

FOI Disclosures November 2021

Index

This month we have responded to questions relating to the following topics:

- [Derbyshire Constabulary investigation involving Supt P](#)
- [Outcomes of misconduct hearings directed by the IOPC](#)
- [Telephony and Information Communications Services](#)
- [Abuse of Power for a Sexual Purpose prosecutions](#)
- [Communications and Marketing](#)
- [Discrimination complaints against the Metropolitan Police](#)

If you require a full copy of any of the embedded attachments, please contact Requestinfo@policeconduct.gov.uk quoting the reference number from the relevant response.

<u>Ref</u> <u>5023048</u> Back to top	<u>Derbyshire Constabulary investigation involving Supt P</u>
<u>Request</u>	<i>You asked a number of questions about an IOPC independent investigation regarding Supt P from Derbyshire Constabulary.</i>
<u>Response</u>	<p><i>1) Why did the investigation report released to the public solely refer to Supt P and not name the officer.</i></p> <p>This decision was entirely consistent with our general policy on naming police officers that are subject to investigation. The policy is published on our website here.</p> <p><i>2) Was race considered as a factor in the motivation of the officer's conduct ?</i></p> <p>And</p> <p><i>3) Did the IPCC ask Derbyshire Constabulary or Supt P if he had been subject to other race related complaints either internally from colleagues or from other members of the public ?</i></p> <p>No. The terms of reference and details of what was considered as part of this investigation can be found in a redacted version of this report which was published on our website at the time and can now be found on the National Archives website.</p>

	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>4) Please provide details as to why 3) was/was not considered?</i></p> <p>As the investigation did not naturally identify any racial motivation in respect of the handling of the complaint process by Supt P, comparative evidence was not considered.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>5) Who was the investigating officer ?</i></p> <p>The lead investigator was Matt Whalley.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>6) Are you prepared to name Supt P and if not why not ?</i></p> <p>No. This decision not to name Superintendent P is consistent with our naming policy and we have decided that we are unable to release this information to you now by virtue of an exemption provided at section 40(2) of the FOIA, which relates to personal data</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Ref</u> <u>5023101</u> Back to top</p>	<p><u>Outcomes of misconduct hearings directed by the IOPC</u></p>
<p><u>Request</u></p>	<p><i>You request information about misconduct hearings directed by the IOPC relating to the years 2018/2019/2020, including the results of those hearings.</i></p>
<p><u>Response</u></p>	<p>We would refer you to our independent investigation outcome reports for 2018/19 and 2019/20.</p> <p>The 2019/20 report states:</p> <p>“During 2019/20, we investigated 704 police officers and staff. We determined that 39% of these (273) had a case to answer for misconduct or gross misconduct.</p> <p>We directed the appropriate authority to hold misconduct proceedings in ten of these cases.</p> <p>.....</p> <p>Of the proceedings held in 2019/20, we directed appropriate authorities to hold them for 19 police officers and staff. In eight of these cases, the proceedings we directed found it was proven that those involved had breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • one person received a final written warning, where gross misconduct was proven • one person resigned before their proceeding, where gross misconduct was proven • one person retired before their proceeding, where misconduct was proven • one person was on long-term absence before their proceeding, where misconduct was proven

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • four proceedings proved misconduct – one person received a final written warning and three people received management advice” <p>Similar data is available in our 2018/19 report.</p>
<p><u>Ref</u> <u>5023075</u> Back to top</p>	<p><u>Telephony and Information Communications Services</u></p>
<p><u>Request</u></p>	<p><i>Your request is for information relating to our telephony and information and communications services.</i></p>
<p><u>Response</u></p>	<p>The IOPC holds information relating to your request. We have estimated, however, that the work involved in complying with your request would exceed the cost limit under section 12 of the FOIA, with the result that we are not required to disclose the information to you.</p> <p>A number of your questions relate to financial information. For example, in relation to telephony you ask for the value of the initial project, the total ongoing annual spend on telephony and the annual support cost for our telephony system. We have carried out a scoping exercise aimed at identifying and retrieving the particular financial information you require and have estimated that the time it would take to complete these tasks would exceed the 18 hour cost limit by a significant margin.</p> <p>However, in accordance with our duty to advise and assist we are supplying the following responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Please confirm the manufacturer of your telephony system(s) that are currently in place</i> <p>Microsoft / Broadsoft.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Who maintains your telephony system(s)?</i> <p>Redcentric</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Do you use Unified Communications or Collaboration tools, if so which ones?</i> <p>Microsoft Teams.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Please confirm the manufacturer of your contact centre system(s) that are currently in place?</i> <p>Cisco.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Who maintains your contact centre system(s)?</i> <p>Redcentric.</p>

- *How many contact centre agents do you have?*

45 in total across different areas of the business.

- *Do agents work from home? Or just your offices?*

Both

- *Do you use a CRM platform within your organisation?*

No.

- *Who provides your WAN and internet connectivity?*

Redcentric

- *Have you, or do you plan to deploy SD Wan services*

No and no.

- *Have you got SIP trunks, if so who from?*

Yes, hosted by Redcentric.

- *Please confirm who provides your LAN, WIFI and Security infrastructure*

GovWiFi.

- *Please confirm your data centre switching and security infrastructure and have you deployed cloud based security and threat management?*

Cisco; yes we have.

- *How many employees do you have overall within your organisation?*

1050

- *Can you provide contact details for your procurement lead / category manager for these services?*
- *Can you provide names and contact details for the following people within your organisation?*
 - *CIO / IT Director*
 - *Head of IT*
 - *Head of Digital Transformation*
 - *Head of Customer services*

	<p>There is no advantage in contacting individual job holders directly given our approach to ICT procurement. The IOPC's contact details are available on our website here.</p>
<p><u>Ref</u> <u>5023086</u> Back to top</p>	<p><u>Abuse of Power for a Sexual Purpose prosecutions</u></p>
<p><u>Request</u></p>	<p><i>In the APSP report, published 25 October, the IOPC stated that of the 52 individuals who faced gross misconduct proceedings, 38 are no longer serving and were barred from working in policing again. It goes on to say that, in that time, seven people were also prosecuted for criminal offences, leading to six convictions, with three individuals receiving a custodial sentence.</i></p> <p><i>1. .Please could you tell me how much (£) money each of the seven people who were subsequently prosecuted for criminal offences were paid in wages while suspended for the offence(s) they had committed. Please can you break down this information in terms of the: name of the force, date the offence complaint was referred to the IOPC (DD/MM/YYYY), the offence(s) the officers were prosecuted for, the conviction details, length of custodial sentence they received and how long it took for the IOPC investigation to be concluded into each officer (in days).</i></p>
<p><u>Response</u></p>	<p>Please find attached the data requested in your email of 26 October 2021. This does not include the amounts paid to the seven investigation subjects during any suspension from duty. This is not held by the IOPC because information about officer pay is not shared with us. Therefore it would have to be requested from the police forces concerned.</p> <p>The figures below relate to APSP-related lead independent investigations following which criminal proceedings took place between 01/04/2018 and 31/03/2021.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The APSP-related investigations were identified using both APSP case factors and themes. • Case factors are applied manually by IOPC staff based on their judgement, and therefore should not be considered definitive. • Investigation durations are calculated using working days, not calendar days. Investigation age bands have been included for illustrative purposes for interpreting working days. • Data is recorded on the Outcomes Tracker manually by Operations staff. As such, the information provided reflects that data which was available during the periods used for publications. • Therefore, this data should not be considered definitive and should be used for illustrative purposes only. •

Criminal proceedings for police officers and staff following IOPC independent investigations relating to APSP

Appropriate Authority	Referral Received Date	Plea	Verdict	Offence Committed/charged	Sentence Type	Sentence Specific Details	Investigation Length (working days)	Investigation on Age-Band
Northumbria Police	22-Sep-2017	Guilty	Guilty	Data protection breach offences	Fine		225	9 - 12 months
Greater Manchester Police	21-Aug-2018	Guilty	Guilty	Obtaining personal data without consent. Unlawful data processing	Community Sentence	Community Order: 18 months; 8 RA days; 200 hrs unpaid work; Restraining Order: 2 years; £85 costs; £85 vsc.	223	9 - 12 months
Hertfordshire Constabulary	11-Oct-2018	Guilty	Guilty	Misconduct in a public office	Custodial sentence	15 months imprisonment	168	6 - 9 months
Cheshire Constabulary	22-Oct-2018	Guilty	Guilty	Two offences of Misconduct in Public Office	Custodial sentence	8 months in prison; 12 months on license on release.	203	9 - 12 months
Dyfed-Powys Police	07-Jun-2019	Guilty	Guilty	7 counts of Section 1 Computer Misuse Act 1990 and 2 counts of s.170(1) Data Protection Act 2018	Suspended Sentence	6 months concurrent sentence for all Computer misuse offences suspended for two years. To serve 120 hours community service and pay prosecution costs.	169	6 - 9 months
West Midlands Police	31-Jul-2019	Not guilty	Guilty	Misconduct in a Public Office	Custodial sentence	12 months imprisonment	126	6 - 9 months
West Midlands Police	29-Aug-2017	Not guilty	Not guilty	Misconduct in public office			217	9 - 12 months

Ref
5023070
[Back to top](#)

Communications and Marketing

Request

- *The total costs incurred by the IOPC on communications/media/marketing for each year.*
- *The total number of individuals employed or contracted by the IOPC in Media/Communications and Marketing*
- *Whether the IOPC use a public relations company and if so the costs in each of the last 5 financial years*
- *Copies of any IOPC communications strategy*

Response

Our Communications team includes media, digital, content and design, internal communications and Hillsborough communication. Our total spend for this team for the relevant years is as follows:

		Year				
		20/21	19/20	18/19	17/18	16/17
FY Spend	Comms	1,497,965	1,451,564	1,362,249	1,331,779	1,133,505
	Hillsborough Comms	332,777	127,998	108,175	124,167	115,638

The full time equivalent (FTE) data for our communications team is as follows:

		Year				
		20/21	19/20	18/19	17/18	16/17
Average FTE	Comms	20.1	20.3	21.1	21.1	18.8
	Hillsborough Comms	4.6	2.2	2.1	2.3	2

The IOPC does not use a public relations company. However, we have in the last five years engaged specialist agencies for specific projects such as building our web site, logo development and development of our Complaint System Awareness Campaign.



IOPC

Communications Str

Ref
5023102

[Back to top](#)

Discrimination complaints against the Metropolitan Police

Request

- (1) *I would like IOPC to provide me with the total numbers of complaints against the London Met Police for the past 10 years*
- (2) *the total number of complaints based on racial discrimination against the London Met Police for the past 10 years.*
- (3) *the total number of complaints by Black and Ethnic Minority Officers (in the Met Police) against the London Met Police for the past 10 years.*

Response

- (1) This information is available online. We would refer you to our annual complaints statistics reports and quarterly performance data available from [this page of our web site](#). For example the number of complaint cases logged for each police force is confirmed on page 17 of our [2020/21 statistical report](#). Our reports for the years 2004/05 to 2015/16 are available on our [National Archive web site](#).
- (2) When a complaint is made to the police it is made up of one or more allegations and these are categorised. One of these categories is discrimination. For the last ten years (from 1 April 2011) the number of complaints and allegations recorded by the Metropolitan Police is as follows:

Table 1 - Complaint cases and allegations against the MPS

Period	2011/ 12	2012/ 13	2013/ 14	2014/ 15	2015/ 16	2016/ 17	2017/ 18	2018/ 19	2019/ 20	2020/ 21
Complaint cases recorded	6610	6788	7115	6828	6293	5836	5071	5418	5566	8375
Allegations recorded	12255	12502	11542	12148	12018	12473	12607	11085	11437	17135
Discrimination allegations	423	478	421	408	341	416	447	305	430	692

The discrimination category is broken down into a number of sub-categories (race, age, disability and so on). Due to changes in internal systems, we are not able to break down all allegations recorded in the period by sub-category and there is no breakdown available for 2019/20.

Table 2 - Available data regarding discrimination allegations

Period	2011/ 12	2012/ 13	2013/ 14	2014/ 15	2015/ 16	2016/ 17	2017/ 18	2018/ 19	2019/ /20	2020/ 21
Allegations from data available	11268	12290	11368	12017	12018	12473	12607	11085	11437	17135
Discrimination allegations	387	472	416	401	341	416	447	305	430	692
Of which race	326	399	356	306	276	310	328	217	n/a	518

Please note that the 2019/20 figures only relate to complaints recorded prior to 1 February 2020, as they do in the annual statistics published on our web site.

- (3) Under the police complaints legislation, a person cannot make a complaint if they are a person serving with the force complained about, unless they are a designated community support volunteer or police support volunteer. The IOPC does not hold data relating to internal grievances raised by police officers or staff. This data would have to be requested from the Metropolitan Police.