

From: Meagan Mirza
Sent: 14 October 2010 13:30
To: 'Liam Maxwell'
Cc: Judith Jones
Subject: Email to Cllr Liam Maxwell re Crime Mapping 20101014

Hello Liam

I am in London on the 21st but I'm only there for the afternoon and am travelling back to Wilmslow immediately after the meeting. It might make sense to meet once I have a better understanding of what the proposals are as, to date, we've only given a broad view on some of the potential risks of point data mapping. You will have seen from our policing consultation response that we support the drive for greater transparency in relation to criminal activity locally as long as appropriate safeguards are put in place to take account of any privacy risks to individuals. You are very welcome to come to our office in Wilmslow as I'm not scheduled to be in London again until early to mid November.

Regards
 Meagan

Meagan Mirza Group Manager, Public Security Group

Information Commissioner's Office, Wycliffe House, Water Lane, Wilmslow, Cheshire, SK9 5AF
 T. 01625 545 621 F. 01625 524510
www.ico.gov.uk

Please consider the environment before printing this email

From: Liam Maxwell [mailto:liam.maxwell@gmail.com]
Sent: 13 October 2010 16:49
To: Meagan Mirza
Subject: Re: point data mapping

Thanks Meagan, I think it would make sense to engage with your office. If you are in London on 21 Oct then that might make a meeting worthwhile for us all. I am concerned that the remit of this exercise has become rather dissolute and so we may well be able to resolve through effective scope mangement.

Liam Maxwell
 Phone: 07967077294
 Diary: www.tungle.me/liammaxwell

On 13 October 2010 16:13, Meagan Mirza <Meagan.Mirza@ico.gsi.gov.uk> wrote:
 Liam

As discussed, please find below the ICO's view on point data mapping. This formed part of our response to the recent policing consultation and is also that which was reflected in what I've outlined to the Home Office.

"We also support the drive to provide greater transparency on criminal activity in local areas. The consultation document includes a commitment that, from

January 2011, crime data will be published at a level which allows the public to see what is happening on their streets and neighbourhoods. Crime mapping can be an effective means of letting people know what crimes are taking place in their local area and we have advised the Home Office and local forces on how such systems can be designed to take account of privacy risks - particularly when 'point data mapping' risks identifying individuals (especially innocent victims, witnesses or vulnerable offenders) or risks disclosure of sensitive personal information about those individuals if, for example, they have been the victim of a racially motivated crime or a sexual assault. We encourage the use of privacy friendly options that reduce the risks of identifying such individuals such as by merging adjoining postcodes in sparsely populated areas and banding together certain categories of crime. The ICO would be concerned if privacy risks arising from aggregation with other datasets in the public domain were not taken fully into account.

We recognise that there are demands from some quarters for even greater openness, with some people arguing for full disclosure of crime details as soon as possible after the event but it is important that privacy risks are managed carefully, especially as once this information is published on the internet, it is no longer possible to control what happens to it."

So far as engaging with us, we would be happy to meet with you to discuss this in more detail if you wish.

Regards

Meagan

Meagan Mirza, Group Manager - Public Security Group

Information Commissioner's Office, Wycliffe House, Water Lane, Wilmslow, Cheshire, SK9 5AF
T. 01625 545 621 F. 01625 524510
www.ico.gov.uk

Please consider the environment before printing this email

The ICO's mission is to uphold information rights in the public interest, promoting openness by public bodies and data privacy for individuals.

If you are not the intended recipient of this email (and any attachment), please inform the sender by return email and destroy all copies. Unauthorised access, use, disclosure, storage or copying is not permitted.

Communication by internet email is not secure as messages can be intercepted and read by someone else. Therefore we strongly advise you not to email any information, which if disclosed to unrelated

third parties would be likely to cause you distress. If you have an enquiry of this nature please provide a postal address to allow us to communicate with you in a more secure way. If you want us to respond by email you must realise that there can be no guarantee of privacy.

Any email including its content may be monitored and used by the Information Commissioner's Office for reasons of security and for monitoring internal compliance with the office policy on staff use. Email monitoring or blocking software may also be used. Please be aware that you have a responsibility to ensure that any email you write or forward is within the bounds of the law.

The Information Commissioner's Office cannot guarantee that this message or any attachment is virus free or has not been intercepted and amended. You should perform your own virus checks.

Information Commissioner's Office, Wycliffe House, Water Lane, Wilmslow, Cheshire, SK9 5AF
Tel: 0303 123 1113 Fax: 01625 524 510 Web: www.ico.gov.uk

COPY

From: David Evans
To: Jonathan Bamford
Cc: Christopher Graham; Steve Wood; Meagan Mirza
Sent: Tue Oct 19 16:57:05 2010
Subject: RE: Windsor & Maidenhead crime mapping discussion at the Local Public Data Panel
Jonathan

This is just a bit of further background for the meeting on Thursday in addition to what Steve has already provided

Hulya Mustafa is the Deputy Director of the CLG's transparency unit and I've had a couple conversations with her about the openness and transparency agenda in relation to local govt. I've now arranged to meet one of her team, Philip Worsfold (whose name is contained in the original email header) next Tues (26/10) to discuss using publication schemes as a means of getting more information from local authorities into the public domain.

As a secondary point I'd also be interested in learning more about these discussions from a local authority perspective.

Regards

David

David Evans Senior Police Officer
Information Commissioner's Office, Wycliffe House, Water Lane, Wilmslow, Cheshire, SK9 5AF.
T. 01625 545772 F. 01625 524519 www.ico.gov.uk

From: Meagan Mirza
Sent: 19 October 2010 12:13
To: Steve Wood
Subject: FW: Windsor & Maidenhead crime mapping discussion at the Local Public Data Panel
Importance: High

Steve

We've been invited to attend a Local Public Data Panel meeting on Thursday afternoon (see the detail below). Jonathan will be attending as I'm involved with the Crime Mapping Steering Group being led by the Home Office. The Panel itself is independent and was previously the Make Public Data Public Panel and seems to be very much linked in with the Transparency Board. Nigel Shadbolt is chairing the Panel. The Panel consists of Chief Execs of Local Authorities amongst others and advises CLG on transparency issues.

Windsor & Maidenhead are proposing to use point data mapping to report on low level crime and anti-social behaviour. They are also proposing to report on outcomes and have developed the software to do this. I understand that this is essentially what the meeting on Thursday will be about as they are keen to understand the ICO's views on data protection concerns (and they've also mentioned witness protection issues in the original email from Julie).

Jonathan asked me to let you know about it. Happy to discuss in more detail if you wish.

Meagan

Meagan Mirza Group Manager - Public Security Group

Information Commissioner's Office, Wycliffe House, Water Lane, Wilmslow, Cheshire, SK9 5AF
T. 01625 545 621 F. 01625 524510

www.ico.gov.uk

Please consider the environment before printing this email

From: Jonathan Bamford
Sent: 19 October 2010 08:52
To: Meagan Mirza
Cc: Christopher Graham; Judith Jones; [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Windsor & Maidenhead crime mapping discussion at the Local Public Data Panel

Meagan

As discussed if a Minister is involved in this we should be represented as there is plenty of scope for misunderstanding our view on crime mapping.

I can go to London for the meeting in the afternoon. If you can get me the finish time and background information that would be helpful.

Jonathan

From: Meagan Mirza
To: Jonathan Bamford
Cc: Judith Jones
Sent: Tue Oct 19 07:44:17 2010
Subject: FW: Windsor & Maidenhead crime mapping discussion at the Local Public Data Panel

Jonathan

Any thoughts on this? I can't attend as I'm at the Home Office at that time. I've copied to Judith as she is aware of the background re the telephone call from Cllr Maxwell and can fill you in tomorrow as I'm off.

Judith – can we have a word today.

Thanks

Meagan

Meagan Mirza Group Manager - Public Security Group

Information Commissioner's Office, Wycliffe House, Water Lane, Wilmslow, Cheshire, SK9 5AF
T. 01625 545 621 F. 01625 524510

www.ico.gov.uk

Please consider the environment before printing this email

From: Julie Wyeth [mailto:Julie.Wyeth@communities.gsi.gov.uk]
Sent: 18 October 2010 16:35
To: Meagan Mirza
Cc: Christopher Graham; andrew.stott@cabinet-office.x.gsi.gov.uk; Hulya Mustafa; Philip Worsfold; [REDACTED]

██████████nrs@ecs.soton.ac.uk

Subject: Windsor & Maidenhead crime mapping discussion at the Local Public Data Panel

Importance: High

Meagan

There is a meeting of the Local Public Data Panel here in Eland House on Thursday 21st October at 13.45 - our Minister for transparency, Baroness Hanham will be attending and we are keen for yourself or a deputy to join us for a discussion on mapping crime data.

The specific issue we will be discussing is in relation to work that Windsor and Maidenhead are taking forward with Home Office on mapping crime data using software they have developed for this. I understand the ICO is aware of this work but has concerns about data protection issues and potential witness protection issues. In a meeting with Cllr Maxwell from Windsor and Maidenhead he emphasised this was not what they wanted to do and he was keen to resolve this so we can move on in developing a project which is potentially a very exciting development.

I understand that although you are in London that day, you have other commitments which clash with the meeting. Hulya Mustafa has asked me to contact you to see if there is a possibility of being able to juggle diary commitments that day so you could attend, or whether it would be possible to field a deputy from the ICO for the discussion. The Home Office will be attending the panel meeting as will Cllr Maxwell and we hope to use the expertise available from the Panel to ensure there is a way forward on this. Our Ministers are also keen to help facilitate this.

Grateful if you could let me know what might be possible here and happy to provide further background information and look forward to hearing from you.

Kind regards

Julie

Julie Wyeth

Communities and Local Government

Floor 3/J3

Eland House

0303 4442542

This email and any files transmitted with it are private and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to which they are addressed. If you are not the intended recipient the E-mail and any files have been transmitted to you in error and any copying, distribution or other use of the information contained in them is strictly prohibited.

Nothing in this E-mail message amounts to a contractual or other legal commitment on the part of the Government unless confirmed by a communication signed on behalf of the Secretary of State.

The Department's computer systems may be monitored and communications carried on them recorded, to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes.

Correspondents should note that all communications from Department for Communities and Local Government may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for lawful purposes.

From: Liam Maxwell [mailto:liam.maxwell@gmail.com]
Sent: 14 January 2011 23:23
To: Meagan Mirza
Subject: Email Cllr Maxwell to ICO privacy tariffs for vanguard project 20110114

Hi Meagan

Thanks so much for the meeting on Tuesday, I think we all realised that we were pointing in the same direction which was great.

I am just getting some notes together on the meeting but one of the actions we agreed was that you and I would try to walk through the relative privacy tariffs for the offences in our vanguard projects. Please note that the crimes and asb we are going to cover are different to the ones identified by the Home Office NPIA stream of work.

Could you please help me with your views on what the levels should be for the spatial granularity and publishing frequency?

Also I thought Tim's question about scenarios would really help explain our reasoning as to why there are concerns about the publication. I have left that blank for your comments so please do add them in there.

If you could come back to me quite soon that would really help - sorry but Nigel and I have been back in the real world of our day jobs all week!

Liam

Liam Maxwell

Phone: 07967077294

Diary: www.tungle.me/liammaxwell

COPY

From: Liam Maxwell [mailto:liam.maxwell@gmail.com]

Sent: 14 January 2011 23:36

To: Meagan Mirza

Subject: Email Cllr Maxwell to ICO guidance document for vanguard projects 20110114

Meagan

here's the technical guidance we mentioned.

Liam

Liam Maxwell

Phone: 07967077294

Diary: www.tungle.me/liammaxwell

COPY

Crime Data - Guidance

This document outlines how one would apply the lessons learned in previous introductions of transparency to government to the issue of crime data and crime mapping. It contains the recommended best practice for making public data open and transparent.

It is important to note that this refers to the data – the mapping technology is a relatively trivial addition of functionality to the standard provision of data. If the data is correctly presented in a standard format then the functions required to meet the business/political objectives can be developed.

Aims and overriding principles

The reason for releasing crime data is in line with the transparency initiatives in other areas of public service - to enable greater accountability, greater engagement and greater efficiency by allowing inspection by residents, and reuse of the data in innovative applications, mashups, visualisations and analysis. It is an opportunity to describe crime activity in a particular area and allow people to compare their area with others. It will help the police communicate what their priorities are and enable members of the public to identify key issues and crime trends using the facts.

Publishing this data will also enable the public to become more involved in the detection and reduction of crime. Members of the public will be able to give police information on crimes that have been committed and help police as potential witnesses. They will be able to identify local trends themselves and prepare accordingly.

Used effectively crime data will enable communities to become safer, have more information on the issues of crime and antisocial behaviour in their neighbourhood and increase the interaction and enhance relations between residents and the police. This offers a situation where the police can achieve a strong growth in the level of public trust. It will also enable police to introduce smarter, leaner business processes around effective data.

The ability for a resident to view the progress of a crime committed against them through the criminal justice system is something we also want. It is something that will help social cohesion, trust in the criminal justice system and ensure a fair deal for every victim of crime.

Given this it is essential that Police Authorities publish their crime data (and other data too) with a licence and a format that allows reuse, and on the basis that data should be published unless there is an overriding reason not to. This means that Police Authorities should be asking, what's the most they can publish, not what's the least they have to do.

The focus of the guidance is on how, pragmatically, to make the data available quickly rather than seeking to achieve full alignment across every entity. This is consistent with the evolving approach within data.gov.uk. Publishing raw data quickly is an immediate priority, but there are significant benefits to be gained by Police Authorities publishing structured, regularly updated data using open standards, and this guidance helps enable this.

There is, however, no reason why, if they have the resources, authorities should not publish in more ways, or in greater detail than in this guidance. For example, some may start publishing

N Shadbolt and L Maxwell - Southampton University/Royal Borough of Windsor and

7/12/2010

the information as linked data (in which the data is semantically described using URIs), and we expect to include the successful practices learnt from such experiments in future versions of this guidance.

Licence, Timing & Contacts

Mandatory:

- Data should be published with with a licence that allows open reuse, including commercially. We recommend the new Open Government Licence <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/>
- There should be a nominated contact person, listed on the page linking to the data files, to oversee the publishing of the data, and this person should also be responsible for answering queries to do with the data, and requests for further information. This will not only increase the skill levels within the police authority and improve relationships with reusers, but also reduce the necessity of going down formal routes (e.g. Freedom of Information requests).
- Data should be published at the most frequent level it is supplied to the Home Office. This data is to be published in individual files, and there should be a single web page that contains links to the individual files.
- Files should be named in a consistent manner with the date included in the file name, and each file name should be unique. You should avoid spaces or characters other than a-z, 0-9, _ and -.
- Authorities may wish to publish the data at longer reporting periods e.g. quarterly, year to date, etc. There is no reason why they should not do this, but this should be in addition to the individual files.
- The Prime Minister has committed to publishing crime data at a level that allows the public to see what is happening on their streets from January 2011. We recommend that where possible data is provided from 1 April 2010. This will add value to the user and demonstrate commitment to complete transparency.

Recommended:

- When errors are discovered, or files are changed for other reasons, rather than 'silently' changing the file it is recommended to publish a revised and differently named version (together with the original files), e.g. 02_2011_v2, 02_2011_v1.
- The data should be published as part of a wider open-data initiative, and there should be a dedicated open-data page/section on the Police Authority's website (the recommended URL for this section is <http://www.yourforce.police.uk/opendata>), as well as listing the files at data.gov.uk.

Scope of Crime Types

Recommended:

For the initial stages of this project we recommend that the following give a range of offences that affect the most people

- Criminal Damage,
- Violent crime (up to and including GBH),
- Vehicle Crime,
- Burglary,
- Robbery,
- Public place antisocial behaviour.

File Format

Mandatory:

The files are to be published in CSV file format. Microsoft Excel files should be converted to CSV. The CSV file must have precisely one header line with field names as suggested. A comma character must separate values with a new line between separating incidents. Text values that contain a comma must have a double quote character at the start and end of the value. This format is the behaviour of Excel when using the "Save As" function selecting CSV as the file type. There should be no comment lines and no blank lines.

Authorities may wish to publish the data in additional formats as well as the CSV files (e.g. linked data, XML, or PDFs for casual browsers). There is no reason why they should not do this, but this is not a substitute for the CSV files, and PDFs in particular do not allow their contents to be reused. Authorities must take full responsibility for the content of their files.

Data content

The content of the published data should match that set out below. Any additional fields that an authority wishes to publish should conform to the general specifications (e.g. quoting values containing commas), and should be added after the fields listed here.

Body

This identifies the police authority to which the data relates, and means that the file is self-describing (i.e. all the information needed is within the file). It should be the URI that represents the police authority. It is a matter of urgency that such URIs are agreed unambiguously. In the case of UK police authorities, they should be of the form of <http://ABC.uk> (where ABC is the id for the authority). You should also add the name of the authority in a Body Name field to aid readability.

Data in the following format is already exchanged between police forces and other partnership and police management information sites.

Crimes

Crime_No	URN	This is the crime number as issued by the police force...
Date_From	Date	Start Date (systems record a start and end date. Sometimes if the offence is a one time offence either could be completed. We therefore have a rule that uses start date but if not present end date is the start date). The date must be in the UK format DD/MM/YYYY
Date_To	Date	End Date as the above in reverse
Time_From	Time	As per Date_From in UTC format e.g 11:49
Time_To	Time	As per Time_From
Input_Date	Date	Format as per Date_From
Offence_Classification	From list of 100+ offences	Criminal Damage, Violent crime (up to and including GBH), Vehicle Crime, Burglary, Robbery. In addition all incidents of public place anti-social behaviour.
Easting & Northing		The exact location will be "vague-d up" to a geo location roughly equivalent to a minimum 12 homes
Disposal Type	Outcome (Unsolved, Convicted etc)	Latest Disposal Type (e.g. Charged, summons or caution)
Disposal Date	Date of Outcome	Format as per Date_From

Public Place Antisocial Behaviour Incidents

INCIDENT DATE	Date
POSTCODE	6 or 7 digit exact code
SUB_CLASSIFICATION	From a list of types
INCIDENT QUALIFIER	
EASTING	The exact location should be given
NORTHING	
INCIDENT_URN	Unique reference number (cf URN for crime)

Crime Types

Each record may need further appending with a new crime groups and sub groups – such a field should be available even if not used (possibly as below shown as a rough % of total crime in one year for a typical non-metropolitan force)

Violence

1. Serious Violence (As defined under APACS terms) 0.6%
2. Robbery 0.8%
3. Sexual offences (NOT SHOWABLE TO PUBLIC) 1.5%
4. Assault with less serious injury (Defined under APACS terms) 9.7%
5. Common Assaults 7.3%
6. Public order and Harassment 5.2%
7. Other violence 0.9%

Burglary

1. House burglary 3.9%
2. Other burglary 6.2%

Vehicle Crime

1. Theft of motor Vehicle 1.8%
2. Theft from motor vehicle 6.3%

Damage

1. Arson 0.7%
2. Other damage 19.5%

Thefts

1. Shop Thefts 9.5%
2. Other Thefts 17%

Drugs 4.4%

Other Crimes 4.7%

From: Meagan Mirza
Sent: 26 January 2011 15:17
To: Judith Jones; Jonathan Bamford; Iain Bourne; Steve Wood
Subject: Email draft response for Cllr Maxwell for comment 20110126
Importance: High

Judith/Jonathan/Iain/Steve – Liam Maxwell has contacted me this afternoon. He is briefing the PM later this afternoon and I therefore need to get our view to him asap. I've drafted this based on our discussions this morning. Could you run your eyes over it and let me have any comments.
Thanks Meagan

Liam

Thanks for sharing your proposals and 'guidance' document with us. As we've said previously we very much welcome the drive to improve accountability through greater transparency and crime mapping can be an effective means of letting people know what crimes are taking place in their local area. However, as you know, care needs to be taken as this can potentially have an impact on the privacy of individuals such as victims or witnesses.

As we discussed in our meeting, this is a fairly new area and technological advances have meant that it is developing rapidly and the impact that crime mapping may have on an individual's privacy has not been properly explored as yet. It is therefore difficult to give specific scenarios for each type of crime that may impact on an individual's privacy. Also, we are not experts on the potential implications of this on victims and it may well be that consultations with victims groups may assist. Further, it is not yet apparent how this type of data could be exploited and indeed what the public perception is or will be once it is seen how the information can be used.

We agreed that it makes sense for different crimes to be treated differently and our starting point is that we consider the high risk areas (risk of identification of individuals) to be those crimes which occur at places owned or occupied by individuals. The Data Protection Act will come into play when there is a likelihood that an individual can be identified and this will mean that you will be required to comply with this legislation when processing personal data.

You have indicated that the privacy tariff for public place anti-social behaviour is low and we would agree with that and the frequency of data upload in this respect would also be low risk. However, consideration will need to be given to the privacy tariff for vehicle crime and criminal damage which is described as 'low'. That may be the case where, for example, the vehicle crime or criminal damage has occurred in a public space ie a car park but would be different for those occurring at an individual's home. We would suggest that there should be a filter to distinguish residential as opposed to non-residential and our view would be that criminal damage occurring at a residence should revert to snap points. An example which may support our concerns here would be where

individuals working in animal research have had their homes targeted. This, in your proposal, would appear on the day it occurred and the exact location thereby putting that individual at risk of identification and of further attacks.

It would also be helpful to clarify what the 'violence' category covers – it says 'violent crime up to GBH' but it is not clear whether that covers sexual offences, rape, grooming etc. You have said that 'the vanguards will .. not include those that include a very high privacy tariff – domestic abuse and so on' and it would be helpful if you could clarify that.

It is not clear whether the crime number/URN is going to be displayed at this stage. We will be exploring this in more detail with the Home Office in relation to the national Crime Mapper site but our initial concern would be that this would potentially lead to victims being identified. Until we know more detail on how this will work in practice it is difficult for us to provide a view at this time.

It was also not clear what the status of the guidance is – I think you had mentioned that it had been drafted for the purposes of the pilots by yourself and Professor Shadbolt and we do have some general comments on that. Neither the Data Protection Act or the Human Rights Act is mentioned in relation to legal duties and that should be incorporated as, as mentioned above, where there is a likelihood that an individual could be identified it will be personal data. It is not clear whether the guidance has been approved by the relevant Police Authority or who it is aimed to and perhaps you could clarify that.

Our consideration of your proposals is based on the fact that we are looking at risks of non-compliance with the Data Protection Act and this means that we generally have a lower appetite for risk. As mentioned above, we do appreciate this is a rapidly developing area and we have tried to deal with this pragmatically. You will have seen the guidance we provided in response to the proposals for the national Crime Mapper site and we will consider revising that if required. However, as a regulator, we would also need to consider any complaints that we may receive from individual/s affected by the disclosure of this data.

Apologies for this slightly rushed email – I note that you are briefing the Prime Minister later today and I wanted you to get this this afternoon.

Please let me know if you have any questions or wish to discuss in more detail.

Regards,
Meagan

Meagan Mirza Group Manager – Public Security Group

Information Commissioner's Office, Wycliffe House, Water Lane, Wilmslow, Cheshire SK9 5AF.
T. 01625 545621 F. 01625 545510 www.ico.gov.uk

Please consider the environment before printing this email

COPY

From: Meagan Mirza
Sent: 26 January 2011 16:00
To: 'Liam Maxwell'
Subject: Email ICO to Cllr Maxwell our views on vanguard proposals 20100126

Liam

Thanks for sharing your proposals and 'guidance' document with us. As we've said previously we very much welcome the drive to improve accountability through greater transparency and the release of crime data can be an effective means of letting people know what crimes are taking place in their local area. However, as you know, care needs to be taken as this can potentially have an impact on the privacy of individuals such as victims or witnesses and in turn engages concerns about compliance with the Data Protection Act and Human Rights Act.

As we discussed in our meeting, this is a fairly new area and technological advances have meant that it is developing rapidly and the impact that the release of crime data may have on an individual's privacy has not been properly explored as yet. It is therefore difficult to give specific scenarios for each type of crime that may impact on an individual's privacy. Also, we are not experts on the potential implications of this on victims and it may well be that consultations with victims groups may assist. Further, it is not yet apparent how this type of data could be exploited and indeed what the public perception is or will be once it is seen how the information can be used. You may wish to consider undertaking a Privacy Impact Assessment given that this is a new developing area and I can provide further information in relation to that if you wish.

We agreed that it makes sense for different crimes to be treated differently and our starting point is that we consider the high risk areas (risk of identification of individuals) to be those crimes which occur at places owned or occupied by individuals. The Data Protection Act will come into play when there is a likelihood that an individual can be identified and this will mean that you will be required to comply with this legislation when processing personal data.

You have indicated that the privacy tariff for public place anti-social behaviour is low and we would agree with that and the frequency of data upload in this respect would also be low risk. However, consideration will need to be given to the privacy tariff for vehicle crime and criminal damage which is described as 'low'. That may be the case where, for example, the vehicle crime or criminal damage has occurred in a public space ie a car park but would be different for those occurring at an individual's home. We would suggest that there should be a filter to distinguish residential as opposed to non-residential and our view would be that criminal damage occurring at a residence should revert to snap points. Also, the rationale for the frequency of upload for this will need to be considered as that is currently 'daily'. An example which may support our concerns here would be where individuals working in animal research have had their homes targeted resulting in criminal damage to their property. This, in your proposal, would appear on the day it occurred and the exact location

thereby putting that individual at risk of identification and of further attacks.

It would also be helpful to clarify what the 'violence' category covers – it says 'violent crime up to GBH' but it is not clear whether that covers sexual offences, rape, grooming etc. You have said that 'the vanguards will .. not include those that include a very high privacy tariff – domestic abuse and so on' and it would be helpful if you could clarify the extent of these other matters beyond domestic abuse. Also, it is not clear whether there will be a facility available for individuals to request that data be removed if there is a concern raised. This has been incorporated into the national Crime Mapper site and you may want to consider this.

It is not clear whether the crime number/URN is going to be displayed at this stage. We will be exploring this in more detail with the Home Office in relation to the national Crime Mapper site but our initial concern would be that this would potentially lead to victims being identified. This is because the crime number may have greater currency than just within the criminal justice system as this is commonly provided to insurance companies when processing claims. Until we know more detail on how this will work in practice it is difficult for us to provide a view at this time.

It was also not clear what the status of the guidance is and the role it is meant to play – I think you had mentioned that it had been drafted for the purposes of the vanguards by yourself and Professor Shadbolt and we do have some general comments on that in particular that it combines practical 'best practice' advice in relation to legal duties with a commentary about the value of crime mapping. This is potentially confusing. Neither the Data Protection Act or the Human Rights Act is mentioned in relation to legal duties and that should be incorporated as, as mentioned above, where there is a likelihood that an individual could be identified it will be personal data. It is not clear whether the guidance has been approved by the relevant Police Authority or who it is aimed to and perhaps you could clarify that.

Our consideration of your proposals is based on the fact that we are looking at risks of non-compliance with the Data Protection Act. As mentioned above, we do appreciate this is a rapidly developing area and we have tried to deal with this pragmatically. You will have seen the guidance we provided in response to the proposals for the national Crime Mapper site and we will consider revising that if required. However, as a regulator, we would also need to consider any complaints that we may receive from individual/s affected by the disclosure of this data.

Apologies for this slightly rushed email – I note that you are briefing the Prime Minister later today and I wanted you to get this this afternoon.

Please let me know if you have any questions or wish to discuss in more detail.

Regards,
Meagan

Meagan Mirza Group Manager – Public Security Group

Information Commissioner's Office, Wycliffe House, Water Lane, Wilmslow, Cheshire SK9 5AF.
T. 01625 545621 F. 01625 545510 www.ico.gov.uk

Please consider the environment before printing this email

From: Meagan Mirza
Sent: 25 January 2011 08:47
To: 'Liam Maxwell'
Subject: RE: Guidance

Thanks Liam.
Meagan

Meagan Mirza Group Manager – Public Security Group

Information Commissioner's Office, Wycliffe House, Water Lane, Wilmslow, Cheshire SK9 5AF.
T. 01625 545621 F. 01625 545510 www.ico.gov.uk

Please consider the environment before printing this email

From: Liam Maxwell [mailto:liam.maxwell@gmail.com]
Sent: 14 January 2011 23:36
To: Meagan Mirza
Subject: Guidance

Meagan
here's the technical guidance we mentioned.
Liam
Liam Maxwell
Phone: 0796707729
Diary: www.tungl.me/liammaxwell