

Cc: 560(2)

Subject: RE: URGENT: TV Licensing Blog - accessed redacted information - Search Warrants

Importance: High

I'll get in touch with Pipa and brief John Shield once 560(2) has put together a note of the sensitive stuff now out there and an update from IPC as to why the PDFs weren't locked. Please don't let Capita know until I have briefed Pipa. 560(2) can you mention it to 560(2) and let him know we will tell Capita after Pipa is informed.

Thanks

560(2)

From: 560(2)

Sent: 06 July 2016 13:22

To:

Cc: 560(2)

Subject: Re: URGENT: TV Licensing Blog - accessed redacted information - Search Warrants

Please let 560(2) know. Also Colin at Capita.

Ta.

On 6 Jul 2016, at 13:14, 560(2)

> wrote:

Hi - Is 560(2)? Might be worth alerting Pipa, just so she's aware.

560(2)

TV Licensing

Phone: 560(2)

Email: 560(2)

Twitter: Follow @TVLicensingNews for news and updates

YouTube: Visit our YouTube channel at [youtube.com/TVLicensing](https://www.youtube.com/TVLicensing)

From: 560(2)

Sent: 06 July 2016 13:06

To: 560(2)

Cc: Communications - TVL; 560(2)

Subject: RE: URGENT: TV Licensing Blog - accessed redacted information - Search Warrants

Importance: High

As an update, 560(2) getting in touch with IPC now to ask that the pack and response be taken down if possible, so it can be uploaded again with the info correctly redacted, but this doesn't stop the blog from releasing this information further - as they have already downloaded it.

We are reviewing the information that is now potentially in the public domain and will send across a full update once we've got the list.

560(2) - in the meantime, is there anyone else that we need to make aware of this issue, or is it best to wait until we've compiled a list?

Thanks,

560(2)

560(2)

Twitter: Follow @TVLicensingNews for news and updates

YouTube: Visit our YouTube channel at [youtube.com/TVLicensing](https://www.youtube.com/TVLicensing)

<image001.png>

From: S40(2)
Sent: 06 July 2016 12:59
To: S40(2)
Cc: Communications - TVL; 1
Subject: URGENT: TV Licensing Blog - accessed redacted information - Search Warrants
Importance: High

Hello all,

Just to make you aware, the TV Licensing blog (tv-licensing.blogspot.co.uk) has published an article about the number of search warrants applied for in 2015, following the publication of the TVL Performance Pack FOI in WDTK.

The full article can be read [here](#) and relevant paras also copied below for ref.

S40(2) we didn't provide a press line for this FOI. We redacted the information, but it would appear that if you copy and paste the table from the FOI response into another document, the figures are then visible. So in essence *all* redacted information from this pack may be visible - S40(2) checking this now.

S40(2) and I are going to review the entire response to find out what information is now potentially out in the public domain.

Many thanks,

S40(2)

Yesterday the BBC released a copy of the TV Licensing Performance Pack for March 2015 in response to a Freedom of Information request by Nathan Gregory (see [request at WhatDoTheyKnow.com](http://requestatwhatdotheyknow.com)).

The Performance Pack, just as the name implies, contains all manner of data about TV Licensing's performance at administering and enforcing the TV licence fee.

Page 29 of the Field Performance Pack, which you can view [here](#), contains data about the number of search warrant applications made by TV Licensing in the 12 months to 31st March 2015.

A cursory glance at that page seems to suggest that the key statistics, which the BBC always refuses to divulge, have been redacted, but actually the data is still available if you drill down a little deeper into the document.

We have reproduced the key data in [this table](#), which we'd encourage you to download and share.

For your convenience, the edited highlights for 2014/15 are as follows:

- Just as we suspected, there were no search warrants applied for in Scotland.
- In the whole of the UK there were only 351 search warrants requests made by TV Licensing's Field Enforcement Division to the TV Licensing Legal Team. Of those TV Licensing made 256 search warrant applications to the courts, of which only 167 were actually granted.
- Of the 167 warrants granted, only 115 of those were executed (97 successfully, 17 unsuccessfully, 1 unknown).

- In London, there were only 2 search warrants granted by the court.

One can only imagine the BBC's immense frustration that these figures - which the Corporation has sought desperately hard to keep hidden for years - have finally been released publicly due to its own incompetent oversight (not unlike [this earlier case](#) actually).

These statistics finally confirm, once and for all, that TV Licensing search warrants really are rarer than hen's teeth.

Certainly anyone who does not legally need a TV licence, should not be unduly concerned by the threat of a search warrant.

540(27)

Twitter: Follow [@TVLicensingNews](#) for news and updates

YouTube: Visit our YouTube channel at youtube.com/TVLicensing

<image001.png>

From: 540(2)
Sent: 07 July 2016 11:41
To: 540(2) Pipa Doubtfire; John Shield - Comms; 540(2)
Cc: 540(2)
Subject: RE: URGENT: TV Licensing Blog - accessed redacted information - Search Warrants

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Thanks for update 540(2) Let me know if we get any media calls.

From: 540(2)
Sent: 07 July 2016 10:22
To: Pipa Doubtfire; John Shield - Comms;
Cc: 540(2)
Subject: URGENT: TV Licensing Blog - accessed redacted information - Search Warrants

Dear all

The TV Licensing Blog has posted another article based on the information in the 2015 Field Performance Pack. This highlights total costs paid to Capita and court stats for 2015 (article can be read [here](#) and text copied below for ref.). We don't believe the information given is a concern – our PICs policy is in the public domain and we have previously confirmed the level of court costs Capita claims. The only item which was not in the public domain was the total costs recovered by the courts and reimbursed to Capita.

Best wishes

Data released by the BBC reveals that TV Licensing operations contractor, Capita Business Services Ltd, is awarded £120m in prosecution costs every year.

This information appears in the TV Licensing Field Performance Pack for March 2015, which was released by the BBC in response to a recent Freedom of Information request. Unfortunately for them, the chimp they hired to do the redactions wasn't very effective at its job.

Part of Capita's role as operations contractor is to prosecute those individuals accused of TV licence evasion. Those convicted of the offence are normally fined and ordered to pay a contribution towards prosecution costs. In TV licence cases the true prosecution costs are minimal, but that doesn't deter Capita from making an inflated, in our opinion, standard costs request of £120 per case (at time of writing, for cases dealt with at the first hearing). In most cases, the court will succumb to that request.

The BBC has previously confirmed that prosecution costs awarded by the court are retained by Capita and are intended to "reimburse the prosecutor and not enrich them". Given the massive sums involved, we suggest that Capita has a clear vested interest in dragging as many people to court as possible, however tenuous the evidence against them.

The overwhelming majority of those prosecuted for TV licence evasion are financially disadvantaged, which makes it particularly galling that Capita, a FTSE 100 company that made £639m in profit in 2014-15, generates such massive revenue at their expense.

Data obtained by the TV Licensing Blog reveals that Capita was awarded £118.2m in prosecution costs in the financial year 2014-15. Of that, some £73.8m was actually recovered by the court and paid to Capita. The BBC has noted that these figures should not be released publicly (oops) because the revelation that the courts are sluggish at collecting prosecution costs might encourage evasion (oh dear).

View the TV Licensing Analysis of Court Activity 2014-15 [here](#).

The data confirms that Capita routinely withdraws about 10 percent of all cases laid before the court. Bear in mind that TV Licensing prosecutes very few of the people it accuses of TV licence evasion. Ministry of Justice data indicates that only about 40 percent of those TV Licensing claim to be evading the fee are actually convicted of the offence (see [this earlier post](#)).

S40(2)

Twitter: Follow [@TVLicensingNews](#) for news and updates

YouTube: Visit our YouTube channel at [youtube.com/TVLicensing](#)



For all of us.

From: S40(2)

Sent: 06 July 2016 13:41

To: S40(2)

Cc:

Subject: RE: URGENT: TV Licensing Blog - accessed redacted information - Search Warrants

Thanks S40(2) yes just caught up with S40(2) He said he'd just bumped into you in any case and agreed to wait until you've briefed Pipa before we flag to Capita.

S40(2) and I are compiling the list of redacted information now so will share once complete.

S40(2) now cc'd for ref.

Many thanks,

S40(2)

S40(2)

Twitter: Follow [@TVLicensingNews](#) for news and updates

YouTube: Visit our YouTube channel at [youtube.com/TVLicensing](#)



For all of us.

From: S40(2)

Sent: 06 July 2016 13:31

To: S40(2)

Cc: S40(2)

Subject: RE: URGENT: TV Licensing Blog - accessed redacted information - Search Warrants

Importance: High

I'll get in touch with Pipa and brief John Shield once S40(2) has put together a note of the sensitive stuff now out there and an update from IPC as to why the PDFs weren't locked. Please don't let Capita know until I have briefed Pipa. S40(2) can you mention it to S40(2) and let him know we will tell Capita after Pipa is informed.

Thanks

S40(2)

From: S40(2)

Sent: 06 July 2016 13:22

To: S40(2)

Cc: S40(2) Communications - TVL; S40(2)

Subject: Re: URGENT: TV Licensing Blog - accessed redacted information - Search Warrants

Please let S40(2) know. Also Colin at Capita.

Ta.

On 6 Jul 2016, at 13:14, S40(2) > wrote:

Hi – Is S40(2) in? Might be worth alerting Pipa, just so she's aware.

S40(2)

TV Licensing

Phone:

Email: S40(2)

Twitter: Follow @TVLicensingNews for news and updates

YouTube: Visit our YouTube channel at [youtube.com/TVLicensing](https://www.youtube.com/TVLicensing)

From: S40(2)

Sent: 06 July 2016 13:06

To: S40(2)

Cc: Communications - TVL; S40(2)

Subject: RE: URGENT: TV Licensing Blog - accessed redacted information - Search Warrants

Importance: High

As an update, S40(2) is getting in touch with IPC now to ask that the pack and response be taken down if possible, so it can be uploaded again with the info correctly redacted, but this doesn't stop the blog from releasing this information further – as they have already downloaded it.

We are reviewing the information that is now potentially in the public domain and will send across a full update once we've got the list.

S40(2) – in the meantime, is there anyone else that we need to make aware of this issue, or is it best to wait until we've compiled a list?

Thanks,

S40(2)

S40(2)

Twitter: Follow @TVLicensingNews for news and updates

YouTube: Visit our YouTube channel at [youtube.com/TVLicensing](https://www.youtube.com/TVLicensing)

<image001.png>

Cc: S40(2)
Subject: RE: URGENT: TV Licensing Blog - accessed redacted information - Search Warrants
Importance: High

I'll get in touch with Pipa and brief John Shield once S40(2) has put together a note of the sensitive stuff now out there and an update from IPC as to why the PDFs weren't locked. Please don't let Capita know until I have briefed Pipa. S40(2) can you mention it to S40(2) and let him know we will tell Capita after Pipa is informed.

Thanks

S40(2)

From: S40(2)
Sent: 06 July 2016 13:22
To: S40(2)
Cc: S40(2); Communications - TVL; S40(2)
Subject: Re: URGENT: TV Licensing Blog - accessed redacted information - Search Warrants

Please let S40(2) know. Also Colin at Capita.
Ta.

On 6 Jul 2016, at 13:14, S40(2) > wrote:

Hi - Is S40(2) in? Might be worth alerting Pipa, just so she's aware.

S40(2)

TV Licensing

Phone:

Email: S40(2)

Twitter: Follow @TVLicensingNews for news and updates

YouTube: Visit our YouTube channel at [youtube.com/TVLicensing](https://www.youtube.com/TVLicensing)

From: S40(2)
Sent: 06 July 2016 13:06
To: S40(2)
Cc: Communications - TVL; S40(2)
Subject: RE: URGENT: TV Licensing Blog - accessed redacted information - Search Warrants
Importance: High

As an update, S40(2) is getting in touch with IPC now to ask that the pack and response be taken down if possible, so it can be uploaded again with the info correctly redacted, but this doesn't stop the blog from releasing this information further - as they have already downloaded it.

We are reviewing the information that is now potentially in the public domain and will send across a full update once we've got the list.

S40(2) - in the meantime, is there anyone else that we need to make aware of this issue, or is it best to wait until we've compiled a list?

Thanks,

S40(2)

S40(2)

Twitter: Follow @TVLicensingNews for news and updates

YouTube: Visit our YouTube channel at [youtube.com/TVLicensing](https://www.youtube.com/TVLicensing)

<image001.png>

From: S60(2)
Sent: 06 July 2016 12:59
To: S60(2)
Cc: Communications - TVL;
Subject: URGENT: TV Licensing Blog - accessed redacted information - Search Warrants
Importance: High

Hello all,

Just to make you aware, the TV Licensing blog (tv-licensing.blogspot.co.uk) has published an article about the number of search warrants applied for in 2015, following the publication of the TVL Performance Pack FOI in WDTK.

The full article can be read [here](#) and relevant para's also copied below for ref.

S60(2) – we didn't provide a press line for this FOI. We redacted the information, but it would appear that if you copy and paste the table from the FOI response into another document, the figures are then visible. So in essence *all* redacted information from this pack may be visible – S60(2) is checking this now.

S60(2) and I are going to review the entire response to find out what information is now potentially out in the public domain.

Many thanks,

S60(2)

Yesterday the BBC released a copy of the TV Licensing Performance Pack for March 2015 in response to a Freedom of Information request by Nathan Gregory ([see request at WhatDoTheyKnow.com](#)).

The Performance Pack, just as the name implies, contains all manner of data about TV Licensing's performance at administering and enforcing the TV licence fee.

Page 29 of the Field Performance Pack, which you can view [here](#), contains data about the number of search warrant applications made by TV Licensing in the 12 months to 31st March 2015.

A cursory glance at that page seems to suggest that the key statistics, which the BBC always refuses to divulge, have been redacted, but actually the data is still available if you drill down a little deeper into the document.

We have reproduced the key data in [this table](#), which we'd encourage you to download and share.

For your convenience, the edited highlights for 2014/15 are as follows:

- Just as we suspected, there were no search warrants applied for in Scotland.
- In the whole of the UK there were only 351 search warrants requests made by TV Licensing's Field Enforcement Division to the TV Licensing Legal Team. Of those TV Licensing made 256 search warrant applications to the courts, of which only 167 were actually granted.
- Of the 167 warrants granted, only 115 of those were executed (97 successfully, 17 unsuccessfully, 1 unknown).

- In London, there were only 2 search warrants granted by the court.

One can only imagine the BBC's immense frustration that these figures - which the Corporation has sought desperately hard to keep hidden for years - have finally been released publicly due to its own incompetent oversight (not unlike [this earlier case](#) actually).

These statistics finally confirm, once and for all, that TV Licensing search warrants really are rarer than hen's teeth.

Certainly anyone who does not legally need a TV licence, should not be unduly concerned by the threat of a search warrant.

540(2)

Twitter: Follow [@TVLicensingNews](#) for news and updates

YouTube: Visit our YouTube channel at [youtube.com/TVLicensing](https://www.youtube.com/TVLicensing)

<image001.png>

Not relevant

From: SLO(2)
Sent: 07 July 2016 12:11
To:
Cc: SLO(2)
Subject: SRP

SLO(2)

Areas I think we may be exposed to further questions

- Data on care homes could be misinterpreted as TVL focussing on vulnerable
- Field leavers numbers high
- G4S activity – have G4S been informed
- Regional variations- difference in performance Wales, Eng, NI and Scotland
 - Scotland code 8's 2014 22.9k dropped down to 7.8k
- NLN visit numbers 7% of numbers loaded
- In March 14 pack we have a tab Evasion Code 8 Target by team - we have to my knowledge stated we have targets and we don't but this looks like we do
- Withdrawn cases data

Regards

SLO(2)

Not relevant

-----Original Message-----

From: SLO(2)
Sent: 07 July 2016 13:13
To: SLO(2)
Subject: SRP

Hi both

I've spoken to SLO(2) and he will be advising G4S that MI relating to them has been released.

Regards

SLO(2)

Sent from my iPhone

SLO(2)

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 07 July 2016 17:53
To: Pipa Doubtfire
Subject: FW: What Do They Know - my comments on [REDACTED] draft
Attachments: 2016-07-07 BN Erroneous TVL disclosure.docx
Importance: High

Hi Pipa

I think this looks broadly fine apart from the last para which I do have a concern about (re produced below). This description doesn't take into account the request [REDACTED] had made of [REDACTED] to lock the documents or the fact that this request was not transferred to [REDACTED]. It also doesn't encompass the wider point we discussed about Information Rights acting as more than a post box and potentially agreeing to spot check high profile releases. I don't know if you were able to arrange 10 minutes with Peter tomorrow but it might be easier to discuss feedback with him over coffee rather than going back with comments over email? Also, I appreciate the name of the document can be read in two ways – either that the disclosure of TVL documents was erroneous or that TVL erroneously disclosed the documents – so I wondered about suggesting a slight re-word of this to Erroneous Disclosure of TVL docs? You may feel that's too detailed a point to make.

This incident has exposed a lack of knowledge around the safe redaction of documents and the use of Adobe redaction software. This will be incorporated into our training programme for divisional FOI reps and we will also highlight the issue in the next FOI newsletter.

Happy to discuss if that would be helpful and [REDACTED]

Have a good evening.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

V1 8.7.16

Q: Why are so few search warrants executed?

A: We are open that TV Licensing applies for search warrants only in rare circumstances where other most cost-effective and less intrusive enforcement methods have been exhausted.

Q: Why were no search warrants applied for in Scotland over the financial year 2014/2015?

A: Previously Procurators Fiscal have not granted search warrants in Scotland. We are working with the Crown Office in Scotland to resolve this. This year a search warrant was successfully executed and further applications are due.

Q: If thousands of people have withdrawn your right of access to visit, does that mean you cannot take enforcement action at those addresses?

A: No. Those addresses will be prioritised for detection. There has been a 30% decrease in WOIRA* claims as at May this year compared to the same time last year.

- **WOIRA = withdrawal of implied right of access to visit an address*
- Further info: total WOIRA claims as at March 2015 = 16k. Since then we have released a figure for December 2015 to WDTK which was 20k. So this figure is not news
- New WOIRA claims 2,369 as at May 2016, figure at same time last year was 3,388 (a decrease of -30.1%)
- Other WOIRA figures released at various times on WDTK (but not to this level of detail).

Q: In the March 2015 SRP pack, all of the following are down from the previous year: field sales, visits, prosecution statements and the number of officers. Is this a lack of success for TVL's collection methods?

A: The opposite. We collected £3.7bn this year and there are more licences in force than ever before (25.6m). Using field staff is expensive as letters and phone calls are much cheaper. Our direct mail methods have improved so sales are achieved earlier and more cost-effectively.

Q: Why did so many field officers leave in 14/15?

A: Being an Enquiry Officer is a tough job and unfortunately the public do not always respect our staff or the job they do. Attacks on officers more than doubled in 2014/5.

Q: Why has the number of prosecution statements taken in Scotland dropped (by 7.8k in 14/15)?

A: Activity patterns for officers and where they are deployed vary over time.

Q: Why is the percentage of No Licence Needed (NLN) homes visited at 7%?

A: We've said publicly we visit a proportion of NLN homes to confirm a licence isn't needed. We constantly revise which addresses are selected, aiming to visit where we believe a licence may be needed.

Q: Why do you withdraw so many cases before they come to court?

A: As noted in the Perry Review of XXX, TV Licensing does not prosecute the majority of first time evaders if they pay a licence before the case comes to court.

Q: In the March 14 pack, a tab reads Evasion Code 8 Target by team. Do officers have targets for the number of prosecution statements to take?

A: Team targets are about working efficiently and effectively. *WDTK* – what's the answer on officer's targets for prosecution statements?

From: S40(2)
Sent: 08 July 2016 17:48
To: S40(2)
Subject: RE: WOIRA information disclosed under FOI
Attachments: RFI20160449 - Response.pdf; RFI20152203 - Response.pdf; RFI20151765 - final.pdf; RFI20141521 - final response.pdf; RFI20140789 - Response.pdf; RFI20140238 - final response.pdf; RFI20130414 - final response.pdf; RFI20130084 - final response.pdf

Hi S40(2)

Please see below and attached.

Regards

S40(2)

Reference	Requester	Area	Time period	Number of WOIRAs	Additional information
RFI20160449	Journalist	N.I.	FY2014/15	408	
RFI20152203	WDTK	UK	2015 (calendar year)	6,445	
			Jan 2011 – Dec 2015 (calendar)	20,101	Service Review Pack 2014/15 16,628 suppressions as at March 2015
RFI20151765	Public	Scotland	Calendar years		
			2012	94	
			2013	514	
			2014	2422	
			2015 (to end of Sept)	127	
RFI20141521	WDTK	UK	Jan 2008 - 31 Mar 2014	8,192	
RFI20140789	WDTK	UK	May 2009 – May 2014	8,380	
RFI20140238	WDTK	UK	Feb 2012 - Jan 2014	5,726	
RFI20130404	Public	UK	Jan 2008 - 11th Mar 2013	2,986	
RFI20130084	WDTK	UK	Jan 2008 - 24th Jan	2,716	

From: 540(2)
Sent: 08 July 2016 16:03
To: 540(2)
Subject: FW: WOIRA information disclosed under FOI
Importance: High

Hi 540(2) - you were going to check what WOIRA figures had been released. Can you let me know asap please as I'm just writing a Q&A for the release of information? I'm most interested in what figures have been released for the total amount of WOIRAs in force and when that was.

Thanks
540(2)

From: 540(2)
Sent: 06 July 2016 17:12
To: 540(2)
Subject: WOIRA information disclosed under FOI

Hi 540(2)

Our responses to FOI requests re: WOIRA since 2013 and our responses can be broadly categorised as follows:

- Cumulative figures for WOIRA claims across the UK from 2008 (the year we began recording this data centrally) to the date of the FOI request
- Cumulative figures for WOIRA claims across the UK for a specified period e.g. last 5 years

Whilst we have disclosed the number of WOIRA claims by year on three separate occasions (1xUK, 1xScotland, 1xN.Ireland), we have not released any information which, either by itself or in conjunction with other information available in the public domain, would enable someone to deduce the information contained in the Summary Report i.e. all headline bullet points and the breakdown of WOIRA address status (licensed or unlicensed).

540(2)

540(2) | BBC TV Licensing Management Team | The Lighthouse,
Media Village, 201 Wood Lane, London W12 7TQ | Mobex: 540(2) Tel: 540(2)