

**APPENDIX A**

**ACPO Strategic Firearms & Conflict Management Taser Trial  
by Specially Trained Units (STUs)**

Summary

This report provides an evaluation of the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) Strategic Firearms & Conflict Management extended use of Taser Trial by ten Forces. The trial extended the use of Taser to Specially Trained Units (STUs) in non-firearms situations. The trial ran for 12 months starting on the 1st September 2007 and ending on the 31st August 2008. During that period the device was used (drawn, aimed, red dot, arced, drive stun, fired) by STUs 661 times of which 93 were discharges.

This report provides an introduction and historical context leading into details of the ACPO extended use of Taser trial. This is then supported by results from the trial together with ACPO criteria for assessment of the trial and recommendations.

ACPO support the further roll out of Taser to all Forces so that Specially Trained Units may deploy this tactical option.

**Introduction**

**What is Taser?**

1. The Taser is a single shot weapon designed to temporarily incapacitate a subject through the use of an electrical current, which temporarily interferes with the body's neuromuscular system. It is a conducted energy device, not a firearm nor a piece of personal protective equipment although, until the start of the trial, it has only been used in the UK by Authorised Firearms Officers (AFOs). Like incapacitant spray it is a prohibited weapon but creates a further tactical option for use by officers in accordance with the Conflict Management Model.
2. The Taser is laser-sighted and uses cartridges attached to the end of the cartridge bay. The cartridges project a pair of barbs or darts attached to insulated wires. The maximum range of the device is currently 21 feet (6.4 metres), this being the length of the wires that carry the current and electrically connect the barbs to the weapon. It may also be used in a direct contact stun mode. The device delivers a sequence of high voltage pulses of very short duration through the wires.
3. The normal reaction of a person exposed to the discharge of the Taser is the loss of some voluntary muscle control resulting in the subject falling to the ground or 'freezing' on the spot. The device relies on physiological effects to achieve its objective. Although the risk is low the potential for injury from the device itself or secondary injury (eg, falling) should be acknowledged.

**Use of Taser in England and Wales**

4. Taser was first used in England and Wales in 2003, during an initial Taser trial in five Forces, which lasted for a period of 12 months. This examined the use of Taser as a less lethal option alongside conventional firearms (within a firearms

authority). In September 2004, following independent evaluation of the trial, the Home Secretary agreed to allow Chief Officers of all Forces in England and Wales to make Taser available to AFOs as a less lethal option for use in situations where a firearms authority had been granted.

5. The Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) concluded that an extension of use could be appropriate in other conflict management situations. A submission was presented to the Home Office seeking an extension to the operational deployment of Taser outside of the firearms criteria. In July 2007 the Home Secretary gave her approval for:
  - Chief Officers throughout England and Wales to deploy Taser for use by AFOs outside of a firearms authorisation.
  - A 12-month trial of Taser by specially trained units who were not firearms officers.

In both scenarios the criteria for deploying Taser is that officers are facing violence or threats of violence of such severity that they would need to use force to protect the public, themselves and/or the subject(s) of their action.

#### **Taser as a Conflict Management Less Lethal Option**

6. The police service already employs a wide range of tactical options. These include negotiation, physical restraint through approved self-defence techniques, and use of equipment such as handcuffs, batons and incapacitant spray plus, where necessary, officers deployed with public order equipment.
7. Taser has been rigorously tested; independent medical advice on the use of Taser within ACPO policy and guidance identifies the risk of death or serious injury as very low. It sits with incapacitant spray and batons as a conflict management tactical option and properly used can be less injurious when compared to the degree of injury that potentially can be caused by other items of equipment or techniques used by officers. Current tactics can often require several officers to subdue a determinedly violent individual who may not react to pain compliance. This puts officers and members of the public at risk and can lead to the individual receiving unintended injuries. Incapacitant spray is the only option available at present that allows officers to maintain distance from a violent subject. Taser provides an additional option with an enhanced separation and will, in the right circumstances, allow violent individuals to be restrained quickly and safely without injury to any person.
8. Prior to the start of the extended use trial, a statement was issued by DOMILL (a panel of independent medical advisors to the government) supporting the use of Taser as part of the ACPO trial. The medical review, which included such matters as the effect of electrical current on pacemakers, cardiac issues, and any potential complications from certain drugs, did not identify any unexpected detrimental effects from the use of Taser on the human body. A further medical statement, based on data accrued during the trial, is the subject of a separate report.
9. ACPO firmly believes that the extended use of Taser can make both police officers and the public safer when resolving violent situations. Quicker resolution can reduce confrontation that is often caused during protracted incidents. This is one of the key reasons behind the desire to see the use of Taser by Specially Trained Units (STUs) expanded to all Forces.

10. Since its introduction Taser has made a positive contribution to the effective and safe resolution of incidents involving conflict. Taser is not a replacement for existing personal safety tactical options, but is an option that should be considered alongside other personal safety tactical options, such as negotiation, batons, incapacitant sprays and dogs. These do not constitute a hierarchy of lawful force and should be viewed as a range of approved options from which the most proportionate and appropriate should be selected, according to circumstances, in order to meet the obligations set out above and below.
11. The Conflict Management Model, contained within the ACPO Personal Safety Manual of Guidance sets out the process by which a measured and appropriate response can be made to any situation involving conflict. The police use of force is governed by:
  - Common Law
  - Section 3 Criminal Law Act 1967
  - Section 117 Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984
  - The Human Rights Act 1998

### **Extended Trial by Specially Trained Units**

#### **ACPO Trial Sites & Qualifications required for STUs**

12. ACPO requested ten Forces to participate in the trial by STUs. These Forces were a mix of urban and rural Forces and included the Territorial Support Group from the Metropolitan Police.
13. The ten trial Forces were;
  - North Wales
  - Gwent
  - Merseyside
  - West Yorkshire
  - Lincolnshire
  - Northamptonshire
  - Northumbria
  - Avon and Somerset
  - Devon and Cornwall
  - Metropolitan Police Service
14. ACPO established guidelines for specially trained units to follow, which built on those used by AFOs. An STU is defined as one or more officers trained in the use of Taser. Chief Officers of the trial sites then identified which officers within their Force areas would be designated STUs. This resulted in a broad and representative cross section of STUs being trained and deployed with Taser.
15. The criteria ACPO established for STUs were:
  - Must be confirmed in the rank of Constable (minimum of 2 years service).
  - Must possess sound judgment; a knowledge and understanding of the Conflict Management Model; have demonstrated maturity of action in the workplace; demonstrated an ability to use legitimate force in a proportionate manner and have an acceptable complaints and misconduct record. This being signed off by an officer of at least the rank of Superintendent.
  - Will be expected to undergo an annual eyesight test in the same way that authorised firearms officers do, governed by local Force policy and procedures.

- Will be expected to be able to discharge a Taser accurately, pass the final examination at the end of the course, demonstrate competence at dealing with role-play scenarios in training and have knowledge and an understanding of the Conflict Management Model and dealing with vulnerable persons.
- Will be required to successfully complete annual refresher training. If they are found not to be competent during re-training then re-accreditation must take place or they will leave this role.

### **ACPO Guidelines for Operational Use**

16. The ACPO guidelines for the deployment of Taser by STUs are:

- Tasers are to be deployed with Specially Trained Units, where the authorising officer has reason to suppose that they, in the course of their duty, may have to protect the public, themselves and /or the subject(s) at incidents of violence or threats of violence of such severity that they will need to use force.
- Taser will be readily available.
- Once deployment of a Taser option has been authorised to conflict management situations, usual supervision will apply.
- Due to the diverse nature of policing operations it is not possible to provide a definitive list of circumstances where the use of Taser would be appropriate.
- Operational guidance has been written to inform and support decision making in relation to an operational trial stipulating training, deployment and use.

As mentioned, it is not possible to produce a definitive list of circumstances where use of Taser would be appropriate but it should be borne in mind that the lawful use of force in any circumstance includes the overriding principle that it must be reasonable and necessary. As such, the exercise of any power for which the use of force is contemplated should also be reasonable and necessary.

### **Post-Incident Protocols**

17. The Post Incident Protocols (PIP) for the Taser trial have been set by ACPO and are identical to those used by Taser officers within firearms units.
18. All Taser uses have to be recorded by the individual officers as a use of force. In addition to the officers' own record an ACPO Taser Evaluation Form has to be completed and sent to ACPO Self Defence, Arrest and Restraint (SDAR) and the Home Office Scientific Development Branch (HOSDB). These forms identify a number of parameters associated with the incident including; the officer, the type of deployment, type of incident and the number of times the Taser was used. It also records personal details of the person restrained and any injuries received.
19. Each Taser X26 has a Dataport that records the time, date and duration of all activations of the weapon and this is downloaded after every incident. Each weapon is subject to a data download every four weeks to ensure compliance with policy. Random downloads are also undertaken by unit inspectors.

20. Taser discharges are only required to be referred to the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC) if the discharge:
  - Results in death or serious injury,
  - Causes danger to the public, or
  - Reveals failings in command.
21. This does not preclude Forces referring discharges in other circumstances if they think it appropriate.
22. The IPCC have stated that they support a gradual and monitored extension of the use of Taser, and have requested all Forces participating in the trial to refer all complaints from the public about the use of Taser to them. This is in addition to the current requirements. The monitoring of complaints will identify any areas of concern and the IPCC can decide to investigate the incident, if appropriate.

### **Details of the Trial**

23. The new guidelines for Taser deployments came into effect in July 2007 for AFOs, which allowed firearms teams to deploy Taser at non-firearm incidents. In September 2007 STUs were permitted to deploy Taser as part of the ACPO trial, with eight of the trial Forces starting then. The Metropolitan Police Service and West Yorkshire started the trial in December 2007 and July 2008, respectively.
24. Protocols for the trial were established following discussions between ACPO Police Use of Firearms (PuF) and Self Defence, Arrest and Restraint (SDAR) Working Groups as part of the broader Conflict Management Portfolio. A crucial part of those discussions was the refinement of the Taser evaluation form to ensure that the necessary data was captured for Taser deployments. It was decided that ACPO PuF would continue to collate Taser deployments within a firearms operation and ACPO SDAR would monitor STU and AFO non-firearm deployment of Taser.
25. The Home Office Scientific Development Branch (HOSDB) would collate and publish the data from the forms at quarterly intervals and also provide more detailed summaries to DOMILL to allow them to review any unexpected injuries or events, also on a quarterly basis.

### **Training / Selection**

26. The Taser training package was designed by an ACPO Taser Practitioners Group with representation from ACPO Firearms and ACPO SDAR. During the course officers are assessed in skill areas within conflict management including judgmental issues. This programme built on the ACPO personal safety training that all officers receive. In total from all trial Forces 1131 officers were selected and trained from a variety of roles within their Force areas.
27. **Taser Usage by Specially Training Units**

#### **27.1 Table 1 – Total Number of Incidents**

Taser Evaluation Forms have been completed for every use of Taser during the trial and submitted for collation and analysis by the Home Office Scientific Development Branch (HOSDB). This information is recorded on a supplementary

report to be read in conjunction with this document. However elements of that data are duplicated below to ensure completeness within this report.

Table 1 shows the number of incidents, by Force, at which Taser was used.

<b>Force</b>	<b>Incidents</b>	<b>As % of Total</b>
Avon & Somerset	<b>24</b>	5%
Devon & Cornwall	<b>28</b>	6%
Gwent	<b>8</b>	2%
Lincolnshire	<b>4</b>	1%
Merseyside	<b>6</b>	1%
Metropolitan Police	<b>143</b>	30%
North Wales	<b>18</b>	4%
Northamptonshire	<b>2</b>	<1%
Northumbria	<b>212</b>	44%
West Yorkshire	<b>37</b>	8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>482</b>	

#### 27.2 Table 2 – Taser Usage by Force

Table 2 provides detail of the number of times Taser was used. With reference to the Table above it should be noted that at a number of incidents more than one Taser was used.

<b>Force</b>	<b>Usage</b>	<b>As % of Total</b>
Avon & Somerset	<b>27</b>	4%
Devon & Cornwall	<b>38</b>	6%
Gwent	<b>9</b>	1%
Lincolnshire	<b>5</b>	1%
Merseyside	<b>10</b>	2%
Metropolitan Police	<b>228</b>	34%
North Wales	<b>19</b>	3%
Northamptonshire	<b>2</b>	<1%
Northumbria	<b>278</b>	42%
West Yorkshire	<b>45</b>	7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>661</b>	

#### 27.3 Table 3 – Type of Deployment

<b>Type of Use</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>As % of Total</b>
Discharges	<b>93</b>	14%
Drive-stuns	<b>9</b>	1%
Arced	<b>20</b>	3%

Red Dot	<b>340</b>	51%
Aimed	<b>37</b>	6%
Drawn	<b>162</b>	25%
<b>Total</b>	<b>661</b>	

The data shows that just over 50% of Taser deployments are red dots. This is when the Taser is aimed at the subject and the target is illuminated by a red dot showing on the clothing of the person. In these instances this action has proved sufficient to resolve an incident and control the person without the need for any further use of the device. It is thought that this is due to the verbal information provided by the officer, public knowledge and in some cases personal experience.

At 25% of total usage is the simple function of 'Drawn'. It means that in a quarter of all uses the drawing of the device alone has been successful in resolving the incident without resort to other use of force options.

Both statistics show the effective deterrent of Taser in resolving incidents. In 85% of uses Taser has resolved an incident without the device being fired or used in Drive Stun (where both electrodes of the device are pressed directly onto the subject).

## 28. **Evaluation against ACPO Criteria for Assessment of the Trial**

Below are the seven ACPO criteria for assessment of the trial. Contained within each is a summary of how the criteria has been met together with reference to specific issues identified by trial Forces.

### 28.1 **Provide a more Human Rights based response in violent situations.**

Taser is a less-lethal option. The development of less-lethal options is consistent with the Human Rights Act 1998, Articles 2 and 3 of the UN Principles on the Use of Force and Firearms, and Article 3C of the UN Code of Conduct for law enforcement officers which stress that it is incumbent on a State to take into account its Human Rights obligations to, "provide a wider range of options to reduce the need to resort to firearms and provide a more proportionate response to threats of violence in accordance with the Human Rights Act".

In their training officers are taught in the use of the Conflict Management Model that incorporates the use of legitimate actions within the "powers & policy" section and focuses particularly on the legislative provisions available to them. Taser and other use of force tactical options do not form a sliding scale of use of force. The tactical deployment of a use of force option must under law rest with the officer to fully justify. The operational guidelines for Taser follow current legislation and as with any use of force has to be recorded and justified. Officers using Taser are subject of a comprehensive training package supplementing the personal safety training in the Conflict Management Model they have previously and continue to receive. Safe use of the device has been further enhanced by supervision both in the decision process for authorising deployment of the device and often present during actual use. These processes are supported by an audit trail created through thorough post incident protocols including recording system within the device itself.

### 28.2 **Reduces the level of injuries sustained to a subject in these incidents.**

DOMILL has completed a comprehensive assessment of the trial and submitted

their own report. However various general observations can be drawn from the trial. Most importantly in the majority of deployments the subject did not suffer any injury, whilst in those deployments where Taser was discharged a number of the subjects received only slight injuries where the Taser barbs penetrated the skin. Anecdotal evidence suggests that the use of Taser against those individuals who were subjecting themselves to self-harm has stopped them from inflicting more serious and potentially life threatening injuries. Additionally in incidents where more than one officer is required to physically restrain a violent individual there is an increased potential for impact injuries to both officers and suspects. The majority of Taser deployments have been resolved either by use of the red dot or drawing of the device without resort to other tactical options to physically restrain suspects.

Comments from STU Trial Forces:

There have been no injuries caused to members of the public due to the use of Taser by STUs during this trial. There is no doubt that had officers resorted to more traditional methods of restraint then injuries would have been caused.  
(Avon & Somerset)

We have only experienced very low levels of very minor injury to the subject; these have consisted of small puncture wounds and slight reddening to the skin.  
(Devon & Cornwall)

This is supported by an 80% reduction in complaints relating to the usage of CS and batons (11 down to 2) whilst conversely there have only been three complaints during the pilot, linked to the usage of TASER. Also there has been a 40% reduction in the usage of CS/PAVA by officers when you compare the pilot to the equivalent period prior.  
(Northumbria)

### **28.3 Reduces the level of injuries sustained to officers in these incidents.**

Across the ten trial Forces no officer using Taser has been injured. The nature of calls taken by the STUs means that such officers are vulnerable to acts of violence, including deployments when assisting medical and mental health teams as well as custody staff. Where individual officers from 24/7 police teams have deployed Taser against a subject the need to have physical contact with the subject has reduced and this has helped the officer to remain safe. The use of Taser by the STU has reduced the likelihood of officers sustaining injury, based on trial data, to zero or at least minimal levels.

Comments from STU Trial Forces:

There have been no reported injuries to officers at incidents where STUs have used Taser. There has been a 25% reduction in injuries reported against Support Group officers from assaults and restraining prisoners during this trial period. It is possible that this reduction is a result of the availability of Taser and officers not needing to resort to physical restraint so early in an incident.  
(Avon & Somerset)

There have been no assaults recorded during the course of the pilot.  
(Merseyside)

In relation to injuries to officers, we have not sustained any injuries directly related to the training or use of the Taser, the number of assaults on officers across the force has shown a reduction. At this time it would be wrong to attribute all of the reductions in injuries to the implementation of Taser however

there is a clear correlation between the reduction and the dates for the trial commencing.  
(Devon & Cornwall)

TASER has contributed to a 30% fall in days lost as a result of injuries on duty and a 23% drop in the number of injuries being reported.  
(Northumbria)

**28.4 Reduces the level and nature of complaints against police officers arising from these incidents.**

Directorates of Professional Standards for each trial Force and the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC) were given a full briefing on Taser prior to the commencement of the trial. The IPCC are releasing an independent report of the trial. It is hoped that this report will show from a 'complaints received perspective' that use of the device has not created a 'stream of complaints', quite the reverse. Clearly any use of force has the added potential for generating adverse comment on police actions, bearing in mind that the incidents to which STUs have been called are for violence or the threat of such. Traditionally these types of incidents have attracted complaints but it seems that the use of the device has minimised any impact on the subject and the interaction with police has been far less severe and confrontational. Anecdotally, STUs have received positive comments on occasions following use of the device.

Comments from STU Trial Forces:

There have been no complaints against officers in relation to the use of Taser by STUs.  
(Avon & Somerset)

One incident informally resolved. None of the other incidents produced complaints against the officers.  
(Merseyside)

There are no complaints relating to the use of Taser reported to our professional standards department during the trial period.  
(Devon & Cornwall)

To date we have received no formal complaints with regards to the use of Taser.  
(Northamptonshire)

As can be seen the complaints received for Taser are far lower than that of physical assaults (20%, handcuffing, self defence, etc) which may be due to the public's perception that Taser is a more proportionate use of force as apposed to a more hands on approach and by the nature of Taser tactics allows officers greater distance and time to communicate with the subject rather than being embroiled in the more physical approach. Complaints – only one complaint has been received during the trial in 74 usages.  
(North Wales)

**28.5 Improve the accountability for the use of force through effective monitoring/subsequent evaluation of incidents when a Taser deployed.**

The use of Taser as with any use of force tactical option has to be justified. The process for the issue and deployment of Taser is covered by an audit trail, which identifies that an officer is fully trained and has a current Taser classification. The deployment of the Taser is recorded on a specifically designed Taser Evaluation Form, which is checked by a supervisor and in turn submitted to the Force Single

Point of Contact (SPOC) for collation and internal senior management reports. The discharge of Taser is further monitored by the agreed ACPO post incident procedure. The Home Office and ACPO then review this data. The post incident review will include debrief of the officer(s) involved and any lessons can be implemented into training or policy guidance. No other use of force, other than the use of firearms, is ordinarily subject to such a high level of review.

**28.6 Provides comprehensive records of the use of force relating to Taser (including figures for aiming the weapon, arcing and actual firing).**

The data for the Taser trial has been collated by the Home Office Scientific Development Branch (HOSDB) and published in quarterly reports posted to the Home Office website. A comprehensive summary of the data from the trial has been produced by HOSDB detailing uses by each of the trial Forces who independently have been monitoring use within their respective areas and this continues to be the case. Each Taser use is subject to an individual audit trail. Detailed reports have also been provided to DOMILL on a quarterly basis highlighting injuries, barb locations and vulnerable groups to assist them in their review of any unexpected medical implications to the extension of TASER use.

**28.7 Improves public confidence in the police service when dealing with violent situations.**

Since the introduction of Taser into the police service much debate has been seen within the media about the use of less lethal technology. Although coverage has been limited there are those that do not support use of such devices or reluctantly accept use of the device but only in certain circumstances. This trial has seen that the use of Taser by STUs has ensured a safer resolution of violent incidents. The media coverage at the start of the STU trial posed many questions based on the North American experience of Taser. Across the trial Forces officers have attended numerous Independent Advisory Group and community meetings and continue to brief and discuss issues with the media and other interested groups in order that the role of the STU and Taser are clearly understood.

Comments from STU Trial Forces:

Prior to the trial starting we provided a briefing for senior police officers, community groups and the local press. The concept was very well received and the press reports were extremely favourable. One of our largest local newspapers has recently run a piece calling for Taser to be made more widely available to all officers.

(Avon & Somerset)

As a force we have not had any adverse incidents or any negative reporting of the use of Taser.

(Merseyside)

We have only experienced one negative news article in relation to Taser.

(Devon & Cornwall)

The public have experienced STU officers deploying/carrying Taser during the course of their duty without making any adverse comments or complaints. In every incident where the Taser has been discharged the subject has thanked Police for their assistance and apologized for their actions.

(North Wales)

**29. Ancillary Issues**

### 29.1 **Equipment Issues - National Contract**

A point to consider for the future development of Taser within the UK police service is the potential risk of having a sole supplier. This problem is exacerbated when all Forces have separate commercial dealings with Taser UK. Taser UK holds the license to supply Taser issued by Taser International. At this time there is no apparent competition within this area of less lethal technology although another weapon is currently being reviewed by HOSDB. It is suggested that a National contract to supply Taser is organised to ensure that all Forces benefit from logistic and procurement savings. The costs of the weapon and ancillary items appear to be fixed and bulk procurement savings for items is not available at this time.

### 29.2 **Use of Force Reporting Forms**

Use of the reporting forms has identified a number of issues, which during the trial could not be amended. Those matters, shown below, will be considered during the future deployment of Taser. The issues are;

- Form looks to capture more data than necessary for use other than fired and drive stun and should be simplified to capture only the data required for on-going monitoring.
- Guidelines for completion of the form are reviewed to ensure consistency of completion by AFOs and STUs and consistency between different police Forces.
- Internal audit by some Forces resulted in tardiness of submission for central collation.
- Appropriate mechanisms and secretarial support for the recording of incidents when deployed by STUs from all Forces across England and Wales.
- Development of a generic use of force reporting incorporating use of Taser.

## 30. **Recommendations**

- 30.1 ACPO support the further roll out of Taser to all Forces so that Specially Trained Units may deploy this tactical option.
- 30.2 With further roll out of Taser all STUs must meet the ACPO selection and training criteria.
- 30.3 ACPO Self Defence, Arrest & Restraint on behalf of and in conjunction with ACPO Strategic Firearms & Conflict Management Portfolio to;
- Provide support and guidance to Forces as they deploy STUs.
  - Retain oversight of Taser training in liaison with NPIA.
  - Review of guidelines and training incorporating lesson learnt.
- 30.4 The careful and thorough training of officers in the use of Taser has clearly played an important part in the successful introduction of this additional tactical option.

ACPO is keen to maintain this commitment so as to ensure that the device is used in the safest and most appropriate manner.

- 30.5 ACPO is looking to build on the success of the Taser trial by the ten trial Forces of STUs. There have been a number of factors that have played an important part in that success. These primarily revolve around utilisation of carefully crafted guidelines and policy, supported by appropriate training, close supervision plus a comprehensive reporting and review mechanism.
- 30.6 The current Taser 'Use of Force' form to be redesigned to provide a less bureaucratic document whilst still capturing the necessary information. To be designed with input from DOMILL, HOSDB and NPJA, with a view to potentially incorporating the data requirement of Taser within a more generic national use of force recording process. In the interim HOSDB, ACPO Strategic Firearms & Conflict Management and ACPO SDAR to maintain a record of uses so as to support continued monitoring and medical assessment.
- 30.7 HOSDB continue to review available and proposed Less Lethal Options together with relevant research and development of such options, advising ACPO accordingly.
- 30.8 The Home Office should fund a post so as to provide the capability for all uses of Taser to be recorded and collated.

**ACPO SDAR**  
**20.11.2008**