

Minutes

Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) – National Advisory Group

Date and time: 28 May 2020, 12:30 – 14:00

Attendees:

Tony Porter (TP) – Surveillance Camera Commissioner (SCC) (Chair)

Chief Constable Charlie Hall (CH) – NPCC ANPR Lead – Hertfordshire Constabulary

Hannah Hall (HH) – NPCC ANPR Portfolio

Paul Dutton (PDU) – The Association of Police and Crime Commissioners (APCC)

Mark Jones (MJ) – Information Commissioner’s Office (ICO)

Lianne Parkinson (LP) – Driver and Vehicle Licensing Agency (DVLA)

Mark Burns-Williamson (MBW) – Police and Crime Commissioner, West Yorkshire

Claire Rush (LP) – DVLA

Sam Smith (SS) – MedConfidential

William Perrin (WP) – Talk About Local

Professor Lorna Woods (LW) – Essex University

Andy Gilks (AG) – Director of Information, Hertfordshire/Bedfordshire/Cambridgeshire Police

Bill Mandeville (BM) – Delivery Manager – National Police System, Home Office Digital, Data and Technology

Jamie Hassall (JH) – Highways England

Philip Darwent (PD) – Metropolitan Police Service

Mick Kelly (MK) – SCC Office

Olahan Akande (OA) – SCC Office

Katie Scotton (KS) – SCC Office

Apologies:

Carl Jennings – Home Office Data and Identity Directorate

Gracie Bradley – Liberty

Hannah Couchman – Liberty

Jack Cousens – The AA

Richard Taylor – Highways England

Steve Wright – ICO

Dr Rachel Adams – Human Sciences Research Council

Welcome and Introductions

1. TP welcomed everyone to the meeting and the group members introduced themselves.

Minutes of last meeting and summary of matters arising

2. Due to the timescales, the below minutes of the last meeting were emailed to members of the IAG group for observations and comments are to be sent to the SCC team.
3. **Action 1: MK to draft a letter from the SCC to go to parish councils to remind them of their responsibilities under the Protection of Freedoms Act 2012. MK will discuss distribution of this letter with the National Association of Local Councils.**

This action has been discharged.

4. **Action 2: The SCC team to collate the views from the IAG on green number plates and feed these into the consultation response from the SCC. IAG members are encouraged to send in their own responses where appropriate.**

This action has been discharged.

5. **Action 3: The IAG group agreed that CC Hall should write a letter to police forces about the speedwatch issue. It was later agreed that the letter would be sent from the SCC.**

This action has been discharged.

6. **Action 4: The IAG group agreed that information on the speedwatch issue would be communicated to police and crime commissioners.**

This action is ongoing.

7. **Action 5: LP to find out whether the DVLA has been approached by any speedwatch organisation for vehicle keeper data and feedback to the group.**

This action has been discharged.

8. **Action 6: HH and AG made a commitment that the police would re-present the NAS DPIA to the IAG group once it has been finalised.**

This action has been discharged.

9. **Action 7: TP will take up the issue of independent analysis of the data coming out of ANPR with Charlie Hall.**

This action is ongoing.

10. **Action 8: HH to liaise with the working group regarding what evidence the police can supply on cloned plates.**

This action is ongoing.

11. **Action 9: HH to feed back to the group at the next IAG on ANPR value model progress by the police.**

This action is ongoing.

12. **Action 10: TP to engage with LP after 12 November 2019 to follow up on progress with gathering evidence on cloned plates and then decide if he will need to provide her with further support.**

This action has been discharged.

Working group on defective/cloned plates and impact on policing – recommendations

13. LP gave a presentation on the ANPR and number plate working group report and recommendations on defective/cloned plates. The key recommendations were divided into three main areas namely Prevent, Identify and Enforce. LP asked the IAG group for a steer on how they envisaged the recommendations being taken forward and through which mechanisms.
14. TP thanked LP for a comprehensive package of recommendations and asked about the views of the IAG group on the presentation.
15. JH suggested making the test about the MOT. Rather than changing the process, the focus should be on whether the number plate can be read or not thereby focussing on the outcome. LP responded to issues raised by JH about the MOT. LP explained that there were a number of MOT yearly failures based on the number plates. She suggested taking the issue forward with DVSA to consider what more can be done in relation to the MOT.
16. BM advised the IAG group about an ongoing process in the Home Office (HO) under the stewardship of the Minister for Crime and Policing, Kit Malthouse, looking at aspects of vehicle crime including cloned plates and suggested that the working group coordinate their work with the HO group.
17. BM asked for consideration to be given to how the report appears when it is presented outside of the IAG.
18. MBW made a couple of observations. MBW was of the view that it is important for the report to be disseminated in an effective manner in terms of implementing the recommendations. LP stated that the issues raised would be reviewed at the next stage and appropriate solutions found. TP stated that when the report is issued, the group would ensure that the issues raised were properly addressed.
19. WP was of the view that the issues raised by the working group report should be directed to the HO Online Harms team. WP suggested that a copyrighted symbol could be put on the number plate. TP asked if the certification proposals by the working group would address people circumventing the requirements. LP's view was there was currently a gap in enforcement if people are operating outside the UK. The DVLA is working to resolve these issues. LP was of the opinion that working with the Online Harms team would help towards tackling the issue and framing new legislation.
20. HH raised the issue of understanding the work the group had achieved in building the evidence base to support the report's recommendations and offered the support of the National ANPR Portfolio in bringing together work within policing.
21. LP welcomed this input regarding the evidence base for cloned plates.
22. TP proposed supporting the recommendation by writing a letter to Home Office Ministers recommending a cross governmental steer and linking the report to the work of the Online Harms team.
23. CC Hall was supportive of the report's recommendations and was of the opinion that the cross governmental steer would be helpful and that we need to sight Ministers on this important work. He suggested that this could be tabled at the event BM mentioned but a letter ahead of that to relevant Ministers is also needed.

24. MBW welcomed the report and stated that the APCC was keen to progress the report.
25. MBW discussed the issue of serious crime and county lines during the pandemic and whether there was any relevant data that could be drawn out in regard to ANPR and fed in to the report as evidence.
26. CC Hall stated that the police would have a detailed look at the county lines information and what could usefully be included.
27. TP proposed that he, MBW and CH put together a collaborative approach to Kit Malthouse for consideration which would also involve DVLA.
28. LP stated that the DVLA was in support of the proposition and would be briefing DfT Ministers on the development.

Action 1: The SCC office will coordinate a joined-up approach to the working group being convened by Kit Malthouse to ensure that we can table the report and the work effectively. There will need to be some collaboration between the SCC, CH, MBW and DVLA for this to happen.

Action 2: The DVLA team led by LP will put together a branded report on the submission of the working group. MK and LP to discuss.

Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) and Ultra Low Emission Zone (ULEZ)

29. PD gave a presentation on the MPS proposal to link into the expanded Ultra Low Emission Zone (ULEZ) in London. The report focussed on the proposed ULEZ expansion area and the MPS plans around this, public consultation and steps to integrating reads from the new ULEZ cameras, compliance with relevant legislation and the timeline for implementation.
30. TP stated that he was grateful to the MPS for sharing their plans regarding the ULEZ expansion with the IAG. TP observed that the project demonstrated the successful implementation of ANPR and the IAG's independent oversight.
31. LW raised a concern around lawfulness including the basis on which TFL is establishing a surveillance system and purpose shift. LW had a concern about the intensity of the surveillance system in terms of the increasing numbers and was of the opinion that privacy concerns would be intensified if you are looking at residential areas. LW queried data sharing. Who is sharing, for what purpose and how long is the data kept? LW called for further scrutiny.
32. PD explained that TFL are responsible for siting the cameras so will be better placed to explain justification. PD stated that in regard to the MPS proposal for data sharing, the consultation will impact on what happens next. There is an ongoing dialogue with the community around ANPR. On data access, the MPS have a centralised system for accessing ANPR, which restricts access to a limited number of police personnel.
33. LW asked how the MPS take into account the scale of the ULEZ scheme in its entirety.
34. PD explained that because of the prevalence of CCTV and high-profile schemes such as the congestion zone, there is already an understanding among drivers in London that ANPR cameras are likely to capture vehicle registration numbers. He proposed that the expansion is an incremental change to Londoners.
35. LW asked if the IAG group has spoken to TFL on the ULEZ issue. TP stated that the IAG had not contacted TFL on this specific issue. TP asked if the ICO position has changed in relation to necessity and proportionality in relation to this kind of issues over time.

36. PD stated that as a result of the integrated ring functionality, the ULEZ cameras would potentially allow the police to change the way they use ANPR in London in the management of serious threat and harm.
37. LW stated that the ULEZ expansion was a significant step in terms of intrusion and has consequences that will need to be looked at.
38. PD explained that the margin of impact on individuals regarding their privacy was limited but there was significant gain for law enforcement.
39. WP was of the view that this was the biggest step forward for surveillance since the Olympics in 2012. WP advised the MPS to seek clear democratic oversight. WP suggested that this could be done by going through the Greater London Authority. WP was of the opinion that some parts of the areas covered by the ULEZ expansion had a significant proportion of ethnic minorities who would be impacted by the changes and would require a robust equality impact assessment. WP was of the opinion that the surveillance might be disproportionate as the MPS would not have rolled out the cameras if TFL had not initiated the project.
40. PD took on board the need for democratic oversight but clarified this would be a matter for MOPAC not the MPS to consider. PD acknowledged the importance of the question raised by WP on the ethnicity balance of those impacted. PD explained that the TFL cameras cover all parts of London with a mixture of ethnic groups and that focusing on ethnicity was not the intention. TFL are in charge of the data capture and MPS staff would only be accessing the data when it was required for law enforcement purposes. PD stated that if reads from the cameras are made available, the MPS would seek to use them for policing purposes.
41. TP stressed the importance of consultation and democratic oversight and tasked the SCC team to liaise with Professor William Webster, National Surveillance Camera Strategy, Civil Engagement strand lead in regard to engaging with MPS on the London ULEZ expansion.

Action 3: The SCC team to liaise with Professor William Webster, National Surveillance Camera Strategy, Civil Engagement strand lead in regard to engaging with MPS on the London ULEZ expansion.

42. SS was of the opinion that the MPS needed to take a more active role in ensuring safeguards were in place for the ULEZ expansion rather than leaving this responsibility to TFL.
43. MJ stated that there are some significant risks that need to be managed and enquired if the proposition was an all or nothing proposition or was their capacity for the cameras to be switched on or off as business demands change. MJ advised the MPS to base their case not on the opportunities offered by the TFL system but on deficiencies in the current system.
44. TP stressed the importance of the group engaging with the MPS on the ULEZ expansion. The IAG group would like the opportunity to engage with the MPS on the DPIA, self-assessment tool and the consultation process. TP invited PD to the next IAG meeting to update on progress.

Action 4: PD to update the IAG group on the MPS progress in regard to the consultation at the next IAG meeting and also to present the DPIA and SAT for scrutiny via the SCC team.

Sheffield ANPR data breach update

45. TP stated that the report had just recently been received and subject to an investigation by the ICO. TP asked for the consent of the group in picking up the additional issues arising from the

incident including partnership and the complexity of the ANPR system to give the group a better insight.

Action 5: TP to provide written observations on the Sheffield ANPR data breach prior to the next meeting.

AOB

46. JH said Highway England would like to offer ANPR camera sites that were being made redundant to the police. HH stated that the police would investigate, where proportionate, incorporating some of the cameras via their national strategy group.
47. Time date and location of next meeting to be notified.

Summary of Actions

Action 1: The SCC office will coordinate a joined-up approach to the working group being convened by Kit Malthouse to ensure that we can table the report and the work effectively. There will need to be some collaboration between the SCC, CH, MBW and DVLA for this to happen.

Action 2: The DVLA team led by LP will put together a branded report on the submission of the working group. MK and LP to discuss.

Action 3: The SCC team to liaise with Professor William Webster, National Surveillance Camera Strategy, Civil Engagement strand lead in regard to engaging with MPS on the London ULEZ expansion

Action 4: PD to update the IAG group on the MPS progress in regard to the consultation at the next IAG meeting and also to present the DPIA and SAT for scrutiny via the SCC team.

Action 5: TP to provide written observations on the Sheffield ANPR data breach prior to the next meeting.