

NATIONAL SAFETY CAMERA PARTNERSHIP FOI WORKSHOP

22 April, 17 May, 22 June 2004, Stratfield Turgis, Hampshire

INFORMATION HELD BY SAFETY CAMERA PARTNERSHIPS

TYPE OF DATA	CONCERNS	PROPOSAL	FORMAT?
1. CASUALTY DATA			
a. Benchmark casualty (or collision) data for each site	None for new sites. Some concern re 15% and legacy sites because of potential public misunderstanding regarding different site status.	RELEASE BENCHMARK DATA for all sites. For existing sites, data released must make it clear that criteria were met at time of site creation.... For 15% sites it should be clear that these are accepted by DfT as community concern sites.	Copyright issues of maps should be addressed. Some concerns re size of files needed and time reqd to download. The group felt that GIS data would be time consuming and there may be copyright issues. It was agreed that collision locations be given as coordinates, and that casualty data itself be tabular.

<p>b. Updated casualty (or collision) data for each site</p>	<p>It was felt that Partnerships should be up-front about casualty data even if the reduction was lower than we had hoped for.</p>	<p>RELEASE DATA. It was agreed that annual reviews including casualty updates should be provided once a year, and that, time and capacity permitting, Partnerships would try to release 6 month data halfway through the year based on the PA return. In the event of such a release, these 6 month figures should be accompanied by two caveats: 1, that the data is subject to audit and change in the future, and 2. that the data needs to be understood in the context of longer periods i.e. that six months' worth of work could be misleading. Partnerships must also point out that the PA data is based on KSI casualties and distinguish these from the KSI collisions upon which sites were initially selected.</p>	<p>Either actual numbers or percentages.</p>
<p>c. Individual accident reports (including causation factors)/ Stats 19 data</p>	<p>Data protection issues of individuals involved in incidents, as high profile fatal casualties may be identifiable. Concerns about interference in prosecutions judgements made by police officer on site may be used for litigation etc and are not necessarily accurate enough for such use (as the officer was not a witness). Acknowledgement that police forces release versions of this information already.</p>	<p>Because this data is currently made available to the public through the relevant Police Force Partnerships should be exempt under Section 21 (Information available elsewhere).</p>	
<p>d. Long-term trends (e.g. fatals over 20 years etc) or comparative periods.</p>	<p>No reason to withhold.</p>	<p>Release <u>if it is held</u> - on request</p>	
<p>e. Specific group casualties - e.g. child or pedestrian casualties.</p>	<p>No reason to withhold.</p>	<p>Release <u>if it is held</u> - on request.</p>	
<p>SPEED DATA</p>			
<p>a. Speed data for camera sites (as per operational case requirements)</p>	<p>No concerns raised apart from sites approved by DfT where speed criteria were not always met.</p>	<p>RELEASE - with some explanation concerning the relationship between speeding and the likelihood of accidents.</p>	<p>Format at the discretion of the individual Partnership.</p>

b. Speed improvements	No concerns raised.	RELEASE	As above
3. FINANCIAL DATA			
a. Operational case budgets (database and text)	Only concerns raised over salaries attributable to individuals as this constitutes personal data	RELEASE proactively but combine staff salaries into a single figure. Historic OCs to be released on request.	Website
b. Partnership costs	Concerns as per personal data above.	RELEASE: Financial data to be released after audits complete. It was agreed that only personal information (salaries, personal expenses etc) are exempt under personal data.	Annual project reports.
c. Overtime		Only total costs or hours be released to avoid breaking it down into what could be construed as Personal Data.	
d. Income Site specific details are highly sensitive - should be exempt	Only concern about income per individual site was that this will give information about utility levels of that site and enable comparisons to be drawn. Could compromise operational effectiveness.	RELEASE income figures as an annual total or as a regional total (e.g. per highway authority area). NO INDIVIDUAL SITE INCOME TO BE RELEASED. Totals to be released only after audit complete. It was agreed that Partnership or regional totals of COs issued and paid may be released every six months (published) and that more frequent requests could be dealt with on an as-and-when basis. Totals for specific sites would not be released unless it was an occasional release and did not constitute setting a precedent for other Partnerships.	It would be useful if standard wording was applied to explain the distinction between CO's, numbers of offences etc. Partnerships should release the same categories of stats - namely, offences detected; NIPs; Conditional offers and CO's paid.
e. Number of COFPNs Site specific details are highly sensitive - should be exempt	As above.	NO INDIVIDUAL SITE TICKET NUMBERS TO BE RELEASED. Partnership or regional totals published proactively every 6 months if possible.	As above.
f. Payment rate/Details of which CO's are cancelled and why		It was felt that the wording of this is crucial. Release on request.	

h. Evidence of transparent tendering procedures (tender document, marking grids etc.)		As per ACPO policy.	
i. Quarterly finance sheets (new proposal from DfT Finance staff)	Releasing information about costs that have not been audited.	As this information has not been audited it would be inappropriate to release it. Do not release until yearly totals are available.	
4. OPERATIONAL DATA			
a. Operational case (database and text)	Only concerns over operationally sensitive data (e.g. site specific numbers, thresholds etc) and personal data (individual salaries etc).	RELEASE public versions which excludes sensitive data. Release as soon after approval as is reasonably practical. Where possible historic operational cases should be published as well.	Website
b. Staffing levels (e.g. numbers of police staff)		Not sensitive, therefore no reason to withhold this information. Release on request.	
c. Thresholds Highly Sensitive - should be exempt	Concern that information about thresholds could encourage drivers to exceed the limit.	DO NOT RELEASE. Standard explanation to be used by all Partnerships.	
d. Fixed Camera Programme	Operationally critical - the public must not know where cameras are active as that could encourage risky driving at housings with no cameras. This could also result in targeted vandalism of housings with live cameras.	DO NOT RELEASE.	
e. Mobile camera Programme	Concerns raised by some Partnerships was that telling people where the cameras may be = telling them where they are NOT, and so encourage speeding / dangerous driving along camera-free routes. Other Partnerships feel the PR value is worthwhile.	It was agreed that those Partnerships that hold Programme information shall release it, although this must be released in a way that does not reveal too much detail about operations or give the impression that other roads are safe for speeding. Partnerships that don't have programmes are not obliged to create them.	

f. Photographs/video images	Data protection concerns.	ACPO policy on images due out imminently.	
g. Information relating to 'other people's offences' - e.g. requests for other peoples images or requests for numbers of tickets issued at a particular speed etc.	The first contravenes personal information/data protection, and the second potentially compromises the effectiveness of cameras as people can deduce thresholds this way.	DO NOT RELEASE.	
h. Calibration Certificates	Providing all certificates could give information about dormant sites.	Release one standard template of a calibration certificate (per type) on website. Others available on request or in court, depending on Partnership's preference.	
i. Details of staff phone numbers/ office locations/ details of Project board members etc.	Concerns re malicious targeting	Need to provide a postal address. Addresses of satellite offices do not need to be released. Mobile phone numbers of individuals do not need to be made public. Re the Steering Group - Titles of members is sufficient.	
j. Details about vandalism	Concerns over copycat vandalism; interference with crime investigation etc.	Decisions will have to be made on a case-by-case basis.	
k. Questions about blue-light offences	No concerns raised. Police must have policies in place.	Refer public to police policy or similar policies in place by Ambulance/ Fire and Rescue services.	
l. Information about the safety/security of Partnership assets? Locations of assets are highly sensitive - exempt under Section 38	Concerns re malicious targeting	Investigate exemption under Section 38	

m. Queries re the type approval process		Refer TO ACPO and Home Office Websites	
n. Equipment Manuals	Commercial interests - also likely to be copyright	Must confirm copyright applies. If so, refer to Manufacturer.	
o. Training of staff	Some concerns raised re Data Protection issues.	Recommendation is that certification/training made available at Court only.	
p. Health and Safety/Risk Assessments a) Camera sites; b) Partnership offices		a) Not sensitive, therefore no reason to withhold this information. Release on request. B) Could contain sensitive information - do not release if there is risk of	
q. Parking/Traffic Regulation Orders		Generally, refer to local authority. If it is held release on request.	
r. Signing schedules/ Road safety Audit		Generally, refer to local authority. If it is held release on request.	
s. Policies and Procedures/ Codes of Practice		No reason to withhold this information once sensitive data has been redacted. Publish proactively.	
t. Operational diagrams/ Organisational chart	None apart from level of detail (Names of staff/Partnership members)	Not sensitive, therefore no reason to withhold this information. Release on request.	
u. Speed limit orders		Refer to Highway Authority if this is not held by the Partnership. If it is held release on request.	
v. Minutes of meetings	Some meetings are absolutely fine, and sensitive info can be redacted fairly easily. Others, such as Operational meetings, are discussions entirely around operations and releasing details of these discussions could be problematic.	For most meetings it will be necessary either to have open and closed sessions or to redact information before release. Release on request, but only after minutes have been accepted as an accurate record at the subsequent meeting.	

w. Project Reports to Partners	As above.	No reason to withhold this information once sensitive data has been redacted. Release on request.	
x. Quarterly returns to PA		Mostly dealt with above through 6 monthly release of data (casualty/speed and COFPNs issued and paid).	
y. Correspondence		Release on request once sensitive information has been redacted.	
z. Dates of installation/ dates of calibration of cameras		Release date of site commissioned.	
aa. Section 9 evidence		Exempt under Section 30	
bb. Equipment maintenance records		Not particularly sensitive apart from that information which could identify dormant sites - Partnership will need to keep maintenance records up even for those sites that are seldom/never used. Others may be involved in investigations. Release on request after establishing the facts of each case.	
cc. Number of live cameras		This is out in public domain for some Partnerships. Release on request.	
dd. Number of housings	None - this is in the public domain already.	Not sensitive. Release.	
ee. Site grading/prioritisation	Some concerns that prioritisation could identify dormant sites.	Do not release priority lists as this could jeopardise operational effectiveness and potentially increase casualties.	
ff. PR monitoring (column inches/website hits)	None.	Release on request.	

gg. Public surveys	None.	Release on request.	
hh. Job descriptions		Release on request.	
ii. Operator pocket books		Subject to FOI policies of police forces	