

ACPO Criminal Records Office

Funding from PNC Charges



Business Case

Author:	Det/Supt Gary Linton	ACPO Criminal Records Office
Owner:	A/DCC Adrian McAllister	Version: 1.0 Dated: 30th October 2006
Customer:	CC Peter Neyroud	

Contents

1	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
2	INTRODUCTION	5
3	BACKGROUND	7
4	ACPO CRIMINAL RECORDS OFFICE	8
5	GOVERNANCE	11
6	LOCATION	12
7	FUNDING	13
7.2	ACRO ESTIMATED ANNUAL COSTS	14
8	THE BUSINESS BENEFITS	15
8.2	MICROFICHE	15
8.3	SUBJECT ACCESS	15
8.4	EXCEPTIONAL CASE PROCEDURE.....	15
8.5	EXCHANGE OF CRIMINAL RECORDS WITHIN THE EU	15
8.6	FORENSIC INTEGRATION STRATEGY (FIS)	16
8.7	DIRECT SAVINGS THROUGH SPEEDIER INVESTIGATIONS AND QUICKER APPEHENSION OF OFFENDERS	17
8.8	EARLY ELIMINATION OF THE INNOCENT AND BETTER TREATMENT OF SUSPECTS	18
8.9	GREATER VICTIM REASSURANCE	18
8.10	AN ABILITY TO RESPOND TO LEGAL AND PARLIAMENTARY SCRUTINY	18
8.11	IMPROVING SYSTEM EFFICIENCY AND CO-ORDINATION OF TECHNICAL CHANGES	19
8.12	EXPERTISE TO NEGOTIATE WITH STAKEHOLDERS ON BEHALF OF ACPO AND GOVERNMENT	19
8.13	ABILITY TO DEAL WITH EMERGING ISSUES EFFECTIVELY AND REMOVE OBSTACLES TO PROGRESS	19
9	STAKEHOLDER SUPPORT AND THE STAKEHOLDER SURVEY	20
10	COMMUNICATIONS STRATEGY	21
10.1	24/7 SUPPORT AND WEBSITES	21
11	BUSINESS AREAS	22
11.1	RETENTION GUIDELINES AND STEP MODEL	22
11.2	INFORMATION COMMISSIONER NEGOTIATIONS	22
11.3	INFORMATION TRIBUNAL	23
11.4	POLICE INFORMATION ACCESS PANEL (PIAP)	24
11.5	VIOLENT AND SEX OFFENDER REGISTER (ViSOR), DATA OWNERSHIP AND ACCESS COMMITTEE (DOAC)	24
11.6	EXCEPTIONAL CASE PROCEDURE FOR REMOVAL OF DNA, FINGERPRINTS AND PNC RECORDS	25
11.7	UKCA - FOR THE EXCHANGE OF CRIMINAL RECORDS (UKCA – ECR)	26
11.8	SUBJECT ACCESS	28
11.9	BRC MICROFICHE	29
11.10	BRC ACQUITTALS	31
11.11	PARLIAMENTARY QUESTIONS AND DATA PROVISION	32
11.12	FORENSIC INTEGRATION STRATEGY (FIS) AND DNA OPERATIONS GROUP	32
11.13	MOPI AND IMPACT	34
11.14	CRB LINKS	34
11.15	NON-POLICE AGENCIES AND FOREIGN NATIONAL CRIMINALS	35
12	APPENDICES	37
12.1	APPENDIX 1 – SUMMARY OF STAKEHOLDER SURVEY RESULTS	38
12.2	APPENDIX 2 - PREDICTED PNC CHARGE INCREASES	43
12.3	APPENDIX 3 – BUSINESS BENEFITS SUMMARY	46
12.4	APPENDIX 4 - STANDARD QUESTIONNAIRE LETTER AND QUESTIONNAIRE	47

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1.1** On 03 May 2006, ACPO Cabinet approved the creation of an ACPO Criminal Records Office (ACRO). It was agreed that initially it would be funded by contributions from police forces and the Home Office. This is vital work, which has led to a significant increase in detections, in many cases against serious crime, which is documented in Section 8 of this detailed business case.
- 1.1.2** Currently, ACRO costs less than £0.5m per annum but is in need of more staff, a dedicated PNC Bureau and larger premises. Suitably sized premises will allow for bureau expansion, which will be required over the next two years, to cater for increased work in several business areas. It will also prepare the ground for the transfer of some National Identification Service (NIS) functions, particularly the removal of the microfiche library. To do so provides a cost effective approach with a single initiative, concerning Subject Access, saving more in cashable terms than the cost of the ACRO provision to forces.
- 1.1.3** The business areas, which are covered by the work, achieve a number of vital components for policing, which fall into four broad categories:
- Detection of crime by linking arrestees through biometrics to crime scenes
 - Protection of the public from dangerous offenders by greater PNC use
 - Significant savings by better record management
 - Greater public assurance through improved governance of records
- 1.1.4** ACRO is now in the process of constructing the appropriate capability to manage and resource the relevant work streams. This includes; the implementation of the ACPO Retention Guidelines (which replaced the ACPO weeding Rules), maintaining links between records and biometric samples to maximise crime detections, the maintenance of an 'Exceptional Case Procedure' for Chief Officers dealing with retention issues, managing the UK Central Authority for the Exchange of Criminal Records (UKCA-ECR) across the European Union, resolving and rationalising millions of old microfiche records, and improving Subject Access arrangements.
- 1.1.5** A 1990 Home Affairs Committee Report recommended the provision of adequate funding to ensure that the whole of the microfiche library be transferred on to the PNC by the end of 1994 at the latest, but that has not yet happened. ACRO who have now examined this area are able to evidence, following a survey of all forces in England & Wales, that the Microfiche Library does not require the significant costs of staffing 24 hours a day. The savings this generates will pay for the digitisation of the library onto the PNC. The ACRO proposal is to take ownership of the library and manage that process over a three to five year period.
- 1.1.6** Overall, ACRO enables ACPO to move from a position of 'event driven' initiatives in relation to record management to a forward thinking problem solving approach. This is a separate and distinct requirement, which is not catered for by the IMPACT and MoPI work or plans to create a Police National Database.
- 1.1.7** The access to PNC data by non-police users, which has been influenced by an Information Tribunal and ongoing demands from the Information Commissioner, has wide implications for the police service. To get the balance right and ensure efficient working between agencies ACRO are working with more than 40 non-police organisations to build a better arrangement. Some of these agencies such as the IND and Prison Service are significant stakeholders, where implications exist in relation to Foreign National Prisoners. The opportunities for improving public safety and further

crime detections are already well known in these areas.

- 1.1.8** ACRO also ensure that efficiencies on a national scale are achieved in respect of DNA sampling and have recently been tasked by the Prime Minister's Office to do further work in this area through Forensic Science and Pathology Unit.
- 1.1.9** The Police of England & Wales now sample and record details of all persons who have come into police custody for a recordable offence. This has huge implications for Human Rights issues, Subject Access arrangements, VISA applications and Employment Vetting. ACRO are working closely in these areas to ascertain the many benefits this approach now brings to policing, protecting the public and apprehending dangerous criminals. It can only do so by ensuring that it has the appropriate resources to meet the demands over the next five years.
- 1.1.10** It is sensible to fund this work from the revenue generated by the very data it currently manages. This revenue forms part of the PNC charge, which is attributed to police forces and all non-police users of the PNC.
- 1.1.11** There are a significant number of non-police users of PNC, all of whom pay a levy for access, as do police forces. The ACPO lead for PNC, DCC John Feavours, has written to the Director of Finance at PITO requesting that £1.5m be included in this budget area to fund the future ACRO requirement on an annual basis from April 2007. This equates to a 5% increase of the PNC charge to forces and an increased levy to non-police users. It is acknowledged that other demands are also being placed upon this charge which lifts the police increase for 2007 to 23%. Whilst some of these areas are essential, others may be viewed as less than essential. The work of ACRO however should be seen as forming part of the essential category.
- 1.1.12** This action has been agreed in principle by PITO and the Home Office and has the support of the ACPO President and several ACPO leads in the relevant business areas.
- 1.1.13** The Home Office is also in the process of implementing a plan to close the National Identification Service (the current holders of the microfiche library) during 2007. Once complete, they want to transfer remaining business areas over to ACRO together with a budget of around £2m plus a further £2m in respect of Subject Access if that work is also undertaken. This will help fund the additional transferred work but does not remove the requirement for the £1.5m funding from PNC charges.
- 1.1.14** Few can believe the effectiveness and achievements of the small ACRO office until they see the evidence. ACRO have put in place a system and business processes in months, where others have previously taken years. A recent example is the UK Central Authority for the Exchange of Criminal Convictions across Europe. Once again this has now highlighted and filled the significant gap that existed concerning our knowledge of serious and dangerous offenders residing in the UK. The significant value ACRO brings to several ACPO portfolios is evident from an extract of a stakeholder survey relating to the work at Appendix 1.
- 1.1.15** In summary ACRO manages several vital business areas for ACPO linked to criminal records. The work now needs to be firmly established as a central ACPO police structure, which Hampshire Constabulary are happy to support in their force area, once the funding is secured. The revenue generated by the data use is the preferred way to find the necessary funds which would then see an effective development of several linked areas of business.

2 INTRODUCTION

- 2.1.1** ACRO is now in the process of constructing the appropriate capability to manage and resource the relevant work streams, which include;
- implementation of the ACPO Retention Guidelines (which replaced the ACPO weeding Rules),
 - negotiating and facilitating PNC access arrangements with a large number of non-police agencies
 - maintaining links between records and biometric samples to maximise crime detections
 - maintenance of an 'Exceptional Case Procedure' for Chief Officers dealing with retention issues
 - exchange of convictions across the European Union
 - management and rationalisation of millions of old microfiche records
 - improving Subject Access arrangements
- 2.1.2** These are just a few examples and the capability will need to cater for future expansion and perhaps accommodate the national microfiche library.
- 2.1.3** ACPO needs to be able to demonstrate a robust and rigorous approach to the management of its data, particularly that held on PNC. ACRO will enable the careful management of police data; minimise the risk of misuse by non-police users; offer greater transparency and secure public confidence. This is evidenced in each of the business areas of the report and in more detail in Section 8.
- 2.1.4** There are a significant number of non-police users of PNC, all of whom pay a fee per check. Police users all pay a levy for unlimited access, determined by the size of the police force. The ACPO lead for PNC has written to the Director of Finance at PITO requesting that £1.5m be included in this budget area to fund ACRO. This action has been agreed in principle by PITO and the Home Office.
- 2.1.5** The Home Office is in the process of implementing a plan to review the National Identification Service (NIS) during 2007 removing significant amounts of business and freeing up physical space. Once complete, they want to transfer remaining business areas to ACRO together with a budget of around £2m plus a further £2m in respect of Subject Access if that work is also undertaken.
- 2.1.6** Initially, the ACRO staffing requirement is likely to be in the order of 35 to 50 employees rising to about 100 over a three to five year period. Suitable premises are required to allow for such expansion, and in line with the Gershon Review¹ it is recommended that the ACRO office is located outside of London.
- 2.1.7** The early work prior to the creation of ACRO is already well known for its strong links to Hampshire Constabulary who are happy to continue to host ACRO against secured funding. Geographically this has proved to be an ideal location which is sufficiently close to key London offices, close to national transport infrastructure and benefits from reduced costs.
- 2.1.8** The formation of ACRO provides a full time effective resource that can support the police service across a range of issues linked to criminal records. The issues are numerous, as reflected in the content of this paper and importantly, in terms of policing, need linking in a coherent way to maximise policing benefits including crime detections and increased public safety.

¹ Independent Review of Public Sector Efficiency - Releasing resources to the front line

- 2.1.9** The focus of the work is about functional aspects of criminal records and not about managing police intelligence. A wide interpretation of criminal records however is important and should include DNA and fingerprint information in this context. The overlap with intelligence management is also significant and this business case acknowledges the need for ACRO to engage with IMPACT and Bichard proposals. In this area ACRO are providing support to the implementation team tasked with supporting the Review, Retention and Disposal section of MoPI.
- 2.1.10** Ultimately, the work of ACRO involves focusing upon the operational use of criminal records to maximise crime detections, improve National Security and increase public protection and confidence in the police service. Identifying business benefits has also remained a core aspect of the work for a number of reasons. Clear evidence of the tangible benefits has encouraged police service engagement with new legislation, such as the Criminal Justice and Police Act 2001 and the Criminal Justice Act 2003. It has also helped others, including the Courts and Parliament, to consider the balancing exercise, which exists between the operational law enforcement requirement and associated Data Protection and Human Rights considerations linked to personal data.
- 2.1.11** The team have set extremely high standards both in terms of service and delivery. This reputation has been reflected in a stakeholder survey that included a wide array of partner organisations, as well as all police forces in England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland.

3 BACKGROUND

- 3.1.1** The DNA and Fingerprint Retention Project was established to devise a system that enables the retention of DNA profiles and fingerprints in accordance with PACE as amended by the Criminal Justice and Police Act 2001. Once established, it was also recognised that there was a need to have a team committed to oversee the implementation of Sections 9 and 10 of the Criminal Justice Act 2003 (CJA). The project was fully funded by the Home Office, and operated under the ACPO badge.
- 3.1.2** One of the Deliverables identified within the original Project Initiation Document was to produce a “State of the Nation” report, setting out how forces were structured to cope with the impending legislation. The CJA enabled police forces to take and retain fingerprints and DNA samples from all persons arrested for a recordable offence and detained at a police station. Those persons where No Further Action is taken, pre charge, are known as ‘CJ Arrestees’.
- 3.1.3** One of the main aims was to determine the number of additional persons who would be processed nationally. To achieve this it was necessary to ascertain the number of persons arrested in each force area, the numbers judicially processed, and therefore establish the numbers who were the subject of No Further Action. This gave a clear indication as to the extra requirement being imposed on each force by the CJA.
- 3.1.4** Each of the 43 forces within England and Wales were visited. This led to an appreciation of the systems in place for custody processing, and any plans for responding to the requirement to sample ‘CJ Arrestees’.
- 3.1.5** Opportunities were recognised to identify best practice across the country, and as the knowledge of the project officers grew, they were able to impart that knowledge to forces. In addition the project officers identified problems surrounding the ability of PITO to carry out the necessary technical changes to PNC, and the limitations of the NSPIS Custody system. It became apparent that these were the greatest concerns to forces who would find difficulty in coping with the requirements of the CJA, and would cause delays in implementation.
- 3.1.6** Whilst this work was ongoing issues began to emerge which created the necessity for more areas of work to be addressed. There were significant problems with the high numbers of Requests For Change to PNC having been submitted but not yet addressed. There were issues over the late arrival of NSPIS Custody and its inability to fully meet the requirements of the CJA.

4 ACPO CRIMINAL RECORDS OFFICE

- 4.1.1** The effective management of criminal records and ensuring the processes are transparent, well governed and instill public confidence is the key driver for a central police operational resource underpinning the relevant business areas. Historically, the police service has not engaged with this area as well as it might and as a consequence it has been fertile ground to make some really positive changes for the benefit of policing.
- 4.1.2** ACRO is also about creating opportunities, which are far more likely to arise when approached from an overarching business perspective. Several examples are discussed in detail in this report, where the concept ensures such changes remain linked to operational benefits. ACRO work streams benefit from the resources, structures and methodology of the successful DNA and Fingerprint Retention Project which includes;
- Communication Strategy
 - Business expertise
 - Knowledge library
 - Problem solving methodology
 - Links with HMIC and PSU
 - Strong stakeholder buy-in. (Police and non-police)
- 4.1.3** Whilst those charged with providing the technical solutions have undertaken sterling work in relation to providing IT platforms, the operational requirements have not always enjoyed a high priority. This has resulted in large gaps relating to the management of such records in some areas, examples include;
- Missed crime detection opportunities (~32,000 load failures)
 - Unresolved microfiche library of over 5 Million records
 - A rise in public complaints (IC Figures / survey)
 - Inefficient business processes (Subject Access)
 - Missed savings opportunities (Multiple sampling)
 - Poor linking to forensic samples (As above)
 - Poor data sharing agreements (HMP, IND)
 - Mismatch between legislation and systems (RFC Process)
- 4.1.4** In terms of productivity and cost savings, tackling and resolving such issues is highly beneficial and is discussed in more detail at Section 8 of this report.
- 4.1.5** The ACRO methodology to achieve this seeks to expand the existing resource and in doing so build the capacity to effectively deal with related issues, which will attract further substantial savings and improved crime detection. It will also enable the police to be much better placed to link with key partners such as the Immigration and Prison Services with obvious operational benefits for all services including better identification of serious offenders.
- 4.1.6** The structure to achieve this takes part of the existing model and then supports that with a dedicated PNC Bureau. The Bureau, which is designed to expand to meet business needs relating to greater partner engagement, with IND for example, will also provide a general resource for certain aspects of NIS work that may be transferred across to ACRO in 2007.
- 4.1.7** The concept of ACRO is to provide a resource which deals with relevant issues through the use of Business Development Officers (BDO), sitting within a local management and administrative framework all underpinned with its own PNC Bureau

and strong links to relevant stakeholders. The Governance is provided by a suitably chaired ACPO Board.

- 4.1.8** Typically, the BDO role involves the management of key work streams, which require a broad and deep understanding of operational police requirements together with the ability to engage with senior stakeholders, whilst managing successful outcomes.
- 4.1.9** Current examples include working with all the non-police agencies to secure appropriate business arrangements for access to PNC data, drafting and introducing the new Retention Guidelines for PNC data, securing, by working with PITO, the technical changes and the creation and management of a Police Information Access Panel (PIAP).
- 4.1.10** It also includes introducing new business processes to make more effective use of DNA records, in the context of police investigations. These are just some of a range of work streams, which can be effectively undertaken by this methodology, which relies upon robust links to the relevant ACPO portfolio holders.
- 4.1.11** Additional roles are then added, which cater for relevant analytical and statistical gathering work, that supports the data gathering requirements to inform business development and satisfy Parliamentary scrutiny. Other roles deal with bespoke areas such as the Exceptional Case Procedure for the removal of DNA, fingerprints and associated PNC records.
- 4.1.12** An office is included to manage the UK Central Authority for the Exchange of Criminal Records (UKCA-ECR), which has dedicated management and a small team of staff. This office would also make considerable use of the dedicated PNC Bureau.
- 4.1.13** One of the real benefits of the model is that it provides a focal point that draws on policing resources across the UK. For example in relation to the EU exchange work, strong links have been formed with Interpol and with the International Law Enforcement Fingerprint Bureau based at NSY for the exchange of fingerprints.
- 4.1.14** Developing the exchange of DNA across the EU also forms part of the work which is managed by the DNA Operations Group. The Forensic Science and Pathology Unit also task ACPO in this area.
- 4.1.15** In relation to the PNC changes, ACRO perform a key role with the ACPO P4G. The same is true in relation to forensic samples and the ACPO chaired Forensic Science Committee as well as the DNA Operations Group for which ACRO provide the secretarial function.
- 4.1.16** As a note of caution it would be erroneous to assume that the IMPACT work and the aspirations towards a Police National Database (PND) by 2010 will deal with these issues. It will be important that this work advises the development of the PND and ACRO have already made significant contributions to areas of MoPI. This is a further important benefit to having ACRO in place which is discussed in more detail in Section 11.13 of this report.

4.1.17

<p>ACPO CRIMINAL RECORDS OFFICE</p>	<p>Governance ACRO Board – Chaired by A/DCC Adrian McAllister Membership includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Police Service Practitioners including Scotland and Northern Ireland • HO National DNA Database Custodian • Home Office Police Information Communication and Technology Unit • Business Practitioners • IDENT 1 • Forensic Science and Pathology Unit (FSPU) • Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) • Police Standards Unit (PSU) • Police Information Technology Organisation (PITO) • HO National DNA Database Custodian • National Identification Service(NIS) • Criminal Records Bureau (CRB)
<p>Office Structure</p>	<pre> graph TD AM[ACRO Manager] --> DM[Deputy Manager] DM --- L1 subgraph L1 [] direction LR UKCA[UKCA – ECR Manager] BDO1[Business Development Officer] BDO2[Business Development Officer] BBO[Business Benefits Officer] ECA[Exceptional Case Advisor] OM[Office Manager] BM[Bureau Manager] end L1 --- L1 UKCA --- EUC[EU Conviction Co-ordinator] UKCA --- PNO[PNC Operator] OM --- OC[Office Clerk] BM --- B12[Bureau x 12 / 15 staff] BM -.-> NYP[Not yet in place] style NYP stroke-dasharray: 5 5 </pre>
<p>Stakeholder Engagement</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Police Forces of England/Wales/Scotland and PSNI • Home Office departments including FSPU, PLPU, PICTU, PSU, HMIC • ICO • Force Disclosure Units • UK Scientific Support Managers • Professional Standards Units • CRB • National DNA Database Custodian • IDENT1 • Data Protection Officers • FOI Group • ACPO Portfolios Forensics / Records / Data Protection / Disclosure / PNC / IMPACT / MoPI / and associated sub committees for Fingerprints / DNA • All non-police PNC users including DfES, IND, HMPS

5 GOVERNANCE

- 5.1.1** The concept of ACRO needs to ensure that appropriate and robust governance arrangements are in place. ACRO support the work of the ACPO portfolio holders for Records and Disclosure, PNC, Data Protection and Forensic Science.
- 5.1.2** One of the obvious benefits, which emerged from the earlier project work, is the linking of what were previously separate business areas. One example would be the relationship between criminal record management and forensic sampling.
- 5.1.3** The previous governance arrangements relating to what has now become a core aspect of the ACRO work reflect the overarching requirements. A Board has been created, currently chaired by the holder of the ACPO Recording and Disclosure of Convictions Portfolio. Membership of the board has been made up of representatives of forensic practitioners, from the police, the Home Office, PITO, PSU, HMIC and police representatives from PSNI and SCRO. It has also provided a forum where other interested stakeholders such as the CRB could engage.
- 5.1.4** A number of other governance structures have also been able to influence the work and include for example, the DNA Operations Group, the Forensic Science Committee, the National Fingerprint Board, ACPO P4G and the Data Protection portfolio.
- 5.1.5** The creation of ACRO has provided an opportunity to review the governance arrangements and ACPO stakeholders are keen to continue with the current model, whilst making suitable adjustments to the membership of the board.
- 5.1.6** Some areas of ACRO business, such as the UKCA for the Exchange of Criminal Records work and aspects of the forensic work have existing and separate funding streams. In acknowledgement of this current arrangement such stakeholders are able to ensure that their interests are secured through the governance board.

6 LOCATION

- 6.1.1** It is important that ACRO is well situated to deliver on the services it will provide. Sir Peter Gershon's Independent Review of Public Sector Efficiency - Releasing resources to the front line, identified that moving posts away from London can deliver efficiency gains through lower property costs, reduced staff turnover and more effective service delivery.
- 6.1.2** This approach is also supported by Sir Michael Lyons' Independent Review of Public Sector Relocation - Shaping the Pattern of Government Services. The report makes the case for sharper incentives to encourage departments to seek the benefits of locations out of London. This is exemplified by the Government's urgency to relocate 20,000 posts away from London by 2010.
- 6.1.3** ACPO acknowledge that for practical reasons it is sensible to link national resources into existing police force infrastructures. The force is then able to provide support for administration of finance, staff, premises, IT and development against an agreed funding arrangement.
- 6.1.4** ACRO are currently hosted by Hampshire Constabulary, and negotiations are ongoing with ACPO and Hampshire Police Authority to formally agree this arrangement on a permanent footing.
- 6.1.5** By continuing to locate ACRO in Hampshire, the needs to deliver efficiency gains are satisfied. At the same time its proximity to London allows easy travel connections to attend meetings at HO, ACPO, PITO etc. Often the journey time is less than for those who live and work in London.

7 FUNDING

- 7.1.1** Currently, ACRO costs less than £0.5m per annum but is in need of more staff, a dedicated PNC Bureau and larger premises. A suitably sized premises will allow for bureau expansion, which will be required over the next two years, to cater for increased work in several business areas. It will also prepare the ground for the transfer of some NIS functions and particularly the removal of the microfiche library.
- 7.1.2** The establishment of ACRO, sufficiently resourced to deal with the issues contained within this report will cost £1.5m per annum. A breakdown of these costs is shown below.
- 7.1.3** The ACPO Portfolio Leads for Records and Disclosure, PNC, Data Protection and Forensic Science believe that it is appropriate to fund ACRO by increasing the PNC levy for police forces and the transaction fee paid by the significant number of non-police users who access PNC. The predicted PNC charge increases including the £1.5m ACRO requirement can be found at Appendix 2 and are broken down by organisation.
- 7.1.4** DCC John Feavoyour (PNC Portfolio) has written to the Director of Finance at PITO, requesting that funds be made available from the income generated by these charges, to support ACRO on an annual basis from April 2007.
- 7.1.5** This report refers to previous project work that provided much of the impetus to create ACRO. Funding to date has been by the Forensic Science and Pathology Unit (FSPU) via the DNA Expansion Programme. Such is the volume of ACRO work related to that area of business, FSPU have continued to inject funds in support of relevant work streams.
- 7.1.6** It will be necessary to scale up the work by providing a central PNC bureau underpinning the various business areas covered by ACRO. To do so provides a cost effective approach, with a single initiative concerning Subject Access, saving more in cashable terms than the cost of the provision to forces. It is sensible to fund this work from the revenue generated by the very data it currently manages. This revenue forms part of the PNC charge, which is attributed to police forces and non-police users of PNC.
- 7.1.7** A separate, albeit small funding stream is also provided in respect of the UKCA work which has enabled the establishment of the office. This funding is provided by the HO via the PLPU. This will need to increase to meet the business needs during 2007/08 and will be subject to a separate business case.

7.2 ACRO Estimated Annual Costs

Premises		
• Capacity		
• Location		£300,000
• Lease arrangements		
• Under-writing risks and future-proof arrangements		
Security & Facilities		
• Facilities Manager		£350,000
• Office Security		
• Specialist storage		
Staff		
• ACRO & UKCA		£600,000
• Existing team 11 + Bureau 13 + 1 (25)		
Equipment		
• Workstation	25k (75k / 3yr)	
• General equipment	10k (30k / 3yr)	£55,000
• Admin/phones etc	20k	
Business Costs		
• Travel	25k	
• Expenses	20k	
• Overtime	30k	
• PNC Costs	(not paying)	£195,000
• Other IT licences	5k	
• Development work	75k	
• Contingency	15k	
• Recruitment/Training	10k	
• Miscellaneous	10k	
TOTAL		£1,500,000
<u>Potential new business</u>		
Microfiche		
With funding		
• Room for storage		
• Room for scanning		
Subject Access		
With £2m Revenue		
• Option to increase costs		
• Manage centrally and possibly return a post to each force		
• Option to include NDNAD		

8 THE BUSINESS BENEFITS

- 8.1.1** ACRO will deliver significant business benefits to the police service. These include cashable savings in respect of the microfiche library and Subject Access process and operational benefits in relation to the Exceptional Case Procedure, the UK Central Authority for the Exchange of Criminal Records and Forensic Integration Strategy. There are also a number of additional efficiency gains which are detailed below.

8.2 Microfiche

- 8.2.1** In support of a Home Office review of the NIS, ACRO have been invited to develop a radical new approach to rationalise the historic records held on microfiche at New Scotland Yard. Supported by the police forces of England and Wales, ACRO have the opportunity to save £millions by reducing routine access to the microfiche library from the existing 24/7 arrangement to an office hours service. With the savings, there is also the potential to better manage the storage, maintenance and disclosure of the historic records.

8.3 Subject Access

- 8.3.1** ACRO recognise that there is the potential to reduce the costs incurred by each police force if the current Subject Access process is refined and a centralised web based approach developed. Alternatively, the Subject Access fee could be significantly reduced which would enjoy support from the Information Commissioner who holds the belief that the process should be offered with no charge.

8.4 Exceptional Case Procedure

- 8.4.1** The Exceptional Case Procedure has significantly improved the national consistency of decision making in respect of police records. The Exceptional Case Advisor has become the national expert in this field and continues to reassure the public that appropriate safeguards are in place and minimises the likelihood of litigation against the police service.

8.5 Exchange of Criminal Records within the EU

- 8.5.1** ACPO successfully bid to become the UK Central Authority for the Exchange of Criminal Records (UKCA-ECR) between EU member states. Now an integral part of ACRO, the work has already identified significant benefits to both national and international policing. These include;
- The exchange of criminal records will enable patterns of criminality to be more readily identified, facilitating the appropriate operational response. People smuggling, international paedophilia, drug trafficking, as well as terrorist related offences are crimes which are trans-national by nature.
 - Courts will be able to take account of a convicted person's complete offending history when considering sentencing.
 - Having a dedicated Central Authority within the UK has already ensured greater accuracy in the creation and updating of records. The unit is also able to ensure consistency in identification of the offender by encouraging the exchange of fingerprints, (and perhaps later DNA), to prove identity.
 - There will be an increased opportunity to identify wanted persons, both in the UK and those subject of a European Arrest Warrant. This will lead to the

apprehension of offenders denying them the opportunity to commit further, often serious crime.

- The ability to identify offenders and emerging offending patterns, such as Fourniret² who commit serious crime in one country and who later move to, and continue to commit crime in another country.
- The timely creation of full and accurate conviction information on PNC and other national databases, such as ViSOR, in support of policing purposes.
- When investigating Terrorism and Organised Crime the police can make greater use of intelligence markers to trace and monitor suspects.
- Employment disclosure will be more effective due to the increase in numbers of records being added or updated on PNC.
- Strategies to create full and accurate records of offending will support the CJIT exchange development programme.
- Data Sharing Across Government for the purposes of National Security Vetting

8.6 Forensic Integration Strategy (FIS)

“As a policy maker and not a police officer it has on many occasions been very helpful to have the advice of the police, in terms of practices and procedures on the ground.”

Home Office Forensic Science and Pathology Unit

- 8.6.1** The Forensic Integration Strategy delivers a number of operational benefits which have been identified by ACRO. These include increased crime detections, direct police savings through speedier investigations and greater victim reassurance.
- 8.6.2** The Criminal Justice Act 2003 creates an environment where the police have the ability to record all arrest events for recordable offences on PNC. This enables offenders, such as Ian Huntley, to be linked to outstanding crimes through the arrest process and patterns of suspected offending to be identified nationally on the PNC.
- 8.6.3** Taking fingerprints and DNA from persons on arrest for a recordable offence has expanded the population of both IDENT1 and NDNAD, significantly increasing the opportunity of matching a crime scene in a speculative search.
- 8.6.4** Since the introduction of the legislation in April 2004, DNA profiles in respect of over 124,000 people have been added to the NDNAD. More than 2,000 of these persons have been linked to over 3,000 crime scenes. These crimes include 37 murders, 16 attempted murders, and 90 rapes (ACRO, January 2006). The Home Office estimate that the introduction of biometric ID cards will bring similar benefits, increasing the detection of serious crimes by comparing the fingerprints of all outstanding crime marks held on IDENT1 against fingerprints taken from all citizens.
- 8.6.5** Home Office statistics identify that the peak age of known offending is 17 for males and 15 for females³. Over 24,000 under 18s have been arrested, DNA sampled and added to NDNAD where their DNA has not previously been taken (ACRO, January 2006). The police need to ensure that they retain sufficient information about young

² Michel FOURNIRET, 63 was arrested for the murder of six French and 1 Belgian girl by Belgian police in 2003. Previously he had been sentenced for seven years imprisonment for rape and indecent assault on minors in France. It is thought that he may have murdered up to 40 victims.

³ Home Office Statistical Bulletin Criminal Statistics 2004, 19/05, RDS Office for Criminal Justice Reform, November 2005.

persons from whom DNA has been taken, in recognition that that age group constitutes the most prolific offending category.

8.7 Direct Savings through Speedier Investigations and Quicker Apprehension of Offenders

- 8.7.1** The cost benefits associated with improved efficiency requires an understanding of costs associated with police activity. By drawing upon existing Home Office and ACRO research, the potential financial benefits of introducing the legislation can be identified. In addition, there are the unequivocal savings for potential victims of crime.
- 8.7.2** The average cost to a police force in relation to one burglary dwelling investigation has been calculated at £240. This relates, merely to police activity⁴. Further costs to the Criminal Justice System amounts to a cost of £2,300 per incident. On an annual and national scale, this adds up to a cost of £3.36m for police investigation, and a total cost of £2.27b to the government. Any reduction in burglary therefore has the potential to make significant savings. The same is true across a range of crimes.
- 8.7.3** Home Office statistics suggest that the average cost of a homicide investigation is £11,000 relating solely to police activity. The total cost per incident, which takes into account costs of Prosecution, Court costs, Jury Service, Legal Aid, and the Prison Service as examples, boosts this figure to a total cost of £1.1m per incident. On an annual basis, the total costs incurred by all incidents of homicide are set at an average £12.1m for police investigation, and a total figure of £1.2b for the government.
- 8.7.4** The following illustrates how DNA enabled the quicker apprehension of a dangerous offender and directly reduced police activity and costs.

£145,000 Saving in one Rape Enquiry

A “Stranger” rape occurred in the South of England but there was little information in relation to the offender. Investigators suspected he came from Southampton and as there were no other reasonable lines of enquiry, decided to carry out DNA intelligence screen in that area, a DNA profile having been obtained in relation to the suspect.

Prior to this, a male had been arrested for an assault on his partner and his DNA and fingerprints were taken. He was released without charge once it became clear that she did not want to pursue a prosecution.

The DNA profile in respect of the arrestee was loaded to the NDNA and matched to the profile in the rape case. This revealed that the suspect did not live in the Southampton area. The planned intelligence screen would not therefore have identified the suspect.

A similar case in Portsmouth, which also involved a DNA intelligence screen accrued costs of around £145,000, before the suspect was identified due to the suspects DNA not being in the system. It is reasonable to assume that had the suspect in the Southampton case not been in the system similar expenditure could have taken place.

Cases such as these clearly illustrate the potential savings, which can be realised, particularly in serious and expensive enquiries, if the business processes are working effectively.

⁴ Home Office Research Study 217, ‘The Economic and Social Costs of Crime’, 2000, Sam Brand and Richard Price, Research and Development Directorate.

8.8 Early Elimination of the Innocent and Better Treatment of Suspects

- 8.8.1 The case below shows that the retention of samples enables the police to quickly and confidently eliminate suspects saving police costs, protecting the rights of the innocent improving the public perception of the police service.

£40,000 Saving from early elimination of suspects

Significant savings are realised by DNA and fingerprint sampling persons that have been arrested for a recordable offence and detained at a police station.

A DNA profile of a rapist was obtained from a semen sample and loaded to the National DNA Database.

Two suspects were arrested for the rape but their DNA did not match that from the rape and both were eliminated immediately. This brought significant financial benefits to the police and personal benefits to the individuals concerned. It also avoided lengthy detention in police cells of up to 36 hours or even further remands in custody of innocent individuals.

The police avoided unnecessary interviews, ID parades, medical examinations and Court appearances. It is estimated that, this activity would have cost around £40,000 of police time. Additionally there would be a saving from unnecessary work carried out by a series of Criminal Justice staff and other professionals such as Doctors, by this improved efficiency.

The police in this case were able to remain focused on catching the perpetrator rather than be distracted with unproductive lines of enquiry.

8.9 Greater Victim Reassurance

- 8.9.1 The family of the murdered school girl Caroline Dickinson have often expressed their dismay over the lengthy detention of the wrong suspect by French police until DNA sampling resolved the issue. The benefit of getting this area right provides for much better victim reassurance as well as better treatment of suspects, particularly the innocent.

8.10 An Ability to Respond to Legal and Parliamentary Scrutiny

“In responding to questions in Parliament or in dealing with judicial cases the information and statistics provided by the team have been extremely valuable and Ministers have in particular been very grateful for the evidence provided to support the justification for the extension of police powers to take and retain DNA and fingerprints”

Mr Eric Downham, Forensic Science & Pathology Unit, Home Office

- 8.10.1 Business benefits can be used to defend legal and ethical challenges and inform the future development of legislation. For example, the benefits relating to the Criminal Justice & Police Act 2001 were used during the 2004 S & Marper Case decided in the House of Lords. Statistics relating to the implementation of The Criminal Justice Act 2003, especially around the numbers of DNA samples, have also been used to answer several recent Parliamentary Questions concerning juveniles on the NDNAD and to brief Home Office Ministers on the success of the legislation (Appendix 3). They have also been published in journals including Police Review and Criminal Justice Management journals to articulate the wider benefits to those working in the Criminal

Justice System.

- 8.10.2** The office of The Prime Minister has also commissioned work by ACRO which has been used to brief the Prime Minister.

8.11 Improving System Efficiency and Co-ordination of Technical Changes

- 8.11.1** Identifying the business benefits allows the police service to fully utilise the opportunities provided by new legislation and policy. They ensure that operational policing drives the technology requirement and that the service can respond appropriately to new Home Office initiatives and legislation.
- 8.11.2** The NDNAD Custodian has submitted a number of change requests to PITO, some of which aim to improve the ability to provide data to the Home Office. In particular, one relates to enhancing the interface between PNC and NDNAD which should enable the delivery of the business benefits relating to DNA more readily.
- 8.11.3** To ensure the successful delivery of these change requests, ACRO will work closely with the Custodian continuing to articulate the benefits until the technical changes are completed.

8.12 Expertise to Negotiate with Stakeholders on behalf of ACPO and Government

- 8.12.1** ACRO have a proven ability to negotiate with stakeholders at all levels. The team have successfully secured technical changes, reviewed and revised current policy and supported all forces through the change process. This has required negotiation with numerous stakeholders including, the Information Commissioner, PITO, ACPO, NDNAD Custodian, IDENT1, NIS, the Scottish Executive, PSNI, CRB, DfES and several HO departments.

8.13 Ability to Deal with Emerging Issues Effectively and Remove Obstacles to Progress

- 8.13.1** The requirement to identify business benefits is not restricted to those derived from the introduction of new forensic powers and processes. Work is being done to identify the benefits to be drawn from back record converting (BRC) acquittal records to PNC and to scan the microfiche library held at NSY into an electronic database. Both these areas are covered separately in this report.
- 8.13.2** Proposals to undertake such work will not receive support without sound business cases evidencing the benefits. ACRO are capable of evidencing and articulating these benefits.
- 8.13.3** The skill base within the team also provides a mechanism for identifying and addressing obstacles to the implementation of new initiatives and legislation. By environmental scanning for proposed changes to legislation and policy, required technical changes to national systems can be properly considered and scoped before they are implemented.
- 8.13.4** This preparation enables the police service to allocate the appropriate finance and resources to such new measures. The implementation of the Exceptional Case Model, which supports Chief Officers when dealing with requests to remove records, is one example. Other examples include the introduction of PNDs, Simple Cautions and the new PACE DNA kit.

9 STAKEHOLDER SUPPORT AND THE STAKEHOLDER SURVEY

“This group have provided a key forum for understanding modifications required to information systems – particularly relevant for me where there is an impact on the National DNA Database – arising from changes in legislation, putting operational policing needs first”.

FSS Information Systems

- 9.1.1** The DNA & Fingerprint Retention Project ran from October 2003 to May 2006. In January 2006, ACRO wrote to all stakeholders requesting their feedback on the success of the project. This survey attracted significant interest from PITO, NDNAD Custodian, Police Practitioners and NIS. The full survey and a summary of the findings can be found at Appendices 1 and 4.
- 9.1.2** The value of providing a focal point for stakeholders in the relevant business areas should not be underestimated. As the survey comments demonstrate, the concept of an ACRO has plugged a gap and the benefits which emerge not only relate to policing but non-police stakeholders who support it.

10 COMMUNICATIONS STRATEGY

10.1 24/7 Support and Websites

"It was really useful, and novel, to have a team of experts who usually had the answer or would find a solution from their wide range of contacts".

Kathryn Mashiter, Scientific Support Manager, Lancashire Constabulary

- 10.1.1** ACRO has developed a robust communication strategy including key individuals within forces, such as Scientific Support Managers, Vetting and Disclosure Unit Managers, PNC Bureaux Managers and Data Protection Officers. In respect of the work concerning changes to police sampling powers, the team published FAQs on the Centrex Genesis web-site and the ACPO Intranet.
- 10.1.2** A permanent 24/7 telephone service has also been useful to ensure that information can be provided out of office hours.
- 10.1.3** Since the introduction of the Retention Guidelines, which were published as part of the Management of Police Information Guidance on 31 March 2006, call volumes have significantly increased. The Guidelines which were published on a number of websites including the ACPO Internet and the Home Office have attracted significant interest from the media, members of the public, solicitors and civil liberty groups.
- 10.1.4** ACRO are currently in the process of reviewing the Retention Guidelines, ensuring that they contain all newly created recordable offences that have been legislated for since the introduction of the Guidelines. The review will also take account of the comments received from police forces and other stakeholders across England and Wales.

11 BUSINESS AREAS

11.1 Retention Guidelines and Step Model

11.1.1 The retention of criminal conviction data held on the Police National Computer (PNC) had been regulated for many years by the ACPO General Rules for Criminal Recording Weeding on Police Systems, commonly referred to as the “Weeding Rules”. These rules were created by ACPO Crime Business Area to ensure that the retention of conviction data was fair, and at the same time protected the public and police officers. Adherence to the weeding rules sought to ensure that all forces adopted a consistent approach.

11.1.2 In recent years, there have been some significant changes in terms of legislation and public expectation, which called for a completely new and radical approach to this area of police activity. In particular, legislation had created the opportunity for the details of persons who have no previous offending history to be held on the PNC alongside those who have criminal convictions.

11.1.3 PACE, as amended by The Criminal Justice and Police Act 2001, removed the requirement for the police to destroy DNA and fingerprint samples, relating to persons following acquittal or a decision not to prosecute. The Act, by definition, requires the details of non-convicted individuals to be retained. Using the PNC to record associated demographic information enables a link to be made to DNA and Fingerprints. This in turn provides the potential for a match to be made between a crime scene and an individual if that person re-offends.

11.1.4 PACE, as amended by the Criminal Justice Act 2003, provides the police with the additional power to take DNA samples and fingerprints, from all persons coming into police custody having been arrested, for recordable offences. In order to link these samples to an individual, the police had to keep a demographic record on PNC.

11.1.5 A clear distinction had to be made between the retention of data for operational policing purposes, and the use that other users or recipients may make of that data. This led to the development of the Retention Guidelines.

11.1.6 The Retention Guidelines contain a ‘step down model’ and replace the weeding regime. The concept of the ‘step down model’ is simply to restrict non-police access to certain data fields after set periods of time, whilst allowing the police continued access in support of operational policing. The ‘step down’ time periods are based on the following criteria;

- The age of the subject
- The final outcome
- The sentence imposed
- The offence category

11.2 Information Commissioner Negotiations

11.2.1 Those representing the Information Commissioner have often stated their perceived difficulties in having to deal with 43 data controllers for the police forces in England and Wales. Their preference to have one higher level data controller in the form of ACPO has been articulated on more than one occasion.

11.2.2 ACRO’s work has involved a great deal of consultation and negotiation with the

Commissioner's Office. These have not always been easy, reflecting the differing views that each must, for understandable reasons, put forward.

- 11.2.3** However, by approaching the various issues in an open professional manner has meant that we have been able to maintain a close working relationship. This situation is probably best reflected in the comments made by the then Assistant Commissioner (now Deputy Commissioner) David Smith whilst giving evidence at the Information Tribunal Hearing (See Section 11.3). The following is taken from the transcript of the evidence;

MR JONES: Mr Smith, would you agree with what I said earlier, I think it is apparent from your second statement, that there has been much progress between yourself and ACPO I think largely to do with the services of Mr Linton and the new provisions in relation to retention of conviction data?

MR SMITH: Yes, there has been a lot of progress, and it may be an opportunity to pay tribute to the professional way in which Mr Linton and his colleagues have dealt with this matter.

- 11.2.4** In January 2006, in response to a questionnaire sent out to evidence the effectiveness of the DNA and Fingerprint Retention Project Team, Mr Smith said;

- 11.2.5** "We would strongly support the idea that there should be a permanent unit dealing with police information management issues. In simple terms I have no doubt that it would lead to more consistent and sensible DP and FOI compliance by the police and better relations with us as regulator"

11.3 Information Tribunal

- 11.3.1** During 2004 the Information Commissioner served Enforcement Notices on three Chief Constables requiring them to remove 'old' convictions from the PNC. These three cases became test cases which ACPO decided to appeal. The matter was subject to an Information Tribunal Hearing at the Royal Courts of Justice which commenced on 23 May 2005.

- 11.3.2** Members of ACRO were amongst those called to give evidence, having collected strong evidence in support of the ACPO position. In particular a total of 19 focus groups were held in ten forces across the country. The findings of this work were produced in a report – "Exploring Operational Policing Views Concerning the Retention of Conviction, Acquittal and Arrest History on the Police National Computer".

- 11.3.3** The police officers and staff who took part in the focus group work were very clear in articulating the need for the police to be able to access not only conviction records, but also records of persons acquitted or simply arrested, and that those records needed to be available for lengthy periods of time.

- 11.3.4** In a Judgment published on the 12 October 2005, the Information Tribunal issued an amended enforcement notice allowing the police to retain the data in question but restricting access to it. The amended enforcement notice had ramifications beyond the 3 cases to which it referred, effectively requiring a 'police only access' regime to be in place in respect of certain data on the PNC. Whilst in the first instance that only related to the 3 specific cases, it now clearly includes many others.

- 11.3.5** The Information Tribunal also gave clear support for the introduction of the Retention Guidelines 'step down model' approach to provide a more sophisticated regime for the management of PNC data.

- 11.3.6** Work has commenced to establish which organisations and agencies will be

considered to be part of the 'policing family' and allowed access to PNC. This list will be drawn up in consultation with the Information Commissioner (see section 11.2).

11.4 Police Information Access Panel (PIAP)

11.4.1 To achieve compliance with the Tribunal Judgment ACPO has established the PIAP, chaired by A/DCC Adrian McAllister, to carry out a review of non-police users of PNC information. ACRO were responsible for the creation of PIAP. They also provide the secretariat to, and carry out most of the actions arising from PIAP meetings.

11.4.2 The work of the panel is broadly broken down into three areas;

- to review all the 'non-police' agencies who currently have direct access to PNC information and decide which can be regarded as police and therefore have access to 'step down' information and which cannot
- to review all the non-police agencies who access PNC information indirectly through CO4 and NIS at New Scotland Yard, against the same criteria
- to review arrangements within forces for the sharing of PNC information to ensure a consistent approach is achieved nationally

11.4.3 In addition the panel will consider new applications for access. This is a challenging piece of work, particularly given the number and nature of the agencies concerned. By way of illustration there are currently 38 agencies with direct access to PNC. They include the Royal Mail, HM Prison Service, IND, Pensions Regulator, DTI, Department of Transport, Health and Safety Executive, and Criminal Records Bureau (CRB).

11.4.4 Amongst those with applications pending are the Gambling Commission, Gangmasters Licensing Authority, and Child Exploitation and Online Protection Centre (CEOPC).

11.4.5 This work has links to the implementation of the MoPI Guidance in forces, as it is likely to influence existing and future Information Sharing Agreements.

11.4.6 What is becoming evident is that some form of national governance or custodian of information may be imposed unless ACPO can be seen to protect and manage its information effectively.

11.4.7 This takes on an even greater importance given the level of misuse and abuse of PNC information that has been disclosed and discovered during the early stages of the work of PIAP. Almost all of the major users including IND, HMPS, and Cabinet Office freely admit to the fact that their staff misuse PNC information.

11.4.8 Having ACRO take a central role as manager of the information provides clear evidence that ACPO is taking appropriate measures to safeguard its data whilst at the same time permitting proper access for legitimate purposes. This is vital to help instill public confidence in the way the police manage records and ensure greater transparency.

11.5 Violent and Sex Offender Register (ViSOR), Data Ownership and Access Committee (DOAC)

11.5.1 ViSOR was developed by PITO for use by the Police, Prison, and Probation Services to store and share information and intelligence on those individuals who have been identified as posing a risk of serious harm to the public. The system also allows users direct access to limited data fields on PNC.

11.5.2 Chief Constable Terry Grange is the ACPO lead for ViSOR. As the system is for the joint use of three services, issues have arisen in relation to data ownership and access. Given his role as chair of PIAP, DCC Adrian McAllister has agreed to CC Grange's request to establish and chair a committee to consider and resolve those issues.

11.5.3 ACRO has now established the DOAC for which they also provide the secretariat, and carry out most of the actions arising from meetings. This requires close working relationships with colleagues in Scotland, PITO, and NOMS.

11.6 Exceptional Case Procedure for Removal of DNA, Fingerprints and PNC Records

11.6.1 Following the implementation of the Retention Guidelines on 31 March 2006, and the blanket cessation of weeding DNA, fingerprints and associated PNC records, it was recognised that there was likely to be a significant increase in the number of requests being made to Chief Constables for the removal of such records. Legal advice sought from James Strachan (Counsel representing the HO in the S & Marper Appeal), during the development of the Guidelines supported this, acknowledging the need for a 'safety valve', however rarely used, once they were introduced.

11.6.2 Whilst acknowledging the responsibility of Chief Officers as Data Controllers, it remains important that national consistency is achieved when considering the removal of such records.

11.6.3 Chief Officers have the discretion to authorise the deletion of any specific data entry on the PNC 'owned' by them. They are also responsible for the authorisation of the destruction of DNA and fingerprints associated with that specific entry. ACRO have suggested that this discretion should only be exercised in exceptional cases, in keeping with Counsel's advice.

11.6.4 It was recognised that support may be required in making decisions regarding exceptional cases. To achieve the consistency required DCC Ian Readhead, ACPO Chairman of Data Protection and Freedom of Information Portfolio, directed that ACRO maintain a library of circumstances that have been viewed as exceptional cases. This will provide a 'bank' of precedents to assist Chief Officers in their decision making process when considering requests to remove records. ACRO has considerable experience in the relevant areas and offers advice in relation to requests from data subjects, to both police forces and the subjects themselves.

11.6.5 Data Protection Officers and others within forces responsible for advising Chief Officers on such matters, find it useful to seek advice from ACRO, prior to making recommendations to their Chief Officers to delete a record deemed to be exceptional. Under the authority of A/DCC McAllister and DCC Readhead, ACRO have ensured that those who carry this responsibility are kept updated with relevant policy and legislation as well as other information to assist in the process of advising their Chief Officer.

11.6.6 As of the 19th October 2006 a total of 141 cases have been referred for advice and currently resulted as follows:

- Retained – 22
- Removed – 43
- To be removed – 57
- Pending – 19

11.7 UKCA - for the Exchange of Criminal Records (UKCA – ECR)

11.7.1 The need to improve the quality of information exchanged on convictions was prioritised in the European Council Declaration on Combating Terrorism in 2004. This work was given added impetus following two cases in Belgium⁵ and France⁶,

11.7.2 Subsequently a Council Decision in November 2005 declared a requirement for all the Member States (MS) of the EU to exchange information extracted from criminal records. The decision was designed to improve the systems of the 1959 Convention on Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters. To support this decision there was a requirement to establish a Central Authority for the exchange of criminal records, in every MS.

11.7.3 After considering bids to set up this Authority, from CRB, SCRO and ACPO, the Home Secretary declared that ACPO should take the lead. On 21 May 2006 the UK Central Authority for the Exchange of Criminal Records (UKCA – ECR) was launched as part of ACRO.

11.7.4 The main tasks for the UKCA – ECR are;

- To notify the relevant Member State of any conviction(s) imposed in the UK on a National from that Member State
- To receive notification of a conviction of a UK national in another Member State and then to:
 - Ensure that PNC is updated or new criminal records created.
 - Ensure that convictions related to nationals from Scotland and PSNI are entered onto PNC and the full details forwarded to SCRO and PSNI.
 - Ensure that appropriate action is taken if fingerprints are attached to the conviction notification.
- To receive and respond to requests, from all UK Police forces and other law enforcement agencies, for an extract of the criminal record of a national from another Member State.
- To receive and respond to requests from another Member State, for an extract of the criminal record of a UK National. Whilst this process does not facilitate employment vetting it does ensure that CRB searches are carried out against PNC records that also contain any relevant foreign convictions of UK Nationals.

11.7.5 Since 21 May 2006 to the date of this report, there have been 232 UK requests for criminal records checks with 19 countries within the EU. 119 (47%) of these requests were for Poland alone, next were Portugal with 19. Of the enquiries requested from other EU countries, it has been found that 37% do have previous criminal convictions in their country of nationality.

11.7.6 The business benefits of this work are considerable. It has the potential to enhance future CRB vetting checks, and will give the police service improved and up to date information to assist in investigations. Ultimately there is clear potential for the scheme to be developed world wide.

⁵ In 2003 Michel Fourniret, 63, was arrested by the Belgian Police for the murder of six French and one Belgian girl. He had previously been sentenced in France to seven years imprisonment for rape and indecent assault on minors in France. The Belgian authorities were unaware of his previous convictions. It is thought that he may have murdered up to 40 victims.

⁶ Francisco MONTES, 55, was convicted of the murder in France of Caroline Dickinson, in 2004. He had previously been arrested for numerous sex offences in Germany and Spain.

11.7.7 Other benefits include;

- The exchange of criminal records will enable patterns of criminality to be more readily identified, facilitating the appropriate operational response. People smuggling, international paedophilia, drug trafficking, as well as terrorist related offences are crimes which are trans-national by nature.
- Courts will be able to take account of a convicted person's complete offending history when considering sentencing.
- Having a dedicated Central Authority within the UK has already ensured greater accuracy in the creation and updating of records. The unit is also able to ensure consistency in identification of the offender by encouraging the exchange of fingerprints, (and perhaps later DNA), to prove identity.
- There will be an increased opportunity to identify wanted persons, both in the UK and those subject of a European Arrest Warrant. This will lead to the apprehension of offenders denying them the opportunity to commit further, often serious crime.
- The ability to identify offenders and emerging offending patterns, such as Fourniret⁷ who commit serious crime in one country and who later move to, and continue to commit crime in another country.
- The timely creation of full and accurate conviction information on PNC and other national databases, such as ViSOR, in support of policing purposes.
- When investigating Terrorism and Organised Crime the police can make greater use of intelligence markers to trace and monitor suspects.
- Employment disclosure will be more effective due to the increase in numbers of records being added or updated on PNC.
- Strategies to create full and accurate records of offending will support the CJIT exchange development programme.
- Data Sharing Across Government for the purposes of National Security Vetting

11.7.8 The UKCA-ECR inherited a total of 27,529 documents from the UKCA for Mutual Legal Assistance in the Home Office. The documents were a mixed collection of foreign conviction notifications received from Ministries of Justice in 15 countries, most of which are in the EU. These documents, dating from 1999 to 2006 were all sent under the 1959 Convention, had had no further action taken on them.

11.7.9 They contained details of 25 UK nationals convicted abroad of rape, 3 of attempted rape, a further 46 convicted of sexual abuse (29 on children). There were also foreign convictions for 5 murders, 9 attempted murders, 13 manslaughters and 29 robberies. The majority of these serious foreign convictions of UK nationals were not on the PNC.

11.7.10 None of the 25 UK nationals convicted of rape had been made subject of the Sex Offender Register. A major cause for concern is the fact that for these particular offenders any previous checks for employment through the CRB would have returned a 'no trace', in which case these men could now be employed within the UK as teachers or taxi drivers, for instance. Arrangements have been made to have a list of 525

⁷ Michel FOURNIRET, 63 was arrested for the murder of six French and 1 Belgian girl by Belgian police in 2003. Previously he had been sentenced for seven years imprisonment for rape and indecent assault on minors in France. It is thought that he may have murdered up to 40 victims.

serious offenders, checked against the CRB system, to establish if any have applied for employment within the UK.

11.7.11 There is an opportunity to assist IND in establishing the true credentials and background of foreign nationals. Many fraudulently claim to be from the EU, while others use forged or stolen documents.

11.7.12 In the future it would be entirely sensible to maintain the relationship with the ACRO structure, in that a great deal of the work necessary to support the UKCA-ECR function could be undertaken by staff employed within any ACRO Bureau, due to the close alignment of the policing functions.

11.8 Subject Access

11.8.1 Subject Access is the mechanism through which the public access police data about themselves. It is important that every opportunity to secure public confidence is undertaken. The process is often enforced for Visa applications and employment vetting purposes. It is therefore important that the police engage in this area from an operational perspective as it provides advantages in law enforcement terms relating to counter terrorism and protecting the public.

11.8.2 The Home Office have asked ACRO to review the Subject Access arrangements whilst they consider strategic options to downsize the NIS within an acceptable timeframe. ACRO are committed to develop and streamline the current PNC Subject Access arrangements.

11.8.3 Police forces currently receive and process all applications and payment for Subject Access checks. The Subject Access forms are forwarded to NIS who log and conduct all the PNC checks. Every month, NIS provide the Home Office with a list of the number of checks conducted on behalf of each force. The Home Office reclaim the payment from each force and receive all funds centrally.

11.8.4 To support the downsizing of the NIS, the Home Office plan to transfer NIS responsibility to conduct Subject Access checks to ACRO. In the short term however, the Home Office are keen that the income generated from Subject Access checks should be used to help fund the NIS work since it does not currently appear to fund any part of the process.

11.8.5 The £10 'prescribed maximum' Subject Access fee was set by the Secretary of State when the first Data Protection Act was introduced in 1984. It has never been revised. Historically, the fee was designed to cover the administrative cost of processing the application. Twenty two years on, it may be appropriate to review the fee. ACRO are working with the ACPO Chair of Data Protection and Freedom of Information Portfolio, DCC Ian Readhead, to explore opportunities and will be recommending any changes to the fee to the Secretary of State.

11.8.6 Many police forces would also like to see a significant reduction in staff and administrative costs. If the Subject Access fees were increased, the income generated could pump prime the establishment of a National PNC Bureau with the capability to conduct the required volume of Subject Access checks, currently in excess of 200,000 pa. Once a new process is established with increased charges applied, it may be possible to consider some form of cost recovery for forces. In the longer term, the revenue could be used to centrally administer the whole process, perhaps online and ACRO would take responsibility for the work.

11.8.7 The volume of Subject Access checks is intrinsically linked to other developing

areas of business such as the work of the PIAP and the ability to carry out Basic checks through the CRB.

- 11.8.8** CRB do not currently offer a basic check, although an equivalent service is available through Disclosure Scotland. Through the work of the PIAP, some non-police organisations are being denied access to PNC, particularly for the purpose of employment vetting. As an affordable alternative, many potential employers may choose to enforce Subject Access on potential employees, rather than conduct the business through Disclosure Scotland. If CRB introduced the Basic check, it is likely that the number of Subject Access checks would significantly drop. Recent research undertaken by Jayne Lawler⁸ has identified that as many as 80% of all Subject Access requests are enforced.
- 11.8.9** The process of Enforced Subject Access is considered inappropriate by the Information Commissioner, although it is frequently used for the purposes of employment vetting or visa applications. ACRO have met with the US Embassy and are liaising with CRB concerning an ACPO proposal to deal with the Visa requirements.
- 11.8.10** An 'Enforced Subject Access Working Group' recently recommended that the 'Home Office should support the implementation of basic checks or open up standard checks to deal with employee vetting and visa requirements'. ACRO consider it a retrograde step to allow the standard level disclosure service to subsume basic checks where the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act should apply. Such a move would completely undermine the principles of the Act.
- 11.8.11** ACRO support the full introduction of the Basic Disclosure Service in England and Wales, although it seems increasingly unlikely that CRB will be offering such a service in the short to medium term.
- 11.8.12** Similar consideration should be given to the DNA Subject Access Process where currently the FSS, the data processor retain the £10 fee. Following the appointment of a Home Office National DNA Database Custodian, CC Tony Lake is supportive that the processes are reviewed and alternative arrangements are explored if necessary.

11.9 BRC Microfiche

- 11.9.1** In May 2005 an Information Tribunal heard an appeal by three Chief Constables against Enforcement Notices, served on them by the Information Commissioner, requiring the deletion of conviction data. The resulting judgment was the latest development in a series of legal scrutinies concerning the management of police data.
- 11.9.2** ACPO recognises that the tribunal outcome has presented an opportunity to improve the management of police information, not least to ensure that it is not disclosed inappropriately. The microfiche library was considered by the Information Tribunal, who directed that erasure, removal or deletion from police systems should mean just that. The microfiche library is therefore not sustainable in its current format. In addition to the Information Tribunal directions, there is a Home Office/NIS strategy to remove the microfiche library from NSY in 2007.
- 11.9.3** The issues surrounding the microfiche library have been evident for over 16 years and are now becoming critical. A PITO Proof of Concept Pilot to determine whether options available for full digitisation of the microfiche library were feasible was carried out and finally reported on in February 2004. Although the pilot was a success, the

⁸ Head of Information Assurance Services, Lancashire Constabulary

estimated cost of £12m was too expensive, would take at least 6 years to complete, and did not offer a complete solution by entering the data on PNC. The proposal was rejected.

- 11.9.4** ACPO have tasked ACRO to produce some radical proposals aimed at satisfying the directions of the Information Tribunal. A survey of all forces carried out by ACRO has revealed that there remains a policing requirement to continue to retain the entire microfiche library.
- 11.9.5** A business case that significantly improves the data management aspects for the police service, produces substantial cost savings for the Home Office and space savings for the Metropolitan Police, will be produced. ACRO will be able to provide the space and staff to continue the service provided by NIS, whilst working to have the entire microfiche collection digitised. Based on research already undertaken, it is likely that this work will take three years to complete.
- 11.9.6** The longer term goal will be to provide all police forces with direct access to the microfiche data via the PNC. Given the scale of the work, it is recognised that any proposal will have to be based on a phased approach clearly identifying and addressing the risks.
- 11.9.7** The microfiche library houses a historic archive of approximately 5.3 million records. The data on fiche starts from 1918 and ends in May 1995. It contains criminal conviction information; including arrests and convictions together with personal details and police intelligence information such as associates and modus operandi. For some records there may be more than one fiche.
- 11.9.8** Prior to 1995, police forces sent this information to the NIS in paper format. It was then entered onto PNC and filmed for storage as microfiche. Since May 1995, forces have entered their own information onto PNC and the NIS is no longer involved in that part of the process.
- 11.9.9** NIS have already BRC over 4 million of these records to the PNC. This exercise has included inputting the arrest and disposal detail to PNC but does not include the MO or any warning signals for example. Effectively this means that records created between 1981 and 1995 have already been BRC to 'conviction level'.
- 11.9.10** Convictions recorded pre 1981 are still only available from microfiche unless an individual has subsequently come to the notice of the police, or the CRB, through the employment vetting process or when an individual applied for a Subject Access check. In such cases the BRC process should have been applied.
- 11.9.11** On a daily basis, police forces from around the country request the information held on these records to be manually extracted for analysis following the arrest of a suspect.
- 11.9.12** The NIS currently provides a 24/7 service to police to supply information from (or copies of) the microfiche. However forces have indicated that there may no longer be a 24/7 requirement for access to the library. ACRO recognise that such a change would bring substantial cashable savings which could be used to improve the management of the historic records
- 11.9.13** Currently, CRB provide the funding for staff to BRC records which come to notice through the vetting process under Part V Police Act 1997. This funding will no longer be required when the ACRO proposals are adopted. This equates to a saving of ~60 staff posts.

11.10 BRC Acquittals

- 11.10.1** One of the objectives for ACRO is;
"To devise and implement a solution for the restoration of weeded records held by Police Forces under the authority of the Criminal Justice and Police Act 2001".
- 11.10.2** With the work undertaken to stop the weeding of records from PNC complete, there is a need to assess the scale of the BRC, which will represent a significant challenge to the police service.
- 11.10.3** The requirement is to BRC records which continued to weed from the PNC from May 2001 to 05 December 2005. Indications are that there could be as many as 800,000 records. Where forces followed the advice given in June 2001, the records are retained in three formats; paper, microfiche, and electronic.
- 11.10.4** At a recent meeting of the Metropolitan Police PNC Strategy Board, consideration was given to three options on how to deal with its own backlog of records (240,000). The options were i) to reinstate all the records held by them, ii) not to reinstate any of the records held by them, iii) to reinstate only those records where it is the only record held on an individual. No final decision was made but there was a strong view that nothing should be done with the records because of the associated cost of taking up options i) or iii). An action was raised to establish the current ACPO view on what should happen to the records.
- 11.10.5** Since 11 May 2001, Sections 81 and 82 of the Criminal Justice and Police Act 2001, have allowed for the retention of the DNA and Fingerprints relating to those who are acquitted of an offence or a decision is made not to prosecute.
- 11.10.6** Whilst the DNA and fingerprints were retained in these cases, the PNC Nominal record continued to weed from PNC until 05 December 2005.
- 11.10.7** In June 2001, forces were advised that:
"In respect of fingerprint acquittals, Forces must retain the hard copy tenprint form, together with the Force source input document for subsequent back-record conversion, as soon as the technical capability to do that on PNC is achieved."
CC Ben Gunn, Cambridgeshire Constabulary
- 11.10.8** Although the retention of fingerprints was allowed from May 2001, they did not cease to weed from the NAFIS database (now IDENT1) until 17 August 2003. That backlog has been addressed by forces on a selective basis. This has been primarily by way of retaining only 'first time come to notice' acquittals (because other 'convicted' tenprint sets were already on the system).
- 11.10.9** In respect of DNA samples, the link between PNC and the NDNAD was not effected until 05 November 2001. Since that time, the profiles linked to acquitted Arrest Summons Numbers have been retained. They are flagged on the NDNAD by way of a Retained Acquittal (RA) marker.
- 11.10.10** If the BRC is to be done by forces individually then there are likely to be considerable costs involved. One force carried out a feasibility study of its requirement to BRC approximately 20,000 paper records. The cost was estimated to be in the region of £200,000 with only £35,000 of that going towards changes to its custody system. The remainder is the estimated cost of researching and re-inputting the court result. If that sort of cost is carried over to all forces then the likely gross cost of dealing

with all the records will reach £8m. (The force concerned decided that it would not pursue the matter further).

11.10.11 Options to resolve the issue have been under discussion with PITO who have stated it is likely to require substantial work. An electronic solution from the centre may not be possible and cooperation with forces could be required.

11.10.12 Decisions need to be made on what part(s) of the weeded record need to be reinstated. It may be that it is only the 'first time come to notice' records which are reinstated, as was the case for a BRC programme for reinstating fingerprints, in 2004. This is not the ideal solution and may well take as long to do as all the records when taking into account the amount of research required. There are also likely to be legal implications, which could influence this decision.

11.11 Parliamentary Questions and Data provision

11.11.1 Since the introduction of Sections 9 and 10 of the Criminal Justice Act 2003, ACRO have been monitoring the associated business benefits. Such benefits provided invaluable evidence to encourage police forces which were slow to take up the powers to take DNA & fingerprints from all persons arrested for a recordable offence and detained at a police station.

11.11.2 ACRO have supported the FSPU in answering a number of Parliamentary Question's (PQ's) relating to the retention of DNA, particularly in relation to those who are arrested and not proceeded against. These include questions from Grant Shapps MP, John Penrose MP, Norman Baker MP, Edward Leigh MP, Lynne Featherstone MP, Stewart Jackson MP.

11.11.3 ACRO have also assisted other Home Office Departments such as the Police Leadership and Powers Unit and the Police Information Computer Technology Unit with Ministerial briefings and PQ's in respect of the retention and disclosure of information held on the Police National Computer.

11.11.4 Most recently, ACRO contributed to an article for CJS Review at the request of FSPU, following an enquiry from the Prime Minister's Office. The ACRO contribution formed part of the response provided to the Prime Minister's Office and informed the recent Labour Party Conference.

11.11.5 The work has identified the clear requirement for further focused work to support police forces who are not maximising their opportunities to lawfully obtain samples. This work is detailed in Section 11.12.

11.12 Forensic Integration Strategy (FIS) and DNA Operations Group

11.12.1 Over the past three years the team have been charged with the completion of a number of areas of work on behalf of the FSPU.

11.12.2 Initially the project work fell into three key areas:

- i) Assisting forces to implement the changes to PACE concerned with taking and retaining DNA samples and fingerprints following the Criminal Justice and Police Act 2001 and the Criminal Justice Act 2003
- ii) Securing the relevant technology changes through negotiation and liaison with PITO, DNA Custodian and IDENT1
- iii) Writing national policies, on behalf of ACPO, in support of the retention of DNA, fingerprints and associated demographic information on the PNC.

- 11.12.3** There have been several occasions when the team have been called upon to organise meetings on Forensic issues, most notably a Cross-Border DNA Workshop and a seminar on Maximising Opportunities to Share DNA across Europe.
- 11.12.4** ACRO have provided the professional interface with appropriate knowledge to complete research amongst practitioners within the police and other relevant stakeholders. This innovative work has enabled FIS to develop new initiatives and legislation based on operational police requirements. It has also served as an excellent buffer to legal challenges. One such example is when ACRO were commissioned to produce a report to illustrate the operational policing value of the Criminal Justice Act 2003 was brought to the attention of the Minister responsible for forensic matters.
- 11.12.5** There has been focused work on increasing the proportion of people who are lawfully DNA sampled, by continuing to support the implementation of the Criminal Justice Act 2003. Forces suffered variously from not being able to fully engage in taking the samples through the delays in having changes made to NSPIS Custody and other Requests for Change submitted to PITO. To enable this work research is carried out across the figures provided by PITO to identify those forces which are apparently under-achieving. Once identified a visit is made to provide advice and support in those business areas where required.
- 11.12.6** More recently there has been exploratory work to exchange fingerprints and DNA between EU Member States through the work of the UK Central Authority for the Exchange of Criminal Records (throughout the EU Member States). This supports the FIS work stream to maximise the opportunities to share DNA and fingerprints across Europe. At the request of the FSPU, ACRO is exploring the use of Interpol's i24 for DNA information exchange.
- 11.12.7** ACRO provide the secretariat function to the DNA Operations Group, another member attends the meetings and the manager is a member of the Forensic Science Committee reporting on the ACRO work streams relating to forensics.
- 11.12.8** There remains a further requirement for the team to continue to provide support to the FSPU in key areas, specifically:-
- Review of the NDNAD Subject Access Process and publication of finalised procedure.
 - Focused work to support those forces who are not maximising their opportunities to lawfully take DNA and fingerprints.
 - Review the position of forces obtaining DNA and fingerprints in relation to non recordable offences.
 - Review the position of retaining and storing second DNA samples and their use.
 - Reviewing and coordinating DNA Liaison Panels/Bulletins.
 - Review of the work that has been conducted concerning volunteer procedures.
- 11.12.9** This new work will require additional staffing and funding resources. Although it is aimed at Forensic issues it is clearly linked to the remaining work of ACRO in the field of records. Funding will be required for two additional staff. As a requirement initiated by central government, a study has already begun to provide support to those forces who are not maximising the opportunities to take fingerprints and DNA. The work will eventually provide greater clarity to forces on the procedures involved in sampling and recording and will, by default, lead to cost savings and improved efficiency.

11.12.10 Although not directly linked to the FIS work, there is a link to the work of the UKCA-ECR (See Section 11.7). The progress of this initiative, built upon a European Council Decision to exchange criminal records of those nationals who offend in other Member States, will eventually lead to the exchange of fingerprints and DNA. Although not an exclusive requirement the UK leads other Member States in requiring the criminal record to be linked to fingerprints to prove identity. Other States are less reliant on this process but some have announced an interest in following the UK example.

11.13 MoPI and IMPACT

“The relationship between the DNA FRP and my work on Review, Retention and Disposal for the Bichard Guidance is significant and my work has benefited greatly from the information and advice provided by the DNA FRP team. I have made use of the telephone support line and email and met with various individual team members in an effort to align my work with the extensive progress already made by the DNA FRP team and am very grateful for their quality input to date”.

NCPE Bichard Team

11.13.1 ACRO have been consulted throughout the development of the Code and Guidance for MoPI and IMPACT and have made key contributions to several areas of the Guidance, including the Review, Retention and Disposal (RRD) of information chapter.

11.13.2 ACRO also participated on the working group to produce the Threshold Standards document.

11.13.3 Following a number of emerging issues relating to RRD, ACRO have been able to put forward some alternative views, particularly around making more productive use of the PNC. These have the potential to make significant savings in police staff/officers time relating to custody records. Currently, custody records under the MoPI regime require a 6 yearly and therefore ongoing review process on each of 43 forces local systems. This involves numerous complex decisions and significant resources. ACRO have introduced an automated model that completely removes this requirement with a significant saving per annum through use of the PNC when arrestees are logged.

11.13.4 The Head of ACRO regularly attends both the IMPACT and MoPI Boards. Whilst the work of both has been largely in parallel, it has always been recognised that the work of ACRO and IMPACT / MoPI would need to be linked. This is particularly true in relation to the development of the Police National Database by 2010/2011. The PNC will however play a fundamental role in policing for at least the next five years and neglect in this area, based upon a move to a new system in the future would be a significant mistake.

11.14 CRB Links

11.14.1 ACRO has enjoyed a close working relationship with colleagues in the CRB over the last three years. The first contact was to represent ACPO, in the form of the then ACPO President Chris Fox, and DCC Ian Readhead, to complete a piece of work to jointly exploit opportunities to provide an improved Enhanced Disclosure process.

11.14.2 This work culminated in the production of a Joint Report titled “Enhanced Disclosure Review Report “. This report was the foundation of a number of changes to the process, most notably the introduction of the Quality Assurance Framework.

11.14.3 Since that time regular contact has been maintained as part of the communications strategy. There continues to be regular consultation and close working liaison with

CRB, particularly in relation to the development of the Retention Guidelines and changes that are required to primary legislation, to amend the definition of police 'central records'.

11.14.4 That close relationship has been evident throughout the work to establish the ACPO UKCA-ECR. Whilst at the outset both ACPO and the CRB submitted business cases to become the UKCA, it was made clear that this was a core police function, and the Home Secretary appointed ACPO to perform this important role on behalf of the United Kingdom.

11.14.5 The CRB perform a valuable and essential role in the protection of children and vulnerable adults. There is however a risk of 'mission creep' where the CRB seeks to use both its name and access to police information to move into other areas of police work. For example it is known that CRB are interested in taking a more proactive role in Subject Access, and have suggested they could supply a new 'Visa Certificate' for those persons seeking to live or work abroad. These and indeed any other areas of activity all rely on access to and use of police information. It may be wise for ACPO to carefully consider the implications of any such suggestions which might at first blush appear attractive.

11.15 Non-police Agencies and Foreign National Criminals

11.15.1 The work of PIAP, and to a lesser extent that of ViSOR DOAC, has involved the development of close working arrangements with key stakeholders to ensure that future agreements for access to systems, particularly the PNC, are mutually satisfactory and comply with legal requirements.

11.15.2 There has been a great deal of media focus in recent times on both IND and HMPS, particularly in relation to the foreign national prisoner issues.

11.15.3 Both agencies have had direct access to PNC information for some time. However the current agreements are out of date and do not reflect the usage that both agencies would now wish to make of the police data.

11.15.4 Both agencies are working hard to capture the full range of activities that might justify a PNC check for inclusion in their corporate business case for consideration by PIAP. ACRO are providing support to both agencies as they develop their business cases.

11.15.5 IND and HMPS are good examples of organisations whose demand for access to PNC information has grown exponentially in a short period of time, and has certainly outgrown their own internal ability to deliver. It will undoubtedly be a long time before either is able to move to create and update PNC records.

11.15.6 By way of example until very recently IND were carrying out around 7,000 PNC checks per month. That figure has risen to around 15,000 per month and in early 2007 there is a predicted level of demand around 250,000 per month. Clearly with their current arrangements even if PIAP were to give their agreement to the checks being done, IND could not cope.

11.15.7 The solution in the short to medium term may be a mixed approach. For instance some checks could be by way of automated bulk data searches, others perhaps 'real time checks' in support of operational IND staff could be carried out by IND whilst the remainder of the 'slow time' checks could be carried out by ACRO. Clearly the checks carried out by ACRO would be at cost, but that is likely to be a cheaper and more efficient solution than IND having to recruit, train, and find accommodation for a large

number of new staff.

- 11.15.8** These principles apply to all non-police agencies with a justifiable demand for PNC access. The creation of an ACRO PNC Bureau brings with it significant benefits including economies of scale and a more structured approach supporting the requirements of all partner agencies.

12.1 Appendix 1 – Summary of Stakeholder Survey Results

A selection of comments made in response to a questionnaire sent out in January 2006.

DNA Expansion & FIS

“As a policy maker and not a police officer it has on many occasions been very helpful to have the advice of the police in terms of practices and procedures on the ground”.

Home Office Forensic Science and Pathology Unit

“This group have provided a key forum for understanding modifications required to information systems – particularly relevant for me where there is an impact on the National DNA Database – arising from changes in legislation, putting operational policing needs first”.

FSS Information Systems

“Progress has been made in areas that may not have been achieved without the work of DNA FRP”.

FSS Customer Training

“Extremely valuable resource”.

DNA Consultant

PNC

“Given the complexity and inter-relatedness of the legislation and complexity of the PNC itself, I’m not sure that PITO and FSS technical representatives would have been able to work through the issues”.

FSS Information Systems

“The project initially I suspect had fairly focussed terms of reference, however it soon became apparent that PNC and in particular the issues dealt with by the Project team cuts across a huge area of policing. The research, evidence and advice provided has been invaluable in supporting policy decisions and the necessary contacts to make those decisions happen quickly with the necessary support from ACPO. It has clearly identified that there is a large gap in the provision of information in this broad area to all levels of the Police Service. PNC users have made many comments to me about the lack of a central advice point, Currently many enquiries are made through me but quite frankly I am not in a position to deal with these enquiries in as professional a manner as I would like to”.

National PNC Advisor

“Absolute requirement”

PNC / PITO / Hendon

“The proposal for establishing a central referral point for ‘exceptions handling’ type work would be strongly welcomed by NIS. This has been lacking in the past, and is particularly relevant in maintaining a uniform approach across police forces. The higher profile of this area of business particularly emphasises the need for this. It would also be extremely useful to have a unit with responsibility for maintaining (e.g.) Retention Guidelines up to date”.

NIS (MPS)

The review of the PNC codes of practice, with its requirement for timeliness and accuracy overlapped a number of areas covered by this group. It was good to have one 'port of call' for this information. I agree with the sentiments expressed in the covering letter, information management is an ongoing responsibility and the creation of a permanent group would ensure that the matters constantly arising in this area are addressed quickly. The output from such a group would ensure a consistent national approach to these contentious issues.

PNC Consultant

Negotiation with PITO

"The project team have been invaluable to me personally in my current role in raising awareness of the issues and priorities of certain work and in ensuring that PITO have clearly defined expectations from the users of PNC".

National PNC Advisor

"I appreciate the vast numbers of change requests that go into PITO stretches their resources and it is useful to have what would be considered specialists in the forensic retention, putting our case forward, retention of forensic samples (fingerprints / DNA) becomes much less useful if this data is not retained on PNC".

Force SSM

"The support provided by the team in dealings with PITO has been unquestionably vital. This was particularly so when negotiating changes to the PNC necessary as a consequence of implementation of the Criminal Justice Act 2003".

Home Office Forensic Science and Pathology Unit

Introduction of new procedures & processes

"The benefits to operational policing has led to a strong demand for the implementation across the Force. This in turn has led to the realisation that using Livescan with the Criminal Justice Act can produce excellent results. As a result, consideration is now being given to recruiting additional resources to take fingerprints on Livescan immediately upon arrest and identifying further offences whilst the detainee is still in custody".

Custody Sergeant Avon & Somerset Constabulary

"Extremely useful. Again, using as an example the implementation of C J Act, we were able to plan (well in advance) a training programme for staff in our PNC Bureau and the force in general. The documentation received from the DNA FRP Team was comprehensive and detailed to practitioner level. This meant that management did not have to start planning with a blank sheet of paper, thus enabling us to adapt the guidance given nationally to suit local circumstances. This helped us to a speedy and relatively trouble free implementation".

S/Yorkshire Constabulary

"It is not an exaggeration to say that the benefits to operational policing and the wider Criminal Justice System following changes in the law introduced by the Criminal Justice and Police Act 2001 and the Criminal Justice Act 2003 would not have been realised to the extent that they have without the assistance of the DNA/Fingerprint Project".

Home Office Forensic Science and Pathology Unit

“Our contacts have been very helpful, the team has been friendly and approachable and delivered the goods!”

Judicial Co-operation – Home Office

“This group have provided a key forum for understanding modifications required to information systems – particularly relevant for me where there is an impact on the National DNA Database – arising from changes in legislation, putting operational policing needs first”.

FSS Information Systems

Communication

“The availability of someone in the team to bounce idea’s and suggestions off has been an immense support in ensuring that decisions are only made after all issues have been considered and as a result advice and policies have been far more considerate and balanced”.

PITO National PNC Advisor

“During the implementation of legislation re sampling at the point of arrest there were numerous difficult issues to resolve. It was really useful, and novel, to have a team of experts who usually had the answer or would find a solution from their wide range of contacts. The links with a team with such a wealth of knowledge has been invaluable. I feel that, in this area, I always have someone to turn to for assistance”.

Force SSM

“Securing the point of contact within DNA FRP to act on behalf of ACPO has been extremely useful in focusing our discussion”.

International Directorate Home Office

“We would strongly support the idea that there should be a permanent unit dealing with police information management issues. In simple terms I have no doubt that it would lead to more consistent and sensible DP and FOI compliance by the police and better relations with us as regulator”.

Information Commissioner’s Office

Legal Challenges

“The assistance and co-operation of Det Supt Linton and his team at the DNA/F’print Retention Project has been absolutely invaluable in all stages up to and including the House of Lords in R on the application of S & Marper v Chief Constable of South Yorkshire (the Appellants have lodged a claim in the European Court I understand). The team provided an indispensable link to the national issues and information relating to S.82 of the Criminal Justice and Police Act 2001 – which was the subject of the challenge in S & Marper – and I have no doubt made a crucial contribution to the successful outcome”.

Force Solicitor South Yorkshire Police

“I have drawn enormous benefit from the operational advantages offered by the DNA FRP retention guidelines. The RRD chapter I have prepared is based on a presumption of retention wherever information is necessary and adequate and my line of argument is supported by the work completed by the DNA FRP to date. Additionally, I had the advantage of seeing the judgement from the Information Tribunal case relevant to this topic, prior to the completion of my chapter and was able to utilise several examples and strands of argument offered by the DNA FRP during this hearing”.

NCPE CENTREX

“Essential to prove business need and the need for change process involving the Data protection commissioner and capable of dealing with legal challenge”.

Information Assurance Officer – Police Force

Police Service Support

“Team has assisted Essex Police with particular advice & guidance regarding specific complaints raised by data subjects on the continued retention of ‘innocent’ persons’ data and forensic material – enabling us to provide a robust response to a complainant which we know is in accord with the national view”.

Information Compliance Team

“Implementing the CJA powers alongside NSPIS custody has been difficult. Advice and support for the difficulties we have faced have been invaluable. I have frequently been in contact with the DNA FRP office who have been able to assist in issues with NSPIS, PITO and Police Standards Unit”.

Custody Sergeant Avon & Somerset Constabulary

Richard Code & Guidance

“The relationship between the DNA FRP and my work on Review, Retention and Disposal for the Richard Guidance is significant and my work has benefited greatly from the information and advice provided by the DNA FRP team. I have made use of the telephone support line and email and met with various individual team members in an effort to align my work with the extensive progress already made by the DNA FRP team and am very grateful for their quality input to date”.

NCPE Richard Team

“The DNA FRP have played an integral part in the development of the guidance on the Management of Police Information (MoPI). The advice has always been accurate, timely and delivered in a format that is easy to know”.

NCPE Doctrine Writer

Business Benefits

“In responding to questions in Parliament or in dealing with judicial cases the information and statistics provided by the team have been extremely valuable and Ministers have in particular been very grateful for the evidence provided to support the justification for the extension of police powers to take and retain DNA and fingerprints”.

Home Office Forensic Science and Pathology Unit

“The DNA FRP is continuing to provide a source of advice, assisting in making decisions on dissemination of intelligence abroad in line with new guidance. In addition the project has provided significant assistance, at the request of the Home Office, which is contributing to the development of international DNA intelligence sharing”.

NCIS, International

“Very useful because all of the work to which the DNA FRP have addressed has implications in the OPERATIONAL sphere of Police work. Example – from the statistics compiled by DNA FRP we have been able to monitor the business benefits such as the increase in the numbers of fingerprints/samples taken (which leads to a potential increase in detections).

Whilst acknowledging that this task is achievable in-force, it is extremely time consuming so we are grateful for the assistance in this area from the DNA FRP Team”.

Police Standards Unit

12.2 Appendix 2 - Predicted PNC Charge Increases

PNC User	Number of checks pa	Current charge pa	2007-2008 total projected charge	Projected Increase	ACRO requirement (1.5/8*project ed increase)
POLICE - proposed 25% increase					
Avon & Somerset	2,903,460	£534,755.52	£668,444.40	£133,688.88	£25,066.67
Bedfordshire	977,589	£213,902.21	£267,377.76	£53,475.55	£10,026.67
Cambridgeshire	1,057,478	£235,292.43	£294,115.54	£58,823.11	£11,029.33
Cheshire	1,607,218	£342,243.53	£427,804.42	£85,560.88	£16,042.67
City of London	632,305	£128,341.32	£160,426.66	£32,085.33	£6,016.00
Cleveland	937,569	£256,682.65	£320,853.31	£64,170.66	£12,032.00
Cumbria	907,730	£149,731.55	£187,164.43	£37,432.89	£7,018.67
Derbyshire	2,151,290	£320,853.31	£401,066.64	£80,213.33	£15,040.00
Devon & Cornwall	1,492,906	£534,755.52	£668,444.40	£133,688.88	£25,066.67
Dorset	1,516,054	£213,902.21	£267,377.76	£53,475.55	£10,026.67
Durham	963,142	£235,292.43	£294,115.54	£58,823.11	£11,029.33
Dyfed-Powys	1,327,292	£149,731.55	£187,164.43	£37,432.89	£7,018.67
Essex	3,421,170	£534,755.52	£668,444.40	£133,688.88	£25,066.67
Gloucestershire	729,542	£171,121.77	£213,902.21	£42,780.44	£8,021.33
Greater Manchester	4,606,443	£1,197,852.36	£1,497,315.46	£299,463.09	£56,149.33
Gwent	774,177	£235,292.43	£294,115.54	£58,823.11	£11,029.33
Hampshire	2,071,404	£620,316.40	£775,395.50	£155,079.10	£29,077.33
Hertfordshire	1,256,481	£385,023.97	£481,279.97	£96,255.99	£18,048.00
Humberside	1,604,943	£342,243.53	£427,804.42	£85,560.88	£16,042.67
Kent	7,482,565	£556,145.74	£695,182.18	£139,036.44	£26,069.33
Lancashire	2,613,564	£534,755.52	£668,444.40	£133,688.88	£25,066.67
Leicestershire	1,114,310	£342,243.53	£427,804.42	£85,560.88	£16,042.67
Lincolnshire	822,143	£192,511.99	£240,639.98	£48,128.00	£9,024.00
Merseyside	2,523,455	£684,487.07	£855,608.83	£171,121.77	£32,085.33
Metropolitan Police	16,713,022	£4,342,214.82	£5,427,768.53	£1,085,553.71	£203,541.32
Norfolk	915,865	£256,682.65	£320,853.31	£64,170.66	£12,032.00
North Wales	1,219,397	£213,902.21	£267,377.76	£53,475.55	£10,026.67
North Yorkshire	1,020,290	£213,902.21	£267,377.76	£53,475.55	£10,026.67
Northamptonshire	1,594,990	£213,902.21	£267,377.76	£53,475.55	£10,026.67
Northumbria	2,170,395	£577,535.96	£721,919.95	£144,383.99	£27,072.00
Nottinghamshire	2,128,077	£385,023.97	£481,279.97	£96,255.99	£18,048.00
South Wales	1,835,429	£513,365.30	£641,706.62	£128,341.32	£24,064.00
South Yorkshire	2,808,352	£534,755.52	£668,444.40	£133,688.88	£25,066.67
Staffordshire	1,810,916	£342,243.53	£427,804.42	£85,560.88	£16,042.67
Suffolk	583,938	£213,902.21	£267,377.76	£53,475.55	£10,026.67
Surrey	1,046,819	£342,243.53	£427,804.42	£85,560.88	£16,042.67
Sussex	2,434,018	£491,975.08	£614,968.85	£122,993.77	£23,061.33
Thames Valley	3,519,979	£727,267.51	£909,084.38	£181,816.88	£34,090.66
Warwickshire	1,033,628	£171,121.77	£213,902.21	£42,780.44	£8,021.33
West Mercia	1,710,111	£342,243.53	£427,804.42	£85,560.88	£16,042.67
West Midlands	5,002,177	£1,304,803.47	£1,631,004.34	£326,200.87	£61,162.66
West Yorkshire	3,246,685	898,389.27	£1,122,986.59	£224,597.32	£42,112.00
Wiltshire	628,726	192,511.99	£240,639.98	£48,128.00	£9,024.00
Sub TOTAL	96,917,044	21,390,220.80	£26,737,776.00	£5,347,555.20	£1,002,666.60

SCOTTISH FORCES (predictions based on current charge of £750,000 pa and predicted 25% increase)					
Central	200,615	£30,026.25	£37,532.81	£7,506.56	£1,407.48
Dumfries & Galloway	241,811	£36,192.09	£45,240.12	£9,048.02	£1,696.50
Fife	407,140	£60,937.05	£76,171.31	£15,234.26	£2,856.42
Grampian	512,374	£76,687.53	£95,859.41	£19,171.88	£3,594.73
Lothian & Borders	1,047,079	£156,717.35	£195,896.69	£39,179.34	£7,346.13
Northern	227,211	£34,006.90	£42,508.62	£8,501.72	£1,594.07
Strathclyde	1,896,394	£283,835.17	£354,793.97	£70,958.79	£13,304.77
Tayside	478,367	£71,597.66	£89,497.08	£17,899.42	£3,356.14
Sub Total	5,010,991	£750,000.00	£937,500.00	£187,500.00	£35,156.25
NON-POLICE - predicted 56% increase					
Assets Recovery Agency	3,478	£1,565.10	£2,408.52	£843.42	£158.14
Bramshill College	23,916	£10,762.20	£16,561.83	£5,799.63	£1,087.43
British Transport Police	752,894	£338,802.30	£521,379.10	£182,576.80	£34,233.15
Centrex	11,560	£5,202.00	£8,005.30	£2,803.30	£525.62
Charity Commission	186	£83.70	£128.81	£45.11	£8.46
Civil Nuclear Constabulary	3,240	£1,458.00	£2,243.70	£785.70	£147.32
Courts (Warrant Enforcement)	207,133	£93,209.85	£143,439.60	£50,229.75	£9,418.08
Courts Service	203,852	£91,733.40	£141,167.51	£49,434.11	£9,268.90
Criminal Cases Review Commission	427	£192.15	£295.70	£103.55	£19.42
Criminal Records Bureau	671,585	£302,213.25	£465,072.61	£162,859.36	£30,536.13
D.V.L.A.	24,822	£11,169.90	£17,189.24	£6,019.34	£1,128.63
Department of Trade & Industry	2,074	£933.30	£1,436.25	£502.95	£94.30
Department for Work & Pensions - Solicitors	53,778	£24,200.10	£37,241.27	£13,041.17	£2,445.22
Disclosure Scotland	1,783,268	£802,470.60	£1,234,913.09	£432,442.49	£81,082.97
Environment Agency	644	£289.80	£445.97	£156.17	£29.28
Financial Services Authority	496	£223.20	£343.48	£120.28	£22.55
Foreign & Commonwealth Office	13,678	£6,155.10	£9,472.02	£3,316.92	£621.92
Forensic Science Service	1,802,397	£811,078.65	£1,248,159.92	£437,081.27	£81,952.74
Guernsey	72,634	£32,685.30	£50,299.05	£17,613.75	£3,302.58
Health & Safety Executive	237	£106.65	£164.12	£57.47	£10.78
Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary	1,086	£488.70	£752.06	£263.36	£49.38
HM Revenue & Customs	456,055	£205,224.75	£315,818.09	£110,593.34	£20,736.25
Home Office Data Quality & Integrity Team (1 month)	99,341	£44,703.45	£68,793.64	£24,090.19	£4,516.91
Home Office Departmental Security Unit	32,796	£14,758.20	£22,711.23	£7,953.03	£1,491.19
Immigration & Nationality Directorate (ICD)	225,058	£101,276.10	£155,852.67	£54,576.57	£10,233.11
Immigration & Nationality Directorate (Status 2)	79,368	£35,715.60	£54,962.34	£19,246.74	£3,608.76
Isle of Man	37,327	£16,797.15	£25,848.95	£9,051.80	£1,697.21
Jersey	71,964	£32,383.80	£49,835.07	£17,451.27	£3,272.11
M.O.D. Defence Vetting Agency	163,960	£73,782.00	£113,542.30	£39,760.30	£7,455.06
Mersey Tunnels Police	2,510	£1,129.50	£1,738.18	£608.68	£114.13
Ministry of Defence	74,490	£33,520.50	£51,584.33	£18,063.83	£3,386.97
N.C.I.S.	176,313	£79,340.85	£122,096.75	£42,755.90	£8,016.73
N.I.S.	1,632,535	£734,640.75	£1,130,530.49	£395,889.74	£74,229.33
National Air Traffic Services	2,666	£1,199.70	£1,846.21	£646.51	£121.22

Ltd					
National Crime Squad	45,698	£20,564.10	£31,645.87	£11,081.77	£2,077.83
National Ports Office	19,094	£8,592.30	£13,222.60	£4,630.30	£868.18
NHS Counter Fraud	634	£285.30	£439.05	£153.75	£28.83
Office for Civil Nuclear Security	27,857	£12,535.65	£19,290.97	£6,755.32	£1,266.62
Office of Fair Trading	921	£414.45	£637.79	£223.34	£41.88
Pensions Regulator	83	£37.35	£57.48	£20.13	£3.77
Police Service of Northern Ireland	472,811	£212,764.95	£327,421.62	£114,656.67	£21,498.13
Port of Dover Police	13,628	£6,132.60	£9,437.39	£3,304.79	£619.65
Port of Tilbury Police	815	£366.75	£564.39	£197.64	£37.06
Prison Service	323,247	£145,461.15	£223,848.55	£78,387.40	£14,697.64
Probation Service (1 month)	2	£0.90	£1.39	£0.49	£0.09
RAF Provost	1,946	£875.70	£1,347.61	£471.91	£88.48
Royal Mail Security	159,962	£71,982.90	£110,773.69	£38,790.79	£7,273.27
S.C.R.O.	9,501	£4,275.45	£6,579.44	£2,303.99	£432.00
Scottish Drug Enforcement Agency	28,336	£12,751.20	£19,622.68	£6,871.48	£1,288.40
Service Police Crime Bureau	36,510	£16,429.50	£25,283.18	£8,853.68	£1,660.06
Transport Security	15,598	£7,019.10	£10,801.62	£3,782.52	£709.22
Vehicle and Operator Services Agency	4,616	£2,077.20	£3,196.58	£1,119.38	£209.88
Others	315,715	£142,071.75	£218,632.64	£76,560.89	£14,355.17
Sub Total	10,164,742	£4,574,133.90	£7,039,083.84	£2,464,949.94	£462,178.11
Total annual PNC costs recovered		£25,964,354.70			
Projected for 2007-2008			£34,714,359.84		
Estimated increase (£8m required)				£8,000,005.14	£1,500,000.96

12.3 Appendix 3 – Business Benefits Summary

Research into effectiveness of retaining DNA under the Criminal Justice and Police Act 2001

The Criminal Justice and Police Act 2001 amended PACE, providing the police in England and Wales with the power to retain DNA samples and fingerprints, relating to persons following acquittal at court or other discontinuance of a case.

Definition

The '**RA**' flag relates to any Database record where the parent PNC record has been deleted. It has been estimated that roughly 86% of PNC deletions is due to acquittals.

As of 30th September 2005 the total number of profiles on NDNAD with an 'RA' flag was 284,619. Allowing for a 26% replication rate among acquittals it is estimated that there are roughly 181,000 DNA profiles on the Database which would have previously fallen to have been removed.

From these, approximately 8,251 profiles of individuals have been linked with crime scene stains, involving 13,709 offences. These offences include 109 murders, 55 attempted murders, 116 rapes, 67 sexual offences, 105 aggravated burglaries and 126 of the supply of controlled drugs (September 2005, NDNAD Custodian Services).

Research into effectiveness of DNA sampling under the Criminal Justice Act 2003

The introduction of the Criminal Justice Act 2003 has led to an increase in the number of DNA profiles held on the National DNA Database (NDNAD). This legislation amended PACE, providing the police with the power to take DNA (and fingerprints) from all persons arrested for a recordable offence and detained at a police station.

Since the introduction of the legislation (April 2004), DNA profiles in respect of 124,347 have been added to the NDNAD. These are persons who have been arrested and not subsequently charged or cautioned with an offence (PITO, December 2005). These DNA profiles have linked more than 2,000 persons to over 3,000 crime scenes. These crimes include; 37 murders, 16 attempted murders, 90 rapes, 92 drug related offences and 1,136 burglary offences (DNA & Fingerprint Retention Project, January 2006).

12.4 Appendix 4 - Standard Questionnaire Letter and Questionnaire



DNA and Fingerprint Retention Project
Kings Worthy Court
Kings Worthy
Winchester
SO23 7QA

Tel: 023 8045 0991

Fax: 023 8074 5427

dna_fptproject@hampshire.pnn.police.uk

17th January 2006

Dear

The DNA & Fingerprint Retention Project will complete most of its objectives by the end of March this year and draw to a close. Many of you have been telling us how valuable the Project has been over the last two years in providing support to your force and your area of business. Your comments have been welcome and are encouraging.

The new Retention Guidelines are scheduled to come into force in April 2006, when the Management of Police Information guidance (Bichard Guidance) is published; the key RFCs will have been completed by PITO; the powers available under the Criminal Justice & Police Act 2001 and Criminal Justice Act 2003 will have been implemented across England and Wales; all the current legal challenges will have been successfully defended and the benefits to operational policing will have been clearly evidenced. The intention has always been to work to a disciplined timetable and it would be wrong to extend the project even though the work has identified significant gaps in policing.

We are therefore in the process of persuading Government and ACPO that a permanent unit delivering a service that deals with police information management is essential. This national police information management unit will deal with many areas you are familiar with and continue to provide the comprehensive support service we have strived to achieve.

We are drawing up a business case, which has provisional support from various Home Office departments and the relevant ACPO leads.

We recognise that this document should represent your views and evidence the value of the proposals, based upon the service we have previously provided during the lifetime of the project. We welcome your views about the need for ongoing central support and coordination, which will form an integral part of the new proposals. All comments will be useful to inform the recommendations. The feedback will also be used to inform the end of project report.

We hope that by requesting a brief and informative response you can find an opportunity to comment in the relevant section of this form. Additional information is welcome should you wish to provide it. As always a timely response is helpful and answers by return, would be appreciated.

We will of course keep you informed of future progress as the proposals are developed.

Yours sincerely,

Gary Linton
Detective Superintendent
DNA & Fingerprint Retention Project

DNA & Fingerprint Retention Project Questionnaire

Name	Department	Organisation	Contact number			
1. How valuable has the availability of advice provided by the DNA FRP (24/7 telephone support or e-mail) been to your area of business?		Very useful	Useful	Moderate	No value	Unknown
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comment						
2. How useful has the documented information provided by the DNA FRP been to your area of business?		Very useful	Useful	Moderate	No value	Unknown
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comment						
3. How valuable has an ACPO point of contact been for your organisation or department as provided by the DNA FRP?		Very useful	Useful	Moderate	No value	Unknown
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comment						
4. How valuable have negotiations with PITO, conducted by the DNA FRP, been to your area of business?		Very useful	Useful	Moderate	No value	Unknown
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comment						
5. How valuable has evidence of operational policing benefits, provided by the DNA FRP, been to your area of business?		Very useful	Useful	Moderate	No value	Unknown
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comment						
6. How valuable has the DNA FRP attendance and contribution at specialist meetings been to your area of business?		Very useful	Useful	Moderate	No value	Unknown
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comment						
7. How valuable has the DNA FRP support generally been to your area of business?		Very useful	Useful	Moderate	No value	Unknown
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comment						