

Assessment of Policing And Community Safety (APACS)

Initial Equality Impact Assessment Report March 2008

By Police Productivity Unit (PPU) Equality and Diversity Team

Contents

Executive Summary	4
Background	5
Introduction	5
Legal framework	6
Methodology	6
Data Collection	8
Internal Consultations	8
Initial group discussions held by domain leads	8
Observations	8
Meetings between the equality team and domain leads	9
Observations	9
Equality & Fairness Workshop	10
Observations	12
External Stakeholder Consultation	15
Support Staff Association and External Stakeholders	15
Feedback from EIA Template and Regional Consultation meetings	16
Observations	16
Recommendations	18
Conclusion of Internal and External Consultations	19

Foreword

This **E**quality **I**mpact **A**ssessment (**EIA**) for the **A**ssessment of **P**olicing **A**nd **C**ommunity **S**afety (**APACS**) framework is an ongoing process. We see this as the first stage to ensuring the Fairness and Equality impact on various equality strands are considered by APACS policy and domain leads. The exercise has not only provided an initial EIA, which I am pleased to say is positive, but also, the consultations provided opportunity to increase the awareness of equality and fairness issues surrounding APACS from stakeholders points of view, particularly our external stakeholders. The report makes **7 recommendations** for consideration and implementation through adopting an action plan by the **5 policy and domain area** leads. I would like to express my personal thanks to a number of individuals who allocated valuable time, at short notice and in spite of a demanding deadline, to help us finish the initial EIA report. In particular I wish to thank Doreen Lawrence, who attended the first meeting, and to Peter Fahy, representing the **A**ssociation of **C**hief **P**olice **O**fficers (**ACPO**), for their experiences and insight. The same goes for the following internal and external stakeholders, organisations and individuals:

- Action Aid
- Race Equality Council (REC)
- Catholic Police Guild
- Community Security Trust
- Community Safety Trust
- Charities Commission
- A: gender
- Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO)
- Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary (HMIC)
- National Black Police Association (NBPA)
- National Association of Muslim Police (NMPS)
- British Association of Women in Policing (BAWP)
- National Policing Improvement Agency (NPIA)
- Notts Black Police Association (Notts BPA)
- Humberside Police Force
- Public and Commercial Services union (PCS)
- Stephen Lawrence Trust
- Association of Police Authorities
- Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary
- Ionann
- Michelle DUNN Police and Crime Standards Directorate Home Office
- Stuart PRINCE Police and Crime Standards Directorate Home Office
- Kim Hands Police Equality and Diversity Policy Unit (**Co -Author**)
- Avril Benjamin Police Equality and Diversity Policy Unit
- Glen Williams Seconded from Nottinghamshire Police to Police Equality and Diversity Unit (**Co-Author**)

Maqsood Ahmad - Head of Police Equality and Diversity Policy

Executive Summary

The overall reaction to the Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) of Assessment of Policing And Community Safety (APACS) was positive, from the responses received from the Support Staff Association and External Stakeholders meetings, and information gleaned from the Technical and Strategic consultations held.

60% of the indicators were positive against only **3%** viewed negatively. The general feeling from the Equality and Fairness Workshops, however, sounded a note of caution in that there was a feeling that, in terms of consultation, the attendees had been there before and received no feedback in relation to how or whether their views and concerns was given credence by the powers that be.

The matter of whether Key Diagnostic Indicators (KDI) were to stay in the final indicator sets was seen as an important one because it was felt that many of them addressed Fairness and Equality issues, and as such it was believed that if KDI's were removed consideration had to be given to whether they were made into Statutory Performance Indicators (SPI). At time of writing, (12.3.2008), a decision had not been made around the future role/development of KDI's. Due to their current number and Home Office commitment to reduce the number of performance measures, cognisance would be given to retaining specific KDI's during any reduction exercise. Minister's views on the SPI's for 2008/09 have been sought and we are reassured that none of the KDI's would be converted to SPI's. Consideration will be given throughout the year as to which KDI's might be developed into SPI's for 2009/10. A statutory consultation process would need to be undertaken as part of this process.

The rationalisation of EIA into future policy and decision making processes was a key issue that came out of the consultations with external stakeholders and Support Staff Associations. It was clear that policy and domain leads involved in the process naturally considered the equality impact that changes in policy and procedure may cause but because rational or formal structures were not in place to identify these considerations they may not have been recorded as EIA issues.

Background

The new performance measurement and assessment framework; APACS, is being developed to replace the current Police Performance Assessment Framework, (PPAF).

APACS aims to simplify the measurement processes which focus on Local and National priorities and will improve joint working among the Home Office, Police and partners. The launch of APACS will be in April 2008, with publication of the outcome of the first assessments, a year later in 2009.

Introduction

It is recognised that a cohesive, structured and open approach between the Home Office and its partners, from within all the diverse communities it serves, is essential throughout each of the APACS development stages. This will ensure that the final assessment measures, included in the new assessment framework, achieve their desired objectives and can be conveyed in a meaningful way to every corner of society that the police serve.

The approach used throughout the planning and development stages aims to provide a number of platforms where issues can be discussed openly and objectively, leading to a shared common ground between all key internal and external stakeholders.

The internal stakeholders are: Home Office policy leads, Home Office staff and other Government Departments. **The external stakeholders** are: Police Diversity Staff Support Associations, Police Productivity Unit, Equality and Diversity team, ACPO, HMIC, CLG, APA and the Audit Commission. Other external stakeholders are representatives from a wide range of communities.

Each stage of the APACS equality and fairness work has had a slightly different emphasis, aiming to ensure that the key aspects of APACS are able to be communicated coherently to all stakeholders. This culminated in open and meaningful discussions between the policy and domain leads and representatives from a wide group of community stakeholders, at the equality and fairness workshop.

Regular meetings between internal stakeholders and domain leads are on-going and will continue until formal introduction of the new performance measures and framework begin.

APACS is a tool for measuring performance. The data collected is used to enable continuous performance improvement. The new framework aims to build on the current performance arrangements in PPAF. APACS aims to reduce the burden created by the current number of measures used whilst still increasing overall effectiveness and performance in policing outputs and community safety. Furthermore, APACS aims to increase the public's understanding, confidence and trust in police work outputs, and in doing so, create a positive impact on the diverse communities that the police forces serve daily. *(Appendix C provides outline of indicators at time of publication. Note: KDI's maybe removed so those shown are not final proposals)*

Although the public does not have any direct control over the measures for adoption, their first-hand knowledge of the perspectives of the communities they represent, will enable the policy leads to make an informed choice of the final measures included in APACS.

Legal framework

APACS will have an overall significant impact on the organisations within the Police Service, partnerships and the communities served. For this reason all the relevant equality legislation has to be taken into account throughout the APACS process and life time. There is a legal obligation for all policies functions and services to be screened for relevance to Race, Disability and Gender and where change is considered a full EIA be undertaken for any potential adverse impact under the Sex Discrimination Act 1975 as amended by the Equality Act 2006, the statutory duties of the Race Relations Amendment Act 2000 and the Disability Discrimination Amendment Act 1995 as amended by the Disabilities Discrimination Act 2005.


Other statutory responsibilities that should be considered are:

- Human Rights Act 1998
- Employment Equality (Sexual Orientation) Regulations 2003
- Employment Equality (Religion & Belief) Regulations 2003
- Employment Equality(Age) Regulations 2006
- Gender Recognition Act 2004

Methodology

The methodology adopted for considering the Equality and Fairness issues in APACS has been in four key stages:

1. Initial group discussions held by the domain leads
2. Meetings between the equality team and domain leads of each APACS strand
3. The Equality and Fairness workshop, with community stakeholders, plus regional consultation meetings that took place between 13th December 2007 and 17th January 2008 and the Support Staff Association consultation on 8th January 2008.
4. Email submissions of the EIA template were collected from Support Staff Associations and external Stakeholders. The template used a colour coded system of **Red**, **Amber** and **Green** to signify **NEGATIVE**, **NEUTRAL** or **POSITIVE** perceptions of Equality Impact perceived by the proposed SPI or KDI from the **five domains**. If **NEGATIVE** indicated, reasons or concerns had to be expressed. For **NEUTRAL** and **POSITIVE** expressed views reasons were given only if it was felt necessary.

-  **Red – Negative**
-  **Amber – Neutral**
-  **Green – Positive**

APACS is made up of **five Performance Indicator Domains areas** all of which require EIA:

1. **Promoting Safety**
2. **Tackling Crime**
3. **Serious Crime and Protection**
4. **Confidence and Satisfaction**
5. **Organisational Management**

(Appendix C provides breakdown of domain area.)

The aim of the initial EIA is to show how the consideration of Equality and Diversity has been worked into the development process of the new performance measurement and assessment framework APACS.

The Initial EIA report is to be published alongside the publication of the proposed indicators in March 2008.

Data Collection

The collection of data for the APACS EIA consisted of qualitative data. The sources included:

- Consultations:
 - ❖ External
 - ❖ Internal
- Data from workshops - (*Appendix B*)
- Data from written feedback - (*Appendix C*)
- Technical and Strategic Consultation Focus groups - (*Appendix A for a list of those stakeholders involved and Appendix D for list of meetings and consultations*)

Internal Consultations

Initial group discussions held by domain leads

The domain leads co-ordinated proposals from the Home Office policy leads, some of which were carried forward from existing PPAF measures. These encompassed the services which the Police deliver alone or in partnership with other agencies e.g. Local Authorities.

Observations

1. There is a desire to reduce bureaucracy and complexity and simplify the performance landscape with the introduction of APACS so that practitioners and the public can receive a consistent performance message. Current arrangements can be contradictory and unwieldy. This situation is compounded by the way the performance data is used, often resulting in different interpretations and contradictory messages. Both of which have the potential to reduce overall confidence and confuse communities due to different levels of interpretation, whilst providing a factual basis for measurement, often mean different things to different people.
2. The measures currently under consideration, in each domain, range from core specific measures to some cross cutting measures that are relevant to more than one domain, where some are already specifically addressing equality and fairness. The scope of the discussions aimed to ensure that the measures currently in use were sufficient, meaningful and appropriate, and also that any new ones were essential and likely to be effective.

3. Each of the five domain leads has met regularly with all relevant policy leads to critically examine each of the current measures used in PPAF, aiming to import only those which are considered to be viable and justifiable into APACS. This critique should increase overall effectiveness and robustness of the framework. It should also increase the public's confidence in the performance criteria of the police service.

Meetings between the equality team and domain leads

The equality and diversity team have met each of the five domain leads to look at the measures being considered for inclusion in APACS. The equality team has drawn on its in-depth knowledge, within the various equality fields and impact assessments, to assist domain leads understand the finer equality and fairness issues in each of their specific areas of work.

Observations

4. The meetings have highlighted and identified inconsistencies and weaknesses, from an equality perspective, ready for further discussion in the workshop. The equality team's input has assisted the domain leads to move their discussions with policy leads on further.
5. The diversity team initially reviewed the proposed APACS measures from a completely different angle to the domain/policy leads. The aim was to gauge whether the performance measures being proposed had the potential to increase confidence in the communities they represented. This was only possible because the equality and diversity team interact with community representatives on a number of different levels in its day to day work.
6. Measures in each domain were reviewed for Equality and Fairness impacts, aiming to highlight issues or potential tensions and barriers which in turn could diminish the public's perception of their effectiveness. This also indicated that some of the measures did not fully reflect current employment and diversity legislation. This emphasises the need for rigorous testing to ensure that the measures finally adopted in the framework do what they are intended to do, both from a policing delivery

perspective, which considers equality and fairness and in doing so aims to ensure that they do not generate any unintended consequences.

7. The information provided was well received by domain leads and each has a far greater insight into some of the key equality issues and current thinking in communities and should assist in getting things right in the final phases of the development of APACS.

Equality & Fairness Workshop

An Equality and Fairness workshop was held in the Civil Service Sports Centre, Chadwick Street London on 23 August 2007. The workshop was considered a suitable way to provide community representatives with an insight into the reasons for the introduction of a new performance framework. Furthermore, it provided community delegates with an opportunity to discuss their concerns, issues and needs from the community perspective.

An initial list of 82 community groups/representatives was drawn up aiming for a workshop with at least 25 participants. The total attendance was 26 stakeholders.

The workshop involved the following Home Office teams:

- The Home Office Equality and Diversity Police Policy team;
- Home Office APACS team;
- Five APACS domain leads.
- The Diversity Staff Support Associations for the police service (National Black Police Association, National Disabled Police Association, British Association of Women in Policing and the Gay Police Association).
- ACPO lead

The community delegates were invited from:

- Other Local and Central Government bodies, including the London Assembly
- Stephen Lawrence and other diversity groups and consultants
- Community representatives for Race, Gender, Gender identity, Disability, Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual, Religion and Faith groups.

Although not everyone invited could attend on the day, the overall attendance represented a broad spectrum of community representation.

(Appendix A provides details the list of invitations and attendees).

Because of the varied interests within the differing communities and the differing levels of awareness of police performance and performance systems and limited time available, the workshop had to provide sufficient clarity on the APACS project in suitably digestible chunks using everyday language. This was achieved by a rewrite of the supporting paperwork.

The workshop was constructed in three components, to ensure best use of time. This encouraged far greater participation by the delegates at the workshop as they had time to frame their thoughts and obtain views on the measures from others within their communities in advance of the workshop.

Pre workshop:

- In advance of the workshop delegates were provided with a matrix consisting of the current list of the measures and the 7 stands of diversity for each domain.
- Delegates were asked to look in detail at the indicators and plot any issues, omissions and points which they considered had/could have an impact (negatively and positively) from their perspective within the community

Workshop:

- Delegates were provided with a general introduction of the reason for moving from PPAF to APACS.
- Delegates were invited to ask questions and raise any issues and concerns.
- Each domain lead introduced their area of work and provided an overview of the changes proposed for measurement using APACS.
- Group discussions provided each domain lead with clarity on the issues affecting their communities.

Post workshop:

- Delegates were provided with the complete list of current PPAF measures and were asked to revisit the topics covered in the workshop and provide the Home Office with any further feedback by the middle of September 07.
- Papers were provided to the community representatives unable to attend the workshop and they were invited to send in their views and comments.

Observations

8. The workshop provided each domain lead in the Home Office with clarity on core issues, through engagement with community representatives and in doing so , highlighted where suitable action could be taken for an indicator, deemed to have the potential for a negative impact on delivery at the earliest stage. That shared knowledge and tailoring of assessment elements, has meant that the final measures being considered for inclusion have taken account of community views and perceptions both locally and nationally.
9. The discussions throughout the day enabled the Home Office to focus on the core issues, views, values and perceptions that are currently held by people in different communities. This highlighted that success of APACS will be gauged by the measures put in place that demonstrate Equality and Fairness to community members. If they do, the general trust and confidence of community members will increase. It is therefore essential that the measures included in the final framework, underpin the performance criteria that the community expects and can easily identify with, which leads to positive outcomes.
10. A wide range of community representatives was invited to participate in the equality and fairness workshop, and whilst not all groups invited could attend, the comprehensive mix of stakeholders at the workshop supplied each domain lead with useful information and insight into real life experiences of communities. Some of the examples demonstrated how the outcome had impacted on relationships between local communities and forces which also affected wider policing matters. The unravelling of some complex issues that had emerged after a particular event has provided the Home Office domains and its partners with details of what focus is needed for any performance measure adopted.

11. Domain leads gleaned useful information during the discussions with the community representatives from which current proposals can be considered against. **(Recommendation 4)**

12. It was noted that there are some areas where the measures proposed for APACS do not fully meet the equality and fairness objectives expected by communities. These issues are being considered (realigned) to ensure that any performance measurement takes full account of the equality issues currently affecting public confidence. Some community representatives considered that failure to take these on board, could reduce community confidence and trust in the processes and outcomes for the scheme, which could lead to deterioration in community values and which may lead to impairment in community cohesion. There is a need to ensure that stakeholders receive feedback on progress here. **(Recommendation 2 and 4)**

13. Domain leads have, throughout the workshop been able to see the issues and concerns from the community perspective first hand. It was enlightening to all present, how different groups viewed the outcomes of current performance indicators and indicated that APACS may resolve some of the current frustrations. It is worth noting that community views on some of the current policy and the rationale for outward facing delivery were quite different from the original intention of the performance policy. **(Recommendation 2 and 4)**

14. Some of the current measurement outcomes appeared to result in negative opposition to the original objective. E.g. "Stop and Search". Whilst communities understood the rationale for this procedure, they were letdown by the processes. Stop and Search was given as an example, which created tensions within communities as the procedure was (1) increasingly disproportionate in terms of representation for BME communities and (2) compounded by the time required to complete the monitoring forms. The general consensus was that the playing field needed to be levelled up and the bureaucracy significantly reduced. **(Recommendation 4)**

15. Discussions provided domain leads with awareness that statistical and empirical data presented was often vastly different to the personal experience and perceptions. This divergence has increased tension, reduced overall confidence and has potential to create confusion and discredit the figures on which, performance is measured.

16. Community representatives and domain leads discussed in depth the issues around the data collected and used as evidence for the British Crime Survey. It was noted that whilst the survey is conducted using random samples from a large percentage of the population, it appeared that some sections of the community are completely excluded from the data collection. The exclusion included anyone less than 18 years of age and also people sitting at home in fear (of crime) as they are the very individuals that the survey should include to ensure the data outcome is balanced. The discussion further highlighted that these individuals are more likely to be the ones affected by crime yet the least likely to be included in the survey, thus increasing the general assumption that the data was not representative of the true picture. **(Recommendation 4)**

17. Suggestions were made to include these excluded groups to increase the confidence in it. The discussions highlighted that in many instances the only way these groups would be able to be included in any survey was if they were contacted via individual community support networks/groups. **(Recommendation 4)**

18. The workshop brought out a number of underlying issues that have an impact on performance and in particular lead to fragmentation and disharmony, which in a modern society is not helpful. However, because APACS is a new framework it is the ideal opportunity to put tools in place which aids betterment and increases cohesion. **(Recommendation 1)**

19. The workshop by its nature set out to get issues that matter, heard so they can be embedded into the process from the beginning. It needs to be recognised that circumstances, opinions and views will change and that any performance measure to be truly effective must change with it.

20. The domain leads will have gained valuable insight in underlying equality issues which should be incorporated into every aspect of work, however, this is just the beginning and regular reviews will be necessary to keep a pace with changes in society. The domain leads have taken the points raised on board, and will endeavour to incorporate them into the final APACS framework. **(Recommendation 4)**

(Appendix B provides an overview of the key issues and concerns expressed during the workshop by community representatives and also include views and thoughts from the groups not present on the day.)

External Stakeholder Consultation

Support Staff Association and External Stakeholders

Support Staff Associations and stakeholders were invited to the Equality and Fairness workshop. The attendance from the Support Staff Associations was low. A decision was made to give a further opportunity for those who were absent from the workshop to give their views through feedback by email. This was in the form of a template on the potential positive, neutral or negative impact of the SPI's and KDI's of APACS. In addition to this, a second meeting was arranged with the Support Staff Associations and key external stakeholders from NPIA, HMIC and regional Black Police Associations, (BPA). The representatives were to discuss the EIA template contents in details as they related to the seven strands of Diversity. (*Appendix C*)

The meeting with the Support Staff Associations and other external stakeholders took place on Tuesday 22nd January 2008 at The Home Office, Peel Building, 2 Marsham Street London. In addition to the attendees there was representation from the Home Office PPU and Police and Crime Standards Directorate (**PCSD**).

The attendees found the process, of going through the SPI and KDI separately to review the potential equality impact, a useful, informative and enjoyable exercise that created lively and positive debate and discussion. The process was not as burdensome as some initially thought it would be. Previous discussions with internal and external stakeholders had expressed the need for clear instruction and guidance from the directorate in relation to EIA being factored into the process, which led to the inclusion of **recommendation 6 and 7** – (*Standardisation and Rationalisation of EIA into scoping exercise and training*)

Feedback from EIA Template and Regional Consultation meetings

Observations

21. The overall response to the EIA of APACS was very positive from the data received from the Support Staff Association, External Stakeholders, Equality and Fairness Work Shops and information gleaned from the Technical consultations held, in particular from the Equality and Fairness technical consultation held in the North West region. The total SPI and KDI for the monitoring period in 2008/2009 came to **142**. **SPI are 46** and **KDI are 96**. **86** indicators were perceived as positive, **47** as neutral, **3** as negative and 6 where no views were forthcoming, due to lack of information/it was identified that further information was required. As a number of KDI's were seen to address important Fairness and Equality issues, if all the KDI's were to be removed from the framework consideration needed to be given to whether the relevant and appropriate KDI's need to be elevated to SPI status. **(Recommendation 3)**
22. The negative responses related to "Number of 'honour/mental health' homicide offence per 1,000 population" and concerned labelling issues for certain sections of the community. A negative response was initially recorded in relation to Counter Terrorism Unit measure, which was regarded as a controversial issue that had already caused negative impacts in certain communities through perceived insensitive implementation. However after discussion with CT it was agreed that APACS implementation of performance indicators introduced monitoring measures. This was seen as a positive move and thus a neutral impact was agreed but based on future monitoring processes and implementation of EIA on policies and procedures being progressed. There was a negative response to "police efficiency", where it was felt that the area of Equality was seen to always suffer when it came to "Delivery of cashable efficiency targets."
23. It was noted that under "Organisational Management" that the focus on recruitment of BME and female officers was recommended but omission of related measures focusing on Retention and Progression had potential for an overall negative impact. This was a common theme expressed by other external stakeholders such as Association of Police Authorities, Audit Commission, and others and confirmed by senior BME Police officers in their response to HMIC. It was also argued that figures should include PCSO's as they were part of the police family. **(Recommendation 5)**

24. Under Equality legislation there is a requirement that all changes to policy and functions be considered for their EIA. As the SPI's and KDI's will have a direct impact on how policies, functions and decisions will be made in relation to policing the public it follows that EIA should be a key process of consideration at the beginning and through the life of APACS. In the scoping process for consultation, both Technical and Strategic, this was not highlighted. Thus, this resulted in written responses from stakeholders which did not identify EIA, unless the response required related directly to a fairness and equality issue such as BME Recruitment. However, the PPU team noted that during the Technical consultation meeting, held in the North West Region, the attendees were actually making EIA considerations as a natural part of their discussion. They failed, however, to identify the process until it was pointed out to them. It was wondered in how many other meetings this same process took place and the information was not identified as such in the proceeding minutes of the meetings. ***(Recommendation 6 and 7)***

Recommendations

- 1. Stakeholders involved in the consultation process, receive copies of the final indicators adopted for APACS.**
- 2. It is important that Fairness and Equality monitoring of APACS through EIA continues throughout the monitoring period of 2008/2009, with a Full EIA report on the final indicators completed by January or February 2009. To aid this process, it is also advisable that the same group of stakeholders, internally and externally, be invited to a follow up workshop during the first year of operation. The additional benefits of this would be to see if the measures were working as expected and any concerns, observations or request outlined during the initial workshops and consultations are auditable and accountable in terms of final decisions made by policy and domain leads.**
- 3. Serious consideration is given to making KDI's, that have a positive Equality Impact, into SPI's**
- 4. Feedback to be passed back to policy and domain leads for consideration and that they make note of the comments made by internal and external stakeholders with a view to providing updated information on process back to them.**
- 5. Expansion of the recruitment of BME and female indicators to include PCSO's in the percentage figures for SPI's, along with the inclusion of retention and progression indicators for both strands.**
- 6. The Standardisation and Rationalisation of EIA by writing it into the scoping document for any change programmes that effects policy or procedure. The scoping document for the Strategic and Technical consultations made no reference to the legislative requirement to consider EIA.**
- 7. That training is provided for all domain leads in relation to EIA (Consequence of recommendation 6)**

Conclusion of Internal and External Consultations

The overall reaction to the Equality Impact Assessment of APACS from external stakeholders was positive, **60%**. There is a need to make external stakeholders, especially those from community and diversity backgrounds, more inclusive in such process from the beginning but this can only be achieved if domain leads understand when EIA is required and how it is done. They must also be able to identify and associate with their level of responsibility to engage in such a process at the beginning and not the end of such processes. In terms of efficiency this will also bring benefits in terms of the collection of ratified and accountable data that can be used in the full Equality Impact Assessment report and thus satisfy any legislative requirement.

The rationalisation and formalisation of EIA would ensure: -

- The concerns and views of internal and external stakeholders are sought at an early stage in APACS from policy and domain leads. This applies to any change programme.
- Information collated in relation to positive, neutral or negative impact perceived as a result of implementation of APACS, in relation to the seven Equality Strands with suggestion and reasons stated when required, are traceable and accountable.
- Template based on views put forward is recorded in a standardised way.
- Recommendations from the consultation process put forward can be traced back to see how they originated.