



National Offender
Management Service

the
Parole
Board

working with others
to protect the public

Streamlining Parole Together

END TO END REVIEW PROGRAMME

Stakeholder Engagement Exercise

This Stakeholder exercise begins on 17/10/ 2013 and ends on 08/11/2013

About this engagement exercise

- To:** Stakeholders involved or have an interest in the parole process for indeterminate sentence prisoners.
- Duration:** From 17 October 2013 to 08 November 2013 [3 weeks]
- Enquiries to:** Email:
jointendtoendreview@noms.gsi.gov.uk
- How to respond:** Please send your response by 08 November 2013 to:
Email:
jointendtoendreview@noms.gsi.gov.uk
- Response paper:** A response to this exercise is due to be published by 31/03/14 at: <http://www.justice.gov.uk>

Contents

Opening introduction	2
Executive summary	3
Audience	5
The proposals	6
Response Form	19
Further information	20

Opening introduction

Since the introduction of the Generic Parole Process (GPP) in April 2009, both the National Offender Management Service and the Parole Board (PB) have made significant progress in delivering timely parole reviews for indeterminate sentence prisoners. Although we have absorbed a threefold increase in caseload, developed our IT systems to make the process paperless and put in place more flexible listing arrangements for oral hearings, there are still too many cases being deferred or adjourned in circumstances where this could have been avoided. This in turn has prevented the timely completion of reviews. We are determined to rectify this.

The Public Protection Casework Section (PPCS) in the Offender Management and Public Protection Group (OMPPG) and the PB have established a programme of work entitled ***Streamlining the Parole Process Together***, which involves a comprehensive end to end review of the GPP for indeterminate sentence prisoners. The aim is to improve the quality of reports being submitted to the Parole Board, enhance case management and ensure that processes are efficient and avoid duplication. We are committed to delivering a lean and transparent process resulting in effective, fair and timely parole reviews. .

A wide variety of stakeholders and practitioners have responded to our initial consultation earlier this year. This involved events, surveys and other initiatives through which we gathered ideas, suggestions and views on how to improve the current process. A record of all these ideas can be found on the Parole Board website at www.justice.gov.uk/about/parole-board.

This programme of work reflects our shared commitment to seek continuous improvements in the parole process and work will continue in the longer term, building on the NAO's recent assessment of the process.

Arising from this initial consultation, PPCS and the PB have developed a number of proposals we consider will improve the GPP. You have been identified as a stakeholder in the GPP process and you are therefore now invited to consider these proposals and feedback your views within the deadline.

We have set out an extremely ambitious timeframe for this review and we plan to implement changes to the process with effect from 1 April 2014.

Gordon Davison
Head of
NOMS - OMPPG

Claire Bassett
Chief Executive
The Parole Board

Executive summary

The NOMS PPCS and the PB have undertaken an “end to end” review of the parole process. The review is intended to build on the many initiatives already in place to improve the delivery of parole reviews. These initiatives include more flexible listing arrangements for oral hearings, the introduction of PB “intensive case management (ICM), the development of e-casework, recruitment of additional Parole Board members, the introduction of pre-tariff sifts and the piloting of video-links.

The review has set out to engage stakeholders and practitioners involved in the parole process with a view to:

- improving the quality of reports and information submitted to the Parole Board;
- identifying and removing obstacles to the effective and timely completion of parole reviews;
- enhancing case management within both PPCS and the Parole Board and identifying further enhancement of IT systems;
- eliminating inefficiencies, duplication and/or needless steps or processes that are preventing the most effective delivery of parole reviews; and
- making the parole process more transparent.

PPCS and the PB have undertaken a comprehensive review of the current parole system, including a detailed analysis of current processes using management information and staff, member and stakeholder experiences and interactions with the processes. We have identified blockages, rubbing points etc, and highlighted examples of effective practice in other jurisdictions. In particular, we have sought to address the significant problem of delays, unproductive deferrals and adjournments.

We are also looking at how we can improve the quality of reports and identify gaps in information at the beginning of the process, as well as early identification of cases where the review cannot take place as scheduled, for example where the prisoner would be in the middle of an offending behaviour programme.

We have also considered how we can engage prisoners and their legal representatives earlier in the process. We have considered the extent to which parole dossiers can be streamlined and avoid duplication. We are also committed to reducing the six month timescale for parole reviews.

We have also taken into account the recommendations from the Victims' Commissioner, in particular on ensuring victims are kept informed of developments of the parole review.

This engagement document presents the opportunity to redesign processes with the aim of improving the parole process and delivering parole reviews more efficiently and on time.

Some of the key proposals are:

- Early notification of the parole review to the prisoner, probation and prison staff in order to evaluate whether the timing is appropriate for the parole review
- A review of the content and composition of the ISP dossier with a view to streamlining the dossier and removing material that adds nothing to the Board's risk assessment;
- Staged delivery of reports to allow the offender manager to complete the PAROM1 having reviewed all other reports
- Engaging the prisoner's legal representative much earlier in the process
- Keeping victims informed of progress of reviews and ensuring a clearer process for their involvement
- More proactive case management on the part of PPCS, particularly in respect of reviews of ISPs in Category D, to ensure that obstacles to the progression of the case to hearing are identified earlier in the process;
- A review of the commissioning of psychiatric reports for the parole process;
- A review of information sharing with other agencies;
- A more consistent case management model by the Parole Board;
- A swifter scheduling system for oral hearings; and
- Better training and guidance for those involved in parole reviews

In the following pages, we set out the full set of proposals and are keen to receive comments and views on these proposals, including the impact the changes will have and the challenges that implementing the improvements will present.

On behalf of the Programme Board we would like to thank you for your time in responding to this Engagement document.

Russell A'Court
Programme Director
PPCS

Martha Blom-Cooper
Programme Director
Parole Board

Audience

This paper sets out for engagement a series of proposals and questions in relation to changes to the Generic Parole Process (GPP) for indeterminate sentence prisoners.

The exercise is primarily aimed at stakeholders who either have a direct influence over the GPP or who, by virtue of their operational standing, have a direct impact on the effective operation of the GPP. This includes lawyers representing offenders; Prisons and Probation senior management; and Parole Board members.

In addition to this key group, the views of other stakeholders are also sought, such as from stakeholders representing respectively the interests of victims and the interests of prisoners.

Finally views are sought in particular from offender managers and offender supervisors, as well as from relevant policy experts from within the National Offender Management Service and the Ministry of Justice.

In support of this engagement exercise, copies of the paper are being made directly available to following key interest groups

- Senior management – Prisons and Probation Trusts
- Senior management – NOMS, Ministry of Justice, Parole Board
- Middle management – Prisons and Probation Trusts
- Parole Board members
- Operational staff – Prisons and Probation, PPCS and Parole Board
- Probation Chiefs Association
- Special interest groups – Victims interests and Offender interests

The proposals

The proposals have been set out in stages, following the logical pathway of a parole review, as detailed in the Parole Journey (2012/13) document. A copy of that document can be found on the Parole Board website <http://www.justice.gov.uk/offenders/parole-board/end-to-end-review>.

We have also added a theme entitled “Managing Review” under which you will find details of the proposals that affect more than one stage of the parole review.

These proposals have been produced in conjunction with our consultation exercises and extensive general feedback has already been gathered and considered. We now want your views on specific aspects of the proposals. To highlight those aspects we have included a series of questions for you to consider when making your response.

Although you are welcome to respond to as many proposals as you wish, to help you identify the proposals we think will be of the most interest to the main stakeholder groups, please see the list below.

Stakeholder Group (A-Z)	Proposals of particular relevance
HMPS Establishment Staff	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 34, 35, 36, 38
Legal Representatives/Prisoners	1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 13, 14, 16, 17, 20, 22, 31, 40
Offender Assessment and Management (OAM)	4, 5, 8, 9, 10
Parole Board Members	2, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42
Parole Board Secretariat	2, 6, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41, 42
Probation Service	1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 16, 17, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 34, 35, 37, 38, 42
Public Protection Casework Section	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 34, 35, 36, 38, 40, 42
Victims	16, 17, 22, 23, 25, 42
Witnesses	16, 17, 22

Referral Stage

Here are our proposals for making changes to this stage of the process.

Proposal No. 01

We will consider the early deferral of cases where the prisoner is undertaking or about to undertake an offending behaviour course, or where a transfer to open conditions is imminent or a series of RTOLs is underway. This should be before the dossier is prepared so that reports are not prepared that will have to be subsequently updated with the outcome of the course.

Feedback question No. 01

How would this assist in stopping nugatory work on reports that will have to be updated? Is this the correct stage at which parties would be able to provide this information accurately?

Prior to Commencement of the Review

Although this is not a formal stage within the parole journey document, a number of activities do take place prior to the commencement of the review. Here are our proposals for making changes to this stage of the process.

Proposal No. 02

4 weeks prior to the compilation of the core dossier, a joint letter from PPCS and the Parole Board (to replace the existing Parole Board initial notification letter) will be sent to the prison, outlining key dates, asking for details of any outstanding offending behaviour courses and asking that legal reps are engaged at an early stage.

Feedback question No. 02

Would you find this early approach prior to the review commencing of benefit? Would it enable legal representatives to be engaged at an early stage? Is a joint approach from PPCS and the Parole Board appropriate?

Proposal No. 03

The core dossier will be prepared by PPCS one month earlier than the current target, but apart from the change detailed in Proposal 04, this will not affect the target date for the completion of mandatory reports.

Feedback question No. 03

Would the early preparation of the core dossier cause any problems?

Dossier Stage

Here are our proposals for making changes to this stage of the process.

Proposal No. 04

The target date for all reports, apart from the PAROM 1, will be reduced from 8 to 6 weeks to provide the Offender Manager with 2 weeks to consider all the information in the reports before completing the PAROM 1. (This should tie in with the next review date already being known from the previous review conclusion in post tariff cases). Full access to PPUD by all parties should facilitate this. This will result in two separate target dates as KPIs for prison and probation and will require guidance on action where other reports are not provided on time.

Feedback question No. 04

Would the OM find it helpful to see the establishment reports before completing the PAROM 1? Are there any obstacles to prison report writers preparing their reports 2 weeks earlier?

Proposal No. 05

The Offender Supervisor report (SPRL) will include all prison reports (apart from security, psychology/psychiatric reports) rather than having separate ones. The OS report will also include a section setting out ROTL progress and timetable (where applicable). This information would assist the Parole Board in assessing whether or not the offender has been/will be tested sufficiently in open conditions by the time of the oral hearing. (This proposal also relates to Proposal 01 – considering early deferrals).

Feedback question No. 05

Would the inclusion of prison reports into an overarching one from the Offender Supervisor cause any problems? Would the Offender Supervisor be able to provide the relevant ROTL information at this stage?

Proposal No. 06

Where a mandatory core document is not available, a template document will be placed in the dossier explaining why it is not available (e.g. with old cases where trial judge's sentencing remarks have not been able to be obtained, it is not possible to do so after 5 years from sentencing) and provide an alternative if available.

Feedback question No. 06

Where a document is not available, what alternatives would be acceptable?

Proposal No. 07

The OASys will be removed as a mandatory document as the relevant areas of risk will be fully detailed in the PAROM1.

Feedback question No. 07

Given the content of the PAROM1 and the SPRL, is the full OASys necessary in every case?

Proposal No. 08

The guidance for completing PAROM 1 reports will be revised with clear advice on what should/should not be included and potentially be a National Standard for NPS, covering all case types. In particular a Risk Management Plan must be completed in all cases, even if progression is not recommended. The guidance will provide details of what should be included in a good quality Risk Management Plan. There will also be improved processes for counter-signing and verifying the quality of the report, potentially using checklists.

Feedback question No. 08

Do you consider that the current guidance on PAROM 1s is detailed enough and if not what changes would you like made?

Proposal No. 09

In the core dossier, only post programme reports that have been produced since the last hearing will be mandatory reports. All SARN/DARNA/psychological/ psychiatric/therapeutic community reports will be mandatory documents in the core dossier. Course certificates will not be included in the full dossier. The OM and OS reports will confirm the courses attended and completed.

Feedback question No. 09

Consultation on this proposal has already taken place with PPCS and Parole Board case managers, ICM members and attendees at Parole Practitioner Forums. Do you agree?

Proposal No. 10

On receipt of the full dossier, PPCS will check that OM and OS reports cover all the issues, particularly Risk Management Plans, ROTL details, ongoing offending behaviour programmes and exclusion zones. This links closely with Proposal 08.

Feedback question No. 10

Are there any other steps that managers within prison and probation could take to ensure that all these issues are covered in the work?

Proposal No. 11

The establishment will take responsibility for chasing details of legal representatives rather than the Parole Board, and the dossier will include a confirmation note if no legal representative is to be appointed.

Feedback question No. 11

Would the transfer of responsibility for obtaining legal representatives from the Parole Board to establishments cause any problems? If yes, why?

Proposal No. 12

A more thorough approach to compiling the dossier will be implemented to reduce admin errors in pagination, scanning and photocopying to ensure the quality of the final document is acceptable. Wider access to PPUD will eventually allow stakeholders to view scanned documents.

Feedback question No. 12

Where should this quality check take place and what should be the criterion?

Proposal No. 13

Where appropriate facilities are available we will do more to enable legal representatives to make use of video-conferencing technology for the purposes of legal visits.

Feedback question No. 13

Would this be of benefit to legal representatives?

ICM Stage

Here are our proposals for making changes to this stage of the process.

Proposal No. 14

The Parole Board will undertake the first paper assessment (currently the ICM assessment stage) as soon as representations are received or within 28 days of receipt of the dossier, whichever is sooner. It is therefore essential that representations are submitted within 28 days of dossier disclosure, and NOMS will need to facilitate timely access for legal representatives to meet their client and prepare representations within the timeframe.

Feedback question No. 14

What are the issues with providing written representations earlier in the process and how can they be overcome?

Paper Review Stage

Here are our proposals for making changes to this stage of the process.

Proposal No. 15

There will be a smaller team of dedicated members to review the dossier at the first paper stage (currently the ICM assessment stage).

Feedback question No. 15

Does this present any issues for stakeholders?

Listing Stage

Here are our proposals for making changes to this stage of the process.

Proposal No. 16

The Parole Board will improve on the logistics of oral hearings to ensure realistic scheduling e.g. moving to a half day/full day estimate only, panel composition and options for chairing; suitability for video link or hearing some evidence by video link and ensuring other requirements are considered.

Feedback question No. 16

What else should be considered when scheduling cases, bearing in mind multiple participants?

Proposal No. 17

We will reduce the scheduling period of oral hearings under the current system. This will result in cases that become ready to list getting heard much sooner than the current three month waiting period, ideally within 6 weeks.

Feedback question No. 17

Is there any negative impact on those attending oral hearings if this period is shortened?

Oral Hearing Stage

Here are our proposals for making changes to this stage of the process.

Proposal No. 18

4-6 weeks prior to the hearing, PPCS will print out CNOMIS case notes (suitably redacted to delete the name of the prison member of staff who completed the note) add them to the dossier and disclose them to all parties. This will primarily apply to prison reports.

Feedback question No. 18

Do you agree with this proposal? If not, why not?

Proposal No. 19

4-6 weeks prior to the hearing, PPCS will contact the establishment to ensure that no new offending behaviour work has commenced, check whether there are any issues with ROTLs and check whether there are any significant developments that the Board should be aware of. This will be standard policy and will be reflected in Directions.

Feedback question No. 19

Consultation on this proposal has already taken place with PPCS and Parole Board case managers, ICM members and attendees at Parole Practitioner Forums. Do you think this would assist the process?

Proposal No. 20

We will introduce a check-point closer to the oral hearing to ensure all parties agree that everything is in place for an effective hearing. 4-6 weeks prior to the hearing, PPCS will contact the legal representatives and the Parole Board to ensure that all parties have the same copy of the dossier, although wider access to PPUD will make this step unnecessary in the future.

Feedback question No. 20

Consultation on this proposal has already taken place with PPCS and Parole Board case managers, ICM members and attendees at Parole Practitioner Forums. Do you think this would add to the process?

Proposal No. 21

We will review the make up of dossiers provided in IPP recall cases. PPCS will stop providing the full pre-release dossier avoiding significant duplicate paperwork being sent to Parole Board members.

Feedback question No. 21

What information from the original pre-release dossier should be presented within the recall dossier that is essential to assess the risk of re-release?

Proposal No. 22

Guidance will be provided on good practice and the expectations of those attending oral hearings in order to achieve a hearing where everyone understands the process and reasons why they are attending, and what is expected of them.

Feedback question No. 22

What should this guidance include?

Proposal No. 23

Guidance will be provided on the expectations for victims attending oral hearings, including around their attendance and participation in the process, taking into account the new Probation Victim Contact Scheme.

Feedback question No. 23

What else should this guidance include?

Proposal No. 24

The Parole Board will consider the flexibility of the panel membership and the possibility of 2 member panels, where appropriate, across different case types.

Feedback question No. 24

Does this present any issues for stakeholders?

Decision Stage

Here are our proposals for making changes to this stage of the process.

Proposal No. 25

We will improve communications with victims to ensure that they are provided with timely notification of Parole Board decisions, and dates of release or transfer to open conditions were applicable, together with an agreed format i.e. telephone call, email, letter, third party.

Feedback question No. 25

Does this present any issues for stakeholders?

Post-decision Stage

Here are our proposals for making changes to this stage of the process.

Proposal No. 26

We will make changes to the process for dealing with A/R of determinate sentence cases where a further sentence has been imposed in order to reduce the size of the dossier provided to the Parole Board where there is no prospect of release. The basic details of the position in such cases will be passed to the Parole Board for a paper review to be completed. The requirement to review all determinate sentence cases notwithstanding the length or type of any subsequent sentence is contained in legislation, leading to significant nugatory work being carried out by all stakeholders.

Feedback question No. 26

What information from the original pre-release and recall dossiers should be presented within the annual review dossier that is essential to assess the risk of re-release?

Managing the Review

Here are our proposals that affect more than one stage of the review.

Proposal No. 27

At any stage in the review process all parties should be notified of any significant developments so that the Parole Board can decide whether or not further directions or a deferral would be appropriate.

Feedback question No. 27

Would it be helpful to have a template for establishments to complete detailing any significant developments?

Proposal No. 28

Where a deferral of longer than six months is indicated the Parole Board will consider the option of concluding the case on the papers, to allow the prisoner to progress outside of the parole window, and the Secretary of State will be minded to set an early next review, taking into account timeframes of work to be completed.

Feedback question No. 28

Do you agree? Do you consider that there should be a maximum period for deferrals?

Proposal No. 29

All PPUD milestones will be reviewed and streamlined/simplified (in consultation with the Parole Board).

Feedback question No. 29

What stages/milestones do you consider add value to the process and which add no value? Are there any tasks/stages that are not currently captured by PPUD?

Proposal No. 30

Guidance will be issued to NOMS agencies on the importance and necessity of complying with Parole Board Directions, supported by the improved function on PPUD to log, monitor and report on compliance. Measures will be put in place to deal with non-compliance and hold parties accountable for the failure.

Feedback question No. 30

In what format would guidance be most suitable and useful for NOMS agencies?

Proposal No. 31

The Parole Board will provide clear and succinct reasons as to why it is making directions, to provide context to those providing the reports and to allow flexibility on the format in which the information may be provided. The new case management model will support good practice and improved consistency in this area.

Feedback question No. 31

Will more specific information assist report writers?

Proposal No. 32

The Parole Board will use a consistent template for Directions (which will include the name of the Parole Board Member) and ALWAYS set a deadline for each request.

Feedback question No. 32

Will this assist those who provide requested information?

Proposal No. 33

The Parole Board will ordinarily issue only ONE set of Directions for a review, and where additional Directions are issued, they will replace the original set so that at any one time only one set of Directions is in force. Wider access to PPUD will facilitate this proposal.

Feedback question No. 33

Will this assist those who provide requested information?

Proposal No. 34

Where reports are less than six months old the Parole Board will not ordinarily issue Directions for addenda from the Offender Manager or Offender Supervisor, and in particular where the OM/OS will be attending the oral hearing. (However, any significant event or developments should be provided to the Parole Board). Changes to the scheduling timetable and wider access to PPUD will support this.

Feedback question No. 34

Will this assist those who provide requested information?

Proposal No. 35

As part of NOMS' ongoing responsibility, on behalf of the Secretary of State, to ensure compliance with Parole Board directions, NOMS will further enhance the quality of its case management processes, including by effective collaboration with the Parole Board in order to remove nugatory work and reduce the number of hand-offs. We will also introduce shared management information on compliance at various stages.

Feedback question No. 35

What parts of the process would benefit from this approach?

Proposal No. 36

A new directions screen will be developed for PPUD to make it easier to track progress of each individual direction, and accountability measures put in place.

Feedback question No. 36

Consultation on this proposal has already taken place with PPCS and Parole Board case managers, ICM members and attendees at Parole Practitioner Forums. Would it assist establishments to access this screen to log progress regarding compliance with directions? What information would practitioners like to see on the new directions screen?

Proposal No. 37

Specific training will be provided to probation practitioners on writing parole reports that meet the needs of Parole Board members, including the revision of the existing Parole Dossier Resource Pack.

Feedback question No. 37

How would this best be delivered and by whom?

Proposal No. 38

A more consistent approach will be taken to managing the life of a review with as few people managing the case as possible, with possibly one member retaining control of the case up to the point of the oral hearing, where no conflict of interest arises.

Feedback question No. 38

Does this present any issues for stakeholders?

Proposal No. 39

Parole Board staff will have more delegated authority to determine administrative changes (as in other organisations such as MHRT), for example facilitating changes to deadlines, start times of hearings etc.

Feedback question No. 39

Does this present any issues for stakeholders?

Proposal No. 40

The Parole Board will consider setting Directions hearings where it would be helpful to progress older or "stuck" cases, or as a temporary measure to deal with the backlog cases.

Feedback question No. 40

Would this be a drain on resources if introduced?

Proposal No. 41

The Parole Board will review the possibility of issuing positive decisions on the papers for ISP cases, without the need for an oral hearing.

Feedback question No. 41

Does this present any issues for stakeholders?

Proposal No. 42

Reviewed and updated training will be provided for Parole Board members and Victim Liaison Officers (VLOs) to ensure that they have a clear understanding of the impact of the process on victims and how best to manage their expectations, taking into account the new Probation Victim Contact Scheme.

Feedback question No. 42

Does this present any issues for stakeholders?

This is the end of our proposals. To respond to any of the feedback question listed above, please complete and return the response form on the following page.

Response Form

Please complete this form electronically and return it to:

jointendoendreview@noms.gsi.gov.uk by 08 November 2013.

Hand written forms, responses sent in a different format or forms received after 08 November 2013 may not be considered.

Please use this section to tell us about yourself

Full name	
Job title or capacity in which you are responding to this exercise (e.g. DDC, Chief Officer etc.)	
Date	
Organisation (if applicable):	
e-mail address	
Are you replying as an individual or are you providing a collated response on behalf of your organisation?	My comments are my personal views / I have discussed this form with my colleagues and I am authorised to reply on behalf of my organisation. [PLEASE DELETE AS APPLICABLE]

Feedback question No. <i>Please enter the feedback question number you are responding to in the box below.</i>	My comments <i>Please provide your comments against the feedback question number (The box will expand to fit your response).</i>
	<i>[To add extra lines click on this box and press the tab key on your keyboard]</i>

Further information

Confidentiality

Information provided in response to this exercise, including personal information, may be published or disclosed in accordance with the access to information regimes (these are primarily the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA), the Data Protection Act 1998 (DPA) and the Environmental Information Regulations 2004). If you want the information that you provide to be treated as confidential, please be aware that, under the FOIA, there is a statutory Code of Practice with which public authorities must comply and which deals, amongst other things, with obligations of confidence. In view of this it would be helpful if you could explain to us why you regard the information you have provided as confidential. If we receive a request for disclosure of the information we will take full account of your explanation, but we cannot give an assurance that confidentiality can be maintained in all circumstances. An automatic confidentiality disclaimer generated by your IT system will not, of itself, be regarded as binding on the Ministry.

The Ministry will process your personal data in accordance with the DPA and in the majority of circumstances; this will mean that your personal data will not be disclosed to third parties.