



Information Commissioner's Office, Wycliffe House, Water Lane, Wilmslow, Cheshire SK9 5AF.
T. 01625 545804 www.ico.gov.uk

From: Meagan Mirza
Sent: 27 October 2010 14:57
To: Steve Wood; Jonathan Bamford; Judith Jones
Subject: Crime Mapping overview

Steve/Jonathan/Judith

I've done a 'briefing' note on crime mapping (attached) which may be helpful background before we meet to discuss this in more detail next week.

Thanks

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

Crime Mapping

Prime Minister David Cameron wrote to Government departments on 31 May 2010 outlining the government's proposals to open up government data. The commitments included, amongst others, publishing crime data at a level that allows the public to see what is happening on their streets from January 2011.

Similar proposals were being considered some two years ago and the then Information Commissioner, Richard Thomas, wrote to the Minister Tony McNulty on 5 August 2008 to outline the ICO's concerns in relation to crime mapping. It was our view, and still is, that we fully appreciate the benefit of crime mapping as a tool to assist police in carrying out their functions. We acknowledged that publishing details of crimes may increase transparency concerning policing and enable closer community working however we highlighted the need to strike a balance between such public policy objectives and the privacy of victims.

In that letter we acknowledged that the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) and Greater London Authority (GLA) had taken on board our concerns to establish an approach which built in appropriate safeguards. In practice this meant that reporting on crimes such as theft or burglary or motor vehicles would be limited to 'lower super output' areas containing a minimum of 400 dwellings. Our view was that this significantly broadened the area to which the information related which minimised the risk of any intrusion into personal privacy. We suggested a higher threshold for offences such as racially motivated offences or sexual offences. We also noted that the MPS were intending to consult victims and we stated that the objection of a victim should certainly be taken fully into account before details of that crime are published on a map.

We also outlined our concerns in relation to point data mapping in that it had significantly broader privacy implications and that it would be similar to responding to an FOI request. We stated that each police force would need to be satisfied that there was a public interest in making the information available to the public at large e.g. that releasing details would be justified if it was the intention of catching a criminal in association with a specific crime. We stated that it was unlikely that the public interest and benefit of sharing point data mapping information would outweigh the risk of intrusion to the individual; particularly where the benefits realised may not be significantly greater than those obtained through providing information at street or higher level.

A recent Decision Notice FS50161581 (dated December 2009) related to a request for street level crime data from Greater Manchester Police (GMP). The request asked for, amongst other information, the number of burglaries which had occurred on two named streets in 2004, 2005 and 2006. GMP provided a range of reasons as to why the information should not be disclosed which included that one of its priorities is to gain confidence within the community so as to encourage members to report incidents of crime particularly when a victim or witness. GMP stated that people reporting crimes have an expectation of confidentiality particularly concerning their address, the information they provide and the type of crime recorded.

GMP stated that disclosure of burglary statistics for such a small geographical area and for such a small data set could potentially lead to the identification of, or speculation about, the identity of the person reporting these crimes. GMP's view was that disclosure of statistics at such a low level would result in an erosion of the public's confidence in reporting crime to the police. GMP also stated that there is evidence to suggest that where a burglary has occurred that crime will be repeated. To release the burglary statistics at street level for the specific time would increase the possibility that burglars could identify these properties and put the victims at risk of further crime. The Commissioner's view was that other factors would contribute to repeat burglaries such as local knowledge amongst criminal gangs and local media reports and the data does not identify individual properties and would therefore be of limited assistance. The Commissioner's view was that (in this case) the data stretched over three years and the risk would be greatest for a short period after the burglary.

The Commissioner was not persuaded by GMP's argument that victims of crime would not report incidents in the future should the statistics be disclosed as he did not believe that the statistics were of such a level of granularity as to erode public confidence. The Commissioner established that there are 13 and 83 properties in the streets named in the DN. The Commissioner's view was that the number of properties and the statistics are relatively small and was not persuaded that taken together they would allow for the identification of any individual. GMP argued that local knowledge would lead to individuals being identified. Overall, the Commissioner was of the view that this was not personal data which was being requested. It should be noted that this was a case specific decision and related to the fact that it was information in respect of one type of crime. The decision was not appealed.

We have reiterated our concerns more recently with the Home Office by stating that the main data protection concern with point data mapping is the risk of identification of individuals (whether that be victims, witnesses or vulnerable offenders) or indeed the risk of disclosure of sensitive personal information about individuals if they have been the victim of a racially motivated crime for example. We also advised that there is the potential risk of identifying individuals if the stats are compiled on the basis of postcodes as it can be the case that a postcode can relate to a single building or residence or school.

We suggested that consideration should be given to postcodes which relate to few homes being combined with neighbouring postcodes containing more houses to avoid the potential risk of identification. We also suggested that some crimes should be combined such as sexual offences or domestic violence which require a higher threshold to safeguard the personal privacy of victims. We also advised that consideration would need to be given to the timescales for displaying information which we understand will be monthly and we stated that we would not be able to endorse any particular model.

We were advised that the proposal is that some crimes will be combined to minimise the risk of individuals being identified and we advised that we were reassured by this. We understand that the data will be uploaded monthly and our concern here is that if only few offences (or indeed one) offence of a particular type has occurred in that month then the potential for identifying the individual concerned is increased.

In response to our concerns we were advised by the Home Office that the proposal which went to the Minister was that data will be published in such a way that ensures that the location of a crime cannot be narrowed down to fewer than eight properties. In order to do this the first option was that the crime would be approximated to the centre of a postcode but if the postcode contained less than eight properties then it would be combined with the nearest postcode area containing eight properties or more. The second option was to approximate crime location to the nearest street containing eight or more properties. In response we stated that we were reassured that the location of a crime could not be narrowed down to fewer than eight properties. Our main concern was for those areas which, for example, contained few properties in a postcode and we confirmed that the two options appeared to resolve our concerns in relation to this.

At the first Steering Group meeting it was stated that the ICO had informally agreed that we consider that publishing data at a level that does not narrow down crime location to less than eight 'postal addresses' to be acceptable. This is slightly different to the original proposal. The 'key decision' document accompanying the papers states 'eight properties' as opposed to 'eight postal addresses' and we have therefore asked for clarification on this. The issue of inaccuracy was raised at the SG meeting as if the proposal is to place the point on another street (if the side street contained less than eight houses for example) then this could feasibly be placed on another residence which would be inaccurate. We were advised that the 'point' would not be on someone's home.

It was also mentioned at the Steering Group that the ICO had previously indicated that 120 residences was as detailed as crime mapping could go but I've not found any reference to that here. I'm also aware of one force that has obtained legal advice and, based on the letter from Richard Thomas to the Minister, are refusing to upload data for the purposes of crime mapping. For this to go live in January 2011 data is required from Forces in November. There is a National Crime Mapping Workshop being held today for Force Crime Mapping leads.

Meagan Mirza
27 October 2010

Judith Jones Senior Policy Officer - Public Security, Government and Society

Information Commissioner's Office, Wycliffe House, Water Lane, Wilmslow, Cheshire SK9 5AF
T. 01625 545804 www.ico.gov.uk

From: Iain Bourne
Sent: 01 November 2010 11:01
To: Judith Jones
Subject: RE: Policy Delivery - advice request form

Ta!

Iain Bourne Group Manager – Policy Delivery

Information Commissioner's Office, Wycliffe House, Water Lane, Wilmslow, Cheshire SK9 5AF.
T. 01625 545325 F. 01625 524510 www.ico.gov.uk

From: Judith Jones
Sent: 01 November 2010 10:59
To: Iain Bourne
Subject: FW: Policy Delivery - advice request form

Iain

A little tricky to find – thanks to the generic “subject” heading!

Judith

Judith Jones Senior Policy Officer - Public Security, Government and Society

Information Commissioner's Office, Wycliffe House, Water Lane, Wilmslow, Cheshire SK9 5AF.
T. 01625 545804 www.ico.gov.uk

From: Policy Delivery Advice
Sent: 08 September 2010 14:57
To: Meagan Mirza; Policy Delivery Advice; Lyn Wibberley; Thomas Oppe
Cc: Liam Duncan; Judith Jones
Subject: RE: Policy Delivery - advice request form

Meagan,

I think your suggested approach is very much along the right lines.

There is considerable debate within the office about this, and some tension between FoI and DP requirements, particularly in the context of crime-mapping and the release of statistics about criminality.

We do not have a settled office view yet, but should be doing some detailed work on this in the short / medium term.

However, here are some pointers that you could use:

- We would always favour the use of partial postcodes over full ones, given the risk of identifying individuals - albeit, in context, the risk might be small.
- Full post codes can be personal data, the most certain example being properties with a single occupant and a unique postcode. Where a postcode is personal data, and the data controller may or may not know this, depending on the other information resources

available to it, the DPA's test of 'necessity' could not be satisfied where partial postcodes (not personal data) could be used as an alternative to full ones (could be personal data and in some cases will be).

- We cannot give the HO as definitive an answer as it might perhaps like. The postcodes issue itself can be complex, depending on numbers of properties sharing a postcode and the properties' occupants. However, I understand that 'brick' arrangements have been developed for use in medical research and other contexts that are intended to facilitate research (and presumably crime-mapping too) whilst minimising the risk of individuals being identified. HO should be encouraged to investigate these techniques.
- The other main problem is one of assessing risk / sensitivity. I can certainly see why someone who was the victim, or conceivably the perpetrator of, or a witness to, a 'sensitive' crime should not be identified with a particular property - even a multiple inhabitant one. However, what if an individual is only the victim of a car-crime?
- We cannot be expected to give definitive yes / no answers based on the nature / sensitivity of the crime, the risk to the people involved and the 'maths' pertaining to postcodes, properties and people. It is for the Home Office to do the research and to justify its use of full postcodes over partial ones - it may well be able to do this.
- At this stage it is also for the HO to evaluate the competing public interests of public access to information about criminality on the one hand, and the protection of individuals who have been the victims of crime, or have been involved in it, on the other.

Be careful, as I have said, about FoI issues - we have argued very hard against police forces, in particular, that have taken an overly conservative approach to the release of crime stats. We need to be careful not to derail our FoI lines by putting forward overly restrictive DP ones.

Hope of use.

Iain

Iain Bourne Group Manager - Policy Delivery

Information Commissioner's Office, Wycliffe House, Water Lane, Wilmslow, Cheshire, SK9 5AF.
T. 01625 545325 www.ico.gov.uk

From: Meagan Mirza
Sent: 08 September 2010 12:59
To: Policy Delivery Advice
Cc: Liam Duncan; Judith Jones
Subject: Policy Delivery - advice request form
Importance: High

Policy Delivery - advice request form

The role of Policy Delivery is to provide advice on novel or complex issues where existing lines to take may need clarifying, amending or new ones created altogether.

Once your form is submitted you will receive a response within 15 working days. If it is not possible to provide a full response within 15

working days an initial response will be given together with an estimate of the date by which a full response should be completed.

Name:...Meagan Mirza..... **CMEH Reference (if applicable):**.....

Date Requested: 8/9/2010.....

1. What kind of issue is it?	DPA	PECR	FOIA	EIR	Hybrid (if so, please state below e.g. Yes - DP / FOI)	Legal
Please indicate by stating "Yes".					Yes - DP/FOI	

1. What do you need advice on?

I am seeking advice on whether we have a line to take (either on the FOI or DP side) about the risk of identification of individuals through post code level data or small scale statistics. I'm not sure if there are any FOI cases on the issue but I understand that there was a recent case in Scotland in relation to potential identification of patients in relation to health data and we've also provided advice, on the DP side, to organisations on anonymisation through use of partial postcodes. Anything would be helpful to expand on our concerns about post code level data being displayed in relation to crimes (see below).

I have flagged this as urgent as the proposals need to be put before the Minister next Thursday 16th and I need to get an outline to the Home Office either today or tomorrow.

2. Please give us any relevant background and facts.

The Home Office are seeking our views on their crime mapping proposals. They are proposing to use the website <http://maps.police.uk/> to display, at street level, where a crime has been committed and the type of crime committed. Some Forces are already using 'point data mapping' however the proposal is that this will be rolled out nationally in January 2011 using the maps.police.uk site as the portal for forces to upload information to. DPP (Phil Jones and Liam) were involved with this issue some time ago and outlined our concerns in relation to risks of identification of innocent victims, witnesses and vulnerable offenders. I reiterated these concerns in a meeting I had with the Home Office on Monday which are:-

Risks of identification of victims of serious sexual offences, domestic violence, race related attacks which should be treated more sensitively – this may mean banding together some crimes to minimise the risk of identification. For example, one police force puts all these offences under one category of 'most serious violent crimes'. We've also said that if the area breakdown is based on postcode then they need to be aware of the risks associated with this ie that a postcode can in some cases relate to an individual building or school or indeed to a house in a rural area and that they may need to consider joining postcode areas together for some offences. We've also said that they need to look at the timescales for the data ie if they are uploading monthly then if there was only one most serious violent crime in that particular month that could lead to identification also. We therefore asked them to consider expanding the timescale in those cases.

3. Is there anything else we need to know? (e.g. the name(s) and location (s) of any documentation relevant to this request)

There are no relevant documents apart from some letters from 2008/09 outlining our concerns both to the Home Office and to some individual forces. Having spoken to the Home Office on Monday they seem to be aware of the data protection issues although hadn't considered the timescale point (above).

TO BE COMPLETED BY MEMBERS OF POLICY DELIVERY

Name:..... **Date of Response:**.....

4. Advice given

Judith Jones Senior Policy Officer - Public Security, Government and Society

Information Commissioner's Office, Wycliffe House, Water Lane, Wilmslow, Cheshire SK9 5AF.
T. 01625 545804 www.ico.gov.uk

From: Meagan Mirza
Sent: 08 November 2010 08:01
To: Iain Bourne
Cc: Steve Wood; Jonathan Bamford; Judith Jones
Subject: FW: Crime mapping

Iain

The Home Office have some provided an overview of their proposals which is attached. You will see that Rebecca has asked if we can provide our line prior to the next Steering Group meeting on the 18th. Having spoken to her late last week she would ideally like something this week if possible. The Minister is due to write out to all Forces and I understand that they want to understand our view before this is done.

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: Bradfield Rebecca [<mailto:Rebecca.Bradfield@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk>]
Sent: 05 November 2010 17:25
To: Meagan Mirza
Cc: Jaspert Gus; [REDACTED] Jonathan Bamford; Liam Duncan; Judith Jones
Subject: RE: Crime mapping

Meagan

Thanks for another useful conversation earlier in the week. I promised a consolidated document setting out our proposal for the publication of street level crime data. This is the same as set out below in our earlier exchange but I have updated some sections of the note to provide additional clarity and set out the further checks and safeguards that are / will be in place.

Thank you for agreeing to update your guidance and for noting the urgency of this. It is important that we have something in advance of the Strategic Group on the 18th but anything that you could provide before this time would be enormously appreciated. It would be really helpful if I could see a draft of the guidance before it goes out – do you think that would be possible?

As before, I'm happy to provide any further information that you may require so please do let me know. Whilst I don't see our proposal changing significantly, I'd be grateful if you could again keep any further circulation of this e-mail within the ICO.

Kind regards

Rebecca

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

From: Meagan Mirza [mailto:Meagan.Mirza@ico.gsi.gov.uk]
Sent: 15 September 2010 9:25 AM
To: Bradfield Rebecca
Cc: Jaspert Gus; [REDACTED] Jonathan Bamford; Liam Duncan; Judith Jones
Subject: RE: Crime mapping

Rebecca

Thank you for providing the further detail which is helpful to understand how it will work in practice. It is reassuring to see that the offences are being combined to minimise the risk of individuals being identified particularly those individuals who are the victims of or who witness those sensitive crimes such sexual offences/domestic violence/race related crime. It isn't clear which category the potentially sensitive offences would come under but I am assuming that it would be under 'violence'?

You have explained that the data will be provided by forces once a month. I note that this may become more frequent and that you would discuss any proposed changes with us and we welcome this. On the point of data being uploaded monthly, I would just reiterate the concern I raised previously in that if for example one rape was reported in one month in a particular area then it may be that having only reported that month's data will increase the potential of identifying the individual involved and consideration will need to be given to minimising the risk of identification in those or similar circumstances.

We are reassured that data will be published in a way that ensures the location of a crime cannot be narrowed down to fewer than eight properties. I note the two options that you've detailed and both appear to resolve the issue of those circumstances when a postcode relates to an individual building or school or in rural areas where there may only be a couple of residences within a postcode. It is also reassuring that crimes that take place in a park, forest or between motorway junctions will be assigned to the centre point of that landmark.

Overall, the proposals do appear to minimise the risk of identification of individuals however, as I mentioned previously, we would still need to consider any complaints that we may receive from individuals who may be affected by a disclosure.

I hope this helps but please let me know if you need any further information.

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: Bradfield Rebecca [mailto:Rebecca.Bradfield@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk]
Sent: 14 September 2010 13:52
To: Meagan Mirza
Cc: Jaspert Gus; [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Crime mapping

Meagan

Thanks for your note below and a useful conversation yesterday. As promised, please find below a summary of our emerging solution to the delivery of crime data at a level at which the public can see what is happening on their streets. As discussed, I will be putting advice to the Minister on this issue later in the week (hopefully tomorrow) and it would be incredibly helpful to be able to provide an indication of the ICO's views on the proposed approach.

What data?

You have explained the ICO's potential concerns around the publication of more granular data on crime such as sexual offences or domestic violence which would require a higher threshold to safeguard the personal privacy of victims and any witnesses. You suggested that potentially sensitive offences should be combined to minimise the risk of identification.

Taking this into consideration, it is our intention to provide the following data to a more granular level:

- Burglary (which includes burglary in a dwelling, aggravated burglary in a dwelling, burglary in a building other than a dwelling and aggravated burglary in a building other than a dwelling)
- Robbery (which includes robbery of personal property and theft from a person)
- Vehicle crime (which includes theft from a vehicle, and theft of a vehicle, but excludes interfering with a motor vehicle)
- Violence (which includes all categories of violence against the person but does not include possession of firearms offences)
- All Crimes (reported under a single category)
- ASB (includes the number of reports of anti-social behaviour that are made to the police, and where possible, to other partners. ASB in this context means all incidents of ASB as defined within the National Standard for Incident Recording).

These are the same categories as currently used on the national Crime Mapping website.

How often?

You have explained the need to consider the time scale for the display of information. The current proposal is for forces to provide this data once a month. We may work with forces to increase the frequency of this data in the future but we recognise the need to discuss any proposed changes with you.

How presented?

You have been clear that the ICO's primary concern with 'point data mapping' is the risk of identifying individuals (innocent victims, witnesses or vulnerable offenders) and have suggested that thought should be given to removing postcodes which relate to a few homes or combining them with a neighbouring postcode which contains more houses to minimise the risk of identifying individuals. As explained previously, Minister's fully agree with the need to safeguard the identity of individuals.

We are therefore proposing to release only anonymised crime data into the public domain. Data will be published in such a way that ensures the location of a crime can not be narrowed down to fewer than eight properties. This will be achieved by either:

Option A) Approximating crime location to the centre point of the postcode centroid that a crime took

place in (e.g SG17 5BA). If this postcode contains less than 8 properties, it will be combined with the nearest postcode area containing eight properties or more.

Option B) Approximating crime location to the nearest street containing 8 or more properties.

For both options, if a crime takes place in a location such as a park, forest or between motorway junctions it will be assigned to the centre point of that landmark.

As discussed earlier, this is an emerging solution that has not yet been discussed with Ministers. I'd therefore appreciate it if you could keep any further circulation of this e-mail within the ICO. I'd be really grateful for your thoughts on the above. As always, I'd be very happy to discuss anything with you if helpful.

Kind regards

Rebecca

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

From: Meagan Mirza [mailto:Meagan.Mirza@ico.gsi.gov.uk]

Sent: 10 September 2010 9:52 AM

To: Bradfield Rebecca

Cc: Judith Jones; Jonathan Bamford; Liam Duncan

Subject: Crime mapping

Rebecca

We agreed that I would expand on some of the concerns which I mentioned when we met on Monday but if there is anything further you need please contact me. Apologies for the delay getting this to you.

The main data protection concern with 'point data mapping' is the risk of identifying individuals (innocent victims, witnesses or vulnerable offenders) or indeed the risk of disclosure of sensitive personal information about those individuals if they have been the victim of a racially motivated crime for example. It is feasible that indicating on a street the location of a crime (sensitive or otherwise) could identify the individual or the family concerned.

As we also discussed, due to the way postcodes are allocated it can be the case that a postcode will relate to a single building (or residence) or indeed a school. Consideration will therefore need to be given to postcodes which relate to a few homes being removed or combined with a neighbouring postcode which contains more houses to minimise the risk of identifying individuals. I understand that 'brick' arrangements have been developed in respect of medical research which minimise the risks of individuals being identified and it may be worth considering these although I appreciate you are working to a tight timescale with this. We understand that some police forces such as the MPS have limited reporting on crimes such as theft/burglary of motor vehicle crimes to lower super output areas which contain a minimum of 400 dwellings (approximately 3 streets).

I understand that you are still considering the type of crimes that

will be flagged (or pin pointed). We discussed those crimes such as sexual offences or domestic violence which require a higher threshold to safeguard the personal privacy of victims and any witnesses. I understand that Hampshire have combined potentially sensitive offences together to ensure minimised risk of identification.

Lastly, you will need to consider the time scale for the display of information as, for example, data covering one month for some sensitive crimes could indeed also lead to identification particularly if there has only been a small number of a particular type of crime in an area or on a street for example.

As I mentioned, the ICO wouldn't be able to endorse any particular model however we could comment more generally if we considered that there appeared to be appropriate safeguards in place to minimise the risk of identification of individuals. We would however need to consider any complaints that we may receive from individuals who may be affected by the disclosure of this information.

If you do need anything further please contact me.

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

This email and any files transmitted with it are private and intended
solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

If you have received this email in error please return it to the address
it came from telling them it is not for you and then delete it from your system.

This email message has been swept for computer viruses.

Proposal for the publication of street level crime data – January 2011

What data?

You have explained the ICO's potential concerns around the publication of more granular data on crime such as sexual offences or domestic violence which would require a higher threshold to safeguard the personal privacy of victims and any witnesses. You suggested that potentially sensitive offences should be combined to minimise the risk of identification.

Taking this into consideration, it is our intention to provide the following broad data categories to a more granular level:

Burglary	Includes both dwelling and non-dwelling burglary.
Robbery	Includes robbery of both personal and business property. Excludes theft from the person.
Violent crime	Includes all categories of violence against the person but does not include possession of firearms offences
Vehicle crime	Includes theft from a vehicle, theft of a vehicle and interfering with a motor vehicle.
Other crime	All other crime types in a single category.
All crime	Total of the above.
ASB	Includes the number of reports of anti-social behaviour that are made to the police, and where possible, to other partners. ASB in this context means all incidents of ASB as defined within the National Standard for Incident Recording.

How often?

You have explained the need to consider the time scale for the display of information. The current proposal is for forces to provide this data once a month. We may work with forces to increase the frequency of this data in the future but we recognise the need to discuss any proposed changes with you.

How presented?

You have been clear that the ICO's primary concern is the risk of identifying individuals (innocent victims, witnesses or vulnerable offenders) and have suggested that thought should be given to removing postcodes which relate to a few homes or combining them with a neighbouring postcode which contains more houses to minimise the risk of identifying individuals.

We are therefore proposing to release only anonymised crime data into the public domain.

Data will be published in such a way that ensures the location of a crime can not be narrowed down to fewer than eight postal addresses. To enable this, forces will be asked to upload the crime category, the date of the crime, the location (through Eastings and Northings) and any helpful contextual information (suitable for the public domain). A central system will then approximate the crime location to the centre point of the nearest street containing 8 or more postal addresses.

RESTRICTED

If a crime takes place in any of the following public locations, it will be assigned to the centre point of that landmark:

Park	Picnic Area
Airport	Sports Ground
Railway, Tube or Bus Station	Ferry Terminal
Car Park	Hospital

What additional safeguards?

We believe that the above approach and methodology takes into full consideration your concerns and proposed mitigating safeguards. In addition, we are proposing to introduce / maintain the following additional checks and safeguards:

- Contextual and background information for the public – ensuring the public know exactly what information is provided / not provided
- Ability to feedback into the system about any issues
- Continual review and learning from this and other similar websites and legal developers (for example the recent FOI for GMP)
- Approved Information Assurance processes and practices to prevent the site from being hacked or defaced
- Potential HMIC inspections to support forces in ensuring that their local practices and processes are of a high standard
- Ongoing presence of the ICO at the Crime Mapping Strategic Group

Judith Jones Senior Policy Officer - Public Security, Government and Society

Information Commissioner's Office, Wycliffe House, Water Lane, Wilmslow, Cheshire SK9 5AF.
T. 01625 545804 www.ico.gov.uk

From: Steve Wood
Sent: 09 November 2010 16:43
To: Iain Bourne
Cc: Jonathan Holbrook; Meagan Mirza; Judith Jones; Thomas Oppe
Subject: RE: Crime mapping document for SL

Hi Iain,

Thanks for putting this together. A few comments attached.

It would be good if we could try and summarise the key lines at the start. As I see it they are:

- In most cases the Commissioner considers that publishing exact household level mapping pins will constitute processing personal data and is unlikely to be fair
- The Commissioner recommends that blocks and zones are the most privacy friendly solution and a strong public interest case has to be made for pins (not yet made).
- Timing – frequent publishing (lower than monthly) of serious crime data is likely to pose significant privacy risks. (Serious crimes should be published quarterly?)
- Plus what we say on the 'math' and the sliding scale.

I'm OK with the graph idea and the ranges you've set out below, I'd like to see this bit when you've finished it. I think we need to express some strong concern if "8 households" is set as a standard baseline for all crime mapping systems and all types of crime.

It is also worth looking at this FOI line we have on postcodes and personal data, the Tribunal took the view that: "We consider that the full postcode, that is the last two letters, would be sufficient for a living individual to be identified and we consider that the postcodes, in this instance, fall within ...the definition of personal data." I think the average number of houses per postcode is around 15.

<http://icoportal/foikb/FOIPolicyAnonymisingpostcodes.htm>

There may also be other risks that Police forces wish to consider e.g. risks to crime at commercial properties. We aren't commenting or discussing these, but if they were in an FOI case, they may be relevant factors related to section 31, that may need to be balanced against public interest (which we've acknowledged is generally there for crime mapping).

Happy to discuss further.

Steve

From: Iain Bourne
Sent: 09 November 2010 13:08
To: Jonathan Holbrook; Meagan Mirza; Steve Wood; Judith Jones; Thomas Oppe
Subject: Crime mapping document for SL
Importance: High

All,

Here's my first attempt at the ICO crime-mapping position statement / 'matrix of considerations' that SL asked us to do at our meeting on Friday.

The big problem is 'the math'. There are different views as to the 'safe' number for publishing crime-mapping stats - there seems to be an emerging consensus (+ relevant tribunal decisions) around the 8 - 15-ish household range - although some police forces want much larger areas. The real issue is perhaps numbers of people living in a crime-mapped area - average occupancy in UK = about 2.3 people / household, so if we could get to a figure of around 25 - 30 people as a 'safety level' then I think that would be OK. However, I don't want us to come out with a precise figure. Therefore Tom is doing an illustrative graph (like the children one we put in the personal info online CoP) showing numbers of people in a crime-map area Vs privacy risk. (bottom left hand corner = 1 person in one household = total risk, tailing off upwards to the right and showing that we are happy around the 8 - 15ish household / 25 - 30 people range, happier still with larger numbers of households / people. Suitably vague red to green shading will be employed...) That way I hope police forces et al will get the message re: what ICO is happy with, without us having to specify precise numbers.

We're also going to include some extracts from crime-maps illustrating privacy good, privacy bad and privacy just about OK types of crime map - again that should provide an insight into our thinking without providing a detailed spec for how we think crime-mapping has to be done.

Tinmescales here are very tight - we need to hand this over to Meagan on Thursday, so please let me have any comments today or before dinnertime tomorrow.

Tom - can you send round your graph and the crime-map extracts as soon as you've done them?

Thanks - I realise this may need more work but I wanted your views as soon as possible.

Iain

Judith Jones Senior Policy Officer - Public Security, Government and Society

Information Commissioner's Office, Wycliffe House, Water Lane, Wilmslow, Cheshire SK9 5AF.
T. 01625 545804 www.ico.gov.uk

From: Steve Wood
Sent: 10 November 2010 13:56
To: Iain Bourne; Jonathan Holbrook; Jonathan Bamford; Judith Jones; Thomas Oppe; Meagan Mirza
Subject: RE: Crime mapping v1.0

Thanks Iain, this looks really good now. As we just discussed – I think one final paragraph tackling the “8” issue a bit more squarely would be useful.

Rather than waiting for inevitable FOI requests I’m keen to discuss whether we should publish on the website as well (after the next meeting), does anyone have any thoughts? More of an SL than PD call given the stage the liaison is at.

Steve

From: Iain Bourne
Sent: 10 November 2010 13:12
To: Steve Wood; Jonathan Holbrook; Jonathan Bamford; Judith Jones; Thomas Oppe; Meagan Mirza
Subject: Crime mapping v1.0

All,

Thank you very much for your very useful comments - I think I’ve managed to accommodate them all.

I think this is finished now, but I’d appreciate it if some of you could have a quick read-through to make sure it’s OK.

Tom - thanks for your work on the diagrams and maps.

Iain

Iain Bourne Group Manager – Policy Delivery (we deliver!)

Information Commissioner's Office, Wycliffe House, Water Lane, Wilmslow, Cheshire SK9 5AF.
T. 01625 545325 F. 01625 524510 www.ico.gov.uk

Judith Jones Senior Policy Officer - Public Security, Government and Society

Information Commissioner's Office, Wycliffe House, Water Lane, Wilmslow, Cheshire SK9 5AF.
T. 01625 545804 www.ico.gov.uk

From: Meagan Mirza
Sent: 11 November 2010 09:49
To: Iain Bourne; Judith Jones; Thomas Oppe; Steve Wood; Jonathan Holbrook; Jonathan Bamford
Cc: Lyn Wibberley; Katherine Vander
Subject: RE: crime mapping v1.0.doc

Iain

Thanks for this really comprehensive advice document which is going to be particularly helpful in relation to the Steering Group but also more generally for those individuals/groups who may contact us separately about setting up something similar. I'm going to circulate it to our key stakeholders over the next few days and I'll arrange for it go up on our website following that.

Thanks again

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: Iain Bourne
Sent: 10 November 2010 15:57
To: Judith Jones; Thomas Oppe; Meagan Mirza; Steve Wood; Jonathan Holbrook; Jonathan Bamford
Cc: Lyn Wibberley; Katherine Vander
Subject: crime mapping v1.0.doc

All - final version - I hope - of the crime mapping document. Meagan - we inserted an extra 'headline' bullet at the beginning, dealing head-on with the 8 properties issue - hopefully of use for your meeting next week. I'm happy to make further amends if you want.

Thanks for your help everyone.

Iain

Judith Jones Senior Policy Officer - Public Security, Government and Society

Information Commissioner's Office, Wycliff House, Water Lane, Wilmslow, Cheshire SK9 5AF.
T. 01625 545804 www.ico.gov.uk

From: Meagan Mirza
Sent: 11 November 2010 15:04
To: Judith Jones
Subject: FW: crime mapping v1.0.doc

Meagan Mirza Group Manager – Public Security Group

Information Commissioner's Office, Wycliff 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: Steve Wood
Sent: 11 November 2010 14:59
To: Meagan Mirza
Cc: Iain Bourne; Jonathan Bamford
Subject: RE: crime mapping v1.0.doc

We may also want to tweak it after Meagan's meeting.

We also need to discuss publishing on the website, I'm not sure that I want to label it as guidance, we should **just** say that we have published our advice, as we are aware it is of wider interest and of possible relevance to other geo-data services. Perhaps give a short shelf life as we may need to review.

Steve

From: Meagan Mirza
Sent: 11 November 2010 13:03
To: Jonathan Bamford
Cc: Steve Wood; Iain Bourne
Subject: RE: crime mapping v1.0.doc

Jonathan

Can we have a quick word about circulation? I need to speak to Rebecca at the Home Office this afternoon as they've asked if we can hold back circulating more widely until end of next week.

Thanks
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: Jonathan Bamford
Sent: 11 November 2010 11:50
To: Iain Bourne
Cc: Meagan Mirza; Steve Wood
Subject: RE: crime mapping v1.0.doc

Iain,

This is most helpful and excellent work. It looks good will be helpful for those who are not crime mapping experts but with a passing interest.

I am keen that we agree it as a final version so we can circulate more widely. Meagan has e-mailed about this. I should send it to the Local Data Panel chaired by Prof. Shadbolt and will once it has been set in stone.

Jonathan

Jonathan Bamford **Head of Strategic Liaison**

Information Commissioner's Office, Wycliffe House, Water Lane, Wilmslow, Cheshire SK9 5AF,
United Kingdom.
T. 01625 545752 F. 01625 524510 www.ico.gov.uk

From: Iain Bourne
Sent: 10 November 2010 15:57
To: Judith Jones; Thomas Oppe; Meagan Mirza; Steve Wood; Jonathan Holbrook; Jonathan Bamford
Cc: Lyn Wibberley; Katherine Vander
Subject: crime mapping v1.0.doc

All - final version - I hope - of the crime mapping document. Meagan - we inserted an extra 'headline' bullet at the beginning, dealing head-on with the 8 properties issue - hopefully of use for your meeting next week. I'm happy to make further amends if you want.

Thanks for your help everyone.

Iain

Judith Jones Senior Policy Officer - Public Security, Government and Society

Information Commissioner's Office, Wycliffe House, Water Lane, Wilmslow, Cheshire SK9 5AF.
T. 01625 545804 www.ico.gov.uk

From: Iain Bourne
Sent: 15 November 2010 12:56
To: Meagan Mirza; Steve Wood; Jonathan Bamford; Jonathan Holbrook
Cc: Judith Jones
Subject: RE: Crime Mapping Advice

Thanks Meagan - I think these are all excellent suggested changes and I have no problem with any of them. In fact, broadening some of our points out slightly will make this advice note more useful in the other crime-mapping issues we'll no doubt get involved with. We can always make more precise points - e.g. not liking the 8 households approach - at the meeting itself. However, I suggest we do meet up tomorrow as planned to make sure we're all happy with this approach.

I'm glad I now know which way is up when it comes to increasing and decreasing granularity!

Iain

Iain Bourne Group Manager – Policy Delivery

Information Commissioner's Office, Wycliffe House, Water Lane, Wilmslow, Cheshire SK9 5AF.
T. 01625 545325 F. 01625 524510 www.ico.gov.uk

From: Meagan Mirza
Sent: 15 November 2010 10:34
To: Steve Wood; Iain Bourne; Jonathan Bamford; Jonathan Holbrook
Cc: Judith Jones
Subject: FW: Crime Mapping Advice
Importance: High

Steve/Iain/Jonathan/Jonathan

The Home Office have come back with some comments on the crime mapping guidance which are attached. Can we meet to discuss these comments as the next steering group meeting is on Thursday and the plan is to circulate this with the papers prior to the meeting. It would be really helpful to discuss these with PD to see if we are able to incorporate any of the suggested changes. I've asked Judith to schedule the meeting for tomorrow morning.

Thanks
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: Bradfield Rebecca [mailto:Rebecca.Bradfield@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk]

Sent: 12 November 2010 17:51

To: Meagan Mirza

Cc: Judith Jones; Jaspert Gus; [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Crime Mapping Advice

Hi Meagan

Following our conversation on Thursday, please find below the key comments / issues from my perspective. I've tracked some changes in the document which reflect the points below which I hope you will also find helpful.

- The document talks mainly about crime mapping and not much about crime data. As discussed previously, the data used to create the maps will be available for reuse after having gone through the sanitisation / filtering process. It would help to make clear that this advice applies to the data as well as the maps – I think this is partly dealt with in the 'secondary uses of crime maps' section but I've tracked a minor change just to clarify.
- The guidance uses 'pinpointing', 'pinpoints' or 'pins' to refer both to the practice of publishing exact household level pins (which we are not proposing to do), and the practice of display information as 'dots' throughout the document. I am worried that this will confuse forces a lot so it's really important that we clarify – I've attempted to do this in the document – see what you think.
- The above clarification is particularly important for the 'indicating crime scenes and levels' section. Based on your earlier advice (see attached) I think the point that you are making is that the ICO will not endorse / support dots on houses but that higher level dots / indicators could be ok depending on the other safeguards that are in place and the provision of clear information to the public about what the data / maps cover so it is not misleading. I've tried to rework on this basis but again see what you think and very happy to discuss. This section feels most significant to me.
- In the fifth bullet of the summary box, I think the point that you are making is that just because we are imposing a filter on the number of properties, doesn't mean that we have covered off all privacy issues – there are multiple other variables to consider i.e. timing, crime types etc. I got slightly confused when reading through so have redrafted slightly.

I hope this is helpful. Thanks again for early sight of the guidance. As you know, this advice is central to delivery of the PM's commitment so I am really grateful for the opportunity to feedback. I'd very much welcome a conversation with you on these points after you have discussed with your policy team on Monday. Gus and I would be very happy to attend a meeting too if you feel that would help at any point.

Rebecca

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

From: Meagan Mirza [mailto:Meagan.Mirza@ico.gsi.gov.uk]

Sent: 11 November 2010 1:35 PM

To: Bradfield Rebecca

Cc: Judith Jones; Jaspert Gus; [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Crime Mapping Advice

Hi Rebecca

We're happy to hold off circulating until then. [REDACTED]
so feel free to give me a call anytime before then otherwise I'll give you a

call tomorrow morning.
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: Bradfield Rebecca [<mailto:Rebecca.Bradfield@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk>]
Sent: 11 November 2010 10:58
To: Meagan Mirza
Cc: Judith Jones; Jaspert Gus; [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Crime Mapping Advice

Hi Meagan

I massively appreciate such a prompt turnaround and early sight of this and would definitely welcome a conversation later today. I wanted to ask though whether you would be happy for this to go on a restricted circulation to the Strategic Group first (before going to ACPO and Liam Maxwell etc.) so it can be used to inform the final proposal for January which is to be agreed by the Group on the 18th and communicated immediately after to forces?

Whilst we have informed ACPO and forces of our proposed high level approach to this work we have been clear that this will be subject to discussions with yourself and testing over the next couple of months. The sequencing of this therefore feels crucial to me and it would greatly help if we were able to write out to forces at the end of next week with our final proposal (in the light of your emerging advice), highlighting that you are issuing revised advice to the service, which can then follow straight after (so by the end of next week). Would that be possible?

Kind regards

Rebecca

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

From: Meagan Mirza [<mailto:Meagan.Mirza@ico.gsi.gov.uk>]
Sent: 11 November 2010 10:06 AM
To: Bradfield Rebecca
Cc: Judith Jones
Subject: Crime Mapping Advice
Importance: High

Rebecca

Please find attached our advice on Crime Mapping. I'm sharing this with you initially but am planning to circulate it more widely tomorrow ie with the Steering Group and with ACPO (and with Cllr Maxwell) and we are planning to place it on our website next week. It is very general advice and doesn't reflect the specifics of the current proposals but I wanted to share this with you first. I'm in the office for most of the day today and tomorrow so please ring me if you want to discuss.

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

This email and any files transmitted with it are private and intended
solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

If you have received this email in error please return it to the address
it came from telling them it is not for you and then delete it from your system.

This email message has been swept for computer viruses.

Judith Jones Senior Policy Officer - Public Security, Government and Society

Information Commissioner's Office, Wycliffe House, Water Lane, Wilmslow, Cheshire SK9 5AF.
T. 01625 545804 www.ico.gov.uk

From: Steve Wood
Sent: 15 November 2010 13:00
To: Meagan Mirza
Cc: Judith Jones; Iain Bourne; Jonathan Bamford; Jonathan Holbrook
Subject: RE: Crime Mapping Advice

Thanks Meagan. We can discuss further tomorrow as proposed. I also agree with Iain that most of their comments seem OK to integrate; the main issue is whether we lose the reference to 8 and just deal with this verbally, as Iain suggests.

In terms of dealing with data re-use/download issues, there is also the new open government licence. It is mainly for central government but other public sector orgs are likely to follow. The licence doesn't cover personal information.

<http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/>

We can also add something further about the data being expressed as blocks (e.g. ranges of grid refs), if the data is also available for download rather than a map view.

Steve

From: Meagan Mirza
Sent: 15 November 2010 10:34
To: Steve Wood; Iain Bourne; Jonathan Bamford; Jonathan Holbrook
Cc: Judith Jones
Subject: FW: Crime Mapping Advice
Importance: High

Steve/Iain/Jonathan/Jonathan

The Home Office have come back with some comments on the crime mapping guidance which are attached. Can we meet to discuss these comments as the next steering group meeting is on Thursday and the plan is to circulate this with the papers prior to the meeting. It would be really helpful to discuss these with PD to see if we are able to incorporate any of the suggested changes. I've asked Judith to schedule the meeting for tomorrow morning.

Thanks
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: Bradfield Rebecca [mailto:Rebecca.Bradfield@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk]

Sent: 12 November 2010 17:51

To: Meagan Mirza

Cc: Judith Jones; Jaspert Gus; [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Crime Mapping Advice

Hi Meagan

Following our conversation on Thursday, please find below the key comments / issues from my perspective. I've tracked some changes in the document which reflect the points below which I hope you will also find helpful.

- The document talks mainly about crime mapping and not much about crime data. As discussed previously, the data used to create the maps will be available for reuse after having gone through the sanitisation / filtering process. It would help to make clear that this advice applies to the data as well as the maps – I think this is partly dealt with in the 'secondary uses of crime maps' section but I've tracked a minor change just to clarify.
- The guidance uses 'pinpointing', 'pinpoints' or 'pins' to refer both to the practice of publishing exact household level pins (which we are not proposing to do), and the practice of display information as 'dots' throughout the document. I am worried that this will confuse forces a lot so it's really important that we clarify – I've attempted to do this in the document – see what you think.
- The above clarification is particularly important for the 'indicating crime scenes and levels' section. Based on your earlier advice (see attached) I think the point that you are making is that the ICO will not endorse / support dots on houses but that higher level dots / indicators could be ok depending on the other safeguards that are in place and the provision of clear information to the public about what the data / maps cover so it is not misleading. I've tried to rework on this basis but again see what you think and very happy to discuss. This section feels most significant to me.
- In the fifth bullet of the summary box, I think the point that you are making is that just because we are imposing a filter on the number of properties, doesn't mean that we have covered off all privacy issues – there are multiple other variables to consider i.e. timing, crime types etc. I got slightly confused when reading through so have redrafted slightly.

I hope this is helpful. Thanks again for early sight of the guidance. As you know, this advice is central to delivery of the PM's commitment so I am really grateful for the opportunity to feedback. I'd very much welcome a conversation with you on these points after you have discussed with your policy team on Monday. Gus and I would be very happy to attend a meeting too if you feel that would help at any point.

Rebecca

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

From: Meagan Mirza [mailto:Meagan.Mirza@ico.gsi.gov.uk]

Sent: 11 November 2010 1:35 PM

To: Bradfield Rebecca

Cc: Judith Jones; Jaspert Gus; [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Crime Mapping Advice

Hi Rebecca

We're happy to hold off circulating until then. [REDACTED] so feel free to give me a call anytime before then otherwise I'll give you a call tomorrow morning.

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: Bradfield Rebecca [<mailto:Rebecca.Bradfield@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk>]

Sent: 11 November 2010 10:58

To: Meagan Mirza

Cc: Judith Jones; Jaspert Gus; [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Crime Mapping Advice

Hi Meagan

I massively appreciate such a prompt turnaround and early sight of this and would definitely welcome a conversation later today. I wanted to ask though whether you would be happy for this to go on a restricted circulation to the Strategic Group first (before going to ACPO and Liam Maxwell etc.) so it can be used to inform the final proposal for January which is to be agreed by the Group on the 18th and communicated immediately after to forces?

Whilst we have informed ACPO and forces of our proposed high level approach to this work we have been clear that this will be subject to discussions with yourself and testing over the next couple of months. The sequencing of this therefore feels crucial to me and it would greatly help if we were able to write out to forces at the end of next week with our final proposal (in the light of your emerging advice), highlighting that you are issuing revised advice to the service, which can then follow straight after (so by the end of next week). Would that be possible?

Kind regards

Rebecca

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

From: Meagan Mirza [<mailto:Meagan.Mirza@ico.gsi.gov.uk>]

Sent: 11 November 2010 10:06 AM

To: Bradfield Rebecca

Cc: Judith Jones

Subject: Crime Mapping Advice

Importance: High

Rebecca

Please find attached our advice on Crime Mapping. I'm sharing this with you initially but am planning to circulate it more widely tomorrow ie with the Steering Group and with ACPO (and with Cllr Maxwell) and we are planning to place it on our website next week. It is very general advice and doesn't reflect the specifics of the current proposals but I wanted to share this with you first. I'm in the office for most of the day today and tomorrow so please ring me if you want to discuss.

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

This email and any files transmitted with it are private and intended

solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

If you have received this email in error please return it to the address

it came from telling them it is not for you and then delete it from your system.

This email message has been swept for computer viruses.

Judith Jones Senior Policy Officer - Public Security, Government and Society

Information Commissioner's Office, Wycliffe House, Water Lane, Wilmslow, Cheshire SK9 5AF.
T. 01625 545804 www.ico.gov.uk

From: Meagan Mirza

Sent: 16 November 2010 10:47

To: Iain Bourne; Jonathan Holbrook; Steve Wood; Jonathan Bamford; Judith Jones; Thomas Oppe

Subject: RE: CRIME MAPPING ADVICE - FINAL VERSION

Iain

Thanks for this. It reflects our discussions and I'll now share it with the Home Office. I'll check where the original 8 came from as well out of interest. As discussed, I'll speak to you next week about wider circulation etc.

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: Iain Bourne

Sent: 16 November 2010 10:16

To: Jonathan Holbrook; Meagan Mirza; Steve Wood; Jonathan Bamford; Judith Jones; Thomas Oppe

Subject: CRIME MAPPING ADVICE - FINAL VERSION

All,

I attach an amended version of the crime mapping advice document - hopefully it reflects this morning's discussion.

Iain

Judith Jones Senior Policy Officer - Public Security, Government and Society

Information Commissioner's Office, Wycliffe House, Water Lane, Wilmslow, Cheshire SK9 5AF.
T. 01625 545804 www.ico.gov.uk

From: Iain Bourne
Sent: 16 November 2010 10:49
To: Judith Jones
Subject: RE: CRIME MAPPING ADVICE NOVEMBER PD (2).doc - tiny typo

Thanks Judith. Have sorted out on our version too.

Iain

Iain Bourne Group Manager – Policy Delivery

Information Commissioner's Office, Wycliffe House, Water Lane, Wilmslow, Cheshire SK9 5AF.
T. 01625 545325 F. 01625 524510 www.ico.gov.uk

From: Judith Jones
Sent: 16 November 2010 10:43
To: Iain Bourne
Cc: Meagan Mirza
Subject: CRIME MAPPING ADVICE NOVEMBER PD (2).doc - tiny typo

Iain

Just a tiny typo in the first bullet point- we've corrected our version but alerting you because you'll want to correct it when you put this on the web/circulate wider.

Judith

Judith Jones Senior Policy Officer - Public Security, Government and Society

Information Commissioner's Office, Wycliffe House, Water Lane, Wilmslow, Cheshire SK9 5AF.
T. 01625 545804 www.ico.gov.uk

From: Meagan Mirza
Sent: 16 November 2010 11:46
To: Ian Miller; Tony Dixon; Liam Duncan
Cc: Judith Jones
Subject: Final version of Crime Mapping advice

Ian/Tony/Liam

Please find attached the final version of the crime mapping advice. This is not for circulation at this stage.

We'll be circulating it more widely within the ICO next week and we'll also be sharing with key external stakeholders such as the Cabinet Office, ACPO etc. It will also be going on our website.

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