

March 2010

# Freedom of Information Act

## Publication schemes

## Police Sector Monitoring Report

Please note that for clarity the term “authority” in this report refers to a public authority as defined by the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). Where there are references to a “police authority” that term will be used in full.

## Contents

<b><u>Summary</u></b>	page 3
<b><u>Introduction</u></b>	page 4
<b><u>Background</u></b>	page 4
<b><u>What we looked for</u></b>	page 5
<u>Adoption of the 2009 scheme</u>	page 5
<u>Meeting their obligations</u>	page 8
<u>The Guide to Information</u>	page 8
<u>Ease of access</u>	page 9
<u>Information provided on application</u>	page 9
<u>Charging regimes and policies</u>	page 11
<b><u>The seven classes of information</u></b>	page 11
<u>Information available within each class</u>	page 11
<u>Who we are and what we do</u>	page 12
<u>What we spend and how we spend it</u>	page 12
<u>What our priorities are and how we are doing</u>	page 12
<u>How we make decisions</u>	page 13
<u>Our policies and procedures</u>	page 13
<u>Lists and registers</u>	page 14
<u>The services we offer</u>	page 14
<b><u>Conformity with the FOIA Codes of Practice</u></b>	page 14
<b><u>What we found</u></b>	page 15
<u>Records management and disposal schedules</u>	page 15
<u>Internal reviews</u>	page 15
<u>Request handling</u>	page 16
<u>Statistics on request handling</u>	page 16
<u>Disclosure logs</u>	page 16
<u>Reference to ICO guidance and information</u>	page 17
<b><u>Other issues</u></b>	page 17
<u>Website maintenance</u>	page 17
<u>Making information available pro-actively</u>	page 18
<b><u>Conclusion</u></b>	page 18
<b><u>Appendix i</u></b>	
<b><u>Freedom of Information Monitoring Strategy</u></b>	page 20
<b><u>Appendix ii</u></b>	
<b><u>Police and police authorities – comments on the individual organisations</u></b>	page 30

## Summary

This is the second monitoring exercise undertaken since the introduction of the Information Commissioner's Model Publication Scheme. In all 90 public authorities (45 police forces and 45 police authorities) were inspected.

The results were mixed. Most disappointingly we found that 26 out of the 90 authorities (approximately 30%) did not appear to be operating an approved publication scheme which s.19 of the Freedom of Information Act requires them to do. This is despite the two sectoral representative bodies, the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) and the Association of Police Authorities (APA) putting a great deal of work into helping their members meet their FOI obligations. Despite us contacting the public authorities concerned, some are still not meeting their s.19 obligations and their details have been passed to our enforcement team.

Overall most of the public authorities inspected, and who we considered were operating an approved scheme, are releasing a large amount of information. However without exception what they are currently doing could be improved.

We found authorities, while following the approved model, did not provide some of the information that we believed they should (and as set out in our "Definition Documents"). We also discovered that information which they said was available by contacting them either wasn't, or there was considerable delay before it was, and websites were poorly maintained with out of date information and broken links.

In some respects our findings are not surprising as the new model scheme was introduced less than 12 months before this inspection started. However, as stated, we along with ACPO and the APA put a great deal of work into communicating these changes and what authorities should do. A lot of work across the sector has been done but there does remain a lot more to do if all the public authorities concerned are to operate good quality publication schemes. There was a great deal of difference between the best authorities and the poorest. What each individual authority now needs to do varies from small improvements through to a thorough revamp of how they make information available.

## Introduction

The Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) introduced a new model publication scheme to be adopted by all public authorities from 1 January 2009.

In March 2009 we published our [Monitoring Strategy](#) (Appendix i). This established the processes and procedures we follow in monitoring the adoption and operation of the model publication scheme across the public sector.

This report sets out the results of our monitoring of the schemes in the police sector. This took place from early October 2009 through until early January 2010.

The entire sector (all police forces and police authorities in England, Wales and Northern Ireland) were monitored. Appendix ii contains the full list of all authorities monitored and provides detailed information about all the authorities inspected.

## Background

Section 19 of the FOIA imposes a requirement to operate an approved publication scheme on all public authorities. This was an obligation which came into effect before the general start date of FOI in January 2005. However with this first wave of publication schemes, once they had been approved they were frequently not updated or used regularly. In addition the ICO did not monitor the schemes.

These schemes were initially approved for up to five years and, as the end of this period approached, we reviewed the situation. We recognised that we did not have the resources to approve individual publication schemes covering over 100,000 public authorities. We also identified that our original approach meant that there was a lot of inconsistency in how public authorities met their obligations.

The result of the review saw the development of the Information Commissioner's Model Publication Scheme. This is now the only approved publication scheme. The idea behind this was for all public authorities to use the same model scheme. To help organisations with what information to put in their schemes we developed sector specific definition documents, for example for central government, for the health service and for the police and other types of public authority. At the same time we made a public commitment to monitor the implementation and running of the schemes. The first

sector to be monitored was central government with a report being published in November 2009. This is the second monitoring report.

## **What we looked for**

In monitoring compliance with the model publication scheme we searched each authority's website to:

- Confirm adoption of the model scheme.
- Assess that the authority had conformed with the obligations of the scheme, for example whether the authority had a 'guide to information'.
- Assess the ease with which information could be accessed.
- Monitor evidence of charging regimes and policies.
- Check whether the authority provided any information about how it handled requests and whether it had a disclosure log.

The monitoring also included an assessment of the speed of response to applications for information not available through the website.

## **Adoption of the 2009 scheme.**

Out of the 90 authorities monitored it was very disappointing to find that 26 (nearly 30%) did not appear to have adopted the new scheme and as a consequence were not meeting their legal FOI obligations.

These authorities were:

1. Avon & Somerset Police Authority
2. Bedfordshire Police
3. Bedfordshire Police Authority
4. City of London Police
5. City of London Corporation as Police Authority
6. Cumbria Police Authority
7. Devon & Cornwall Police
8. Devon & Cornwall Police Authority
9. Dorset Police Authority
10. Essex Police Authority
11. Gloucestershire Constabulary
12. Greater Manchester Police Authority
13. Gwent Police Authority
14. Hertfordshire Police Authority
15. Lancashire Constabulary

16. Merseyside Police Authority
17. Northumbria Police
18. Northumbria Police Authority
19. Nottinghamshire Police Authority
20. Staffordshire Police Authority
21. Surrey Police Authority
22. Sussex Police Authority
23. Thames Valley Police Authority
24. West Mercia Police
25. Wiltshire Police
26. Wiltshire Police Authority

The disappointment is even greater because both the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) and the Association of Police Authorities (APA) put a great deal of work into helping their members prepare for the revised approach. These bodies cannot be faulted for their efforts to get their member organisations to meet their publication scheme obligations.

With these authorities not following the approved scheme we have made no further assessment of any information they might provide, either with an old and no longer approved scheme, or just in general without any FOI considerations.

The authorities have now all been contacted and following further inspection we are satisfied that those listed below are now operating an approved scheme:

- Avon & Somerset Police Authority
- City of London Corporation as Police Authority
- Cumbria Police Authority
- Devon & Cornwall Police
- Devon & Cornwall Police Authority
- Dorset Police Authority
- Essex Police Authority
- Greater Manchester Police Authority
- Gwent Police Authority
- Lancashire Constabulary
- Northumbria Police
- Surrey Police Authority
- Thames Valley Police Authority
- West Mercia Police
- Wiltshire Police
- Wiltshire Police Authority

In our view some of the above authorities still have further work to do to improve how information within their scheme can actually be found by users. In particular this applies to:

- City of London Corporation as Police Authority
- Devon & Cornwall Police Authority
- Greater Manchester Police Authority
- Gwent Police Authority
- Thames Valley Police Authority
- Wiltshire Police Authority

One authority has provided plans to operate an approved scheme by the end of March:

- Gloucestershire Constabulary

The following have responded but at the time of writing are still not operating an approved scheme:

- Bedfordshire Police
- Bedfordshire Police Authority
- Hertfordshire Police Authority
- Merseyside Police Authority
- Northumbria Police Authority
- Staffordshire Police Authority

If they fail to operate an approved scheme then we will consider using the Commissioner's formal legal powers to compel them to meet their FOI obligations.

The three remaining authorities have either not accepted their responsibilities or have just failed to respond and again we are now considering using the Commissioner's formal powers to ensure that they comply with their FOI obligations.

These authorities are:

- City of London Police
- Nottinghamshire Police Authority
- Sussex Police Authority

### **Meeting their obligations**

In order to assess if the authorities were meeting their obligations we looked at a variety of issues:

- whether we could find information on their websites about the scheme;
- if they provided information within the seven classes (and if we had to contact them for the information, how long it took to provide);
- how they approached their records management responsibilities;
- how they dealt with requests, internal reviews and general compliance with the section 45 and section 46 codes of practice; and
- if they had a disclosure log.

Some of the material we looked for was not mandatory (for example operating a disclosure log and other information we looked for which was not specifically in the relevant Definition Documents) but overall we considered that this approach would not just confirm basic legal compliance but would enable us to roughly assess an authority's overall practice towards their FOI responsibilities.

### **The Guide to Information**

This is the key to successfully operating the model publication scheme. If the ICO's guidance is followed a public authority's guide should set out the information available from the authority, how they make it available (for example by putting it on a website or by sending out a copy on application) and whether any charges will be levied for information in the publication scheme.

The aim is that this is just a guide to information and not a mechanism through which information must be accessed. As a consequence we did not specify the format of the guide. Some organisations use their website map as their guide while others have produced guidance documents with links to information within the classes or clear instructions that people should contact the authority for the information.

It has become clear during this exercise that where authorities have produced a guide as a record of the information they make available routinely, then this is both the best way to keep track of what they are doing and it is straightforward for people to access information covered by the scheme.



As a result we will in future recommend that all public authorities follow this approach to producing their guide to information. This means that they should produce a guide which lists, by class, the information they are making accessible, how the information can be got and whether there are any charges.

### **Ease of access**

We approached the monitoring exercise as if we were members of the public starting at the authority's home page. Some authorities had clear links from these pages to the FOI sections of their websites, while with others the use of the site's search facility quickly provided access to the relevant part of the site. Once at these pages some authorities provided a list of classes with clear links to either the class or the information contained within them. Others provided clear directions to whereabouts on their sites the information could be found.

A small number of the authorities were though poor at providing links or clear directions to where their guide could be found:

- Cheshire Police Authority
- Hampshire Police Authority
- Leicestershire Police Authority
- Merseyside Police
- Northamptonshire Police Authority
- Nottinghamshire Police
- Police Service of Northern Ireland

### **Information provided on application**

Where it is not possible for a public authority to provide information via their website then they can provide this material when an individual contacts them. As this information is available through the authority's publication scheme there should be no delay in providing it. A request for information from a publication scheme should not be treated as a Freedom of Information request. Unfortunately this did occur a number of times during the monitoring. Some authorities did not even respond to requests for such information. The full details for how authorities dealt with such requests can be found in Appendix ii.

However most authorities were on the ball, with Staffordshire Police setting a high standard by responding in just over an hour from the request being made.

Other quick responders were:

- British Transport Police Authority – 3 working days
- Cleveland Police Authority – 2 working days
- Dyfed-Powys Police – 2 working days
- Dyfed-Powys Police Authority – 2 working days
- Gloucestershire Police Authority – 3 working days
- Greater Manchester Police - 1 working day
- Hampshire Police Authority – 1 working day
- Hertfordshire Constabulary – 1 working day
- Humberside Police Authority – 1 working day
- West Midlands Police – 2 working days

Poor responders:

- Derbyshire Police - 21 working days (one day after a reminder was sent, the force say that the original request was not received)
- Durham Police Authority – 28 working days (received after a reminder was sent but with an apology)
- Hampshire Constabulary – they responded but did not provide the requested information, instead we were told that the information would be published annually.
- Lancashire Constabulary\* - 32 working days and after a reminder was sent.
- Lancashire Police Authority – 20 working days
- Lincolnshire Police Authority – 6 working days. Initially the request was treated as a standard FOI request and we were told they would respond within 20 working days. After reminding them about their publication scheme responsibilities they provided the information one day later.
- West Midlands Police Authority – 16 working days – this was after informing us that the request would be treated as a full-blown FOI request which they would respond to within 20 working days.

No response:

- Cambridgeshire Police Authority
- Northamptonshire Police Authority
- Nottinghamshire Police
- South Wales Police

\* Information was requested from Lancashire Constabulary before we reached the conclusion that they were not operating an approved scheme due to a class of information being missed from

their scheme.

### **Charging regimes and policies**

Overall this was a poor area. Out of the 90 public authorities inspected only 42 provided any information about charges they could levy. Quite often even this information was basic and did not follow the ICO's recommendations about making any charges clear and up front.

This issue will be taken up with all authorities within the sector so that people who use their publication schemes are made clear where charges will be applicable and what those charges will be.

### **The seven classes of information**

#### **Information available within each class**

Our monitoring did show that by far the majority of authorities inspected did make a large amount of information available through their publication schemes. What was disappointing was that only a few authorities provided all the information we looked for as part of this exercise (and information not specifically set out in the relevant definition documents was not counted for this purpose). These authorities were:

- Derbyshire Constabulary
- Dorset Police
- Humberside Police Authority
- Kent Police Authority
- Leicestershire Police Authority
- Merseyside Police
- Northamptonshire Police Authority
- North Wales Police Authority
- North Yorkshire Police
- North Yorkshire Police Authority
- West Yorkshire Police Authority

In addition the following authorities had all but one piece of information available (including information not found because of broken links):

- Cumbria Constabulary
- Cheshire Constabulary
- Lancashire Police Authority

- Police Service of Northern Ireland
- Sussex Police

### **Who we are and what we do**

- Details of the organisation structure
- Contact details – ideally with job titles

We found that most of the organisations monitored did provide this information and some provided more detail than others. The contact details provided were mainly generic although some did provide direct email addresses.

### **What we spend and how we spend it**

- Police force budget (as agreed by Police Authority or Board)
- Senior staff / board members allowances and expenses

The majority of inspected authorities did provide this information although not all of them. We found this to be disappointing because at the heart of freedom of information is the idea of accountability. Information covered by the class forms an important part of this, providing transparency about a public authority's use of resources.

### **What our priorities are and how we are doing**

- Current business plan
- Police forces – most recent performance review
- Police authorities – statistical information provided to the authority

The results from this class were very mixed. A lot of the authorities inspected did provide this information but there was a large minority (including both police forces and police authorities) who only provided a limited amount of material. This was disappointing when all organisations follow some sort of corporate or business plan. While it is possible to allow for the fact that some police authorities may not receive a lot of statistical information, all police forces are routinely inspected by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC). From these inspections a lot of performance information is made available. This material could easily be provided under this class either directly or by a link to the relevant part of the HMIC website.

## **How we make decisions**

- Minutes of management boards / senior management meetings
- Reports or papers for the meetings

This class was another one which produced mixed results. Most organisations did make the minutes of senior management meetings available. With the state of modern electronic communications all authorities could make such information available and it is surprising that some do not. As for the reports or papers, this information was not covered by the relevant definition documents. It was therefore pleasing to see that a sizable minority of inspected authorities provided this type of information. One other issue with this class was quite often the inspected bodies did not provide up to date material.

## **Our policies and procedures**

- Recruitment policy
- Information about partnership working

The latter was not on the sectoral definition documents however we were pleasantly surprised that quite a few authorities made this information available even if sometimes it was listed under Class 1. This was pleasing to see especially with the increased amount of such working between different types of public authorities. On a more disappointing note a large number of authorities did not appear to have a recruitment policy or if they did it was not accessible through their publication scheme. For both police forces and police authorities we often found a lot of information about vacancies but not any underlying recruitment policy.

## **Lists and registers**

- Register of Gifts and Hospitality
- Register of Interests

We thought that the provision of this information was very much in-line with the accountability factor contained within freedom of information. Most organisations did provide at least one of the two items and most made both available, albeit a lot had to be contacted for the information. Three authorities (Cheshire Police Authority, South Wales Police Authority and Suffolk Police Authority)

said that the information was only available for inspection at the organisation's headquarters. In our view this is not providing information in accordance with the publication scheme.

### **The services we offer**

- Media / press releases
- Details of the services for which the authority is entitled to recover a fee

Most authorities made the first type of information available (although there were a small number of exceptions). For the second type we recognise that there are few if any services which are provided by a police authority where they can recover a fee for providing the service. It is a quite different matter for police forces. Some of those that we inspected made it clear where they could recover a fee and how much the fee was while others provided little or no information.

### **Conformity with the FOIA Codes of Practice**

The Information Commissioner has a duty under s. 47 of the FOIA to promote observance with both the Act itself and the two codes of practice provided for under s.45 and s.46 of the legislation (the Code of Practice on the Discharge of Public Authorities' Functions under Part 1 of the FOIA 2000 and the Code of Practice on the Management of Records respectively).

The monitoring of publication schemes provided an ideal opportunity to check on how authorities met the responsibilities imposed by both codes. However the inspection only looked at information provided pro-actively by the authorities; it was not a full audit of their compliance procedures.

The ICO Publication Scheme Monitoring Strategy indicates that we will look at:

- whether internal review procedures and timeframes conform to ICO guidance and the codes of practice
- general request handling procedures in use at an authority, including those that deal with the transfer of requests
- the authority's statistics in relation to request and complaint handling
- the authority's disclosure log (if they operate one).

## What we found

- **Records management and disposal schedules**

The section 46 Code of Practice on the Management of Records provides a framework for public authorities to manage their records, including the importance of having retention schedules defining how long they should keep records for. This is an area that the police service has already done a lot of work in. In particular following the Bichard Report (2004), which recommended that the police should adopt better records management procedures, the Home Office and ACPO produced the Management of Police Information (MOPI) as a framework for how the police should manage their information. While some of the forces have either followed MOPI or have least linked to it through their publication scheme, a large number of forces (19) do not provide any information about their records management policies. The picture for police authorities is poor as well with 15 of them providing no information about how they manage their records. This is despite having so much material available to use.

- **Internal reviews**

Again the provision of information about how both police forces and police authorities met the obligations of the s.45 code of practice was patchy. Once more this is despite of a lot of centrally developed work contained within the ACPO FOI Manual of Guidance. The most recent version (v6) launched during this period of monitoring. This meant that some forces were inspected before they had an opportunity to use the manual. It was though pleasing to see a number of forces inspected towards the end of the process had placed this version of the manual in their publication scheme. Others had already been making older versions available. In both cases the manual provides information on dealing with internal reviews, with the most recent following ICO guidance on the issue. With all this material available it was surprising that not all forces provided this information (13 forces provided no information about how they handled internal reviews or requests).

- **Request handling**

The s.45 Code of Practice states that public authorities should

publish their procedures. Fortunately for the police service ACPO's Manual of Guidance provides comprehensive procedures for handling requests including where they need to be transferred to other public authorities. Like the Internal Review procedures it is surprising that not all forces provide this information.

Looking at the police authorities, while they have less central resource provided than the police service, there does not appear to be any reason why they cannot follow the police service's manual. Having said this, a number of police authorities did provide information about how they deal with FOI requests (12 out of the 26 police authorities who we considered were operating an approved publication scheme).

- **Statistics on request handling**

Very few authorities provided this information:

Avon & Somerset Police  
Dyfed-Powys Police  
Greater Manchester Police  
Hampshire Police  
PSNI

- **Disclosure logs**

It was pleasing to see that a number of authorities (both police forces and police authorities) provided this information with varying degrees of detail from a list of the requests or issues through to full copies of the responses provided:

Avon & Somerset Police  
Cambridgeshire Constabulary  
Cheshire Constabulary  
Cheshire Police Authority  
Derbyshire Constabulary  
Dorset Police  
Durham Constabulary  
Dyfed-Powys Police  
Dyfed-Powys Police Authority  
Greater Manchester Police  
Gwent Police  
Hampshire Constabulary  
Hampshire Police Authority  
Hertfordshire Constabulary  
Humberside Police Authority



Lincolnshire Police Authority  
Merseyside Police  
Metropolitan Police Authority  
Norfolk Constabulary  
North Yorkshire Police  
North Yorkshire Police Authority  
Police Service of Northern Ireland  
Northern Ireland Policing Board  
South Wales Police  
South Yorkshire Police  
South Yorkshire Police Authority  
Surrey Police  
Sussex Police  
Warwickshire Police  
West Midlands Police  
West Midlands Police Authority

- **Reference to ICO guidance and information**

While most of the inspected organisations provided a link to the ICO website, only a few provided any links to specific ICO guidance.

## **Other issues**

In addition to what has already been covered, we identified other issues which prevented authorities from making information set out in the relevant definition document available.

### **Website maintenance**

The most important and easiest way a public authority can make information available is via their website. It is therefore important to make sure that the site is well-maintained and updated on a regular basis.

During our monitoring of police forces' and police authorities' publication schemes we noticed the following:

- Information had not been updated, for example an authority's last senior management meeting information was over 6 months old;
- Messages were found that said information would be "available soon" without providing any timescales;
- Broken links, in a few cases this meant that we found an authority did not meet their section 19 obligations because

the link to the information did not work. At other times it was frustrating that information which should be accessible was not because of a failed link.

- Information which was stated to be available was not because even when a site's search facility was used, the information could not be found.

### **Making information available pro-actively**

During the course of the monitoring it became clear that some of the public authorities had not made key people aware of their proactive dissemination responsibilities. A practical example of this was seen where information was listed in a publication scheme as available by contacting the authority. However when this was done, the authority instead of providing the information, treated the issue as a full FOI request under Part 1 of the legislation. More information is provided in an earlier part of the report.

### **Conclusion**

Monitoring the publication schemes of police forces and police authorities was the second publication scheme monitoring exercise undertaken by the ICO following the introduction of the ICO model scheme in January 2009.

As stated earlier in the report, both ACPO and the Association of Police Authorities have worked hard to get their respective memberships up to date with the ICO's new model publication scheme and the revised approach to publication schemes in general. It is therefore disappointing to see so many organisations (26 out of 90 inspected) apparently not operating an approved publication scheme as required by s.19 of the FOI Act. While some of these failings were technical (re-organised IT provision resulting in classes of information being missed out) too many authorities appear to be ignoring their FOI responsibilities. In particular there is a lot of work to be done for many of the police authorities.

Given this background it is difficult to be overly positive. However a few authorities are delivering a high quality service albeit with further work to do. For example the Police Service of Northern Ireland (PSNI) provided a lot of information in an easily accessible manner. The only information that we could not find was their recruitment policy. Leicestershire Police Authority also operate a good scheme with information from all classes being provided as well as a lot of material about how they deal with their FOI responsibilities. In both cases this is despite details of their

respective publication schemes not being straightforward to find on their websites. Cheshire Constabulary also operated a good publication scheme.

These though were the exceptions. While a number of public authorities have provided good “foundations” there are too many who have not done the minimum. This is despite all the work put in by the ICO and, more significantly, the authorities’ representative organisations.

# Freedom of Information

## Monitoring Strategy

### **1. Background**

The start of 2009 marked the fourth anniversary of the implementation of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA) and the Environmental Information Regulations 2004 (EIR). In the years prior to the implementation, public authorities were required to either adopt one of the Commissioner's model publication schemes or to submit a bespoke scheme for approval. As of 1 January 2005 they were under a duty to publish information in accordance with their scheme. These schemes expired on 31 December 2008.

### **2. The publication scheme Development and Maintenance Initiative (DMI)**

In 2005 the Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) reviewed the effectiveness of publication schemes. The outcomes of this review highlighted the need to develop and improve the proactive dissemination of public sector information.

The review identified the need for:

- consistent approaches to the inclusion of information
- a requirement for improvements to the maintenance of schemes
- further awareness-raising of the general public regarding information which is readily available and how to access it

The objective of the DMI was to encourage and help public authorities to improve and expand publication schemes through:

- proactively disseminating information
- consistently making information available
- providing uncomplicated and swift access to the information they routinely make available

More specifically, it aimed to

- develop a list of core classes for all public sector bodies

- produce comprehensive guidance specific to each public authority sector
- progress all sectors towards a culture of maximum release and a scheme structure to enable a consistency of core classes across public authorities
- identify and disseminate good practice in relation to maintaining publication schemes
- direct and support public authorities to creatively consider how to promote and publish the information they make readily available

In the first instance we collected and collated opinions and ideas regarding the content, maintenance and dissemination of publication schemes from professionals, practitioners and users.

Following this initial fact finding numerous workshops were held with sector specific practitioners and representative bodies to develop core classes, maintenance regimes and dissemination methods. Existing networking groups were also invited to provide an input into these discussions.

The initiative also enrolled an advisory panel made up of FOI experts and interested parties. This group provided a 'sounding board' for ideas, brought a user perspective to the work as it developed and provided feedback when appropriate.

There are three key elements to the revised policy on proactive dissemination:

1. The model publication scheme – a commitment document, approved by the ICO for adoption by all public authorities
2. Sector specific definition documents – containing the definitions of information covered by the seven core classes
3. A means by which the information made routinely available by an authority can be easily identified and accessed, a 'guide to information'

### **3. The Model Publication Scheme**

As a result of the Publication Scheme DMI the ICO introduced a model publication scheme that all public authorities were to adopt from 1 January 2009.

Authorities must also produce a 'guide' to the specific information which they hold and is covered by any of the scheme's seven classes. We expect authorities to ensure that the information can be easily identified and accessed by the general public.

To assist public authorities to develop a guide to information, we have produced a series of definition documents for the main public sectors. These documents identify the type of information we would expect to be included in each class within their guide to information.

For some smaller authorities such as parish councils and primary schools, we have produced template guides to information.

With effect from 1 January 2009, all public authorities should:

- have adopted the model publication scheme
- have produced a guide to information using either our definition documents or template guides to information, and
- be publishing in accordance with it

#### **4. Monitoring**

The ICO will regularly review the model scheme and definition guidance. Authorities should review and update their guide to information and its contents on a regular basis.

From 1 April 2009, the Commissioner will begin proactive monitoring of the adoption of, and publication in accordance with, the new scheme, as well as proactive dissemination under the EIR. Our monitoring will also provide an important opportunity to review more general compliance with the FOIA and the EIR and to assess the practices of public authorities.

Monitoring of the operation of publication schemes and the routine release of information will generally be carried out using public authority websites. We will target different sectors for specific periods of time (for example, central government for 2 months, police forces for 3 months). There will also be an element of targeted monitoring within certain sectors, for example strategic health authorities and those authorities where we are already aware of compliance issues.

We aim to monitor at least 20 public authorities per month and typically this will involve:

- Confirming that the authority has adopted the model publication scheme
- Confirming that the authority has produced a guide to information

- An initial check against the key types of information identified in the ICO sector-specific definition guidance or template guides, eg:
  - for principal local authorities – the Council directorate structure
  - for police authorities – the expenses and allowances paid to or incurred by Authority or Board members and senior employed staff
  - for health bodies - performance against targets (KPI) and/or a performance framework
- A review of an authority's guide to information with particular emphasis on the medium and accessibility of that information, and any charges made
- Checking that any charging regime is clear and coherent and backed by published policies
- Establishing that internal review procedures and timeframes conform with our guidance and the codes of practice
- A review of general request handling procedures in use at the authority, including those for transfer of requests
- An analysis of the authority's statistics in relation to request and complaint handling
- A review of the authority's disclosure log (where one exists)

The monitoring carried out during 2009 will provide useful feedback and intelligence for the ICO, which will help inform the Commissioner's future strategies in relation to good practice and enforcement.

## **5. Enforcing**

The vast majority of public authorities are taking their FOI responsibilities seriously. Through the Commissioner's DMI, public authorities have now had ample opportunity to learn about and adopt publication schemes and develop suitable systems to ensure that they publish in accordance with them. The ICO will therefore now be taking a more robust proactive approach towards public authorities that consistently fail to meet these responsibilities.

The Commissioner will adopt a targeted but proportionate risk-based approach to monitoring and enforcing in this area promoting the effective use of his limited resources (see also Annexe 2 – Better Regulation Task Force Principles).

Where monitoring identifies non-compliance or other issues, we will, in accordance with our FOI Enforcement Strategy:

- Contact failing authorities on an informal basis to establish the problem areas and to seek informal resolution, where necessary through a Practice Recommendation
- Consider formal enforcement action only after serious, repeated or systemic failure to comply

Where the Commissioner is satisfied that a public authority has failed to comply with any of the requirements of Part I of the FOIA or Parts 2 and 3 of the EIR he may serve that authority with an Enforcement Notice.

An Enforcement Notice differs from a Decision Notice in that it is action initiated by the Commissioner rather than following a complaint from an applicant who believes that their request for information has not been properly dealt with.

The Commissioner's Enforcement Strategy specifically states that "Enforcement Notices may also be served where a public authority has failed to adopt a publication scheme or where it fails to make information available in accordance with its scheme".

## **6. Promoting Good Practice**

The Commissioner's duty to promote the following of good practice relates to both the requirements of the FOIA and the EIR, and the provisions of their related codes of practice. The Commissioner recognises that public authorities will follow different procedures and allocate different resources in relation to their access to information obligations. The ICO will therefore continue to provide authorities with help and support but will where necessary take appropriate action. Through promoting good practice in relation to publication schemes the Commissioner aims to:

- promote open government
- maximise the proactive and progressive release of information
- bring about a culture of maximum disclosure consistent with good government
- deliver benefits for citizens and public authorities

Authorities demonstrating good practice in relation to publication schemes and other aspects of our monitoring activities may be specifically identified in ICO stakeholder communications.



## **7. Reporting Performance**

The ICO will produce periodic monitoring reports identifying our activities, examples of good and poor practice, and where appropriate any actions taken. Reports may be sector specific setting out the 'general performance of the sector' or authority specific in relation to, for example, particularly good or poor practice. Actions such as Practice Recommendations and Enforcement Notices are already published on the ICO website as a matter of course.

## **8. Information Charter**

When we decide that some form of structured or regulatory intervention is necessary or desirable in the case of a particular public authority, we may make a public statement to that effect and give an indication of our intended approach. More generally, we will make information available on the number of cases we pursue, their nature and the outcomes. We will also publish the details of some illustrative cases that have been considered for enforcement action, whether or not action is in fact taken.

In addition, we will publish findings which are of wider import that may affect a range of public authorities or citizens generally.

## **9. Guiding principles**

This Monitoring Strategy is consistent with the five Principles of Good Regulation (see Annexe 2) established in 2005, by the Better Regulation Task Force (BRTF) and the recommendations of the Hampton Review. The BRTF was replaced by the Better Regulation Commission on 1 January 2006 which in turn was replaced by the Risk and Regulation Advisory Council in January 2008.

## **Annexe 1**

### **Statutory powers available to ICO**

The Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA), section 47, places a duty on the Commissioner to promote the following of good practice by public authorities. In particular it places a duty on him to promote observance by public authorities with the requirements of the FOIA and the provisions of the related codes of practice, the section 45 Access Code and the section 46 Records Management Code. In addition, Part IV of the FOIA provides the Commissioner

with various enforcement tools including Decision Notices (s50), Enforcement Notices (s52) and Information Notices (s51). Failures to comply with these notices may be referred to the court, where they may be dealt with as contempt of court.

To provide for a consistent approach in both the handling and regulation of information requests Regulation 18 of the Environmental Information Regulations 2004 (EIR) provides for the FOIA enforcement provisions to also apply in relation to the EIR. Furthermore, Regulation 16(5) of the EIR provides for the general provisions under section 47 FOIA, above, to apply to the EIR.

As well as the enforcement tools available to the Commissioner he also has the power to issue non-enforceable Practice Recommendations under section 48 of the FOIA in relation to non-conformity with the Codes of Practice. These provisions also apply to the EIR by virtue of Regulation 16(5).

## **Enforcement tools**

The main options are:

### **Enforcement Notice s52**

This is a binding enforceable notice served by the Commissioner on public authorities. The notice specifies the requirements of Part 1 with which a public authority has failed to comply, the steps it is required to take and the timescale for doing so. This is to be used in cases involving systemic or repeated breaches of Part I of FOIA or the EIR as opposed to Decision Notices (s50) which are used when an individual makes a complaint to the Commissioner about the handling of their information request. Failure to comply with a notice will usually result in the Commissioner certifying that fact in writing to the court for the matter to be dealt with as contempt of court.

It should also be noted that a breach of section 77 FOIA, may lead to a criminal sanction. For example, where the investigation of concerns in relation to records management relates to the inappropriate or deliberate destruction or concealment of information with the intention of preventing disclosure to which an applicant would have been entitled.

## **Information Notices s51**

This is a binding enforceable notice. The Commissioner may serve an information notice where he reasonably requires any information to determine whether a public authority has complied or is complying with the requirements of Part I or if its practices conform with the Codes of Practice. An information notice may also be served in relation to a section 50 complaint.

## **Other ways in which the ICO encourages and secures compliance and good practice**

### **Practice Recommendations s48**

This is a non-enforceable recommendation in relation to conformity with the Access and Records Management Codes of Practice. A practice recommendation indicates to a public authority the steps which, in the Commissioner's opinion, are necessary to ensure conformity with the Codes. The Commissioner will normally make practice recommendations public either by publishing them proactively or making them available on request in line with our Transparency Policy. Although a practice recommendation is not directly enforceable, a failure to comply with a Practice Recommendation may lead to a failure to comply with the FOIA or EIR.

### **Assessment s47(3)**

This is an assessment made by the Commissioner, with the consent of the public authority, as to whether that authority is following good practice including conformity with the s45 Access Code and the EIR Code. In relation to the conformity of public authorities with the Records Management Code of Practice such assessments will be made in conjunction with the Keeper of Records or in the case of Northern Ireland the Deputy Keeper of Public Records.

### **Negotiation**

This is not a formal enforcement power but an approach that will be widely used by the Enforcement team in order to bring about conformity with the Codes and compliance with the FOIA and EIR. Public authorities will be given every opportunity for voluntary compliance. However, it is important in building and maintaining public confidence in and respect for the system that the Commissioner develops procedures which are robust and transparent in taking steps to ensure that public authorities fulfil their statutory obligations.

## **Report to Parliament s49(2)**

A failure to take account of a Practice Recommendation may be published by the Commissioner, for example in a special or Annual Report to Parliament. The Annual Report will also include details of Enforcement action taken against public authorities.

## **Annexe 2**

The Better Regulation Task Force was replaced by the Better Regulation Commission on 1 January 2006.

### **The Better Regulation Task Force Principles**

- |                 |   |                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
|-----------------|---|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Transparency    | - | We will be open about our approach to enforcement action and open about the action we take and the outcomes we achieve.                                                                                                       |
| Accountability  | - | We will include information on the use of our enforcement powers in our annual report to Parliament. We will make sure that those who are subject to enforcement action are aware of their rights of appeal.                  |
| Proportionality | - | We will put in place systems to ensure that enforcement action we take is proportionate. We will not resort to formal action where we are satisfied that the risk can be addressed by negotiation or other less formal means. |
| Consistency     | - | We will apply our decision making criteria consistently in the exercise of our enforcement powers.                                                                                                                            |
| Targeting       | - | We will target enforcement action on those areas where it is the most appropriate tool to achieve our goals. Our own targets will be based on                                                                                 |

outcomes rather than how often we use our enforcement powers.

## Appendix ii

# Police and police authorities – comments on the individual organisations.

## Index

### Public Authority

[POL1 - Avon and Somerset Constabulary](#)

[POLA01 - Avon and Somerset Police Authority](#)

[POL02 – Bedfordshire Police](#)

[POLA02 - Bedfordshire Police Authority](#)

[POL03 - British Transport Police](#)

[POLA03 - British Transport Police Authority](#)

[POL04 - Cambridgeshire Constabulary](#)

[POLA04 - Cambridgeshire Police Authority](#)

[POL05 - Cheshire Constabulary](#)

[POLA05 - Cheshire Police Authority](#)

[POL06 -City of London Police](#)

[POLA06 - City of London Corporation](#)

[POL07 - Cleveland Police](#)

[POLA07 - Cleveland Police Authority](#)

[POL08 – Cumbria Constabulary](#)

[POLA08 - Cumbria Police Authority](#)

[POL09 - Derbyshire Constabulary](#)

[POLA09 - Derbyshire Police Authority](#)

[POL10 - Devon and Cornwall Police](#)

[POLA10 - Devon and Cornwall Police Authority](#)

[POL11 - Dorset Police](#)

[POLA11 - Dorset Police Authority](#)

[POL12 - Durham Constabulary](#)

[POLA12 - Durham Police Authority](#)

[POL13 - Dyfed-Powys Police](#)

[POLA13 - Dyfed-Powys Police Authority](#)

[POL14 - Essex Police](#)

[POLA14 - Essex Police Authority](#)

[POL15 - Gloucestershire Constabulary](#)

[POLA15 - Gloucestershire Police Authority](#)

[POL16 - Greater Manchester Police](#)

[POLA16 - Greater Manchester Police Authority](#)

[POL17 - Gwent Police](#)

[POLA17 - Gwent Police Authority](#)

[POL18 - Hampshire Constabulary](#)

[POLA18 - Hampshire Police Authority](#)

[POL19 - Hertfordshire Constabulary](#)

[POLA19 - Hertfordshire Police Authority](#)

[POL20 - Humberside Police](#)

[POLA20 - Humberside Police Authority](#)

[POL21 - Kent Police](#)

[POLA21 - Kent Police Authority](#)

[POL22 - Lancashire Constabulary](#)

[POLA22 - Lancashire Police Authority](#)

[POL23 - Leicestershire Constabulary](#)

[POLA23 - Leicestershire Police Authority](#)

[POL24 - Lincolnshire Police](#)

[POLA24 - Lincolnshire Police Authority](#)

[POL25 - Merseyside Police](#)

[POLA25 - Merseyside Police Authority](#)

[POL26 - Metropolitan Police Service](#)

[POLA26 - Metropolitan Police Authority](#)

[POL27 - Norfolk Constabulary](#)

[POLA27 - Norfolk Police Authority](#)

[POL28 - Northamptonshire Police](#)

[POLA28 - Northamptonshire Police Authority](#)

[POL29 - Northumbria Police](#)

[POLA29 - Northumbria Police Authority](#)

[POL30 - North Wales Police](#)

[POLA30 - North Wales Police Authority](#)

[POL31 - North Yorkshire Police](#)

[POLA31 - North Yorkshire Police Authority](#)

[POL32 - Nottinghamshire Police](#)

[POLA32 - Nottinghamshire Police Authority](#)



[POL33 - Police Service of Northern Ireland](#)

[POLA33 - Northern Ireland Policing Board](#)

[POL34 - South Wales Police](#)

[POLA34 - South Wales Police Authority](#)

[POL35 - South Yorkshire Police](#)

[POLA35 - South Yorkshire Police Authority](#)

[POL36 - Staffordshire Police](#)

[POLA36 - Staffordshire Police Authority](#)

[POL37 - Suffolk Constabulary](#)

[POLA37 - Suffolk Police Authority](#)

[POL38 - Surrey Police](#)

[POLA38 - Surrey Police Authority](#)

[POL39 - Sussex Police](#)

[POLA39 - Sussex Police Authority](#)

[POL40 - Thames Valley Police](#)

[POLA40 - Thames Valley Police Authority](#)

[POL41 - Warwickshire Police](#)

[POLA41 - Warwickshire Police Authority](#)

[POL42 - West Mercia Police](#)

[POLA42 - West Mercia Police Authority](#)

[POL43 - West Midlands Police](#)

[POLA43 - West Midlands Police Authority](#)

[POL44 - West Yorkshire Police](#)

[POLA44 - West Yorkshire Police Authority](#)

## [POL45 - Wiltshire Police](#)

## [POLA45 - Wiltshire Police Authority](#)

### [Index](#)

#### **Avon and Somerset Police**

##### **Ref: POL01**

The publication scheme was checked on 16 October 2009. It was easy to find and the authority's guide to information conformed to ICO guidance.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information was found.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. Budget information was available along with the expenses claimed by the Chief Constable, Deputy Chief Constables and Assistant Chief Constables.
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – details of the annual policing plan were available but no performance information was found.
4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior management meetings were provided and, although it went further than the definition document, we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings. Unfortunately none were provided.
5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy. However what we found was focused on actual recruitment rather than the underlying policy. Again we looked for information not

covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working and this was provided.

6. "Lists and registers" – When the inspection was carried out the website stated that the "Register of Gifts and Hospitality" was inaccessible. A list of business interests broken down by rank was made available.
7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases but we did not find out about any services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee.

All information was made available on their website and they did not have to be contacted.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies. Avon and Somerset Police does publish this information, including their retention and disposal schedule. No information was provided about policies and procedures concerning charging for information.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. They provide a copy of the ACPO Manual of Guidance v1.2. Although this is comprehensive, the guidance provided in this version does not accord with current ICO guidance. Our current position is reflected in v6 of the ACPO manual, which was published after the inspection of this scheme took place. Providing this version will ensure that Avon and Somerset police provide up to date information about their information request handling practices.

Finally we were pleased to see that the authority provided a disclosure log.

## **Recommendations**

- Performance information should be available;
- The authority's recruitment policy should be published;
- The Register of Gifts and Hospitality should be accessible;

- Clear information should be available about the services the authority offers which it can charge for. Also information should be available about any charges that may be made for providing information from the publication scheme.

## **Avon and Somerset Police Authority**

**Ref: POLA01**

This authority was inspected on 28 October 2009. It was found that the authority did not meet the requirements set out in the Freedom of Information Act, section 19 to operate an approved publication scheme. We wrote to them on 19 January 2010. They responded on 15 February and explained that they had adopted the ICO's model publication scheme with information being accessible via the authority's website. This was checked on 23 February and Avon and Somerset Police Authority now appear to be compliant with the requirements of s19.

### **[Index](#)**

## **Bedfordshire Police**

**Ref: POL02**

This authority was inspected on 26 October 2009. It was found that the authority did not meet the requirements set out in the Freedom of Information Act, section 19 to operate an approved publication scheme. We wrote to them on 19 January 2010. They responded on 5 February and stated that Bedfordshire Police have adopted the ICO model publication scheme. They recognise that there are problems in locating and retrieving information from their scheme and they are looking to improve this by the end of April 2010.

A check of the force website on 10 February 2010 still showed that the authority was following the form of their old publication scheme and not the ICO model scheme.

## **Bedfordshire Police Authority**

**Ref: POLA02**

This authority was inspected on 13 November 2009. It was found that the authority did not meet the requirements set out in the

Freedom of Information Act, section 19 to operate an approved publication scheme. We wrote to them on 19 January 2010 and they have responded. They explained that they are following the approved scheme but they recognised that the links on their site should work better and that publication scheme information needs to be easily found and accessed. They have promised to write formally.

As of 19 March there is still no evidence on their website that they have adopted the ICO model scheme.

## [Index](#)

### **British Transport Police**

#### **Ref: POL03**

The publication scheme was checked on 16 October 2009. It was easy to find but we discovered that they had added a class of information; "Complaints and discipline". There was no separate guide to information, rather working links were listed under the classes of information.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information was found. We did think that the organisation's structure could be presented in a clearer manner.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. Budget information was available along with the expenses claimed by the Chief Constable.
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – details of the annual policing plan were available but no performance information was found.
4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of strategic command meetings were provided and, although it went further than

the Definition Document, we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings. Unfortunately none were provided.

5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy and this was found. Again we also looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working. This though was not provided.
6. "Lists and registers" – Only gifts and hospitality relating to the Chief Constable were found. A list of business interests broken down by rank was made available.
7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases but we did not find out about any services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee.

All information was made available on their website and they did not have to be contacted.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies. British Transport Police publish this information, including their retention and disposal schedule. No information was provided about policies and procedures concerning charging for information.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. No information was provided despite it being available in the ACPO FOI Manual of Guidance. The latest version follows our recommendations on how to handle requests and, where required, internal reviews.

They claimed to provide a disclosure log but the link to this was not working at the time of the monitoring.

## **Recommendations**

- Performance information should be available

- More information should be provided about the gifts and hospitality received by the authority;
- Clear information should be available about the services the authority offers which it can charge for. Also you should provide information about any charges that may be made for providing information from the publication scheme.
- Information about how the authority handles FOI requests and, where necessary, deals with internal reviews should be published.

## **British Transport Police Authority**

### **Ref: POLA03**

The publication scheme was checked on 13 November 2009. It was easy to find and the authority's guide to information conformed to ICO guidance.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information was found.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. Links to the budget information did not work so the provision of this information could not be verified. Information about the allowances paid to senior staff/board members was available as a hard copy on request.
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – details of the authority's strategic plan were available but no statistical information was found.
4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior management meetings were provided although not updated since the 12 March 2009. In addition, although it went further than the

Definition Document, we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings and these were available.

5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy. We found brief details about recruitment arrangements but no underlying policy. Again we also looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the authority's partnership working but this was not provided.
6. "Lists and registers" – The Register of Gifts and Hospitality was available on request. They also stated that the Register of Interests was available but the links to this did not work.
7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases but we did not find out about any services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee.

The authority was contacted for some of the above information on the 13 November and they responded on the 18 November.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies. British Transport Police Authority does not publish this information.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. The only information found was about their request handling procedures which was available on application.

Finally although the authority had a disclosure log page on its website no information was provided. They did state that information would be provided "soon".

## **Recommendations**

- Once set-up the scheme needs to be maintained. This means both ensuring that up to date information is available and that links to information work.



- Information about the authority's performance should be available;
- The Register of Interests should be published;
- Information should be available about the services the authority offers which it can charge for. Also information about any charges that may be made for providing material from the publication scheme should be clear.
- Information about how the authority handles FOI requests and, where necessary, deals with internal reviews should be published.

## [Index](#)

### **Cambridgeshire Constabulary**

#### **POL04**

The publication scheme was checked on 28 October 2009. It was easy to find (despite no reference to FOI being on their homepage) and the authority's guide to information conformed to ICO guidance.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information was found.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. Budget information was available along with the expenses claimed but only up until 31 March 2009.
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – details of the local policing plan were available. Performance information was provided via a link to the HMIC home page.

4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior management meetings were provided but only until 7 April 2009. Although it went further than what the Definition Document required, we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings. Unfortunately none were provided.
5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy. However what we found was focused on actual recruitment rather than the underlying policy. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working and some information was provided.
6. "Lists and registers" – A list of business interests was made available but the not the Register of Gifts and Hospitality.
7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases and information about any services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee (and this was comprehensive).

All information was in theory made available on their website and they did not have to be contacted.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies. Cambridgeshire Constabulary did not provide any force specific information but they did make available "Guidance on the Management of Police Information 2006".

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. Only brief details about their request handling procedures were published.

Finally we were pleased to see that the authority provided a disclosure log.

## **Recommendations**

- Once set-up the scheme needs to be maintained. This means both ensuring that up to date information is available and

that links to information work.

- The information provided through the scheme needs to be kept up to date, for example details of expenses and the minutes of senior management meetings;
- The authority's recruitment policy should be published;
- Access to the authority's Register of Gifts and Hospitality should be provided;
- Information about how the authority handles FOI requests and, where necessary, deals with internal reviews should be published.

## **Cambridgeshire Police Authority**

### **POLA04**

The publication scheme was checked on 16 October 2009. It was easy to find and the authority's guide to information conformed to ICO guidance.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information was found.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. Budget information was available along with information about expenses and allowances.
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – only details of the local policing plan were available on request.
4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior management meetings were provided and, although it went further than what the Definition Document required, we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings. These were provided.

5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy. However what we found was a link to Cambridgeshire Constabulary's website. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working but no information was provided.
  
6. "Lists and registers" – A list of business interests was made available (on request) but the not the Register of Gifts and Hospitality.
  
7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases but not about any services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee.

A copy of the Register of Interests was requested on 13 November 2009. To date they have not responded.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies. The authority stated that it operated the same policy as Cambridgeshire Constabulary and provided a link to their site.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. No information was made available.

Finally they did not operate a disclosure log.

## **Recommendations**

- If the authority states in the publication scheme that information will be provided when someone contacts the authority then this needs to happen. It is not acceptable for a request for such information to be ignored;
  
- More information should be provided in the "What are our priorities and how we are doing" class;

- The Register of Gifts and Hospitality should be made available through the authority's publication scheme;
- Information about how the authority handles FOI requests and, where necessary, deals with internal reviews should be published.

## [Index](#)

### Cheshire Constabulary

#### Ref: POL05

The publication scheme was checked on 15 October 2009. It was easy to find and the authority's guide to information conformed to ICO guidance.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information was found.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. Budget information was available along with the expenses claimed by senior officers and staff.
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – details of the annual policing plan were available. Performance information was provided via a link to the HMIC site.
4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior management meetings were provided and, although it went further than the definition document, we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings. Unfortunately none were provided.
5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy and this was available. Again we looked for information not covered by

the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working. Unfortunately this was not provided.

6. "Lists and registers" – Information was provided from both the Register of Gifts and Hospitality and from the Register of Interests.
7. "The services we offer" – we looked for but could not find copies of press releases. There was though information about services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee.

All information was made available on their website and they did not have to be contacted.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies. Cheshire Constabulary does not publish this information although it does provide a link to the Manual of Police Information.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. This information was available and conformed to the provisions of the Section 45 Code of Practice.

Finally we were pleased to see that the authority provided a disclosure log. We found it to be comprehensive and easy to navigate.

## **Recommendations**

Apart from providing copies of press releases, we found what we were looking for. The authority now needs to maintain this standard.

## **Cheshire Police Authority**

### **Ref: POLA05**

The publication scheme was checked on 20 October 2009. There was no direct reference to FOI on the authority's home page and

consequently it required some searching to find the scheme. However the authority's guide to information conformed to ICO guidance.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information was found.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff/board members allowances and expenses. This was found.
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – details of the current policing plan were available but no performance information was found.
4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior management meetings were provided and, although it went further than the definition document, we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings. Unfortunately because files on the relevant web page could not be opened, the availability of the latter could not be verified.
5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy. However what we found was focused on actual recruitment rather than the underlying policy. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working and this was provided.
6. "Lists and registers" – When the inspection was carried out the website stated that the "Register of Gifts and Hospitality" was only available for viewing. A list of business interests was made available.

7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases but we did not find out about any services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee.

While there was no information which had to be sent out as a hard copy, our concern is that the Register of Gifts and Hospitality was only available for viewing at the authority's premises.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies and Cheshire Police Authority do publish this information, including their retention and disposal schedule. Policies and procedures about charging for information were also provided.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. Basic information was provided about how they handled requests and dealt with internal reviews. No information about transferring requests was made available nor was any statistical information about request and complaint handling accessible.

Finally we were pleased to see that the authority provided a basic disclosure log.

## **Recommendations**

- More information should be provided in the class "What are our priorities and how we are doing", especially statistical/performance information;
- The authority's recruitment policy should be published;
- The site should be kept maintained so that all links work;
- The authority should consider (like many other public authorities) placing the Register of Gifts and Hospitality online.

## **[Index](#)**

**City of London Police**

**POL06**



This authority was inspected on 22 October 2009. It was found that the authority did not meet the requirements set out in the Freedom of Information Act, section 19 to operate an approved publication scheme. We wrote to them on 9 November 2009 and to date no response has been received.

## **City of London Corporation as Police Authority**

### **POLA06**

This authority was inspected on 26 October 2009. It was found that the authority did not meet the requirements set out in the Freedom of Information Act, section 19 to operate an approved publication scheme. We wrote to them on 19 January. They responded on 1 February. They explained that they had made it clear that the City of London Corporation's role included being the formally constituted police authority for the City of London Police. Following on from this they said that they had adopted the ICO model scheme and information from the seven classes was available with this being set out in their guide to information. Checking their website (10 February 2010) does verify this. However they could make this all a lot clearer to people looking to use their publication scheme and especially in this case in their role as the police authority.

### **[Index](#)**

## **Cleveland Police**

### **POL07**

The publication scheme was checked on 26 October 2009. It was easy to find and the authority's guide to information conformed to ICO guidance.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information was found.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff

allowances and expenses. Budget information was not available and only the expenses claimed by the Chief Constable were provided.

3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – details of the annual policing plan were available as was performance information.
4. "How we make decisions" – no minutes of senior management meetings were made available. Although it went further than the Definition Document we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings. None were provided.
5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy. However what we found was focused on actual recruitment rather than the underlying policy. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working and this was provided.
6. "Lists and registers" – neither a register of gifts/hospitality nor a Register of Interests was made available.
7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases. We also found out about the services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee.

All information was made available on their website and they did not have to be contacted.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies and Cleveland Police do publish this information, including their retention and disposal schedule. There was though no information provided about policies and procedures dealing with charging for information.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. No information was provided.

At the time of inspection the authority did not operate a disclosure log although on its website it stated that this was under development.

### **Recommendations**

- Budgetary information should be provided along with information about the expenses claimed by senior officers and staff and not just the Chief Constable.
- Information about senior management meetings should be available through the publication scheme.
- The Register of Interests and the Register of Gifts and Hospitality should be made available through the scheme.
- Information about how the authority handles FOI requests and, where necessary, deals with internal reviews should be available.

### **Cleveland Police Authority**

#### **POLA07**

The publication scheme was checked on 2 November 2009. It was easy to find and the authority's guide to information conformed to ICO guidance.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information was found.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. Budget information was available along with the expenses claimed by senior members of the authority.

3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – details of the annual policing plan were available but no performance information was found.
4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior management meetings were provided and, although it went further than the definition document, we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings. Unfortunately none were provided.
5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy. Nothing was provided. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working. No information about such working was provided.
6. "Lists and registers" – The "Register of Gifts and Hospitality" was available on request. A Register of Interests was made available online.
7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases but we did not find out about any services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee.

The Register of Gifts and Hospitality was requested on 2 November and provided on 4 November.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies. Cleveland Police Authority does not publish this information. There was though information provided about the policies and procedures concerning charging for information.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. No material was published.

Finally the authority did not provide a disclosure log.

## **Recommendations**

- Performance/statistical information should be provided;
- The authority's recruitment policy should be available;
- Information about how the authority handles FOI requests and, where necessary, deals with internal reviews should be published.

## **Index**

### **Cumbria Constabulary**

#### **POL08**

The publication scheme was checked on 12 November 2009. It was easy to find and the authority's guide to information conformed to ICO guidance.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information was found.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. Budget information was available along with expenses information.
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – details of the area policing plans were available as was performance information.
4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior management meetings were provided and, although it went further than the definition document, we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings. Unfortunately none were provided.

5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy. This was provided. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working and this was also provided.
6. "Lists and registers" – Both the Register of Gifts and Hospitality and the Register of Interests were made available.
7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases. The authority stated that information about any services that they provided where they were entitled to levy a fee would be added to the site.

All information was made available on their website and they did not have to be contacted.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies. Cumbria Constabulary does publish this information in the form of a copy of the Manual of Police Information. There was though no information provided about policies and procedures in connection with charging for information although it was said that this would be added.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. No information was provided.

At the time of the inspection there was no disclosure log although again there was a statement that this would be added to the website.

### **Recommendations**

- Information about how the authority handles FOI requests and, where necessary, deals with internal reviews should be published.

**Cumbria Police Authority**

**POLA08**

This authority was inspected on 16 November 2009. It was found that the authority did not meet the requirements set out in the Freedom of Information Act, section 19 to operate an approved publication scheme. We wrote to them on 14 January 2010 and to date no response has been received. However a check on their website on 22 March revealed that they are now operating an approved publication scheme.

## [Index](#)

### Derbyshire Constabulary

#### POL09

The publication scheme was checked on 12 October 2009. It was easy to find and the authority's guide to information conformed to ICO guidance.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information was found.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. Budget information was available along with the expenses information.
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – details of the annual policing plan were available and performance information was found.
4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior management meetings were provided and, although it went further than the definition document, we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings. Unfortunately none were provided.
5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy and this

was available. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working. This though was not provided.

6. "Lists and registers" – The Register of Gifts and Hospitality was available on the website while the constabulary had to be contacted for the Register of Interests.
7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases. We also found some information about the services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee.

A request was made for information in the scheme but not on the authority's website on the 12 October with a reminder being sent on 9 November 2009. A response was then received one day after the reminder was sent.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies. All that was provided was a link to the Manual of Police Information. While there was material provided about policies and procedures concerning charging for information, these did not follow the relevant ICO guidance.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. No information was made available.

Finally we were pleased to see that the authority provided a disclosure log.

## **Recommendations**

- Information available from the publication scheme on application to the authority should be provided within five working days;
- Information about how the authority handles FOI requests and, where necessary, deals with internal reviews should be published.



## Derbyshire Police Authority

### POLA09

The publication scheme was checked on 13 October 2009. It was easy to find however the authority's guide to information did not conform to the ICO guidance on the subject.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information was found.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. Only information from the capital budget was available while the link to information about allowances and expenses did not work.
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – policing plans were available and performance information was found.
4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior management meetings were provided and, although it went further than the definition document, we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings. These were provided.
5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy. Nothing was provided. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working. This though was not provided.
6. "Lists and registers" – No information was made available about either the Register of Gifts and Hospitality or the Register of Interests.

7. "The services we offer" – we looked for but did not find any copies of press release. Nor did we find out about any services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee.

All information made available was via their website and they did not have to be contacted.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies. Derbyshire Police Authority do not publish this information. Information was provided about the policies and procedures concerning charging for information.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. No information was provided.

The authority did not publish a disclosure log.

### **Recommendations**

- The authority should ensure the scheme is maintained both with keeping it up to date and ensuring that links work.
- The Register of Gifts and Hospitality and the Register of Interests should be made available through your publication scheme.
- Information about the authority's records management policy should be available.
- Information about how the authority handles FOI requests and, where necessary, deals with internal reviews should be published.

### **[Index](#)**

## **Devon and Cornwall Police**

### **POL10**

This authority was inspected on 16 October 2009. It was found that the authority did not meet the requirements set out in the Freedom of Information Act, section 19 to operate an approved publication

scheme. We wrote to them on 9 November. They responded on 30 November. They claimed to have adopted the ICO model scheme from January 2009, however they recognised that failings with their internet meant that this was not clear. They have taken effective remedial action. On 10 February 2010 information both about and from their publication scheme could easily be found.

## **Devon and Cornwall Police Authority**

### **POLA10**

This authority was inspected on 16 October 2009. It was found that the authority did not meet the requirements set out in the Freedom of Information Act, section 19 to operate an approved publication scheme. We wrote to them on 28 October. They responded on 12 November. They admitted that they had been "...tardy in our formal adoption of the new publication scheme..." However they have now adopted the ICO model scheme and this is welcomed. There does though remain work to be done to improve access to the information on their website and to remove the old publication scheme.

### **[Index](#)**

## **Dorset Police**

### **POL11**

The publication scheme was checked on 14 October 2009. It was easy to find and the authority's guide to information conformed to ICO guidance.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information was found.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. What can be described as "headline" budget information was available along with the

expenses claimed by the Chief Constable and senior officers and staff.

3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – details of the annual policing plan were available and performance information was found.
4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior management meetings were provided and, although it went further than the definition document, we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings. Unfortunately none were provided.
5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy. However what we found was focused on actual recruitment rather than the underlying policy. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working. The authority's policy to partnership working was provided.
6. "Lists and registers" – copies of both the Register of Gifts and Hospitality and the Register of Interests were available.
7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases. Limited material was available about any services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee.

All information was made available on their website and they did not have to be contacted.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies. Dorset Police do publish a very high level policy including their approach to records retention and disposal. There was also some basic information provided about policies and procedures concerning charging for information.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. The only information available was via a link to ACPO guidance about request handling.

Finally we were pleased to see that the authority provided a comprehensive and well set out disclosure log.

### **Recommendations**

- Information about how the authority handles FOI requests and, where necessary, deals with internal reviews should be published.
- The authority's recruitment policy should be published;
- In addition we think that the authority can make more information available (for example more detailed budgetary information).

### **Dorset Police Authority**

#### **POLA11**

This authority was inspected on 14 October 2009. It was found that the authority did not meet the requirements set out in the Freedom of Information Act, section 19 to operate an approved publication scheme. We wrote to them on 28 October. They responded on 10 November 2009. The authority said that they had adopted the model scheme but following the ICO's contact with them they would be seeking to improve access to both the scheme and the information it contained. This appeared to be the case when the scheme was checked on 10 February 2010. This effort is to be welcomed.

#### **[Index](#)**

### **Durham Constabulary**

#### **POL12**

The publication scheme was checked on 16 October 2009. It was easy to find and the authority's guide to information conformed to ICO guidance.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information was found.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. The most recent budget information available covered 2008. Information about expenses and allowances could be found and was up to date.
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – details of the annual force policing plan was available but no performance information was found.
4. "How we make decisions" – No information about senior management meetings was provided and, although it went further than the definition document, we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings. Unfortunately none were provided.
5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy. A link was provided to a national police recruitment website. There was no information about the underlying policy. Like the previous class we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working and this was provided.
6. "Lists and registers" – The information on the Register of Gifts and Hospitality only went up to August 2008 and there was no material provided about any outside interests of senior officers or members of staff.
7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases and we found out about the services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee.

All information was made available on their website and they did not have to be contacted.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies. Durham Constabulary do publish their own Information Management Strategy, including their approach to retention and disposal issues. There was though little further information provided about charging for information.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests and internal reviews. Unfortunately nothing was available.

Finally we were pleased to see that the authority provided a comprehensive and searchable disclosure log.

## **Recommendations**

- Information in the publication scheme should be kept up to date. For example the most recent budget information found was from 2008 and it was the same for the Register of Gifts and Hospitality.
- Minutes from senior management meetings should be available;
- A copy of the authority's Register of Interests should be accessible;
- Information about how the authority handles FOI requests and, where necessary, deals with internal reviews should be published.

## **Durham Police Authority**

### **POLA12**

The publication scheme was checked on 21 October 2009. It was easy to find and the authority's guide to information conformed to ICO guidance.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information was found.

2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. Budget information was available along with the expenses/allowances claimed by authority members but not staff.
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – details of the annual policing plan were available as was performance information.
4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior management meetings were provided and, although it went further than the definition document, we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings. They were provided.
5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy. No information was found. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working and this was provided.
6. "Lists and registers" – Copies of both the Register of Gifts and Hospitality and the Register of Interests were available on request.
7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases but we did not find out about any services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee.

Information from the Register of Gifts and Hospitality and the Register of Interests was requested on the 26 October 2009. By 23 November there was no response and a reminder was sent. This elicited an apology and the information requested was received on 3 December 2009.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies. No information was available although they stated that policies were being developed. Information was provided



about policies and procedures about charging for information. This though did not appear to accord with current ICO guidance (eg charges of 50p per sheet for copying)

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. No information was made available.

The authority did not operate a disclosure log.

## **Recommendations**

- If the authority states in the publication scheme that information will be provided when someone contacts the authority, then this needs to happen. The applicant should not have to chase-up the authority's response;
- Information about how the authority handles FOI requests and, where necessary, deals with internal reviews should be published;
- Information should be available about the services the authority offers which it can charge for. Also information about any charges that may be made for providing material from the publication scheme should be clear;
- Once developed, the authority's records management policy should be published.

## **[Index](#)**

### **Dyfed-Powys Police**

#### **POL13**

The publication scheme was checked on 15 October 2009. It was easy to find and the authority's guide to information conformed to ICO guidance.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information was found.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. Budget information was available along with the expenses claimed by senior officers and staff.
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – details of the annual policing plan were available and performance information was found.
4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior management meetings were provided and, although it went further than the definition document, we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings. Unfortunately none were provided.
5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy. However no policy information was found. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working but this was not provided.
6. "Lists and registers" – Both the "Register of Gifts and Hospitality" and the "Register of Interests" were provided albeit by contacting the authority.
7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases and information was found about the services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee.

When the authority was contacted for some of the information provided via the publication scheme they responded within two working days.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies. While there was a reference to these and to

their retention and disposal schedule it did not appear that the authority published this information. However material was provided about policies and procedures for charging for information.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. They did not make information about request handling available. However information about their internal review process was available and they appear to have been following ACPO guidance in this area. That guidance though did not accord with the relevant ICO guidance. Revised ACPO guidance which was published after the inspection of this scheme took place does reflect the ICO position. Following ACPO's new guidance will ensure that Dyfed-Powys Police provide up to date material about their information request handling practices.

Finally we were pleased to see that the authority provided a comprehensive disclosure log.

### **Recommendations**

- The authority's recruitment policy should be available;
- The records management policy and retention and disposal schedule should be published;
- Information about how the authority handles FOI requests and, where necessary, deals with internal reviews should be provided.

## **Dyfed-Powys Police Authority**

### **POLA13**

The publication scheme was checked on 15 October 2009. It was easy to find and the authority's guide to information conformed to ICO guidance. However it was felt that the guide was not as comprehensive as the online version of the publication scheme.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information was found.

2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. Budget and expenses information was available but only by contacting the authority.
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – at the time of the inspection visitors to their website were informed that their business plan was under development. Statistical information was available but only by contacting the authority.
4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior management meetings were provided and, although it went further than the definition document, we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings. These were provided.
5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy. This was found. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working and this was also provided.
6. "Lists and registers" – Both the Register of Gifts and Hospitality and the Register of Interests were available by contacting the authority.
7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases but we did not find out about any services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee.

Where we had to contact the authority for information this was provided within two working days.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies. Dyfed-Powys Police Authority stated that their records management policy was under development. Their retention and disposal schedule was available by contacting them. Material was also provided about policies and procedures for charging for information.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. No such information was found.

Finally we were pleased to see that the authority provided a limited disclosure log.

### **Recommendations**

- The authority's records management and retention and disposal schedule should be published;
- Information about how the authority handles FOI requests and, where necessary, deals with internal reviews should be published.
- Overall more of the information should be available online.

### **[Index](#)**

## **Essex Police**

### **POL14**

The publication scheme was checked on 16 October 2009. It was easy to find and the authority's guide to information conformed to ICO guidance.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information was found.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. Budget information was available along with the expenses and allowances claimed by senior officers and staff.

3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – details of the annual policing plan were available and there were some links to performance information.
4. "How we make decisions" – Essex police stated that this part of their website was under development. As a consequence no minutes of senior management meetings were provided. Although it went further than the Definition Document we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings, unfortunately these were not provided.
5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy. No information was provided. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working but this was not made available.
6. "Lists and registers" – Both the "Register of Gifts and Hospitality" and the "Register of Interests" were stated to be under development and as a consequence no information was available.
7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases and we found out about the services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee.

All information was made available on their website and they did not have to be contacted.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies. It does not appear that Essex Police publish this information. However their retention and disposal schedule was available. Some information was provided about their policies and procedures for charging for information.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. No information was found.

The authority did not publish a disclosure log.

## **Recommendations**

- The authority should provide the minutes of senior management meetings;
- The Register of Gifts and Hospitality and the Register of Interests available via the authority's publication scheme;
- The authority should publish its records management policy;
- Information about how the authority handles FOI requests and, where necessary, deals with internal reviews should be published.

## **Essex Police Authority**

### **POLA14**

This authority was inspected on 20 October 2009. It was found that the authority did not meet the requirements set out in the Freedom of Information Act, section 19 to operate an approved publication scheme. We wrote to them on 28 October. They called the ICO two days later to inform us that their adoption of the model scheme would be on their website later that day. When we checked the website on 10 February 2010 what appeared to be a link to publication scheme information did not work. A final check on 22 March revealed that the link did work and they have now adopted the Information Commissioner's Model Publication Scheme.

### **[Index](#)**

## **Gloucestershire Constabulary**

### **POL15**

This authority was inspected on 20 October 2009. It was found that the authority did not meet the requirements set out in the Freedom of Information Act, section 19 to operate an approved publication scheme. We wrote to them on 28 October. They have responded and promised that they will operate a scheme in accordance with the requirements of section 19. This will be in operation by the end of March 2010, some 14 months late. However because they have committed to do this any further action is not likely to assist their

compliance at this stage. If they fail to meet this deadline further action will be considered.

## **Gloucestershire Police Authority**

### **POLA15**

The publication scheme was checked on 20 October 2009. It was easy to find and the authority's guide to information conformed to ICO guidance.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information was found.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. Budget information was available along with expenses information (the latter in the Statement of Accounts).
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – neither current business plan nor any performance information were found.
4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior management meetings were provided and, although it went further than the definition document, we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings and they were provided.
5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy. None was provided. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the authority's partnership working and some information was provided.



6. "Lists and registers" – There was no "Register of Gifts and Hospitality". A "Register of Interests" was available on request.
  
7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases but we did not find out about any services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee.

Where the authority had to be contacted for information they responded within three working days.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management and retention and disposal policies. Gloucestershire Police Authority does not publish this information. There was some information provided about policies and procedures for charging for information.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. No information was found.

The authority did not publish a disclosure log.

### **Recommendations**

- Business plans and performance/statistical information should be published;
- The authority's recruitment policy should be available;
- A copy of the Register of Gifts and Hospitality should be published;
- The authority's records management policy should be provided;
- Information about how the authority handles FOI requests and, where necessary, deals with internal reviews should be published.

### **[Index](#)**

## Greater Manchester Police

### POL16

The publication scheme was checked on 21 October 2009. It was easy to find and the authority's guide to information conformed to ICO guidance.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information was found.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. Budget information was available along with expenses information.
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – details of the annual policing plan were available but no performance information was found.
4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior management meetings were provided but only up until March 2007. Although it went further than the Definition Document we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings. Unfortunately none were provided.
5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy. This was published. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working but this was not provided.
6. "Lists and registers" – The "Register of Gifts and Hospitality" and the "Register of Interests" were provided but only by contacting the authority.

7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases and we found out about the services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee.

Where Greater Manchester Police had to be contacted for information they responded within one working day.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies. No information was found. Neither was information provided about their policies and procedures concerning charging for information.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. The only material published was statistics about the number of requests received by the authority.

Finally we were pleased to see that the authority provided a comprehensive disclosure log.

## **Recommendations**

- Performance information about the authority should be made available;
- The publication scheme needs to be kept up to date, for example minutes from recent management meetings should be provided;
- Information should be provided about how the authority manages its records (including retention and disposal schedules);
- Information about how the authority handles FOI requests and, where necessary, deals with internal reviews should be published.

## **Greater Manchester Police Authority**

### **POLA16**

This authority was inspected on 21 October 2009. It was found that the authority did not meet the requirements set out in the Freedom of Information Act, section 19 to operate an approved publication

scheme. We wrote to them on 28 October. Their response was sent on 10 November. They stated that they would take remedial action to put the new model scheme on their website by the 18 December. In the end the information was made available a few days after this. When the scheme was checked on 10 February 2010 the scheme was available. However they can still improve the accessibility of both the scheme and the information available through it.

## [Index](#)

### **Gwent Police**

#### **POL17**

The publication scheme was checked on 5 November 2009. It was easy to find and the authority's guide to information conformed to ICO guidance.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information was found.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. Budget information was available along a general figure covering all the expenses claimed by the force's ACPO ranks.
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – details of the policing plan and strategy plan were available but no performance information was found.
4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior management meetings were provided but only until 2007. Although it went further than the Definition Document we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings. Unfortunately none were provided.

5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy and this was found. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working and this was also provided.
  
6. "Lists and registers" – The "Register of Gifts and Hospitality" was only maintained until 2007/8. A basic Register of Interests" was also provided.
  
7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases but we did not find out about any services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee.

All information was made available on their website and they did not have to be contacted.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies and Gwent Police do publish this information, including their retention and disposal schedule. There was though no substantial information provided about policies and procedures about charging for information.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. Some material was made available. The internal review timescales did not follow ICO guidance, however this scheme was inspected before ACPO revised their guidance on the subject to follow the ICO's line.

Finally we noted that the authority provided a basic disclosure log.

## **Recommendations**

- More detailed information should be provided about expenses and allowances, for example what each senior officer or senior member of staff claimed for;
  
- Information about the authority's performance should be provided;
  
- The scheme needs to be kept up to date for example with the minutes of recent senior management meetings;

- A current “Register of Gifts and Hospitality” should be available;
- You should provide information about the services you offer for which you are entitled to levy a fee.

## **Gwent Police Authority**

### **POLA17**

This authority was inspected on 9 November 2009. It was found that the authority did not meet the requirements set out in the Freedom of Information Act, section 19 to operate an approved publication scheme. We wrote to them on 14 January 2010. They have responded that they are operating an approved scheme but that this is not clear from their website. They have committed to make this clearer and ensure that all links connected to the scheme work. When their website was checked on 10 February a copy of their publication scheme was easily found. However they could still improve their guide to information by being clear to users about locating the information.

### **[Index](#)**

## **Hampshire Constabulary**

### **POL18**

The publication scheme was checked on 10 November 2009. It was easy to find and the authority’s guide to information conformed to ICO guidance.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. “Who we are and what we do” - we looked for information about the organisation’s structure and for contact details. This information was found.
2. “What we spend and how we spend it” - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. Budget information was available

along with the expenses claimed by senior management.

3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – details of the annual policing plan were available and performance information was found.
4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior management meetings were provided and, although it went further than the definition document, we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings. Unfortunately none were provided.
5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy and this was available. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working. This was not provided.
6. "Lists and registers" – When the inspection was carried out this part of their website was not hyperlinked. No Register of Gifts and Hospitality was available. A de-personalised Register of Interests was provided and a policy about the Register of Gifts and Hospitality was available by contacting the authority.
7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases and we found out about the services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee (although this information could have provided in a clearer form not across different parts of their website).

They were contacted on 10 November about their Register of Gifts and Hospitality. They responded on 12 November. Unfortunately they did not provide the information requested, rather they informed us that the information would be published annually.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies and Hampshire Constabulary do publish this information (although without any retention and disposal schedule). Information was provided about policies and procedures concerning charging for information.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. This information was a mixture of force specific material and links to the ACPO FOI Manual of Guidance (v5). This version of the ACPO manual did not follow ICO guidance on the handling of internal reviews (and some other aspects of FOI). However v6 of the ACPO manual, which was published after the inspection of this scheme took place, does follow the ICO approach. Making this version available will ensure that Hampshire Constabulary provide up to date information about their information request handling practices.

Finally we were pleased to see that the authority provided a comprehensive disclosure log.

### **Recommendations**

- Both the Register of Gifts and Hospitality and the Register of Interests should be available through the publication scheme;
- Better organisation of information about the services the authority offers and which you can levy a charge for would be beneficial.

## **Hampshire Police Authority**

### **POLA18**

The publication scheme was checked on 9 November 2009. It was not easy to find though because the links from the authority's home page were not clear. The authority's guide to information conformed to ICO guidance.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information was found.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. Budget information was available but had to be searched out and was found in the



"Publications" part of their website. A policy on claiming expenses and allowances was provided but not any information on what was actually claimed by members and the authority's senior staff.

3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – details of the annual policing plan were available along with performance information. However like above in Class 2 this information had to be searched for on their website.
4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior management meetings were provided and, although it went further than the definition document, we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings and these were provided.
5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy. However what we found was limited. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working but none was provided.
6. "Lists and registers" – copies of the "Register of Gifts and Hospitality" and the "Register of Interests" were not provided, although there references to these registers recorded in the minutes of some of the authorities' meetings.
7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases but could not find out about any services the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee.

A request was made for some information from their Disclosure log on 10 November and a response was received the next day.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies. Hampshire Police Authority does not publish this information. Nor do they publish a retention and disposal schedule. There was also no information provided about policies and procedures concerning charging for information.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. We found some limited information about making complaints under their publication scheme material.

Finally we were pleased to see that the authority provided a disclosure log although the actual information within it was limited, with most material being provided on request to the authority.

### **Recommendations**

- The authority should provide information about the actual expenses claimed by members and senior staff rather than just a policy;
- Details of the authority's recruitment policy should be available;
- Copies of the "Register of Gifts and Hospitality" and the "Register of Interests" should be published;
- More information should be provided about how the authority handles FOI requests and, where necessary, deals with internal reviews.

### **[Index](#)**

## **Hertfordshire Constabulary**

### **POL19**

The publication scheme was checked on 11 November 2009. It was easy to find and the authority's guide to information conformed to ICO guidance.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information was found.

2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. Budget information was available along with the expenses claimed by the Chief Constable, Deputy Chief Constables and Assistant Chief Constables.
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – details of the annual policing plan were available. Performance information was provided via a link to the HMIC website.
4. "How we make decisions" –minutes of senior management meetings were provided but only up until June 2009. Although it went further than the Definition Document we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings. Unfortunately none were provided.
5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy but this was not available. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working and this was provided.
6. "Lists and registers" – Copies of the "Register of Gifts and Hospitality" and the "Register of Interests" were provided.
7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases. We also found a comprehensive table of charges covering a wide range of services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee (except for FOI).

A request was made for a copy of the expenses claimed by chief officers. This was done on 11 November 2009 and the authority responded on 12 November.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies and Hertfordshire Constabulary do publish this information, but not their retention and disposal schedule. There was no information provided about policies and procedures concerning charging for information.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. They provided information about how they dealt with requests for internal reviews and this conformed to the requirements of the s45 Code, except for the timescales. No material was provided about how the authority handles requests for information.

We were pleased to see that Hertfordshire Constabulary published a disclosure log but noted that it had not been updated since March 2009.

### **Recommendations**

- The authority should ensure that the scheme is maintained, for example with minutes from recent senior management meetings and links checked to ensure they work.
- Information about how the authority handles FOI requests should be published.

## **Hertfordshire Police Authority**

### **POLA19**

The publication scheme was checked on 12 November 2009. It was found that the authority did not meet the requirements set out in the Freedom of Information Act, section 19 to operate an approved publication scheme. We wrote to them on 11 February 2010. They responded on 24 February and informed us that they had adopted the new model scheme but admitting that they did not have the "Policies and procedures" class. When their scheme was checked on 2 March they had this class in the scheme. Unfortunately it did not have the class of "Who we are and what we do". Their guide to information is also poor in that it does not clearly direct inquirers to where information can be found on their website.

### **[Index](#)**

## Humberside Police

### POL20

The publication scheme was checked on 16 November 2009. Some confusion was caused with information from the old publication scheme being easily accessible. The guide to information was also confusing because the order of the classes of information had been changed from the order of the Information Commissioner's Model Scheme.

We then looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information (albeit basic contact information) was found.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. Budget information was available along with the expenses claimed by the authority's senior officers and staff.
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – details of the annual policing plan were available and performance information was found.
4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior management meetings were provided and, although it went further than the definition document, we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings. Unfortunately none were provided.
5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy. This information was available. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working and this was provided albeit in Class 1.

6. "Lists and registers" – When the inspection was carried out the website stated that the "Register of Gifts and Hospitality" was to be added. They also stated that the "Register of Interests" was to be added, however this was actually available.
  
7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases. They also provided information about services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee. They did appear to have confused this with charging for information provided under FOI.

They were contacted for a copy of their recruitment policy on 16 November 2009 and they responded on 23 November.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies. Humberside Police do not publish this information. The information provided about policies and procedures about charging for information were confusing (see 7 above).

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. No information was found.

Humberside Police's website stated that a disclosure log will be added but no timescale was provided.

## **Recommendations**

- The authority should ensure that the scheme is set up in a clear and accessible manner (for example we found some confusion over the provision of information about charges the authority is entitled to levy);
- A copy of the "Register of Gifts and Hospitality" and the "Register of Interests" should be made available;
- Information should also be provided about how the authority handles FOI requests and, where necessary, deals with requests for internal reviews;
- A timescale should be provided about when the disclosure log will be added.

## Humberside Police Authority

### POLA20

The publication scheme was checked on 16 November 2009. It was easy to find but we thought that the authority's guide to information was set out in an unnecessarily complicated manner.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information was found.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. Budget information was available along with the expenses claimed by authority members and senior staff.
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – details of the authority's business plan were available and so was performance information.
4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior management meetings were provided and, although it went further than the definition document, we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings. These were provided.
5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy. This was available. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working and this was provided albeit under Class 1.
6. "Lists and registers" – Both the "Register of Gifts and Hospitality" and the "Register of Interests" were available by contacting the authority. When the information was provided

they had combined information from both into one document.

7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases. The only information about charging related to charges that could be made under FOI.

Information was requested (see 6. above) on 16 November 2009 and a response was received on 17 November.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies. Humberside Police Authority stated that they publish this information, including their retention and disposal schedule. However the only information on their website was entitled "Updated Filing Structure" and this dated from 2008. No information was provided about policies and procedures covering charging for information, except under FOI.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. In our opinion the authority appear to have confused their duty to respond to requests with their publication scheme obligations as there is a reference to carrying out internal reviews under the publication scheme.

Finally we were pleased to see that the authority provided a disclosure log.

## **Recommendations**

- The operation of the scheme should be as straightforward as possible with a simple and accessible guide to information;
- You should also be aware of the differences between an FOI request (which you have 20 working days to respond to) and a request for information from your publication scheme. In the latter case the information requested should be provided within five working days;
- The records management information which the authority says should be available needs to be.

## **[Index](#)**



## Kent Police

### POL21

The publication scheme was checked on 16 October 2009. It was easy to find but we thought that the authority's guide to information did not conform to the ICO guidance on the subject.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information was found.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. Budget information via a link to the Police Authority website was available. Details of the expenses claimed by the Chief Constable, Deputy Chief Constables and Assistant Chief Constables were provided.
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – no information about policing plans was found but performance information was published.
4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior management meetings were provided and, although it went further than the definition document, we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings. Unfortunately none were provided.
5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy. However what we found was focused on actual recruitment rather than the underlying policy. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working and this was not provided.
6. "Lists and registers" – When the inspection was carried out the website link to the "Register of Gifts and Hospitality" did

not work, The "Register of Interests" was not available on line.

7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases but we did not find out about any services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee.

All information was made available on their website and they did not have to be contacted.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies. Kent Police does publish this information, including their retention and disposal schedule. Brief information was provided about policies and procedures concerning charging for information.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. They followed ACPO's guidance. Although this is comprehensive, the guidance provided in the version available at the time of this inspection does not accord with current ICO guidance. Our current position though is reflected in v6 of the ACPO manual, which was published after the inspection of this scheme took place. Following this version will ensure that Kent police provide up to date information about their information request handling practices.

The authority did not publish a disclosure log.

## **Recommendations**

- Policing plans should be published;
- A copy of the "Register of Gifts and Hospitality" and a copy of the "Register of Interests" should be made available;
- The authority recruitment policy should also be available via the publication scheme;
- The authority should provide clear information about the services provided where they are entitled to levy a fee.

## Kent Police Authority

### POLA21

The publication scheme was checked on 19 October 2009. It was easy to find and the authority's guide to information conformed to ICO guidance.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information was found.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. Budget information was available along with the expenses claimed by authority members and senior staff.
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – details of a three year strategic plan were available but no performance information was found.
4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior management meetings were provided and, although it went further than the definition document, we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings. Unfortunately none were provided.
5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy and this was published. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working and this was provided.
6. "Lists and registers" – Information from both the "Register of Gifts and Hospitality" and from the "Register of Interests" was available.

7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases but we did not find out about any services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee.

All information was made available on their website and they did not have to be contacted.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies. Kent Police Authority do not publish this information. There was also no information provided concerning policies and procedures about charging for information.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. Limited information was published about how they handle requests but we could not find any information about how they dealt with internal reviews.

Finally while the authority said that it published a disclosure log we could not find it.

## **Recommendations**

- Information about how the authority handles FOI requests and, where necessary, deals with internal reviews should be published;
- The authority's records management policies should be published;
- Information should be provided about any fees the authority charges for providing information.

## **[Index](#)**

## **Lancashire Constabulary**

### **POL22**

This authority was inspected on 5 January 2010. It was found that the authority did not meet the requirements set out in the Freedom of Information Act, section 19 to operate an approved publication scheme. Specifically we reached this conclusion because of the omission of an entire class of information (How we make decisions) from the scheme.

We wrote to them on 14 January 2010. The constabulary responded on 29 January. They said that they had adopted the ICO model scheme in full before 1 January 2009. During changes to their external website in the summer of 2009 they effectively “lost” one class of information and they had not been able to correct the situation prior to our inspection. They had subsequently taken remedial action and are now meeting their publication scheme obligations. This was checked and confirmed on 10 February 2010.

There is one further point to make in connection with Lancashire Constabulary. As it was not clear that their publication scheme did not meet the ICO criteria, we went as far as to request some information covered by their scheme from them. The request was made on 5 January, a reminder was sent on 3 February and the information was provided on 18 February.

## **Lancashire Police Authority**

### **POLA22**

The publication scheme was checked on 5 January 2010. It was easy to find and the authority’s guide to information conformed to ICO guidance.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. “Who we are and what we do” - we looked for information about the organisation’s structure and for contact details. This information was found.
2. “What we spend and how we spend it” - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. Budget information was available along with the expenses claimed by authority members but not for senior staff.
3. “What are our priorities and how we are doing” – details of the annual policing plan were available and so was statistical information.

4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior management meetings were provided. Although it went further than the Definition Document we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings and these were provided.
5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy. This could not be found. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working but this was not published.
6. "Lists and registers" – Both the "Register of Gifts and Hospitality" and the "Register of Interests" were available on request.
7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases but we did not find out about any services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee.

Information from the publication scheme was requested on 5 January. They responded on 2 February 2010

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies but Lancashire Police Authority does not publish this information. There was also no information provided concerning policies and procedures about charging for information.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. No information was provided.

The authority stated that it provided a disclosure log but they had to be contacted for this.

## **Recommendations**

- Details of the expenses paid to senior members of staff need to be available;

- Information about the authority's recruitment policy should be provided through the publication scheme;
- The authority's records management policies should be published;
- Information should be provided about how the authority handles FOI requests and, where necessary, deals with internal reviews;
- Information should be provided about any fees the authority charges for providing information from the publication scheme.

## [Index](#)

### Leicestershire Constabulary

#### POL23

The publication scheme was checked on 19 October 2009. It was easy to find and the authority's guide to information conformed to ICO guidance.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information was found.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. Budget information was available via a link to the police authority website. The expenses claimed by the Chief Constable were available but no information was provided about expenses paid to other senior officers or senior members of staff.
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – information about policing plans was sought but this part of their website was described as "under development". Performance information was available.

4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior management meetings were provided and, although it went further than the definition document, we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings. Unfortunately none were provided.
5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy. No specific recruitment policy was found. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working and this was provided albeit across their website rather than linked to this Class.
6. "Lists and registers" – Neither the "Register of Gifts and Hospitality" nor the "Register of Interests" were available. This section was described as "under development".
7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases. We did not find out about any services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee and again this was described as "under development".

All information was made available on their website and they did not have to be contacted.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies but Leicestershire Constabulary do not publish this information, rather it is yet another area "under development". There was though information provided concerning policies and procedures about charging for information.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. No information was published.

Finally the authority claimed that their disclosure log was again "under development".



## **Recommendations**

- Too much information was missing from most of the seven classes;
  - Class 2 – only expenses paid to the Chief Constable, no information was provided about expenses paid to other senior officers and senior members of staff;
  - Class 3 – No policing plans were found;
  - Class 5 – no specific recruitment policy was found;
  - Class 6 – This part of the site was described as “under development” and as a consequence no copies of the “Register of Gifts and Hospitality” and the “Register of Interests” were available;
  - Class 7 – no information available about the services provided where the authority is entitled to charge a fee.

All this information should be routinely available from the authority’s publication scheme.

- The authority’s records management policy and the retention and disposal schedules should be made available.
- Information should be provided about how the authority handles FOI requests and, where necessary, deals with internal reviews.

## **Leicestershire Police Authority**

### **POLA23**

The publication scheme was checked on 16 October 2009. It was not easy to find. However the authority’s guide to information conformed to ICO guidance.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. “Who we are and what we do” - we looked for information about the organisation’s structure and for contact details. This information was found.

2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. Budget information was available along with the expenses claimed by authority members and senior staff.
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – details of the annual policing plan were available along with statistical information.
4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior management meetings were provided. Although it went further than the Definition Document we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings and these were provided.
5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy and this was provided. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working but this was not found.
6. "Lists and registers" – Both the "Register of Gifts and Hospitality" and the "Register of Interests" were available through the scheme.
7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases and we found out about the services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee.

All information was made available on their website and they did not have to be contacted.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies. Leicestershire Police Authority does publish this information, but their retention and disposal schedule could not be located. Information was also provided about policies and procedures concerning charging for information.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. They provided some information about their internal review procedures and their published timescales (15 working days) exceeded ICO guidance (which recommends 20 working days for carrying these out). There was though no information about their request handling procedures.

Finally we were pleased to see that the authority provided a limited disclosure log.

### **Recommendations**

- The authority should make the scheme easier to find on its website;
- Information about how the authority handles FOI requests and, where necessary, deals with internal reviews should be published.

### **[Index](#)**

## **Lincolnshire Police**

### **POL24**

The publication scheme was checked on 30 October 2009. It was easy to find and the authority's guide to information conformed to ICO guidance.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information was found.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. There was a link to the police authority's website where Budget information was available (although it was not easy to find). The expenses and allowances claimed by senior officers and staff were available on request.

3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – area policing plans were available on request. Performance information was found via a link to the police authority's website (but again this was not easy to access).
4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior officer group meetings were provided and, although it went further than the Definition Document, we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings. Unfortunately none were provided.
5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy. However what we found was focused on actual recruitment rather than the underlying policy. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working and again some information was provided.
6. "Lists and registers" – The "Register of Gifts and Hospitality" was available on request. Limited information from the "Register of Interests" was available.
7. "The services we offer" – we looked for but did not find copies of press releases. We found some information about any services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee.

We contacted the authority for some information on 30 October 2009 and we received a response on 9 November.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies. The only information we found though was their retention and disposal schedule. Information was provided concerning policies and procedures about charging for information.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. Lincolnshire Police did provide information about how they handled FOI requests and also about their internal review procedure. Their approach though did not appear to follow ICO guidance on these matters.

Finally while Lincolnshire Police do not currently publish a disclosure log they have made a statement on their website that they will publish this sometime this year (2010).

## **Recommendations**

- Information (such as budget and performance material) provided via a link to the police authority's website should be easy to find at the end of the link;
- The authority's recruitment policy should be provided under the scheme;
- Records management information should be made available.
- The authority should follow the ICO's recommendations for handling FOI requests.

## **Lincolnshire Police Authority**

### **POLA24**

The publication scheme was checked on 2 November 2009. It was easy to find and the authority's guide to information conformed to ICO guidance.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information was found, although a link to the authority's structure did not work.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. After some searching budget information was found in the committee papers. There are references to expenses and allowances on the authority's disclosure log but no information was found on the authority's website.

3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – details of the annual policing plan were available as was statistical information.
4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior management meetings were provided and, although it went further than the Definition Document, we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings. These were provided.
5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy. However no information could be found. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working but this also could not be found.
6. "Lists and registers" – Both the "Register of Gifts and Hospitality" and the "Register of Interests" were only available by contacting the authority.
7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases but we did not find out about any services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee.

We contacted the authority for some information on 2 November 2009. We received a response on 8 November stating that our request for information from the publication scheme "will be treated as a FOIA request and will respond in 20 days. On 9 November the authority were reminded about their publication scheme commitments. The information requested was then provided on 10 November.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies but Lincolnshire Police Authority does not publish this information. They claim to have published a retention and disposal policy but no information was found. There was also no information provided about policies and procedures concerning charging for information.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. We could not find any published material.

Finally we were pleased to see that the authority provided a disclosure log.

## **Recommendations**

- The authority should ensure that links on its website work so that information such as the authority's structure can be accessed;
- The information covered by the scheme needs to be easy to find, On a few occasions when checking this scheme we found information was not easy to find and access;
- Clear information should be provided about any charges levied for providing information;
- The authority's records management policies should be made available under the scheme;
- Information should be provided about how the authority handles FOI requests and, where necessary, deals with internal reviews.

## **[Index](#)**

### **Merseyside Police**

#### **POL25**

The publication scheme was checked on 3 December 2009. The scheme was not easy to find but the authority's guide to information conformed to ICO guidance.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information was found.

2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. Budget information was available along with the expenses claimed by the Chief Constable, Deputy Chief Constable, Assistant Chief Constables and senior staff.
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – details of the annual policing plan were available. The guide indicated that performance information was available but this was in the form of a link to the police authority's website and the information provided was not informative.
4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior management meetings were provided and, although it went further than the Definition Document, we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings. Unfortunately none were provided.
5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy and comprehensive material was available. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working but this was not provided.
6. "Lists and registers" – Copies of the "Register of Gifts and Hospitality" and the "Register of Interests" were provided.
7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases and we found out about the services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee.

All information was made available on their website and they did not have to be contacted.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies. Merseyside Police do not publish this information but state that further development work is being undertaken in this area. Information was provided about policies and procedures concerning charging for information. We do though think that Merseyside Police could have made clearer the difference



between charges for pro-actively released information and the fees regulations which may be applied to a request.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. They do publish a small amount of information about how they handle FOI requests but they did not include any timescales. There was no information published about their internal review process.

Finally we were pleased to see that the authority provided a disclosure log. While comprehensive it was unfortunately last updated in March 2007.

### **Recommendations**

- More informative performance information should be available;
- Information should be provided about the authority's records management policy;
- Information about how the authority handles FOI requests and, where necessary, deals with internal reviews should be published.

## **Merseyside Police Authority**

### **POLA25**

This authority was inspected on 12 January 2010. It was found that the authority did not meet the requirements set out in the Freedom of Information Act, section 19 to operate an approved publication scheme. We wrote to them on 14 January. They responded on 27 January and stated that they had adopted the new scheme. However on checking their website (11 February), it was clear that they had only modified their old publication scheme. They informed us that they had improved the links on the site to the scheme as well. The result was the scheme was easier to find but the document (dated November 2009) did not follow the approved ICO model scheme.

### **[Index](#)**

## Metropolitan Police Service

### POL26

The publication scheme was checked on 14 October 2009. It was easy to find and the authority's guide to information conformed to ICO guidance.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information was found.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. Budget information was not available but comprehensive information was published concerning the expenses of senior officers and staff.
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – the last force-wide policing plan that could be located covered the period 2007 – 2010. A lot of departmental business plans were available as were local policing plans for individual boroughs. Unfortunately it did not appear that a lot of the material available was kept up to date.
4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior management meetings were provided but only up until April 2009. Although it went further than the Definition Document we then looked for any supporting papers for these meetings. Unfortunately none were provided.
5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy and this was found. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working and some material was provided.

6. "Lists and registers" – A copy of the "Register of Gifts and Hospitality" was made available but the "Register of Interests" was not provided.
  
7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases and we found out about the services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee.

All information was made available on their website and they did not have to be contacted.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies. The Metropolitan Police Service does publish its records management policies but not its retention and disposal schedule. Information provided was provided about the policies and procedures concerning charging for information.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. They provide a copy of the ACPO Manual of Guidance v5. Although this is comprehensive the guidance provided in this version does not accord with current ICO guidance. Our current position though is reflected in v6 of the ACPO manual, which was published after the inspection of this scheme took place. Providing this version will ensure that the Metropolitan Police Service provides up to date information about their information request handling practices.

The authority does not publish a disclosure log.

## **Recommendations**

- Information provided under the scheme needs to be kept up to date, for example the most recent minutes of senior management meetings came from meetings held six months prior to this inspection;
  
- A copy of the Register of Interests should be published;
  
- There also needs to be a more joined up approach to the publication scheme from the borough commands and other parts of the MPS to ensure a consistency of information provision.

## Metropolitan Police Authority

### POLA26

The publication scheme was checked on 15 October 2009. It was easy to find and the authority's guide to information conformed to ICO guidance.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information was found.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. Budget information was available but only after searching for it and finding within the current business plan. Expenses claimed by the authority members and senior staff were published.
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – details of their current business plan were available but no performance information was found because the links provided did not work.
4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior management meetings were provided and, although it went further than the Definition Document, we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings. These were provided.
5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy. However no information could be found. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working but this was not provided (although there was a lot of information published in this class by the authority).
6. "Lists and registers" – The "Register of Gifts and Hospitality" was made available but the links to the "Register of Interests"

did not work.

7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases but we did not find out about any services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee.

All information was made available on their website and they did not have to be contacted.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies. The Metropolitan Police Authority does publish this information, including their retention and disposal schedule. They also published material concerning their policies and procedures about charging for information.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. They published basic information about their request handling procedures and about their internal review processes but no timescales were provided.

Finally we were pleased to see that the authority provided a disclosure log. Unfortunately it appeared that this was last updated in 2007.

## **Recommendations**

- The authority needs to ensure links provided on its website function. Too often in this inspection we came across broken links which resulted in information not being available;
- A copy of the authority's recruitment policy should be published under the scheme;
- More information about how the authority handles FOI requests and, where necessary, deals with internal reviews should be published.

## **[Index](#)**

## Norfolk Constabulary

### POL27

The publication scheme was checked on 16 December 2009. It was easy to find and the authority's guide to information conformed to ICO guidance.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details and comprehensive information was found.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. Budget information was available along with the expenses claimed by senior officers and staff.
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – Norfolk Constabulary do not produce area policing plans rather they have a force-wide strategic plan which all departments contribute to. Performance review information was provided via a link to the police authority website.
4. "How we make decisions" – Norfolk Constabulary stated that this part of their publication scheme was under development and while this was being done information would be provided by contacting the authority.
5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy and we found this. We also looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working but this was not provided.
6. "Lists and registers" – Comprehensive information about the "Register of Gifts and Hospitality" and the "Register of Interests" was published.

7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases and we found out about the services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee.

Except for "How we make decisions" all information was made available on their website and we did not contact them.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies but Norfolk Constabulary does not publish this information. Nor do they publish their retention and disposal schedule. There was though material concerning policies and procedures about charging for information.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. They provided a lot of information about their request handling procedures and how they dealt with internal reviews. ICO guidance, including timescales, was followed by the authority. However no information was published about how they dealt with the transfer of requests to other public authorities.

Finally we were pleased to see that the authority provided a disclosure log.

### **Recommendations**

- Information from the "How we make decisions" class needs to be easily accessible;
- The authority should publish its records management policy. The Manual of Police Information (MOPI) contains a lot of useful material;
- You should provide some information about how the authority deals with transferring FOI requests to other public authorities.

### **Norfolk Police Authority**

#### **POLA27**

The publication scheme was checked on 12 January 2010. It was easy to find but it was not absolutely clear that the authority had

adopted the ICO model scheme. The authority had produced a guide to information.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information was found.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. Budget information was not available but the expenses claimed by members of the authority and senior staff were available.
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – details of the current business plan were available and so was performance information.
4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior management meetings were provided and, although it went further than the Definition Document, we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings. These were published.
5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy. However we only found information about the recruitment of independent members of the police authority. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working but this was not provided.
6. "Lists and registers" – Copies of the "Register of Gifts and Hospitality" and the "Register of Interests" were available by contacting the authority.
7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases but we did not find out about the services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee.



They were contacted by email on 5 January 2010 for some information. They responded on 12 January and provided their records management and disposal policy and their "Register of Gifts and Hospitality for members, staff and senior personnel."

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies. Norfolk Police Authority does publish this information, including their retention and disposal schedule but only in response to a request to the authority (see above). They did provide information online about their policies and procedures concerning charging for information.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. They provided some information about their procedures for handling requests (which did not conform to ICO guidance) but nothing on how they dealt with internal reviews or about transferring requests to other public authorities.

The authority did not publish a disclosure log.

### **Recommendations**

- Information should be provided about the police force's overall budget;
- The authority's recruitment policy should be provided under "Our policies and procedures";
- More information should be provided about how the authority handles FOI requests and, where necessary, deals with internal reviews.

### **[Index](#)**

## **Northamptonshire Police**

### **POL28**

The publication scheme was checked on 16 December 2009. It was easy to find and the authority's guide to information conformed to ICO guidance.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. While contact details were found, the link to the authority's structure did not work.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. Budget information was available along with the expenses claimed by senior officers and staff (but only up until March 2009).
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – details of the annual policing plan were available and comprehensive performance information was found.
4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior management meetings were sought. However while links were provided in their guide to information, the links did not take users to the expected information. Although it went further than the Definition Document, we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings. Unfortunately none were provided.
5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy and this was provided. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working but this was not available.
6. "Lists and registers" – The "Register of Gifts and Hospitality" was available, however the information provided was sparse and it did not appear to have been updated since 2007. The "Register of Interests" was not available.
7. "The services we offer" – we looked for but did not find copies of press releases. A link was provided but again it did not take the user to the expected information. We did find a lot of information about the services that the authority provided

where they were entitled to levy a fee.

All information was made available on their website and they did not have to be contacted.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies but Northamptonshire Police does not publish this information. Nor do they publish their retention and disposal schedule. Information was provided about the services they could charge for but there was nothing about charges for the release of proactively disseminated material.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. They provided information about how they dealt with requests for information and this conformed to ICO guidance. They also provided information about their internal review process but here their approach did not follow the ICO's recommendations. If they follow the recently published ACPO Manual of Guidance v6 then they will be conforming to the ICO's approach. They did not provide any material about how they dealt with transferring requests to other public authorities.

Finally we noted that the authority did not publish a disclosure log.

## **Recommendations**

- Once set-up the scheme needs to be maintained and kept up to date. For example the link to the force's structure did not work. Also it appeared that information such as the expenses claimed by senior officers and staff and the Register of Gifts and Hospitality had not been kept up to date;
- More information from the Register of Gifts and Hospitality needs to be provided along with information from the Register of Interests;
- Information provided through the publication scheme needs to be accessible. Some of the links used did not take the user to the expected information;
- The authority should provide some information about how they deal with transferring FOI requests to other public authorities.

## Northamptonshire Police Authority

### POLA28

The publication scheme was checked on 12 January 2010. It was not easy to find however the authority's guide to information conformed to ICO guidance.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information was found.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. Budget information, although hard to find was available. The authority's policy on expenses and allowances was available but not information about the claims made.
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – details of the business plan were available as was performance information.
4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior management meetings were provided and, although it went further than the Definition Document, we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings. These were provided.
5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy. However this was not found. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working and some information was made available.
6. "Lists and registers" – the authority stated that both the "Register of Gifts and Hospitality" and the "Register of Interests" were available either online or by requesting a hard

copy. Unfortunately online copies of the information could not be found.

7. "The services we offer" – we looked for but could not find copies of press releases (although the website said that they were available) nor did we find out about any services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee.

We contacted the authority about the information in Class 6 on 12 January 2010. They have not responded.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies but Northamptonshire Police Authority does not publish this information. There was though some information provided concerning policies and procedures about charging for information but this did not follow ICO guidance.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. No information was published

While the authority claimed that it had a disclosure log, the link to it did not work.

## **Recommendations**

- Budget information should be easily accessible and details about the expenses claimed by members of the authority and senior staff should be available;
- A recruitment policy should be provided in the class "Our policies and procedures";
- Copies of the Register of Gifts and Hospitality and the Register of Interests should be freely available;
- Where information is not available on the authority's website but instead the authority has to be contacted for the information, it is not acceptable to ignore requests for such information;
- Where the authority claims to be making information available in a class then it needs to ensure that the information is

actually available, unlike the press releases;

- The authority's record management policies should be published;
- Information should be provided about how the authority handles FOI requests and, where necessary, deals with internal reviews;
- Once the scheme has been set-up it needs to be maintained with up to date information and a regular check to see that links still work etc.

## [Index](#)

### **Northumbria Police**

#### **POL29**

This authority was inspected on 16 December 2009. It was found that the authority did not meet the requirements set out in the Freedom of Information Act, section 19 to operate an approved publication scheme. We wrote to them on 14 January. They initially responded by telephone and explained that they had adopted the new model publication but due to errors on their part the "How we make decisions" part of the scheme had been removed. They have since confirmed this in writing and have now rectified the situation. They now appear to be operating an approved scheme. In addition they confirmed that will be undertaking further work to place more information into the scheme and to make this more widely available. Finally they have said that they have introduced a monthly audit schedule to ensure that their publication scheme is kept up to date. This is all to be welcomed.

### **Northumbria Police Authority**

#### **POLA29**

This authority was inspected on 12 January 2010. It was found that the authority did not meet the requirements set out in the Freedom of Information Act, section 19 to operate an approved publication scheme. We wrote to them on 14 January. They responded on 4 February and explained that they will take immediate action to meet their legal obligations. As of the 22 February they still had an out of date scheme available on their website.

## [Index](#)

### North Wales Police

#### POL30

The publication scheme was checked on 16 October 2009. It was easy to find and the authority's guide to information conformed to ICO guidance.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information was found.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. For a copy of the budget there is a link to the police authority's website but this did not lead to it. Information about the expenses claimed by the Chief Constable, Deputy Chief Constable, Assistant Chief Constable and senior civilian staff member was available.
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – details of the annual policing plan were available. Performance information was via a link to the HMIC website but this was not a direct link to information relevant to North Wales Police.
4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior management meetings were provided and, although it went further than the Definition Document, we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings. Unfortunately none were provided.
5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy. However what we found was focused on actual recruitment rather than the underlying policy. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was

material about the force's partnership working but this was not provided.

6. "Lists and registers" – The "Register of Gifts and Hospitality" was available although it was light on detail. There was a heading "Register of Interests" but no information was provided.
7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases but only found out about applying for firearms licences in terms of the services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee.

All information was made available on their website and they did not have to be contacted.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies. North Wales Police do not publish this information. There was also no information provided about policies and procedures concerning charging for information.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. No information was found

Finally we were pleased to see that the authority provided a disclosure log.

## **Recommendations**

- Links to information in the scheme should work (eg the link to the police authority's website for budget information and the link to the HMIC website for performance information) and take users either directly to the information or to a point where it can easily be found;
- The authority's recruitment policy should be provided in the class "Our policies and procedures";
- Both the Register of Gifts and Hospitality and the Register of Interests should be available through the publication scheme;



- Clear information should be provided both about the services that the authority provides where it is entitled to levy a fee and about any charges for providing information from the publication scheme;
- The authority's records management and retention and disposal schedules should be published.
- Clear information needs to be provided about how the authority handles FOI requests and, where necessary, deals with internal reviews.

## **North Wales Police Authority**

### **POLA30**

The publication scheme was checked on 18 January 2010. It was easy to find and the authority's guide to information conformed to ICO guidance.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information was found.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. Budget information was not available. Information about the authority's policy on claiming expenses and allowances was available but not information about the individual claims of authority members and senior staff.
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – details of the current business plan were available but no performance information was found due to a broken link.
4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior management meetings were provided and, although it went further than the Definition Document, we looked for any supporting papers

for these meetings. Unfortunately none were provided.

5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy but this was not published. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the authority's partnership working but this was not provided.
6. "Lists and registers" – When the inspection was carried out the "Register of Gifts and Hospitality" was not available. A "Register interests" was provided.
7. "The services we offer" – we looked for but could not find copies of press releases. We also did not find out about any services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee.

All information was made available on their website and they did not have to be contacted.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies. The North Wales Police Authority does publish this information, including their retention and disposal schedule. There was also information about policies and procedures concerning charging for information.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. They published information about how they handled requests and their internal review procedures. They followed ICO guidance about these matters. No information was provided on how they dealt with the transfer of requests to other public authorities.

The authority did not publish a disclosure log.

## **Recommendations**

- Budget information and details of the expenses claimed by members and senior staff should be available;

- The scheme needs to be maintained both with up to date information and making sure that links still work. Due to a broken link we could not access information about the authority's performance;
- A recruitment policy should be available in the class "Our policies and procedures";
- The Register of Gifts and Hospitality should be accessible;

## [Index](#)

### North Yorkshire Police

#### POL31

The publication scheme was checked on 24 November 2009. It was easy to find and the authority's guide to information conformed to ICO guidance.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information was found.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. Budget information was available along with the expenses claimed by senior officers and staff.
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – details of the annual policing plan were available as was performance information.
4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior management meetings were provided and, although it went further than the Definition Document, we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings. These were provided.

5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy. This was found but it was not easy to locate. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working and this was provided.
6. "Lists and registers" – The "Register of Gifts and Hospitality" was made available as was a "Register of business interests". The latter though only contained vague information.
7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases and we found out about the services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee.

All information was made available on their website and they did not have to be contacted.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies. North Yorkshire Police do not publish this information. They do though provide their retention and disposal schedule based on the requirements of the Manual of Police Information (MOPI). There was also information provided about policies and procedures concerning charging for information.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. They provide a copy of the ACPO Manual of Guidance v6. This is a comprehensive manual which follows current ICO guidance. This includes information about how the authority handles requests, conducts internal reviews and transfers requests to other public authorities.

Finally we were pleased to see that the authority provided a disclosure log.

## **Recommendations**

- Information such as the recruitment policy should be easy to find via the scheme;
- The authority should publish more information about its records management policy.

## North Yorkshire Police Authority

### POLA 31

The publication scheme was checked on 23 November 2009. It was easy to find and the authority's guide to information conformed to ICO guidance.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information was found (although we thought that the organisational information was incomplete).
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. Budget information was available along with the expenses claimed authority members and senior staff.
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – details of the current business plan were available as was statistical information provided to the authority.
4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior management meetings were provided and, although it went further than the definition document, we looked for any supporting papers for the meetings. These were provided.
5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy. No specific recruitment policy was found but information was provided about the members' appointment process. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working and this was provided.

6. "Lists and registers" – The "Register of Gifts and Hospitality" was provided but it was felt that it was not easy to interpret. A copy of the "Register of Interests" was also made available.
  
7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases. North Yorkshire Police Authority also clearly stated that it "... does not impose fees".

All information was made available on their website and they did not have to be contacted.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies. The only information that we found was North Yorkshire Police Authority's record disposal procedure. The only information provided about charging was as set out above.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. They provided information about they handled requests and how they dealt with transferring requests to other public authorities. We felt this conformed to ICO guidance. While they also provided information about how they handled requests for internal review, in this case they did not follow ICO guidance.

Finally we were pleased to see that the authority provided a comprehensive disclosure log with copies of responses provided in full.

## **Recommendations**

- The authority's Register of Gifts and Hospitality should be easy to understand;
- A copy of the authority's records management policy should be published;
- The authority's approach to dealing with internal reviews should follow ICO recommendations.

## **[Index](#)**

## Nottinghamshire Police

### POL32

The publication scheme was checked on 27 November 2009. It was not easy to find but the authority's guide to information conformed to ICO guidance.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information was found.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. Budget information was available along but not the expense information.
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – details of the annual policing plan were available. Performance information was available on request.
4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior management meetings were available by contacting the authority. Although it went further than the Definition Document we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings. Unfortunately none were provided.
5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy. This was information available on request. We again looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working but this was not provided.
6. "Lists and registers" – The "Register of Gifts and Hospitality" was available while the authority had to be contacted for the "Register of Interests".

7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases but once again the authority had to be contacted for details of the services which they are entitled to recover a fee.

Nottinghamshire Police were (not surprisingly) contacted for information available from their publication scheme. This was done on 27 November 2009 and to date no response has been received.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies and they were available on request (see above). There was though no information provided about policies and procedures concerning charging for information.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. No information was published.

Finally they did not provide a disclosure log.

### **Recommendations**

- Too much information is only available by requesting it from Nottinghamshire Police. What makes it worse is that when such a request is made, it is ignored. As much information as possible should be available online. Where people do have to contact the force, the response should be within five working days;
- Information about the actual expenses paid to senior officers and staff should be available;
- How the authority handles FOI requests and, where necessary, deals with internal reviews should be made clear.

### **Nottinghamshire Police Authority**

#### **POLA32**

This authority was inspected on 16 November 2009. It was found that the authority did not meet the requirements set out in the Freedom of Information Act, section 19 to operate an approved



publication scheme. We wrote to them on 19 January 2010 and to date no response has been received.

## [Index](#)

### Police Service of Northern Ireland (PSNI)

#### **POL33**

The publication scheme was checked on 26 November 2009. It was not easy to find but the authority's guide to information conformed to ICO guidance.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information was found.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. Budget information was available along with the expenses claimed by the Chief Constable, Deputy Chief Constable, Assistant Chief Constables and senior staff.
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – details of the annual policing plan were available as was performance information.
4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior management meetings were provided and, although it went further than the definition document, we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings. These were provided.
5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy. However what we found was focused on actual recruitment rather than the underlying policy. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was

material about the force's partnership working and this was provided.

6. "Lists and registers" – Copies of both the "Register of Gifts and Hospitality" and the "Register of Interests" were published.
7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases. We also found out about the services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee.

All information was made available on their website and they did not have to be contacted.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies. Unfortunately the PSNI do not publish this information. They did make it clear that there were no charges for providing information.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. They do not directly publish any information about how they handle requests, however the PSNI do provide a link to the part of the ICO's website which covers request handling. The authority does provide information about how they deal with internal reviews but they do not conform to ICO guidance on the subject (it appears that the authority is following old advice from ACPO who now do follow the ICO's guidance on dealing with internal reviews). No information was provided about transferring requests to other public authorities.

Finally we were pleased to see that the authority provided a disclosure log.

### **Recommendations**

- The authority's recruitment policy should be available under the "Our policies and procedures" class;
- The records management policy and retention and disposal schedule should be published;
- More information should be provided about how the PSNI deals with requests for internal reviews and when it transfers

requests to other public authorities.

## **Northern Ireland Policing Board**

### **POLA33**

The publication scheme was checked on 26 November 2009. It was easy to find and the authority's guide to information conformed to ICO guidance.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information was found.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. There was a heading for budget information but no link to it. Allowances information was provided but not information about expenses claimed.
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – details of the business plan were available and so was statistical information.
4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior management meetings were provided and, although it went further than the Definition Document, we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings. These were provided.
5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy. Unfortunately we could not find any material. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working and this was provided.

6. "Lists and registers" – A heading for the "Register of Gifts and Hospitality" was in place but unfortunately there was no working link. A copy of the "Register of Interests" was provided.
  
7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases but we did not find out about any services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee. Again a heading was provided but no link.

All information was made available on their website and they did not have to be contacted.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies. The Northern Ireland Policing Board does publish this information, but not their retention and disposal schedule. Some information was provided about policies and procedures concerning charging for information.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. Some basic information about how the authority handles requests was published. There was no information about their internal review procedures nor about transferring requests to other public authorities.

Finally we were pleased to see that the authority provided a disclosure log.

## **Recommendations**

- The authority needs to ensure that links in the scheme work (for example we could not see budget information nor a copy of the Register of Gifts and Hospitality because of broken links);
- The actual expenses claimed by members of the board and senior staff should be published;
- More information should be provided about how the authority handles FOI requests and, where necessary, deals with internal reviews.

## [Index](#)

### South Wales Police

#### POL34

The publication scheme was checked on 14 October 2009. It was easy to find and the authority's guide to information conformed to ICO guidance.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information was found.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. Budget information was available along with the expenses claimed by senior officers and staff.
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – details of the annual policing plan were available as was performance information.
4. "How we make decisions" – we looked for the minutes of senior management meetings but they were not provided. Although it went further than the Definition Document we looked for any supporting papers for such meetings. Unfortunately (but not surprisingly) none were provided.
5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy. However what we found was focused on actual recruitment rather than the underlying policy. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working and some information was provided.

6. "Lists and registers" – When the inspection was carried out the part of the website that listed the "Register of Gifts and Hospitality" and the "Register of Interests" was stated to be "currently under construction".
7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases but we did not find out about any services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee (this part of their website was also "under construction").

All information was supposed to be made available on their website. However because quite a lot of material was inaccessible, a request was made on 15 October for a copy of their "Register of Gifts and Hospitality". To date there has been no response.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies but South Wales Police do not publish this information. There was some general information provided about charging for information but no detail was available.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. There was a reference to the ACPO Manual of Guidance but no link. Neither was there any further information about how the authority handled requests, dealt with internal reviews or transferred requests to other public authorities.

Finally we were pleased to see that South Wales Police published a disclosure log.

## **Recommendations**

- Information such as the minutes of senior management meetings, recruitment policy, Register of Gifts and Hospitality and the Register of Interests should be routinely available;
- Where areas of the site are "under construction" some indication should be provided about when the work will be complete;
- We consider that you should provide information about the services that the authority provides where you can levy a fee as well as information about any charges being made to provide information from the publication scheme.

- The authority's records management policy should be available;
- Information needs to be provided about how the authority handles FOI requests and, where necessary, deals with internal reviews.

## **South Wales Police Authority**

### **POLA34**

The publication scheme was checked on 15 October 2009. It was easy to find but the authority's guide to information did not conform to the ICO guidance on the subject. Specifically while the guide set out what information was available no links or directions were provided as to where the information was located on the authority's website. Users of the guide were invited to contact the authority for information when it was actually available online using the website's search facility.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information was found.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. Budget information was available along with the some information about the expenses and allowances claimed by authority members and senior staff.
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – details of the business plan were available and statistical information was found.
4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior management meetings were provided and, although it went further than the Definition Document, we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings. These were provided.

5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy. However what we found was focused on actual recruitment rather than the underlying policy. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working and this was provided.
  
6. "Lists and registers" – a copy of the "Register of Gifts and Hospitality" was available. The "Register of Interests" was only available for inspection at the police authority's headquarters.
  
7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases but we did not find out about any services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee.

The information was made available on their website and they did not have to be contacted (but see the first paragraph).

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies. South Wales Police Authority does not publish this information. Their retention and disposal schedule is available. There was also information provided about policies and procedures concerning charging for information.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. They do not publish any information about how they handle FOI requests.

The authority did not provide a disclosure log.

### **Recommendations**

- The guide to information should make it straightforward for users to find information covered by the publication scheme;
- The authority's recruitment policy should be available in the class entitled "Our policies and procedures";



- Making the Register of Interests available for inspection only does not accord with it being in the publication scheme;
- The authority's records management policy should be published;
- Information about how the authority handles FOI requests and, where necessary, deals with internal reviews should be published.

## [Index](#)

### South Yorkshire Police

#### POL35

The publication scheme was checked on 16 October 2009. It was easy to find but the authority's guide to information did not conform to ICO guidance. This was because no information was provided about any charges.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information was found.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. Budget information was available along with the expenses claimed by senior officers and staff.
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – details of the annual policing plan were available as was performance information.
4. "How we make decisions" – we looked for the minutes of senior management meetings but these were not provided. Instead it was stated in the guide that the information was intended for future publication. Although it went further than the Definition Document we looked for any supporting papers

for these meetings. Unfortunately (but not surprisingly) none were provided.

5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy and this was provided. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working and this was not provided.
6. "Lists and registers" – policies were provided about both the "Register of Gifts and Hospitality" and the "Register of Interests" but no other information was found.
7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases but we did not find out about any services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee.

All the information they made available was via their website and they did not have to be contacted.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies. South Yorkshire Police does publish this information as well as their retention and disposal schedule. There was though no information provided about policies and procedures concerning charging for information.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. No information was provided.

Finally we were pleased to see that the authority provided a disclosure log.

## **Recommendations**

- The minutes of senior management meetings should be available in the class called "How we make decisions";
- Copies of the Register of Gifts and Hospitality and the Register of Interests should be published;

- More information should be provided about how the authority handles FOI requests and, where necessary, deals with internal reviews;
- Clear information should be provided about any services the authority provides for which it can levy a fee and also about any charges it may make for providing information from the publication scheme.

## South Yorkshire Police Authority

### POLA35

The publication scheme was checked on 16 October 2009. It was easy to find and the authority's guide to information conformed to ICO guidance.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure. Unfortunately the link provided did not work and no information was found. As for contact details, this information was found.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. Budget information was available along with the expenses claimed by authority members (albeit the latest expenses information was for the year 2007-08).
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – no business plan for the authority was found and nor was performance or statistical information.
4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior management meetings were provided and, although it went further than the Definition Document, we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings. These were provided.

5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy. No information was found. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working and this was provided.
  
6. "Lists and registers" – The guide to information listed both the "Register of Gifts and Hospitality" and the "Register of Interests" but no information was found, not even by using the website's search facility.
  
7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases but we did not find out about any services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee.

All the available information was on their website and they did not have to be contacted.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies but the South Yorkshire Police Authority does not publish this information. There was though some basic information provided about policies and procedures concerning charging for information.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. They provided basic information about how they handled FOI requests, less information about internal reviews and nothing about how they handled the transfer of requests to other public authorities.

Finally we were pleased to see that the authority provided a disclosure log.

## **Recommendations**

- The scheme needs to be maintained, both keeping it up to date (the last expenses information was from 2007-08) and ensuring that links work (we could not find information about the authority's structure because of a broken link);
  
- Where the authority states that information will be available, it needs to ensure that it is. For example despite stating that

it was available, we could not find copies of the Register of Gifts and Hospitality or the Register of Interests. We expect both to be accessible;

- South Yorkshire Police Authority should publish its records management policy;
- More information about the whole process of handling FOI requests should be made available.

## [Index](#)

### **Staffordshire Police**

#### **POL36**

The publication scheme was checked on 20 October 2009. It was easy to find and the authority's guide to information conformed to ICO guidance.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information was found.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. Budget information from 2007-08 was available along with the expenses claimed by the Chief Constable only.
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – details of the annual policing plan were available (only by searching the authority's website) and performance information was found.
4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior management meetings were provided and, although it went further than the Definition Document, we looked for any supporting papers

for these meetings. Unfortunately none were provided.

5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy. However what we found was focused on actual recruitment rather than the underlying policy. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working but this was not provided.
6. "Lists and registers" – The policy on gifts and hospitality was found but not the specific register, nor was a recognisable "Register of Interests" provided.
7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases but we did not find out about any services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee.

They did have to be contacted for some of the information. We requested a copy of their "Ethical interview policy". Our contact was by email and they responded in just over an hour.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies. Staffordshire Police does not publish this information nor their retention and disposal schedule. There was also little information provided about policies and procedures concerning charging for information.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. They provide information on their request handling procedures. They also provide information on how they handle internal reviews. The timescales they refer to though do not accord with the ICO's guidance on the issue. This is because they appear to have followed an old ACPO approach to the subject. Since the inspection ACPO have published a revised Manual of Guidance which does conform to the ICO position. No information was provided about how they deal with the transfer of requests to other public authorities.

Finally there was a link to a disclosure log. Unfortunately this did not lead to any information.

## **Recommendations**

- Budget information more recent than 2007 – 08 should be available along with the expenses claimed by senior officers and staff, not just the expenses claimed by the Chief Constable;
- The authority's recruitment policy should be available in the class entitled "Our policies and procedures";
- Both the Register of Gifts and Hospitality and the Register of Interests should be accessible;
- The records management policies should be published;
- Clear information should be available about the services the authority provides which it can charge for. Also they should make clear any charges for providing information from the publication scheme;
- The scheme needs to be maintained with up to date information and checked to make sure links work.

## **Staffordshire Police Authority**

### **POLA36**

This authority was inspected on 22 October 2009. It was found that the authority did not meet the requirements set out in the Freedom of Information Act, section 19 to operate an approved publication scheme. We wrote to them on 28 October. They responded on 6 November and claimed to have adopted the ICO model scheme. Unfortunately the information they provided does not make it clear that they have adopted the scheme. They have not listed their classes of information in the way that the model scheme requires and hence are still not conforming to the ICO model (which is now the only legally approved scheme).

### **[Index](#)**

## Suffolk Constabulary

### POL37

The publication scheme was checked on 22 October 2009. It was easy to find and the authority's guide to information conformed to ICO guidance.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information was found.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. Budget information was not available. The expenses claimed by the Chief Constable only were published.
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – details of the annual policing plan were available as was performance information.
4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior management meetings were provided and, although it went further than the Definition Document, we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings. Unfortunately none were provided.
5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy. However while the policy was listed what was available appeared to be an impact statement and not the policy itself. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working and some information was provided.
6. "Lists and registers" – A copy of the "Register of Gifts and Hospitality" up until 2008 was published and so was the



## “Register of Interests”

7. “The services we offer” – we looked for and found copies of press releases and we found out about some of the services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee.

All information was made available on their website and they did not have to be contacted.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies. Suffolk Constabulary stated that this information was “to be added in due course”. The authority did publish information about their charging regime but there was no schedule of charges for hard copies of their publication scheme information.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. They published material on how they handled requests and on conducting internal reviews. However in the case of the latter no timescales were provided. There was also no information on their procedure for transferring requests to other public authorities.

Finally the authority stated that a disclosure log would “be available soon”.

### **Recommendations**

- Budget information needs to be made routinely available;
- We would expect to find expenses paid to senior officers and staff as well as those paid to the Chief Constable;
- The authority’s recruitment policy should be available;
- The scheme needs to be maintained with up to date information and working links;
- More information about how the authority handles FOI requests and, where necessary, deals with internal reviews should be published.

## Suffolk Police Authority

### POLA37

The publication scheme was checked on 27 October 2009. It was easy to find and the authority's guide to information conformed to ICO guidance.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information was found.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. Budget information was available via links to information to Suffolk Constabulary's website. There was also information about the authority's scheme of members' allowances and expenses. There were no details of individual claims.
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – details of a three year business plan were available as was some statistical information.
4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior management meetings were provided and, although it went further than the Definition Document, we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings. These were provided.
5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy. However what we found was focused on current vacancies rather than the underlying policy. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working. Some FAQs were provided but no detailed information.

6. "Lists and registers" – On their publication scheme the authority stated that both the "Register of Gifts and Hospitality" and the "Register of Interests" were "available for public examination at the Police Authority offices by prior arrangement..."
  
7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases but we did not find out about any services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee.

There was no information where the authority had to be contacted. It was either on their website or stated as available for inspection.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies. Suffolk Police Authority does not publish this information nor do they publish any retention and disposal schedule. There was though information provided about policies and procedures concerning charging for information.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. No information was found about how they handled requests, carried out internal reviews or transferred requests to other public authorities.

The authority did not publish a disclosure log.

## **Recommendations**

- We expect that details of the expenses claimed by members and the senior staff of the authority would be published;
- The authority's recruitment policy should be made available under the class heading of "Our policies and procedures";
- Making the Register of Gifts and Hospitality and the Register of Interests only available for inspection at the authority's headquarters does not meet publication scheme obligations. Copies of both registers should be available, preferably online or at least provided in response to an individual contacting the authority;
- The authority's records management policy should be published;

- Information should be provided about how the authority handles FOI requests and, where necessary, deals with internal reviews or situations where the request is transferred to another public authority.

## [Index](#)

### Surrey Police

#### POL38

The publication scheme was checked on 4 November 2009. It was easy to find but the authority's guide to information did not conform to the ICO guidance on the subject because no information was provided about charging in the guide.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information was found.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. Some budget information was available via a link to the police authority website but this was the 2008 – 09 budget. No information was found about the 2009 – 10 budget. Details of the expenses claimed by the senior officers and staff were available.
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – details of the area policing plans were available as was performance information.
4. "How we make decisions" – the only minutes provided were of the Strategic Change Board and, although it went further than the Definition Document, we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings. Unfortunately none were provided.

5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy. However what we found was focused on actual recruitment rather than the underlying policy. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working and this was provided albeit under the first class.
  
6. "Lists and registers" – The "Register of Gifts and Hospitality" was listed in the guide but Surrey Police then said that "there are no items to report at this time". A "Register of Interests" was provided broken down by rank of officer.
  
7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases and we found out about the services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee.

All information was made available on their website and they did not have to be contacted.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies. Surrey Police do not publish specific information rather they provide a link to the NPIA regarding the Management of Police Information. There was information provided about policies and procedures concerning charging for information.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. They provide a copy of the ACPO Manual of Guidance. Although this is comprehensive, the guidance provided in this version does not accord with current ICO guidance. Our current position though is reflected in v6 of the ACPO manual, which was published after the inspection of this scheme took place. Providing this version will ensure that Surrey Police provide up to date information about their information request handling practices including how they handle requests, deal with internal reviews and, where appropriate, transfer requests to other public authorities.

Finally we were pleased to see that the authority provided a comprehensive disclosure log.

## **Recommendations**

- Current budget information eg 2009 – 10 or 2010 – 11 should be available;
- The minutes of senior management meetings should be published;
- The authority's recruitment policy should be accessible;
- An up to date copy of the Register of Gifts and Hospitality needs to be provided;

## **Surrey Police Authority**

### **POLA38**

This authority was inspected on 4 November 2009. It was found that the authority did not meet the requirements set out in the Freedom of Information Act, section 19 to operate an approved publication scheme. We wrote to them on 9 November. They have responded and stated that remedial action will be undertaken. Their site was checked on 2 March 2010. They now appear to be operating an approved scheme. The quality of their guide to information could be improved by making it clear to users where they can find information on their website.

### **[Index](#)**

## **Sussex Police**

### **POL39**

The publication scheme was checked on 5 November 2009. It was easy to find and the authority's guide to information conformed to ICO guidance.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information was found.

2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. The budget information link lead to "file not found". The expenses claimed by the senior officers and staff were found.
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – details of the annual policing plan were available. Some performance information was found but the link from "Police Performance Assessments" did not return any information.
4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior management meetings were provided and, although it went further than the definition document, we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings. Unfortunately none were provided.
5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy. However what we found was focused on actual recruitment rather than the underlying policy. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working and this was provided.
6. "Lists and registers" – A copy of the "Register of Gifts and Hospitality" and a copy of the "Register of Interests" were both published.
7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases but we found out about the services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee.

All information was made available on their website and they did not have to be contacted.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies. Sussex Police do publish some information based on the Manual of Police Information. Their retention and

disposal schedule was not found. There was no information provided about policies and procedures concerning charging for information.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. They provided basic procedures for dealing with requests and they also provide a link to the ACPO Manual of Guidance for further information. This also covered how they dealt with internal reviews and the transferring of requests to other public authorities. Unfortunately the version of the ACPO Manual of Guidance they referred to did not conform to the ICO's approach to dealing with these issues. ACPO have now updated their manual to follow the ICO approach.

Finally we were pleased to see that the authority provided a comprehensive disclosure log.

### **Recommendations**

- The scheme needs to be maintained. This means not only providing up to date information but ensuring that links in the scheme work. Because of broken links we could not find any budget information or some performance information;
- A copy of the authority's recruitment policy should be available in the class entitled "Our policies and procedures";
- Clear information should be provided about the services the authority offers where it can charge a fee. Also information about any charges for providing information from the publication scheme should be provided.

## **Sussex Police Authority**

### **POLA39**

This authority was inspected on 5 November 2009. It was found that the authority did not meet the requirements set out in the Freedom of Information Act, section 19 to operate an approved publication scheme. We wrote to them on 19 January 2010 and to date no response has been received. When their website was checked on 11 February it appeared that they still had an old and no longer approved scheme available on the site.

[Index](#)



## Thames Valley Police

### POL40

The publication scheme was checked on 20 October 2009. It was easy to find and the authority's guide to information conformed to ICO guidance.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information was found.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. Budget information was available via a link to the police authority's website. The expenses claimed by the senior officers and staff were available but there was no information about any allowances.
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – details of area policing plans were available as was performance information via a link to the HMIC website.
4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior management meetings were provided and, although it went further than the Definition Document, we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings. Unfortunately none were provided.
5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy. However what we found was focused on actual recruitment rather than the underlying policy. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working but this was not provided.

6. "Lists and registers" – No "Register of Gifts and Hospitality" was found. A basic "Register of Interests" was made available.
7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases and we found out about the services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee but not about the fee they would levy for a particular service.

All information was made available on their website and they did not have to be contacted.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies. Thames Valley Police do not publish this information. There was though information provided about policies and procedures concerning charging for information. This was in the form of a copy of the ACPO Manual of Guidance v1.2.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. They provide a copy of the ACPO Manual of Guidance v1.2. Although this is comprehensive, the guidance provided in this version does not accord with current ICO guidance. Our current position is reflected in v6 of the ACPO manual, which was published after the inspection of this scheme took place. Providing this updated version will ensure that Thames Valley Police provide up to date information about their information request handling practices including how they deal with internal reviews and they procedures for transferring a request to another public authority.

The authority did not publish disclosure log.

### **Recommendations**

- The authority's recruitment policies should be made available under the class headed "Our policies and procedures";
- The authority should make a copy of its Register of Gifts and Hospitality available.

## Thames Valley Police Authority

### POLA40

This authority was inspected on 21 October 2009. It was found that the authority did not meet the requirements set out in the Freedom of Information Act, section 19 to operate an approved publication scheme. We wrote to them on 28 October and they responded on 5 November. They stated that they had adopted the ICO model scheme but that the old scheme had been made available by error. On 11 February their website was checked and this confirmed that they had adopted the ICO model. However the guide to information could be improved so that information could be found more easily.

### [Index](#)

## Warwickshire Police

### POL41

The publication scheme was checked on 26 October 2009. It was easy to find and the authority's guide to information conformed to ICO guidance.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. Information about the authority's structure was easily found. However while there was a link to contact details it required a password to proceed.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. While there was a link to the police authority website for budget information no material could be found. The expenses claimed by the senior officers and staff were provided.
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – details of force-wide and neighbourhood policing plans were available as was performance information via a link to the HMIC website.

A link was also provided to "Police Performance Assessments" but this was not working at the time of the inspection.

4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior management meetings were provided and, although it went further than the Definition Document, we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings. Unfortunately none were provided.
5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy and this was published. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working and some material about information sharing with other organisations was provided.
6. "Lists and registers" – A copy of the "Register of Gifts and Hospitality" was found but the link to the "Register of Interests" did not work.
7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases but we did not find out about any services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee because of a failed link.

All information was made available on their website and they did not have to be contacted.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies and Warwickshire Police do publish this information. No specific retention and disposal schedule was found but there was general guidance within their records management policy. There was also information provided concerning policies and procedures about charging for information, just not about the actual level of charges.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. They provide a copy of the ACPO Manual of Guidance v5. Although this is comprehensive the guidance provided in this version does not accord with current ICO guidance. Our current position is reflected in v6 of the ACPO manual, which was published after the inspection of this scheme took place. Providing this updated version will ensure that

Warwickshire Police provide up to date information about their information request handling practices including how they deal with internal reviews and they procedures for transferring a request to another public authority.

Finally we were pleased to see that the authority provided a disclosure log.

### **Recommendations**

- Information provided through the publication scheme should not be password protected.
- Once the scheme is set-up it then needs to be maintained. This means providing up to date information and ensuring that links work. We could not find budget information, performance information and a copy of the Register of Interests because of broken links;
- Clear information about the services the authority provides where a charge can be made should be available along with information about any charges for providing information from the publication scheme.

## **Warwickshire Police Authority**

### **POLA41**

The publication scheme was checked on 17 November 2009. It was easy to find and the authority's guide to information conformed to ICO guidance. They do though appear to have added a class entitled "Significant Public Interest Events".

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. Information about the authority's structure was found but not contact details.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff

allowances and expenses. There was a link to the budget page but this did not display any information. No information about expenses was provided either.

3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – details of the business plan were available but no performance information was found. The latter was despite the authority's guide to information stating that this will be available.
4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior management meetings were provided and, although it went further than the Definition Document, we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings. These were provided.
5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy. This was provided via a link to Warwickshire Police's police staff recruitment policy. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working and some information was provided.
6. "Lists and registers" – A link to Warwickshire Police's policy towards the maintenance of a "Register of Gifts and Hospitality" was provided but not the actual register. A copy of the "Register of Interests" could not be found.
7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases but we did not find out about any services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee.

All information was made available on their website and they did not have to be contacted.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies. Warwickshire Police Authority provided a link to Warwickshire Police's Management of Police Information policy. There was though no information provided about policies and procedures concerning charging for information despite clearly saying that this will be published.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. They provided no information about their request handling procedures, how they dealt with internal reviews or their procedures for transferring requests to other public authorities.

They did not publish a disclosure log.

### **Recommendations**

- Contact details for the authority should be provided;
- Information about budgets and about expenses paid to members and senior staff should be available;
- Performance information needs to be published;
- Copies of both the Register of Gifts and Hospitality and the Register of Interests should be provided through the scheme;
- Clear information needs to be available about any services the authority provides which it can charge for and the authority needs to make it clear whether it will charge for any information provided from the publication scheme;
- Information about how the authority handles FOI requests and, where necessary, deals with internal reviews should be published.

### **[Index](#)**

## **West Mercia Police**

### **POL42**

This authority was inspected on 23 December 2009. It was found that the authority did not meet the requirements set out in the Freedom of Information Act, section 19 to operate an approved publication scheme. This is because they have missed out the class "Lists and registers". We wrote to them on 11 February 2010. They responded on 23 February and admitted that they were not meeting their s.19 obligations. Their scheme was checked on 2 March where it was found that they were apparently meeting their obligations and to what appears to be a good standard.

## West Mercia Police Authority

### POLA42

The publication scheme was checked on 24 December 2009. It was easy to find and the authority's guide to information conformed to ICO guidance.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information was found.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. Budget information was available along with the allowances for authority members and senior staff. No expense information was provided.
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – details of the current business plan were available and statistical information was found.
4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior management meetings were provided and, although it went further than the definition document, we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings. Only one paper was provided.
5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy. This was available by contacting the authority. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the authority's partnership working and this was provided.
6. "Lists and registers" – Both the "Register of Gifts and Hospitality" and the "Register of Interests" were available by



contacting the authority.

7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases. Details about any services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee would be provided on contact with them.

They were contacted on 5 January for copies of;

- Information about expenses paid or incurred;
- The authority's recruitment policy;
- Register of members' interests;
- Register of Gifts and Hospitality received;
- Details of the services for which the authority is entitled to recover a fee.

They responded on 11 January with links to expenses policy and their recruitment policy. They also said that there were no services where they were entitled to levy a fee. On 12 January we received printed copies of the "Register of Gifts and Hospitality" and the "Register of Interests". Information about expenses actually paid out was emailed on 1 February.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies. West Mercia Police Authority does publish this information, including their retention and disposal schedule but it is only available by contacting the authority. There was no information provided about policies and procedures concerning charging for information.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. No information was provided about how they handled requests, dealt with internal reviews or transferred requests to other public authorities.

Finally we were pleased to see that the authority provided a disclosure log but again only on contact with them.

## **Recommendations**

- A lot of information is provided on contact with you. As much information as possible should be made available online;

- In our view it took too long to provide information about actual expenses paid out to authority members and senior staff.

## [Index](#)

### West Midlands Police

#### POL43

The publication scheme was checked on 17 January 2010. It was easy to find and the authority's guide to information conformed to ICO guidance.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. Unfortunately the link to the organisation structure did not work. General contact information was found.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. There was a link to the police authority's website for budget information but no clear force budget details were found. The expenses claimed by senior officers and staff were available.
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – details of the force-wide policing plan were available (the authority does not produce area plans). Performance information was published via a link to the HMIC website.
4. "How we make decisions" – Command team meeting minutes were available while minutes of the authority's Key Advisory Group were available on contact. Although it went further than the Definition Document we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings. Papers for the Command team meetings were provided.

5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy. However what we found was focused on actual recruitment rather than the underlying policy. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working but this was not provided.
  
6. "Lists and registers" – A comprehensive "Register of Gifts and Hospitality" was published along with a brief "Register of Interests".
  
7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases and we found out about the services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee.

They were contacted for minutes of the last two Key Advisory Group meetings on 17 November and they responded on 19 November and they provided the information requested.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies but West Midlands Police do not publish this information. There was also no information provided about policies and procedures concerning charging for information.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. They provide a copy of the ACPO Manual of Guidance v5. Although this is comprehensive the guidance provided in this version does not accord with current ICO guidance. Our current position is reflected in v6 of the ACPO manual, which was published after the inspection of this scheme took place. Providing this updated version will ensure that West Midlands Police provide up to date information about their information request handling practices including how they deal with internal reviews and they procedures for transferring a request to another public authority.

Finally we were pleased to see that the authority provided a disclosure log.

## **Recommendations**

- The scheme needs to be maintained. This means providing up to date information and ensuring that links continue to work. Due to a broken link we could not find information about the authority's structure;
- The authority's recruitment policy should be published;
- The authority should clearly let people know whether there will be any charges for providing information from the publication scheme;

## **West Midlands Police Authority**

### **POLA43**

The publication scheme was checked on 24 December 2009. It was easy to find but the authority's guide to information did not follow ICO guidance on the subject. They also appear to have added a class of information to their scheme.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information was found.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. Budget information was available but only by contacting the authority. Expenses and allowances information was not published.
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – details of the current business plan were available but no statistical information was available.
4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior management meetings were available by contacting the authority. Although it went further than the Definition Document we looked for

any supporting papers for these meetings. They were again available on contacting the authority.

5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy. No information was found. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the authority's partnership working and some material was provided.
6. "Lists and registers" – Both the "Register of Gifts and Hospitality" and the "Register of Interests" were to be provided on contact with the authority.
7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases but we did not find out about any services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee.

They were contacted on 5 January 2010 for the following;

- Police force budget;
- Minutes from management board/senior management meetings;
- Register of Gifts and Hospitality;
- Register of Interests;
- Information about the authority's retention and disposal schedule.

They responded on 11 January stating that the request would be considered and responded to within the statutory timescale of 20 working days, subject to any exemptions that might apply. They then provided the information requested on 1 February.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies but the West Midlands Police Authority does not publish this information. Their retention and disposal schedule is available on request from them. There was information provided about policies and procedures concerning charging for information.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. They provided information about how they handled requests and their procedure for transferring requests to other public authorities. They appeared

to follow ICO guidance on these matters. However no information was provided about how they dealt with internal reviews.

Finally we were pleased to see that the authority provided a basic disclosure log.

### **Recommendations**

- We felt that too much information was only available by contacting the authority. We would like to see as much information as possible made available online;
- Where information is provided when an individual contacts the authority this should be provided within five working days, it should not be treated as an FOI request;
- Information about the actual expenses paid to authority members and senior staff should be provided;
- A copy of the recruitment policy should be published;
- The authority's records management policy should be available;
- Some information should be provided about how internal reviews are dealt with.

### **[Index](#)**

## **West Yorkshire Police**

### **POL44**

The publication scheme was checked on 2 December 2009. It was easy to find and the authority's guide to information conformed to ICO guidance. However they had added a class of information called "Information requests charging structure". They had also swapped around the class entitled "How we make decisions" with the "Policies and procedures" class.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. This information was found.
2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. High level budget information was available along with the expenses claimed by the senior offices and staff.
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – some details of the area policing plans were available and they stated that more information would be published. Performance information was provided via a link to the HMIC website.
4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior management meetings were provided and, although it went further than the definition document, we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings. Unfortunately none were provided.
5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy. However what we found was focused on actual recruitment rather than the underlying policy. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working but this was not found
6. "Lists and registers" – Both the "Register of Gifts and Hospitality" and the "Register of Interests" were not available. The authority did say on their website that the information would be "added soon".
7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases and we found out about the services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee.

All information was made available on their website and they did not have to be contacted.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies but West Yorkshire Police do not publish this information. Only a very general records management statement was found. There was though some information provided about policies and procedures concerning charging for information.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. By the time this authority was inspected v6 of ACPO's Manual of Guidance had been published and this was available on West Yorkshire Police's website. This set out the procedures that the authority follows when handling requests, dealing with internal reviews and transferring requests to other public authorities. It follows ICO guidance on all these matters.

The authority did not publish a disclosure log.

### **Recommendations**

- The authority's recruitment policy should be available under the class heading "Our policies and procedures";
- Copies of the Register of Gifts and Hospitality and the Register of Interests should be provided;
- The authority's records management policy should be published.

## **West Yorkshire Police Authority**

### **POLA44**

The publication scheme was checked on 4 January 2010. It was not easy to find but the authority's guide to information conformed to ICO guidance.

We looked for information from each of the seven classes of the ICO model scheme:

1. "Who we are and what we do" - we looked for information about the organisation's structure and for contact details. Information was provided about the authority's committee structure but no organisational structure was found. Contact



information was provided.

2. "What we spend and how we spend it" - we sought information on the police force budget and senior staff allowances and expenses. Budget information was available along with the expenses claimed by authority members and senior staff.
3. "What are our priorities and how we are doing" – details of the business plan were available and statistical information was found.
4. "How we make decisions" – minutes of senior management meetings were provided and, although it went further than the Definition Document, we looked for any supporting papers for these meetings. These were provided.
5. "Our policies and procedures" – we specifically looked for information about the authority's recruitment policy and this was published. Again we looked for information not covered by the definition document. In this case it was material about the force's partnership working but this was not provided.
6. "Lists and registers" – Both the "Register of Gifts and Hospitality" and the "Register of Interests" were to be provided on contact with the authority.
7. "The services we offer" – we looked for and found copies of press releases but we did not find out about any services that the authority provided where they were entitled to levy a fee.

They were contacted on 5 January 2010 for copies of their "Register of Gifts and Hospitality" and their "Register of Interests". They responded on 8 January seeking clarity on what period the request covered. That information was provided on 15 January and they sent a printed copy of the information out on 18 January.

We then looked to see if the authority published its record management policies. West Yorkshire Police Authority publishes this information, including their retention and disposal schedule. There

was though no information provided about policies and procedures concerning charging for information.

Our attention then turned to whether information was provided about how the authority handled FOI requests. The authority did not publish information about how it handled requests, dealt with internal reviews or their procedures for transferring requests to other public authorities.

The authority provided a disclosure log but it only covered the period from January 2005 to April 2008.

### **Recommendations**

- The publication scheme should be easy for a user to find;
- Information about the authority's organisational structure should be provided;
- Clear information should be provided about any services provided by the authority which it can charge for. Also it should be made clear whether there are any charges levied for providing information from the publication scheme;
- Information should be published about how the authority handles FOI requests and, where necessary, deals with internal reviews.

### **[Index](#)**

## **Wiltshire Police**

### **POL45**

This authority was inspected on 4 January 2010. It was found that the authority did not meet the requirements set out in the Freedom of Information Act, section 19 to operate an approved publication scheme. We wrote to them on 11 January. They have responded. They said that they had adopted the new model scheme. This though was not clear from their website. In addition when the site's search facility was used the information which was found first related to their old and no longer valid publication scheme. They have said that they will carry out remedial work to make the adoption of the ICO model scheme clear. On checking their publication scheme (10 February), while now using the seven

classes, they need to re-order the classes of information to follow the format of the ICO model scheme.

## **Wiltshire Police Authority**

### **POLA45**

This authority was inspected on 4 January 2010. It was found that the authority did not meet the requirements set out in the Freedom of Information Act, section 19 to operate an approved publication scheme. We wrote to them on 7 January. They responded on 4 February and said that they had adopted the ICO model scheme. When their website was checked on 11 February this was confirmed. They do accept that they need to do further work to make the information in the scheme more accessible to users and they have said that this will be done.

[Index](#)