

**KEEPING THE RIGHT PEOPLE
ON THE DNA DATABASE**
SCIENCE AND
PUBLIC PROTECTION



Home Office

Summary of Responses
Public Consultation
7 May – 7 August 2009

NOVEMBER 2009

Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Summary of Responses	5
3	Implementing the judgment and statutory framework for future retention	11
4	List of respondents	16

Introduction

This document is in two parts with the first part representing a summary of the views expressed during the three month consultation period, from 7 May 2009 to 7 August 2009 on the paper “Keeping the Right People on the DNA Database”. In addition to the overall summary, a summary of individual responses by respondent and by subject heading can be found on the Home Office Police Powers webpage.

There were 503 formal responses to the consultation paper of which some 402 were from individuals. In addition, meetings were held with key national stakeholders across the spectrum of policing, judiciary, defence and human rights groups. A list of individuals and organisations who responded to the consultation is listed at Annex A. An email has been sent to those on the list who provided an electronic address informing them of the publication of this document.

Part 2 of this document sets out our proposals for implementing the judgment of the European Court of Human Rights in the case of S and Marper and for improving the governance and accountability around biometric data. This includes:

- Deletion of legacy samples and retention policy on future samples
- Criteria of retention for profiles and fingerprints from persons convicted and for those not convicted

- Terrorism-related issues
- Pro-active approach for deletion of data which does not meet the retention criteria
- Statutory appeals process
- Governance, monitoring, reporting and scrutiny framework
- Rights and entitlement of the individual
- Research
- Future research programme
- Legislation
- Operational implications & costs
- Equality Impact
- Timelines for implementation

Following completion of the consultation period and consideration of the responses, the Government will be taking forward implementation of its proposals in the Policing and Crime Bill due to be introduced later this year in the 5th Session of this Parliament.

PART ONE

Summary of Responses

- This Summary reports on the content of responses and does seek to comment, correct or agree or disagree with the views expressed.
- Summaries of individual responses are available at:
<http://police.homeoffice.gov.uk/operational-policing/powers-pace-codes/pace-code-intro/>

1 Samples

2 Retention of Profiles

Arrested but not convicted or no further action

Arrested and convicted

Universal database

Disproportionality (Ethnicity)

Vulnerable groups

Young people

3 Fingerprints

4 Early deletion of profiles

Appeals process

Witnessing destruction

5 Governance

6 Security

7 Taking samples – arrest

8 Terrorism

9 Research

10 Volunteer samples

11 Taking samples additional categories

12 Legislation

1 SAMPLES

Number of respondents: 61

- 1.1 There was strong support for the proposal to destroy all samples. The majority of respondents welcomed the destruction of legacy samples (i.e. samples already retained) and future samples to be retained only for the purposes of obtaining a suitable profile and for such retention being up to a maximum period of six months. The period of six months was considered an ample period for quality assurances purposes.
- 1.2 A number of respondents, primarily for policing and prosecutorial organisations, expressed caution at deletion of samples on the grounds that it may compromise criminal proceedings. This was because samples should be treated as any other exhibit and be subject to destruction only at the point of disposal of the investigation. Others pointed out that an additional sample could be taken from a defendant at court if confirmation or upgrading of their profile is needed for evidential purposes.
- 1.3 There was some concern that sample destruction would impact on the future ability of police to use the NDNAD to investigate certain unsolved crimes. However when set against the retention of genetic material from over 4.5m people, it was considered that the proposed approach obtained the right balance between human rights and public protection.

2 RETENTION OF PROFILES

● Arrested but not convicted or no further action

Number of respondents: 384

- 2.1 This topic generated most responses with the significant majority opposed to any form of retention of profiles and fingerprints for persons arrested and against no further action was taken or acquitted. Most of those opposed to any form of retention considered that the 'state' should not hold personal information on an individual when they are innocent in the eyes of the law. It

was entirely inappropriate that a person should be treated the same as a person who had been found guilty and it went against the principle of 'innocent until proven guilty'.

- 2.2 Many respondents considered that it was against the ECtHR judgment to retain profiles of 'innocent' people and that the Government would be failing to implement the judgment by having such a selective interpretation of the S and Marper judgment. A number indicated that such a policy if implemented would leave any future legislation open to future legal challenge in both domestic courts and the European Court of Human Rights. To some, it was seen as an attempt by the Government to hold onto personal data and comparisons were drawn with approaches on identity cards, CCTV and increasing use of surveillance tools.
- 2.3 There was recognition from a large volume of respondents to the retention of profiles in relation to serious violent and sexual offences. That recognition identified the link between the level of harm caused by such offences and the need for public protection. Many people referred to the system in use in Scotland and considered that it provided a useful approach in retaining the data of only those in this serious category of offences. There were calls for greater clarification on the list of offences that fall into this category as the suggested list (contained in Schedule 1 to the Criminal Justice Act 2003) was currently too wide and contained some relatively minor offences.
- 2.4 There was support for a retention policy and respondents supported the proposed retention periods of 6 and 12 years, whilst others suggested varying other periods from 3 years to 14 years. A number recommended that there should be a single retention period irrespective of the offence involved. This was suggested on grounds of simplicity, (police) operational efficiency and the heterogeneity of offending.

- 2.5 The suggestion was made both from respondents who supported or were against retention policy, that the decision to retain profiles and fingerprints for those arrested and not convicted or against whom no further action was taken should be a matter for the court. It was not appropriate for such an important decision to be made by the police. Instead, the police would have to justify retention on a case-by-case basis against strict criteria relating to the individual, the offence and propensity for future offending.
- **Arrested and convicted**
Number of respondents: 94
- 2.6 The overwhelming response was in support of a retention policy for those convicted of an offence. Many supported the indefinite retention of data irrespective of the offence for which the person had been convicted. Whilst no proposals were contained in the consultation paper to change the current policy, a number of respondents considered that the existing retention policy was not proportionate. Suggestions were received on varying periods of retention ranging from completion of sentence to 40 years.
- 2.7 It was suggested that indefinite retention of the DNA failed to take into account the seriousness of the offence or the circumstances of the offender. The period for DNA on minor crimes or those subject to a warning, reprimand or caution should either be nil or a period of 1 or 2 years.
- 2.8 It was also proposed that it should be a matter for the courts to determine the period of retention in cases where the conviction did not involve violent or sexual offences. In those cases, the retention period should be revised to provide a proportionate retention period supported by a suitable evidence base around the type of offence and propensity for future offending.
- **Universal database**
Number of respondents: 24
- 2.9 Responses in support of a universal database indicated that such an approach would take away concerns around guilt and innocence and disproportionality. They also focused on the rights of the victim and the need for the individual to be afforded as much protection from future offending.
- **Disproportionality (Ethnicity)**
Number of respondents: 28
- 2.10 All respondents on this topic pointed to high levels from the black and minority ethnic populations, particularly young black males, on the NDNAD. There was concern that taking DNA on arrest for all recordable offences impacts adversely on ethnic minority communities. Respondents pointed to particular sections of society being treated differently by the criminal justice system and as a consequence, being potentially denied the right to access opportunities.
- **Vulnerable groups**
Number of respondents: 5
- 2.11 Respondents pointed to people with disabilities that affect their social interaction and behaviour skills, being subject to arrest before their disabilities and/or capacity to respond has been identified or considered. Special consideration should be considered for the deletion of data for people arrested either under the Mental Health Act or as a consequence of any mental health condition.

- **Young People**

Number of respondents: 66

- 2.12 There was universal support for deletion of records of all children under 10 years old from the NDNAD and the commitment that they would not appear on the database in the future in relation to any volunteer profiles. In relation to children over 10 years old, there was confusion on the proposed retention policy for young people and concern on the impact of stigmatisation of a young person and their ability to access future opportunities. A number of respondents pointed to the need to adhere to the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child.
- 2.13 Particular concern was expressed at the retention policy for those over 10 and under 18 years old who had been arrested but not convicted. There were suggestions that data should only be retained for the purposes of the investigation only irrespective of the outcome and that it would then be a matter for the court to determine whether retention should be in place on a case-by-case basis.
- 2.14 There were some calls for those convicted of an offence to be on the same retention period as an adult and for those not convicted to be retained for periods of up to 10 years. The majority view from those who responded on this was that applying adult retention periods to children was wholly inappropriate and that young people are in need of support and protection to allow them to develop their full potential.

3 FINGERPRINTS

Number of respondents: 27

- 3.1 The two main viewpoints were that fingerprints and DNA should have the same regime and that an individual should retain the right to witness destruction. Removing the right to witness destruction was seen by some as potentially diminishing public confidence. There was also recognition of the potential operational

implications of witnessing the legacy deletion. Instead, it may be more appropriate to limit witnessing of data to those cases deleted under the exceptional case procedure.

- 3.2 Policing organisations pointed to the option of a different retention period for fingerprints, including indefinite retention. They pointed to the acknowledgement of the ECtHR judgment that fingerprints are not as sensitive personal data as DNA samples or profiles and that they are used for other purposes in policing.

4 EARLY DELETION OF PROFILES

- **Appeals process**

Number of responses: 50

- 4.1 The proposals for reforming the existing exceptional case procedures were welcomed in principle. There was general dissatisfaction with the current process which many thought was arbitrary, lacking transparency and subject to too much local discretion.
- 4.2 Placing the system on a statutory footing and the criteria for consideration of application was welcomed. More needed to be done to publicise the appeals process to the individual, both at the time of taking the biometric data and at the conclusion either of the investigation or prosecution process.
- 4.3 The requirement for annual reporting and greater scrutiny of the appeals process was also welcomed. A number of respondents felt that it should not be a matter for the Chief Officer in each force to be the final arbiter on the outcome of applications. Any decision of the Chief Officer should be subject to appeal to a court. It was considered that judicial review was not an approach which many people would choose to follow and therefore, a suitable course of appeal should be established to a lower court.

4.4 There was some recognition of the benefits of an independent body but insufficient detail was provided on how such a body would be constituted.

- **Witnessing destruction**

4.5 As discussed under Fingerprints at section 3, there were calls to retain the ability to witness fingerprints and for that to be applied to biometric data more generally. There was also a need identified on what process should be in place at the end of a 6 year or 12 year retention period by which a person is informed that their data has been deleted.

5 GOVERNANCE

Number of respondents: 24

5.1 Proposals to extend the independent governance of the NDNAD were welcome, subject to more detailed information on the future arrangements of the NDNAD Strategy Board.

5.2 Some respondents considered that the governance structure should be independent of the police; and that an independent body should be established which reported direct to Parliament and not to Ministers.

5.3 If the existing Board remains in place, it should have more extensive outside representation and the chair of the Board should be other than the police.

6 SECURITY

Number of respondents: 46

6.1 Concern over the ability to maintain a secure database and to ensure that access is strictly limited to those who should have access. Respondents pointed to data losses in other areas as illustrative of the inability of government and organisations to secure or manage large databases effectively.

6.2 Some respondents pointed to the need for sufficient safeguards to prevent access to the database being extended in the future to purposes other than for use in crime detection. Pointing to public confidence in the database, the Government needed to assure the public that data on the database was secure and only contained data which was necessary to protect the public.

7 TAKING SAMPLES – ARREST

Number of respondents: 29

7.1 Suggestions were made that the current threshold of taking biometric data is too low and that the volume of recordable offences is too wide. This resulted in people being arrested for minor offences and, currently, their DNA being retained indefinitely. Instead, data should only be taken on arrest for specific offences if relevant to the investigation and on charge in order to conduct a speculative search. For children, speculative searches should only be conducted on the order of a court.

8 TERRORISM

Number of responses: 9

9.1 Need for explanation and clarification on what is meant by terrorism-related offences and evidence to support retention periods specific to this category.

9 RESEARCH

Number of responses: 91

9.1 Whilst there was recognition at the intention to identify an evidence base and acknowledgement in the consultation paper itself of the status of the material, there was significant criticism from a range of respondents on the content of the research and the impact assessment.

9.2 There were three key criticisms: the sample size was too small; the linking of arrested and not convicted and arrested and convicted but not given a custodial sentence was considered flawed; and the material presented had not been peer reviewed. As a consequence, critics considered

that the proposed retention periods were not based on a solid evidence base and required more detailed work to be carried out. Some respondents indicated that scientific certainty was required in order to determine a retention policy, if any, for arrested and not convicted and also for arrested and convicted.

12.2 The opportunity should also be taken to review the existing list of recordable offences and the list of offences under the Criminal Justice Act 2003 which constitute violent and sexual offences.

10 VOLUNTEER SAMPLES

Number of respondents: 54

10.1 Significant support for the deletion of legacy data from volunteers and future policy on retention. Suggestions for volunteers to witness destruction of data and proposals for improved information to volunteer when consent is sought to the taking of data.

11 TAKING SAMPLES ADDITIONAL CATEGORIES

Number of respondents: 23

11.1 General support for the proposals to take data and for the retrospective application in relation to those convicted either in England and Wales or in other jurisdiction. Need to ensure that a conviction from an overseas jurisdiction would complement the human rights requirements in the UK. It was essential that each case was considered on the individuals circumstances of the conviction. Further consideration should be given to the proposed retrospective application of the provisions.

12 LEGISLATION

Number of respondents: 31

12.1 Most respondents on this topic favoured any new measures to be introduced in primary legislation. There was concern that legislation in this area had been developed in a piecemeal approach over time. It would be of some benefit to bring those changes together with new proposals.

PART TWO

Implementing the judgment and statutory framework for future retention

WRITTEN MINISTERIAL STATEMENT NOVEMBER 2009

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (ALAN JOHNSON)

1. I am announcing today proposals on a new retention framework for DNA and fingerprints to be introduced through primary legislation as soon as Parliamentary time allows. I am also today publishing on the Home Office website the responses to the consultation exercise on earlier proposals published in May 2009, and a review of the research carried out in this area.

www.homeoffice.gov.uk/documents/cons-2009-dna-database/

Background

2. The UK has been at the forefront of using DNA in the detection of crime for many years, and it has played a key role in the conviction of numerous individuals for the most serious of crimes over the years; some 832 matches to the National DNA Database were made in cases of murder, manslaughter or rape in 2008/9 alone. The Government is determined that DNA and fingerprints should continue to play a key role in public protection and the prevention and detection of crime.
3. In December 2008 the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) judgment in the case of S and Marper found that the blanket retention of DNA profiles and fingerprints indefinitely where there had been no conviction represented a breach of Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights.
4. The Government undertook to give effect to the judgment and to amend domestic law accordingly. We published proposals in May 2009 in a Consultation Paper "*Keeping the Right People on the DNA Database.*" The consultation period ended in August and some 500 responses, the majority from individuals, were received. We have considered those responses carefully before bringing forward the proposals below.
5. The retention of biometric data remains a sensitive issue. Such data helps in the detection and conviction of criminals and may also be used for identification purposes outside the criminal justice context. There is less argument about the retention of biometric information in respect of those who have been convicted of a criminal offence than there is in respect of those who have been arrested and had their DNA and fingerprints taken but were not subsequently cautioned or convicted. Achieving the appropriate balance between privacy and public protection, in a way which satisfies the ECtHR judgment, has been our objective.

Research

6. Since the publication of the Consultation Paper we have sought to further the evidence base through additional research. The research lends support to the public protection case for retaining the DNA of those who have been arrested but not convicted of criminal offences. It suggests that we can go some way to reduce the retention periods originally proposed without compromising public protection, indicating that the chance of re-arrest, following an arrest with no further action, of individuals with no previous convictions remains higher than the chance of arrest in the general population for 6 years following the initial arrest.

Proposals

7. *DNA Samples* – The ECtHR judgment highlighted the particular sensitivity of retaining DNA samples as distinct from the profiles taken from them which are held on the National DNA Database (NDNAD). Although not required by the judgment, we continue to believe that there is scope for destroying samples not only of those arrested but not convicted and but also of those who have been convicted. We propose that samples should not be retained beyond a 6 month maximum which is needed to ensure satisfactory loading of the profile taken from the sample onto the NDNAD. We do, however, propose to bring forward a power for the police to take a further sample should the defence of an accused person challenge the authenticity of the results of the analysis of the destroyed sample.
8. *Convicted adults* – We propose the indefinite retention of DNA profiles of convicted adults in line with the Consultation Paper. This would also apply to people who are given a caution, warning or reprimand.
9. *Unconvicted Adults* – In setting a proportionate retention period for the DNA profiles of unconvicted adults which does not compromise public protection, we have taken account of the improved evidence base and responses to the proposals in the original Consultation Paper. We propose a 6 year retention period for the profiles of unconvicted adults irrespective of the seriousness of the crime for which they were arrested. Although the ECtHR suggested that the seriousness of the alleged offence should be a factor in determining what length of retention was proportionate, the best available evidence indicates that the type of offence a person is first arrested for is not a good indicator of the seriousness of offence he might subsequently be arrested for or convicted of in future. As the retention of the DNA of innocent people is not punitive but rather a measure to facilitate the detection of future offences, the Government therefore concludes it is appropriate to have a single retention period.
10. *Juveniles* – While the evidence base does not support shorter retention periods for juveniles, we have, in setting a proportionate retention regime for juveniles, whether convicted, or unconvicted, given weight to the comments in the ECtHR judgment on juveniles, and the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child responses to the Consultation Paper.
11. *Convicted Juveniles* – We propose that the DNA profiles of convicted juveniles should be retained indefinitely for serious offences, and for 5 years for the first minor offence, with indefinite retention for a second conviction. This recognises that for many young people involvement in crime in their teenage years is often an isolated and minor incident. However, we also recognise that, for some young people, involvement in crime in their teenage years is a strong indicator of risk of further criminal activity into adulthood. We believe, therefore, that a limited retention period for a single conviction, with indefinite retention in the case of any further conviction, strikes the appropriate balance.
12. *Unconvicted juveniles* – we propose that, where 16- and 17-year-olds are arrested for but not subsequently convicted of a serious offence, their DNA profile would be retained for 6 years (as for adults), taking account of the ages at which peak offending occurs. For all other juveniles, we propose a 3 year retention period for DNA of those who have been arrested but not convicted whatever the offence for which they were arrested, and at whatever pre-18 age they were arrested at. This corrects a possible anomaly with the original proposal, identified by consultation respondents, that an individual arrested at age 10 might have had their DNA retained for 8 years, whereas someone arrested at age 17 might have had their DNA retained for only 1 year. It also provides an appropriately more lenient approach to juveniles who are arrested but not convicted, compared with those who do receive a conviction.

13. *Fingerprints (Adult and Juveniles)* – We propose that, in all cases, the same regime should apply to the retention of fingerprints as for DNA profiles. The ECtHR judgment implied that fingerprints were a lesser intrusion of privacy, but we are not aware of evidence which suggests we should propose a different retention policy.
14. *Additional powers* – In line with our aim to ensure that the right people are on the database our proposals in this area will, as we set out in the May consultation document, include giving the police the power to take fingerprints and non-intimate samples without consent from UK nationals or residents convicted of specified serious offences abroad at any time; to remove the existing statutory bar (in the Criminal Evidence (Amendment) Act 1997) on taking non-intimate samples from persons convicted of serious offences before 10 April 1995 who have been released from prison; and to give the police the power to take non-intimate samples and fingerprints post-arrest where the initial sample has proved inadequate for analysis even though a person is no longer in police detention.
15. *Destruction of DNA and fingerprints profiles before the end of retention period* – Currently, Chief Officers may consider the exceptional destruction of DNA and fingerprints under the exceptional case procedure. We propose to introduce greater transparency by setting out in statute more clearly defined criteria where deletion would be appropriate. This should bring greater clarity to the public and also the police.
16. *Governance* – It is important that, in addition to putting in place the proportionate regime for the retention of DNA and fingerprints set out above, we are also able to promote public confidence in the operation of that regime. We therefore propose to strengthen governance arrangements by placing the national DNA Database Strategy Board on a statutory footing and by introducing to it a wider independent membership.
17. *Terrorism and National Security* – material taken under any regime (including the Terrorism Act 2000,) would be able to be retained beyond the 6-year point where there is a case for doing so on the basis of a case by case review on national security grounds. This would require a review by a senior police officer every two years – although data would be deleted if it became clear between reviews that its retention would no longer be necessary. The policy for juveniles would be similar but would take account of the differential treatment proposed for juveniles more generally.

SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

DNA Profile Retention Proposals

Occurrence	May 09 Consultation Proposals	Revised Proposals
ADULT – Conviction – All Crimes	Indefinite	Indefinite
ADULT – Non Conviction – Serious Crime	12 Years	6 Years
ADULT – Non Conviction – Minor Crime	6 Years	6 Years
UNDER 18s – Conviction – Serious Crime	Indefinite	Indefinite
UNDER 18s – Conviction – Minor Crime	1st Conviction – Remove at 18; 2nd – Indefinite	1st Conviction – 5 Years; 2nd – Indefinite
UNDER 18s – Non Conviction – Serious Crime	12 Years	3 Years (6 Years for 16/17-year-olds)
UNDER 18s – Non Conviction – Minor Crime	6 Years or 18, whichever is sooner	3 Years

DNA Sample Retention Proposals

Occurrence	Retention Period May 09 Consultation	Revised Proposals
All Cases	6 Months	6 Months

Fingerprint Retention Proposals

Occurrence	May 09 Consultation Proposals	Revised Proposals
ADULT – Conviction – All Crimes	Indefinite	Indefinite
ADULT – Non Conviction – Serious Crime	12 Years	6 Years
ADULT – Non Conviction – Minor Crime	6 Years	6 Years
UNDER 18s – Conviction – Serious Crime	Indefinite	Indefinite
UNDER 18s – Conviction – Minor Crime	1st Conviction – Remove at 18; 2nd – Indefinite	1st Conviction – 5 Years; 2nd – Indefinite
UNDER 18s – Non Conviction – Serious Crime	12 Years	3 Years (6 Years for 16/17-year-olds)
UNDER 18s – Non Conviction – Minor Crime	6 Years or 18, whichever is sooner	3 Years

Additional Power Proposals

- UK Nationals convicted abroad – power to take DNA & fingerprints on their return to the UK;
- Historic UK convictions – power to take DNA & fingerprints where not held;
- Those on police bail – power to take DNA & fingerprints where not held
- In order to deter/deal with potential defence challenges at court where a sample has been destroyed, we propose a power to retake samples following such a challenge.

Governance Proposals

- Wider independent membership of the DNA Strategy Board.

Exceptional Case Procedure/Appeal Proposals

- More clearly defined categories where deletion under the Exceptional Case Procedure would be appropriate
- Appeals against Chief Constables decisions under the Exceptional Case Procedure decisions to be heard at a Magistrates Court. Applicant to pay standard Magistrates' Court civil case fee of £200 on application.

National Security/Terrorism Related Material

- Position yet to be finalised

List of Respondents

11 MILLION

A C Lawrey
ACPO
Adam
Adam Kirkham
Adam Taylor
Adrian Kerton
Adrian Wake
Alan Fisher
Alan Fox
Alan Halner
Alan Hewitt
Alan Hughes
Alec Pemberton
Alex Salmon
Alison Smith
Alistair Lairds
Allan Carr
Allan Lloyd
Allan Lloyd
Amarick Azarian
Amennunc
Andrea Blood
Andrew Evans
Andrew Flather
Andrew Gerrity
Andrew Hart
Andrew Onorio
Andrew Smith
Andy Kirby
Anna Fors
Anthony Etherington
Ards Borough Council
Ashtok Argent-Katwala
Asif Saddique
Association of Police Authorities
Association of Youth Offending Team Managers
augereau1805
Avtar Singh
Ballymena Borough Council
Ballymena District Policing Partnership
Banbridge District Council
Barry Tighe
Barry Whitbread
Beatrix Goodman
Bede Ward
Ben Boyle
Ben Darji
Benjamin David
Bernard Woods
Beryl Horsley
Beverlea Ventress
Bilal Sacha
Bill Sharp
Black Mental Health UK
Bob Hobbs
Brian Thomas
Brian Woodgate
British Irish Rights Watch
Bronwyn McGahan
Bruce Bedford
Bruce Wright
C Buckley
Dr C. P. Van der Beek
Camille Cline-Cole
Caroline Day
Caroline Smith
Carsten Hartwig
Centre on Human Rights for People with Disabilities
Charles Campbell
Charles Farrier
Charles Turner
Cheryl Anne
Chez Cotton
Children's Law Centre, Belfast
Child's Rights Information Network
Chris Burnmajster
Chris Jayne

Chris Kidd	Dea Mayfield
Chris Pounder	Dean Flower
Chris Williams	Dean Sas
Chris Williams	Debbie Devine
Christopher Fisher	Debbie Privett
Christopher Hudson-Gool	Department of Enterprise, Trade and Investment, NI
Church of England's Mission and Public Affairs Council	Devraj Randhawa
Clair Syme	Diane Beddoes
Clare Caves	Diversity and Citizen Focus Directorate, Metropolitan Police Service
Clare Hegarty	Donald Dryer
Clive Page	Down District Council
Colin Fenn	Dr Andrew Norman
Colin Inglis	Dr Peter Flowerdew
Colin Spalding	Dudley Simms
Colin Ward	Edmund Jackson
Committee on the Administration of Justice NI	Elizabeth Davies
Consulting For Tomorrow	Elizabeth Morgan
CPS	Emma Stainer
Criminal Justice Council	Equalities & Human Rights, South Wales Police
D. L. Quinn	Equality and Human Rights Commission
Daniel Gillin	Eric Avebury
Daniel Mountford	Erik Chakravity
Danny Hughes	Ernest Brant
Dave Hawkins	Ernie Holden
Dave Rolin	Ethics Group of the NDNAD
Dave Shurlock	Euan Mathieson
David Archer	Eugene O'Callaghan
David Armstrong	Ewin Rose
David Beckett	Fiona Couzens
David Bramhall	Forensic Science Service NI
David Grant	Forensic Science Service
David Leigh	Foundation for Information Policy Research
David Locke	Frederick Cooke
David McHale	G D Silkstone
David Mery	Gareth Lawrence
David Perriman	Gareth Young
David Ramsbottom	Gary Jones
David Scurr	Genewatch
David Vest	Geoff Gilbert

George Anthony Havens	James Begent
George Gardiner	James d’Arcy
George Smith	James Evans
Geraint Bevan	James Stewart
Gill Chant	James Tilburn
Glen Burchall	Jane B Langley
Grace	Jane Dunne
Graham Brothers	Janet Batterbee
Graham Pearce	Jason Marcus
Grahame Reynolds	Jeanette Arregger
Grant Hole	Jenny Willott MP, Cardiff Central
Greater Manchester Police Authority	Jeremy Chandler
Greg Cooper	Jim Cosser
Gul Mughal	Joe Kennard
Guled Roobleh Michael	John Bowen
Gwenda Yeomans	John Carter
H L Hirsch	John Davies
Hampshire Constabulary Scientific Services	John Davies
Hannah Isaacson	John Fiume
Harry Metcalfe	John Goodliffe
Helen Tibble	John Haigh
Henry Haslam	John Hall
High Coakley	John Kingsmore
Hull City Council	John Mannion
Human Genetics and Bioethics, Department of Health	John Punshon
Ian Browne	John Scholes
Ian Evans	John Scott
Ian Gray	John Shale
Ian Law	John Smith
Ian Neish	John Westmoreland
Ian Shortman	John Wilson
Ian Strickland	John Wilson
Ian Walsh	Johnnie Shannon
Identity Trust CIC	Johnston Gilpin
Information Commissioner’s Office	Jon Almond
INTRESCO	Jon Buckingham
Ivor Deacon	Jonathan Mair
J Abbots	Jonny Gough
J M Walker	Joseph Foster
J. Bradley	jrUK

Julian Swaby	Margaret Carr
Julie Eckford	Margaret Collier
JUSTICE	Mark
K. Mullally	Mark Benson
Karen Challinor	Mark Ferri
Karen Lucas	Mark Heaton
Karen Rolfe	Mark Kinzley
Karl Barrow	Mark McKay
Kate MacDonald	Mark Oaten MP Winchester
Keith Soothill	Mark Ogilvie
Keith Wells	Mark Smith
Ken Best	Mark Townsend
Ken Horsman	Mark Tunstill
Ken Price	Mark Wilding
Kevin Donnelly	Martin Budden
Kevin Foster	Martin Fuller
Kevin Hunt	Martin Jury
Kevin Peters	Martin Parker
Khaider Haider	Martin Roche
Kieran Scotney	Matt Parker
Kingsly Napley LLP	Matthew Green
Laurence Bryant	Maureen Hames
Laurence Isaacson	Merseyside Police Authority
Laurence Lustgarten	Michael Greig
Law Society	Michael Innes
Len Mackin	Michael Timms
Leonard Mosley	Michelle Knight
Lesley Misrahi	Mike Atkinson
LGC Forensics	Mike Lake
Liam McLernon	Mike Lawrence
Liberty	Mr J Coldrick
Lisburn City Council	NASUWT
Louise B	Natalie Jester
Ludwig Gelot	Nathan Dennis
Luke Fernandes	Nathan Lawson
M Rawlings	Neil Adams
Malcolm Boura	Neil Macehiter
Malcolm Reid	NI Human Rights Commission
Manc O'	Nicholas Godwin
Marcus Lasance	Nick Arundel

Nick Flowers
Nick MacLean
Nick Ringshall
NL
Noel Collyer
Norman Stevens
Northumbria University
NPIA
NSPCC
Nuffield Council on Bioethics
Oliver Clifford-Mobley
Oliver Walker
Orchid Cellmark Ltd (DNA/Paternity testing service)
P. Purcie
Pam Bennett
Patricia Cawson
Patrick Mahon
Paul Burgess
Paul Burrows
Paul Clein
Paul Cousins
Paul Fovargue
Paul Halliwell
Paul Mansfield
Paul Pocock
Paul Smith
Paul Vella
Pee Dee
Pete Chown
Pete Marshall
Peter Bishop
Peter Coleborn
Peter Coller
Peter Hawkins
Peter Keating
Peter Kenrick
Peter Mahy
Peter Newton
Peter Shakeshaft
Peter Ward
Phil Wadley
Philip Ridley
Philippa Matthews
Police Federation
Police Superintendents Association of England and Wales
Policing Board NI
Polly Loxton
Polly Rossetti
Professor David Gregg
Professor Michael Zander
Professor Shiela M Bird Institute of Public Health
PSNI
Public and Commercial Services Union
Public Prosecution Service
R J Long
R. Johnson
R. S. Mitchell
Rabel Civil Liberties
Ralph Eschur
Rhys Gwynn
Richard Adam
Richard Bragg
Richard Caborn MP Sheffield Central
Richard Cowling
Richard Ham
Richard Hollinshead
Richard Marshall
Richard Moth
Richard Oliver
Richard Pembridge
Richard Sherhod
Richard Tilford
Rob Hobart
Robert Baile
Robert Grammer
Robert James
Robert Nock
Robert Paulton
Robert Rhodes

Robert Smith	Stewart Wilkinson
Robert Thompson	Stewart Calligan
Robert Young	Stuart Bruce
Robin Muers	Stuart Colley
Rod Smith	Stuart Duckworth
Roddy McLachlan	Stuart Montrose
Roger Farrar	Stuart Pett
Rolf Clayton	Sue Bavin
Rosemary McKenna MP Cumbernauld, Kilsyth & Kirkintilloch East	Sue Caro
Ross Johnson	Sue Wheeler
Royal Statistical Society	Sue at Jollys
Rt Hon Lord Justice Thomas	Superintendents Association of Northern Ireland
Runnymede Trust	Susie Labinjoh
Russell Francis	Sylvia Zachariah
Ryan Duffy	T Maddem
S Mckie	Tanby Croft
Sal Vager	Terence Eden
Sanchia Wheeler	Terence Paget
Sarah Kennedy	Terry Smyth
Scott Wheeler	Tessa Lancaster
Serena Tireney Mid Sussex Liberal	The Police Foundation
Shaun Walton	The Rev Chancellor Geoffrey Morris
Shena Clarke	Thomas Crane
Shirley Judges	Tim Dore
Silvia Alvares	Tim Ireland
Simon Shearer	Tim Miller
Sinn Fein	Tim Walker
spicedtea	Toby Farmer
Standing Committee for Youth Justice	Tom Thomson
Stephen Coombs	Tony Cox
Stephen Halden	Tony Groves
Stephen Nelson	Tony Hedley
Stephen Simblet	Trevor Aldridge
Stephen Westwood	Trevor Clough
Steve Butler	University of Cambridge
Steve Ranson	University of Surrey
Steve Walker	Vanessa
Steven Farrell	Vanessa Ayres
Stewart Tennyson	Victim Support
	Vijay Chopra

Vin Kennedy

virexcfc

Wade Brice

West Midlands Police Forensic Services

West Yorkshire Police

You should also contact the Police Powers and Procedures Team should you require a copy of this consultation paper in any other format, e.g. Braille, Large Font, or Audio.

© Crown Copyright 2009

Produced by the Home Office. November 2009.
Ref: 299740. ISBN: 978-1-84987-105-1