher likelihood that the recording contains sensitive information. For example, prosecutors may wish to review recordings of specific types of events, such as violent felonies, victim-related crimes, recordings of minors, and other situations where concerns of witness intimidation or privacy may be present. Assigning paralegals or interns to conduct an initial screening review of BWC recordings is one potential way to balance capacity constraints with necessary pre-discovery viewing. Prosecutors should be mindful that even if a recording is not viewed, the prosecutor has constructive knowledge of its contents. Ultimately, individual offices' discovery procedures and local statutes will govern when the recordings must be turned over.

Viewing and identifying discoverable material is not the end of the challenge. The prosecutor will have to determine how to provide defense counsel with access to the recordings. This can be done by providing the defense with a DVD, sending a link to the recording stored in a cloud system, or allowing viewing in the prosecutor's office. However, some defense counsel do not have the computer capacity or the technical knowledge needed to view the recordings. Accommodations will have to be made to complete discovery. Regardless of how the BWC recording is provided to the defense, a good record must be kept of when the information was sent to and received by the defense.

## RELEASE OF BWC RECORDINGS

Ethical rules such as Ethical Rule 3.8 (Special Responsibilities of a Prosecutor) of the ABA Model Rules of Professional Conduct

may prohibit prosecutors from releasing recordings to the public while a criminal case is pending. The rule states: “except for statements that are necessary to inform the public of the nature and extent of the prosecutor’s action and that serve a legitimate law enforcement purpose, refrain from making extrajudicial comments that have a substantial likelihood of heightening public condemnation of the accused and exercise reasonable care to prevent investigators, law enforcement personnel, employees or other persons assisting or associated with the prosecutor in a criminal case from making an extrajudicial statement that the prosecutor would be prohibited from making under Rule 3.6 or this Rule.” (MODEL RULES OF PROF’L CONDUCT r. 3.8 (Am. Bar Ass’n 1982), [http://www.americanbar.org/groups/professional\\_responsibility/publications/model\\_rules\\_of\\_professional\\_conduct/rule\\_3\\_8\\_special\\_responsibilities\\_of\\_a\\_prosecutor.html](http://www.americanbar.org/groups/professional_responsibility/publications/model_rules_of_professional_conduct/rule_3_8_special_responsibilities_of_a_prosecutor.html); see also Prosecuting Att’y Ass’n of Mich., *Best Practices Recommendation: Prosecutor and Law Enforcement Communication to Media* (June 19, 2015), [https://www.michiganprosecutor.org/files/PAAM\\_Best\\_Practices\\_Communications\\_to\\_Media.pdf](https://www.michiganprosecutor.org/files/PAAM_Best_Practices_Communications_to_Media.pdf).) In addition to professional conduct rules for prosecutors, local rules also may prohibit disclosure. For example, in Indiana, prosecutors who prematurely release evidence during a criminal proceeding may be subject to disciplinary action before the Indiana Supreme Court Disciplinary Commission. (See Marilyn Odendahl, *Prosecutors Say Ethics Rules Limit Release of Police Body Camera Video*, IND. LAW., June 29, 2016, <http://www.theindianalawyer.com/prosecutors-say-ethics-rules-limit-release-of-police-body-camera-video/PARAMS/article/40732> (citing IND. R. PROF. CONDUCT §§ 3.6, 3.8).)

One area of debate between police and prosecutors is when and if to release BWC footage, particularly during the investigative phase of a case. The police, who own the BWC recordings, are more likely to release a recording as soon as possible if needed to quell concerns in the community. In contrast, prosecutors may argue against early release of the recording for fear that it might interfere with the investigation and influence witnesses. It is useful for the police and the prosecutor to discuss this issue as a BWC program is being developed and before a high-profile incident occurs.

### INTRODUCING BWC RECORDINGS AS EVIDENCE

As with other evidence, before the BWC video can be admitted into evidence and published to the jury, it must be authenticated. (Greg Hurley, Nat’l Ctr. for State Courts, *Body-Worn Cameras and the Courts* (2016), <http://www.ncsc-jurystudies.org/~media/files/pdf/jury/final%20bwc%20report.ashx>.) Typically, a BWC video is authenticated by a witness to the event, usually the officer wearing the BWC, who will testify that the BWC recording fairly and accurately represents what the witness observed. If the officer wearing the BWC is not available, someone else who was at the scene may be able to testify that the recording is a true and accurate representation of what occurred at that date and time.

If the authenticity of a BWC video is challenged, or a party alleges that the recording has been altered, prosecutors should be prepared to establish the BWC video’s chain of custody from the start of the recording to its presentation in the courtroom. (*Id.* at 5.) To establish the chain of custody, the prosecutors should consider when and how the BWC video was uploaded, who had access to the video, and the availability of an audit

trail that can track who has viewed or altered the recording.

For prosecutors to present BWC recordings in the grand jury or in court, there must be the necessary equipment to play the recordings. Most jurisdictions provide that “the party offering the video evidence is responsible for appearing at the hearing or trial with [the evidence] and arranging for it to be played.” (*Id.*) Modern courtrooms may have the appropriate equipment available to play recordings, such as a widescreen television, a projector, computer, wireless Internet, and other equipment. In other, less sophisticated court rooms, however, the parties may have to “carry the required equipment into the courtroom to show the video.” (*Id.*)

Typically, even when a BWC recording is stored in a cloud system, the BWC recording will be introduced into evidence using a CD/DVD. The current rules of evidence “do not allow parties to move a data stream into evidence.” (*Id.*) In the future, parties may be able to upload BWC videos directly to a court’s case management system, from which the video can be played to the jury and, once admitted into evidence, also “included in the electronic case file . . . like an electronic document.” (*Id.* at 6.) It even may be possible to “stream a BWC video directly from its cloud-based environment to show to the judge or jury.” (*Id.* at 5.) Notably, however, this technology is currently out of reach for most jurisdictions.” (*Id.*)

### BWC EVIDENTIARY LIMITATIONS

Though they are a reliable source of evidence, BWC recordings have limitations in terms of evidentiary value. For example, if the BWC device is situated on the officer’s chest, but the officer is looking over his shoulder, the BWC may not capture what the officer saw. Perspective or lighting may be distorted by camera specifications. A BWC may capture something that the officer did not notice because the officer had focused on something else, or the officer’s arm may be in the way of the camera, obstructing something the officer did see. As a result, prosecutors should be prepared to manage the expectations of jurors and the public by explaining that BWCs may not provide a comprehensive synopsis of all events that occurred at a particular time.

### CONCLUSION

From daily news broadcasts to the courtroom, police BWCs are a topic of conversation and debate. BWCs are now expected by the public and are becoming a standard component of criminal investigations and prosecutions. The recordings generated from BWCs provide significant evidence and are important tools for prosecutors to evaluate, investigate, and prosecute criminal cases. The technology and policy considerations surrounding BWCs are complex and rapidly evolving. Prosecutors need to understand the technology behind BWCs—both its advantages and limitations—so that they can create sound policies and use this new evidence effectively. The implications of regular use of BWCs in criminal investigations have yet to be fully understood. Prosecutors should take a central role in guiding the use of BWCs, so they can be used to enhance investigations, provide increased police accountability, and improve the criminal justice system as a whole. ■