OFFICE OF THE BIOMETRICS AND SURVEILLANCE CAMERA COMMISSIONER

Meeting Minutes – ANPR Independent Advisory Group (IAG)

Date: 20 July 2021

Time: 11:00-13:20

Location: Virtual

Attendees

Name	Role
Fraser Sampson (FS)	Biometrics and Surveillance Camera Commissioner, Chair of the Group.
Katie Scotton (KS)	Policy Officer for the Office of the Biometrics and Surveillance Camera Commissioner.
Olivia Cullen (OC)	Project Support Officer for the Office of the Biometrics and Surveillance Camera Commissioner.
Lorna Woods (LW)	Professor of Internet Law at Essex University.
Andy Gilks (AG)	Director of Information at Bedfordshire Council
Charlie Hall (CH)	Chief Constable for Hertfordshire Police,
Hannah Hall (HH)	Strategic Capability Manager, (National Police Chief's Council) NPCC ANPR Portfolio.
Phillip Darwent (PD)	Metropolitan Police managing the ANPR system and delivery of the ANPR service to CT.
Rachel Adams (RA)	Academic and expert in AI academics.
Will Perrin (WP)	Talk About Local
Mark Burns-Williamson (MBW)	Police and Crime Commissioner for West Yorkshire

Megan Goulding (MG)	Liberty
Sam Smith (SS)	MedConfidential
Emmanuel Andrews (EA)	The Policing Campaigns Officer at Liberty.
Lianne Parkinson (LP)	Head of Policy at the DVLA.

Agenda Items

- **11:00-11:20** – Welcome and Introductions
- **11:20-11:50** – Revision of Terms of Reference
- **11:50-12:15** – Update from Lianne Parkinson, DVLA, on recommendations made via the cloned and defective plates sub group (10 minute update + follow up discussion / Q&A with group
- **12:15-12:40** – Update from NPCC ANPR Portfolio Lead CC Charlie Hall (15 minute update + follow up discussion / Q&A with group)
    - Establishment of new national capability board
    - Update on the National ANPR Service
    - Information Standards
- **12:40-13:10** – Update from Hannah Hall on National ANPR Public Engagement Survey (20 minute update + follow up discussion / Q&A with group)
- **13:10-13:20** – AOB and Closing Remarks

Key Actions

ID	Action	Owner
IAG0721-01	Review the IAG Terms of Reference.	OBSCC
IAG0721-02	Include issues raised in IAG meeting in the BSCC's Annual Report.	OBSCC / KS
IAG0721-03	Liaise with the ICO regarding their membership to IAG.	KS
IAG0721-04	Raise ANPR misreads with Ministers.	CH

IAG0721-05	Provide more detail on how misreads in ANPR data could be actioned, and update on timescales for the 5 key recommendations to develop short term strategic change.	LP
IAG0721-06	Liaise with Home Office for internal observations on the matter of ANPR misreads.	FS/OBSCC
IAG0721-07	Provide another update to the group at the next meeting.	CH
IAG0721-08	CH to respond to the question raised by SS – are the police are seeing a lot of searches that bring back nothing i.e. the retention period ended before it was found to be useful.	CH/AG
IAG0721-09	FS/OBSCC to raise the evidential use of ANPR data with FSR and ICO.	FS/OBSCC
IAG0721-10	Repeat the national ANPR public engagement survey and assess whether the findings have changed and what may have caused this.	HH
IAG0721-11	HH to engage with the wider public and experts to further develop the survey.	HH
IAG0721-12	Produce an update on correspondence with councils on cloud-based speed cameras.	OBSCC
IAG0721-13	PD to provide an update on the rollout and efficiency of these ANPR cameras in relation to ULEZ once they have been implemented.	PD

Detailed notes

Time	Agenda item	Notes
11:00-11:20	Welcome and Introductions	FS welcomed the group and outlined his role as joint Biometrics and Surveillance Camera Commissioner.
11:20-11:50	Revision of Terms of Reference (ToR)	FS opened the group for discussion, beginning by focusing on paragraph 6 of the ToR. FS highlights the need for a more general description than 'accountably' for police non-compliance. CH agrees and explains that paragraph 6 is incorrect. **Action IAG0721-01: OBSCC to review the ToR**

		LW suggested addressing the issues raised within the group in the Annual Report as an accountability mechanism. **Action IAG0721-02: OBSCC to include issues raised in IAG meeting in the BSCC's Annual Report.** KS informed the group that the ICO have withdrawn their membership from IAG however, FS requests that the ICO remain members. **Action IAG0721-03: KS to liaise with the ICO regarding their membership to the group.**
11:50-12:15	Cloned and defective plates sub-group update	LP delivered a presentation to the group on ANPR and Number Plate Working Group recommendations. To note: • The level of ANPR misreads are proportionately high for the amount recorded, yet there is no regulation to reduce this. Causes range from the physical aspects of the plate, to the manufacturing and supply chain, to digital development and technological constraints. • The group focused on 5 key recommendations to develop short term strategic change. Manufacturing is important because it will drive accountability and raising standards throughout the entire process, and gaining insight on social compliance (e.g. avoiding congestion charges, clean air zones) is key to target the public in a way that can drive social change. **Action IAG0721-04: CH to raise ANPR misreads with Ministers.** LP highlighted the difficulties in being able to give timeframes for this work but says any regulatory change would take between 18 months to 2 years to deliver. **Action IAG0721-05: Provide more detail on how misreads in ANPR data could be actioned, and update on timescales for the 5 key recommendations to develop short term strategic change.** FS noted that ANPR misreads needs to be to be followed up with internal observations (Home Office). **Action IAG0721-06: OBSCC to speak to contacts within the Home Office for internal observations on ANPR misreads.**
12:15-12:40	NPCC ANPR Lead update	CH outlined the new national governance structure in place to provide oversight on the use of ANPR in policing

		and law enforcement. There is also Standards and Security subgroup that ensures ANPR is managed appropriately and proportionally in line with national standards. There is work being led by the Home Office that is looking at what further capabilities policing and law enforcement requires. **Action IAG0721-07: CH to provide another update to the group at the next meeting.** SS asked what, if anything, is being done about failed searches and the number of failed searches. CH explained that data can be preserved beyond the retention period where appropriate and justified – any other data is automatically deleted. AG confirmed that a record is retained if there is a legitimate policing interest in it e.g. it may be of any help in a criminal investigation. All other data is deleted after a year, and all of this information can also be found in the National ANPR Service (NAS) Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA) - DPIAs are in put in place to cover all uses of the ANPR data. Regarding failed searches, AG confirmed that if a non-existent vehicle registration mark (VRM) is searched the system would not return any data. **Action IAG0721-08: CH to respond to the question raised by SS – are the police are seeing a lot of searches that bring back nothing i.e. the retention period ended before it was found to be useful.** HH provided an explanation of search functionality on the NAS and highlighted how there is a National Auditor in place for it. WP raised issues with oversight of ANPR, and highlighted there has never been an ANPR select committee in Parliament, even though this is essential to national security. CH said the use of ANPR in policing and law enforcement is governed by the National ANPR Standards of Policing and Law Enforcement (NASPLE). The Home Office do not have access to this data – it is police owned. FS said he would like to explore more of the evidential use of ANPR data. He has regular meetings with Gary Pugh (the new Forensic Science Regulator (FSR)) and is going to be raising this with him and the ICO.

		Action IAG0721-09: FS/OBSCC to raise the evidential use of ANPR data with FSR and ICO.
12:40-13:10	Update from Hannah Hall on National ANPR Public Engagement Survey followed by discussion from group	HH reported that the NPCC ANPR Portfolio have run the first national ANPR public engagement survey to provide the public with the opportunity to share their views on the use of ANPR by policing and law enforcement. The survey ran for 4 weeks and was written in conjunction with representatives from the Home Office, SCCO and ICO. The survey was publicised nationally via police engagement channels, including force websites, APPC websites, and social media. The response levels were high with 96270 members of public responding. The outcome of the survey shows the public support for the use of ANPR by policing and law enforcement was very high – the highest level of support being for the use to counter terrorism. HH said the aim was to run the survey annually and could include the addition of further questions to support the work being led by the DVLA. The NPCC ANPR Portfolio considered using a professional survey company, but that this was cost prohibitive, however they were open to looking at again when the survey is re-run. **Action IAG0721-10: Repeat the survey and assess whether the findings have changed and what may have caused this.** SS advised that some of the figures may have been a result of what the public perception of ANPR. HH responded the survey did ask questions around the wider use of ANPR, by councils and private companies, but this could be developed further for future surveys. **Action IAG0721-11: HH to engage with the wider public and experts to further develop the survey.**
13:10-13:20	AOB and Closing Remarks	LW said that the previous Commissioner Tony Porter had raised the issue of a cloud-based speed camera being set up. There were some concerns expressed over this, and Tony had said his office would write to either the councils involved or councils generally – LW questioned what, if anything, had come from this. **Action 12: OBSCC to produce an update on correspondence with councils on cloud-based speed cameras.** PD gave an update on plans for Transport for London (TfL) to expand Ultra Low Emissions Zone (ULEZ) in

		October of this year, and the Metropolitan Police Service's (MPS) plans to utilize this data for policing purposes. The expansion will impact areas in central and outer London, covering the North and South circular roads. Consequently, this will involve changes in the connections between the MPS and TfL networks, which allow the transfer of images from TfL cameras to ANPR systems for the first time and bringing them in line with the National ANPR Standards for Policing and Law Enforcement (NASPLE). The sharing of imagery will ensure the accuracy of the data, but it will also create technical issues as the sheer quantity of data captured increases significantly. There may also be some concerns about the impact on privacy. The MPS' approach is now in three phases. Firstly, making sure they future proof against potential future needs. The second phase starts at the point the ULEZ goes live in October 2021 when the MPS will look to replace any 'like for like' cameras which will improve reliability. The third phase will be to be a strategic review of the entire London camera infrastructure to identify any sites that are either redundant as a result of the TfL changes or any operational gaps. Where there is case to show that additional coverage is operationally proportionate and necessary, a submission will be made under the internal governance process and the taking of the additional reads may be authorised on a case by case basis. Where new cameras are added the DPIA will be reviewed accordingly. This could lead to growth in capability and also reduction in the capability as they identify areas where the cameras may not be needed, leading to a measured growth in the capability. **Action IAG0721-13: PD to provide an update on the rollout and efficiency of these ANPR cameras in relation to ULEZ once they have been implemented.** WP said the potential outcome of this was a gargantuan increase of surveillance in London, where there is a strong set of democratic structures i.e. the councils, so the matter should be taken to them so that they know what is happening. There may also be a disproportionate effect on ethnic minority communities due to placement of the cameras – something that has already happened in the West Midlands.

		PD responded that every single site being considered will be reviewed in terms of its proportionality and necessity. Within the DPIA process there will be a requirement to look at this in terms of demographics and equality. FS asked the Group to address any negative impact the public may believe this to have before they do, and to challenge the police to 'prove a negative' i.e. to prove that X (whatever the public are afraid of/concerned about) is not what is being done. FS closed by thanking the Group for their time.