



1. Introduction

- 1.1 This consultation sought views on the scope, objectives, governance, content and strands of the draft national surveillance camera strategy for England and Wales.
- 1.2 Under the Protection of Freedoms Act 2012, the secretary of state issued the surveillance camera code of practice with 12 guiding principles on the appropriate and effective use of surveillance camera systems. The government is fully supportive of the use of overt surveillance cameras in a public place whenever that use is: in pursuit of a legitimate aim; necessary to meet a pressing need; proportionate; effective, and; compliant with any relevant legal obligations.
- 1.3 This strategy aims to develop a holistic approach to raising standards and compliance with legal obligations in line with the 12 guiding principles of the code by working in partnership with leaders from various sectors within the surveillance camera industry.
- 1.4 This will mean that where overt surveillance cameras are used in public space, it is done efficiently, proportionately and effectively thereby enhancing public support and trust as well as ensuring their right to privacy as set out in Article 8 of the European Convention of Human Rights is protected.
- 1.5 The consultation ran from 25 October 2016 until 6 December 2016. It invited responses online though the survey, by email or post.
- 1.6 In addition to these responses the Commissioner attended and facilitated a number of events where the consultation was discussed and further comments received.
- 1.7 This document provides a summary of the responses and outlines the next steps in the development of the strategy.

2 Overview of responses

2.2 Survey Responses

We received 129 (including 70 partial responses) responses to the consultation through the online survey. The profile of the respondents to the consultation survey is shown below.

| | Organisation | Response | Response Total |
|---|----------------------------------|----------|----------------|
| | | Percent | |
| 1 | Local authority | 37.50% | 21 |
| 2 | Police Force | 3.57% | 2 |
| 3 | Police and Crime Commissioner | 0.00% | 0 |
| 4 | Local Councillor | 0.00% | 0 |

| 5 | Surveillance Camera system operator (public authority) | 1.79% | 1 |
|----|--|--------|----|
| 6 | Surveillance Camera system operator (non public authority) | 1.79% | 1 |
| 7 | Surveillance camera system designer, supplier, installer or maintainer | 3.57% | 2 |
| 8 | Security supplier | 3.57% | 2 |
| 9 | Regulator body, standards body or inspectorate | 7.14% | 4 |
| 10 | Civil liberties charity/organisation/pressure group | 1.79% | 1 |
| 11 | Representative body | 1.79% | 1 |
| 12 | Member of the public | 28.57% | 16 |
| 13 | Other (please specify) | 8.93% | 5 |

Only 56 people answered this question.

3 Summary of survey responses

The survey invited views on specific issues and provided an opportunity for respondents to give a more detailed response to the proposals.

The key points from the survey are set out below:

Question 1: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding the national surveillance camera strategy for England and Wales

(People had a range of choices on the following statements from strongly agree to strongly disagree)

- The national surveillance camera strategy should cover all types of public space surveillance.
 - 92.7% agreed 7.3% disagree
- The national surveillance camera strategy should clearly explain to the public the obligations of those using surveillance cameras
 - 100 % agreed 0% disagreed
- The national strategy will help increase compliance with relevant regulations

70.3% agreed - 7.5% disagree 22.2% unsure

 The national surveillance camera strategy provides clear obligations and directions for different users of surveillance cameras that have to show regard to the surveillance camera code of practice and those that choose to voluntary adopt the code.

80% agreed - 3.6% disagreed 16.4% unsure

I support the development of the national surveillance camera strategy

88.7% agreed - 9.5 % disagreed 1.9% unsure

The draft strategy was generally supported by the respondents with a large percentage agreeing that there is a need for this strategy to inform the public of the obligations of those using surveillance. A number of respondents thought that the strategy should cover all types of public space surveillance regardless of whether the cameras are owned by government or private operators. This was further supported by the 92.7% of respondents that agreed with the following statement –

'The national surveillance camera strategy should cover all forms of public space surveillance'.

Another recurring topic was the question around enforcement and a number of respondents did not feel that the strategy would be effective without the backing of some form of enforcement powers. For example some of the comments include the following

'A strategy which cannot be enforced by the courts, with the threat of imprisonment for those who transgress, is likely to be ignored.....'

'Not sure if it will increase compliance if it remains voluntary'

The Commissioner's Response

The role of the surveillance camera commissioner is to promote compliance with the surveillance camera code of practice. Over the last three years he has been doing this by raising awareness and encouraging compliance using the tools that he has developed including the self assessment tool. While the role does not come with any enforcement powers, he has successfully encouraged local authorities to complete the self assessment tool in order to show regard to the code and without and powers can report that 85% of local authorities across England and Wales have completed the tool. This supports the fact that the absence of enforcement powers will not be a hindrance to uplifting compliance.

While the suggestion that the strategy should apply to all forms of public space surveillance in spite of the owners is understandable, section 33 of the protection of freedoms act lists relevant authorities who have to show regard to the code and all others are encouraged to voluntarily adopt the code.

The Commissioner raised the issue of widening the list of relevant authorities with Ministers in the 2016 review of the Code. Summary of views from this consultation will be shared with

Ministers to ensure they are aware. The strategy will provide evidence for effectiveness of pursuing voluntary adoption.

The Commissioner has been working with and will continue to work with non relevant authorities to encourage compliance. Already this has had a positive outcome and a number of voluntary organisations such as universities and the retail sector have evidence compliance by completing the self assessment tool and in some cases certification against the code. It is the intention to continue to use the strategy to encourage compliance across all sectors using public space overt surveillance.

Question 2: Are the strands listed in the strategy the right ones?

90.91% yes - 9.09% no

Question 3: Are there any strands missing from the strategy?

In general the respondents agreed that the listed in the strategy are the right ones. They were a few suggestions of other areas that should be covered by the strategy such as cyber security, domestic CCTV, data storage, digitalisation, financial support and the use of audio among others.

In addition there were some concerns around how well the strategy will be communicated across all relevant sectors to ensure its effectiveness.

The Commissioner's Response

The Commissioner appreciates the suggestions to include other areas into the strategy and will address concerns around cyber security within the standards and regulatory strand. Some of these are tactical issues which will be addressed within the delivery plans which were not available during consultation.

The use of domestic CCTV is not covered by this strategy as it is not covered by the surveillance camera code of practice – the Information Commissioner oversees use of domestic CCTV. However, there is some guidance on our website on best practice as well as lots of information on the Information Commissioner's website. The Commissioner is in discussion with the ICO to ensure there is clarity for the public over where to go for advice on the use of surveillance cameras for domestic purposes.

A communication strategy has been developed for the strategy to make sure that it is communicated to a large range of stakeholders to encourage take up and how the strategy relates to them.

Question 4: To what extent do you agree or disagree that the strategy has clear achievable objectives for each strand?

71.42% agreed - 8.93% - disagreed 19.64% unsure

While it was generally agreed that the objectives are achievable, there was some concern that the objectives were not specific enough to make them measurable by the public. Furthermore some respondents expressed concern over the lack of detail in the objectives which make it difficult to assess whether any or all of them are achievable.

There was also concern around the delivering of these objectives in the mist of austerity and the difficultly of meeting standards and so on during times of financial cuts.

The Commissioner's Response

It is accepted that the objectives are not written as SMART objectives and this will be considered during the re draft of the strategy making them more measurable and achievable.

It is noted that the objectives do lack detail and SMART deliverables which contribute towards achievement of strategy objectives are being developed. The Commissioner acknowledges that these were not available during the consultation but will be publishing the delivery plans alongside the finalised strategy document.

Furthermore the issue of cost is one that cuts across all sectors and a number of affordable options will be available for users to meet their statutory obligation or chosen obligation to comply with the code such as the self assessment tool. This is a free downloadable tool available on the SCC website.

Question 5: Are these objectives extensive enough to cover all aspects of public space overt surveillance?

78.57% yes – 21.43% No.

Question 6: Are there any other objectives you think should be included in the strategy?

40.74% yes - 59.26% no

While a large percentage of respondents agreed that the objectives were extensive enough, there were some suggestions of other objectives that should be included in the strategy. A number of the suggestions seem to repeat those listed in question 3 above.

In addition to those mentioned above, there were also calls for the need to look at image standards.

One thing that reoccurred in comments on a number of questions is the coverage of the code as it currently is and the need for it to be expanded to include a range of other sectors such as transport, high street stores, taxis, as well any organisation that has surveillance cameras positioned in a way that they cover an area used by the public and capture images of the same. There were further suggestions that the strategy should be enforceable.

The Commissioner's Response

The suggestions have been considered but at this stage as the surveillance camera code of practice only creates a statutory obligation for relevant authorities; we will work with non relevant authorities to encourage compliance. The role of the Commissioner is to encourage compliance to the code including voluntary compliance. Only the Government can consider expansion of the list of relevant authorities and in a review of the code last year, the Commissioner recommended such an expansion. In addition, it is the view of the government that the incentives and enablers currently in place are sufficient enough to encourage compliance and therefore they are not of a view to give the Commissioner any form of enforcement powers.

Question 7: Are the governance arrangements outlined in the strategy clear and easy to understand?

92.86% yes - 7.14% no

Question 8: To what extent do you agree or disagree that the strategy has sufficient governance to ensure it is successfully implemented?

57.14% agree - 17.85% no, 25% unsure

Respondents generally agreed that the governance arrangements are clear and will ensure it is successfully implemented; however clarification is needed on the composition of the commissioner's advisory council to ensure it is evenly balanced alongside the newly formed strategy group. There was also some suggestion that the strategy group will need to meet more that the minimum of twice a year to ensure the strategy is effectively delivered.

Another issue that reoccurred across response is the concern around penalties and enforcement power which are not provided to the Commissioner for those that are non compliant.

The Commissioner's Response

The Commissioner takes on board the fact that the strategy group may need to meet more than twice a year, which is the minimum, and will build this in to the governance arrangements for the strategy. Both the strategy group and the advisory council will meet when necessary to ensure smooth delivery of the strategy.

As mentioned above, enforcement powers cannot be built in to the strategy at this stage as the Commissioner has no powers of enforcement. The Government is not inclined to give the Commissioner enforcement powers at this stage and neither is the Commissioner asking for such powers as the incentives and enablers already used by the Commissioner go a long way to encourage compliance.

Question 9: To what extent do you agree that the strategy will help forge effective partnerships?

54.55% agree - 10.91% disagree 34.55 unsure

There were mixed views by respondents on whether the strategy will help to forge partnerships.

The Commissioner's Response

The strategy is made up of 11 strands which cover a range of sectors in the surveillance camera industry. Leaders from these sectors are working together to develop and implement the strategy therefore the commissioner and the strategy group are confident that the strategy will further build effective partnerships by working together to uplift standards in the industry.

Question 10: To what extent do you agree that the strategy will help encourage better regulation of public space surveillance?

64.28% agree - 19.65% disagree 16.07% unsure

The commissioner is encouraged that generally respondents agreed that the strategy will help encouraged better regulation of public space surveillance.

There were a number of suggestions on how to ensure the strategy encourages better regulation including proper monitoring, more regional involvement in delivery and the need to ensure sustainability within local authorities in the light of austerity.

There were also concerns around how effective the strategy will be in the absence of enforcement powers and incentives for those who want to comply.

The Commissioner's Response

As mentioned above, while the Commissioner does not have any enforcement powers, over the last three years through a number of incentives and enablers the level of compliance to the code has been uplifted. The absence of enforcement powers is not considered a hindrance to uplifting standards in the industry.

That said the Commissioner will take on board comments around the need for effective monitoring and regional involvement in delivering the strategy and promoting the code. Also while it is accepted that a number of organisations have financial challenges, it must be pointed out that it is possible to show regard to the code by completing the self assessment tool for free.

Question 11: Please provide any other comments on the strategy

Overall the response to the strategy consultation is positive. One respondent went as far as to say it is 'a thoughtful and well produced document...'

In addition to the responses above, we received a number of general comments on the strategy some of which are outlined below.

There was concern around capturing those sectors that do not have to comply with the code as well as the need to continually police the strategy to ensure it is effectively delivered.

Another respondent expressed their concern around the poor quality of CCTV in licensing premises who currently do not have to comply with the code. This ties in with concerns raised

around blanket licensing conditions such as those which paragraph 1.14 of the surveillance camera code of practice says "... are likely to give rise to serious concerns about the proportionality of such an approach...."

In addition some respondents want to see more control over the access to data captured by surveillance cameras as stated in principle 7 of the surveillance camera code of practice.

Another recurring subject is about keeping up with new technology including drones and improvement in camera devices as well as the challenge to achieve common standards across the vast range of manufacturers, designers and installers. In addition there was a further concern around the various forms of connectivity including Wi-Fi, GPS and Bluetooth tracking.

Other suggestions include having a single code that picks up all the regulatory requirements for surveillance cameras to reduce the complexity of the industry

The Commissioner's response

The support for the strategy is appreciated and a number of the comments have been taken on board.

The strategy distinguishes between the regulated sector and those that choose to voluntarily adopt the code. There are separate strand leads for these sectors and the document explains the difference between the two.

In the light of improving technology and concern around security, the standard strand now includes work around cyber security.

Please see the summary table for more information on what has changed in the strategy.

4 Written responses

In addition to the survey response to the consultation, we also received a number of written responses as listed below.

| | Name/Organisation |
|----|--|
| 1 | Welsh government |
| 2 | Office of the Surveillance Commissioners |
| 3 | British Parking Association |
| 4 | Police Action Lawyers Group (PALG) |
| 5 | Information Commissioner's Office |
| 6 | Privacy International |
| 7 | Big Brother Watch |
| 8 | The Home Office DNA Database Ethics Group |
| 9 | CCTV User Group |
| 10 | Elmbridge Borough Council |
| 11 | Salisbury Citywatch Community Interest Company |

| 12 | Web Way |
|----|----------------------------------|
| 13 | University of Essex – Law School |
| 14 | Kinesense |
| 15 | Key Forensic |
| 16 | British Transport Police |
| | |

A summary of written responses

It was suggested that there is a need for **strong leadership** in order to ensure the strategy reaches its full potential.

Lots of support for a single point of contact although it was suggested that it should be made clear that the legal entity still has overall responsibility as the data controller and not the individual acting as the single point of contact.

It was suggested that evidence gathering will be vital to support the use of surveillance systems. The public should be made aware of such evidence as well as any other information on the cameras such as if they are switched off or faulty this supports the transparency vision of the strategy.

It was pointed out by some respondents that further clarification needs to be provided around information sharing between organisations and sharing information with the public. This is to avoid it being confused with information requested under the Freedom of Information Act. It was further mentioned that the document should provide guidance on the sort of information that should be published and how it should be published - not hidden on a website that will be difficult for members of the public to find. One suggestion was to establish an annual publication day, when all organisations publish details about their systems.

In response to the issue of ownership and governance it was suggested that as one of the roles of the surveillance camera commissioner is to inform the secretary of state informed on the code of practice, a strategic framework which enables the Commissioner to secure the information required and inform the public seems like a legitimate undertaking.

There was some confusion around the use of the term 'surveillance by consent' as this could be interpreted in a number of different ways. An alternative term suggested was 'surveillance enjoying public support which was thought to be less confusing. It was further stated that in the face of the changing surveillance landscape public opinion is unknown and therefore there is a need to be cautious in making assumptions about public support.

Another concern was that around the need to distinguish between what data is captured by surveillance cameras and how the data is used once it has been captured.

In addition a number of the written responses expressed concern over the absence of reference to a number of other relevant legislations such as the Human Rights Act as well as the Data Protection Act and the Freedom of Information Act. On similar lines a number of respondents thought that the strategy focused largely on the Protection of Freedoms Act and the surveillance camera code of practice without sufficiently balanced with other regulations and codes such as

the Information Commissioner's Code - A data protection code of practice for surveillance cameras and personal data.

Further comments include concerns over the details of the strategy such as, **accountability**, measuring improved **transparency**, as well as the wide range of the sector that the strategy aims to cover. There was some suggestion that it might be best to focus on specific areas which might be more readily achievable.

Another respondent raised concerns around the strategy being called a 'national strategy' as the Surveillance Camera Commissioner's remit only covers England and Wales. It was thought that the term national would create confusion. It was further suggested that to make it a national strategy, the document should include other issues around surveillance cameras such as Data Protection and Human Rights laws.

This point has been taken on board and the strategy has since been renamed as the national surveillance camera strategy for England and Wales. In addition further reference has now been made to the document to include regulations that impact of surveillance cameras.

There was some concern that the strategy did not make a clear distinction between **relevant** authorities and the voluntary sector (those that chose to adopt the code)

The importance of **image quality** being fit for purpose was mentioned by some respondents as well as the accountability for the images. This relates directly to how the operational requirement document/passport to compliance will be used and who is responsible for the document.

Another issue raised was in terms of the **language** used throughout the document. It was thought that some of the words used are subjective and therefore difficult to measure, such as the phrase 'make them feel safe'. Other terms mentioned include – a clear road map, 'early warning system to horizon scan technological developments, soft levers, greater synergies and a single well publicised digital portal.

Another respondent mentioned their concern about how well the public understand what a **surveillance camera** is and suggests that the document should include an explanation as well as making it clear what overt surveillance camera is. They go further to suggest the document should list what is included in the term 'surveillance camera' with some information on types of devices and technical specifications.

One of the recurring comments was the issue of **security** of the cameras including cyber security and software issues. There was further mention of concerns of security around the combination of image databases and facial recognition technology which could be used to track people's movements.

In addition to the response above, we received a number of detail responses on the objectives in the strategy including the number of objectives and the way they have been written. This has being considered and the strategy will be revised accordingly.

The Commissioner's response

The above comments have been considered and the strategy has been re drafted to reflect a number of the comments that have been taken on board.

In order to ensure that the governance is strong, the strategy working group will meet quarterly rather than twice a year. This will increase oversight and enable the Commissioner to update the Advisory council and the public on the strategy's progress.

The support for the single point of contact is appreciated and this is being incorporated into the local authority delivery plan.

The language and certain terminology in the strategy have been changed to reflect some of the additional general comments.

In addition the suggestion of a national publication day or a national surveillance camera day is being considered under the civil engagement strand in order to create awareness among members of the public.

Please see the summary table for more information on what has changed in the strategy.

5. Responses from events

The commissioner spoke at a number of events during the consultation period. These were the Independent Parking Community (IPC) conference, The Global MSC conference and the National Association or Healthcare Security Officers (NAHS) conference.

At each of these events the commissioner spoke about the strategy and received overwhelming support.

In addition to these speaking events, there were two consultation events where specific feedback was sought.

- An event jointly organised with the Welsh Government for relevant authorities (local authorities and police forces)
- A private roundtable event organised with the Centre for Research into Information, Surveillance and Privacy

Below is a brief overview of feedback gathered at these events

- The strategy is an enabler that will raise awareness of the Code and help organisations to comply with relevant legislation, codes of practice and guidance.
- How aware are the public about post surveillance events what happens to the data?
- Emphasis has to be given to encouraging organisations informing the public why
 cameras are being installed and what the information is used for increased
 transparency.
- Support for closer working between the police and local authorities as reflected in objectives 4 and 5.

- It was noted that the strategy should have government backing
- The strategy will help to provide clarity to a changing surveillance landscape.
- There was a reiteration of the concern around the public's understanding on what surveillance cameras can do. It was suggested that the strategy could help raise public awareness.
- The strategy needs to ensure that the 12 guiding principles are applied to the whole surveillance system and not just the cameras.
- The strategy should make clear the distinction between relevant authorities who have to comply and the voluntary that can choose to comply.
- The language of the strategy document needs to be such that the public understand and avoid the use of terminology that can easily be misinterpreted such as 'soft levers' and 'surveillance by consent'.

The Commissioner's response

The Commissioner appreciates the support he received from the events. The feedback from the events indicates support for the strategy and he has taken on board the comments around closer working between the police and local authorities. The strand leads for these two areas are working together to develop a workable plan to reflect this, such as improving feedback on how surveillance has helped in cases and information sharing.

The strategy has been redrafted to make it easier for the public to understand what surveillance cameras are as well as the potential capabilities in the light of improving technology.

Please see the summary table for more information on what has changed in the strategy.

6. Responses outside the scope of this strategy

In addition to the response above, we received a number of responses that are currently beyond the scope of this strategy and the code but will be referred to the Home Office for consideration.

Below is a list of these issues

- The use of the term surveillance by consent' as mentioned in the Code
- For the strategy to be effective the Commissioner needs to have enforcement powers
- There was an echoing call in the responses for more organisations to be included in the list of relevant authorities in order to make the strategy more effective.
- It was recommended that all system operators who record data of members of the public in public spaces should be placed under the statutory duty to comply with the Code
- Specific mention was made on the importance of including the transport sector (national rail and other transport networks) in the list of relevant authorities.

7. Summary of changes to the national surveillance camera strategy for England and Wales in response to the consultation

| i ili kara | Strategy document paragraph reference | Consultation response | SCC response | Questions for the AC |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Legislation and regulations | The strategy is too POFA focused | Spoken about the HRA and individuals rights to | Do we need to consider any other |
| | Page 5 paragraph 4 Page 6 paragraph 5 Page 7 paragraph 12 | Not enough mention of HRA and individuals rights to privacy | privacy. We have included all relevant regulations and legislation | legislation or explain how they link to the SC Code? |
| Control of the Contro | * * | Need to include links to other regulations and codes | Added an annex (annex B) to cover history of surveillance cameras including relevant legislation and developments to make it less | address the comments that the introduction was too POFA focussed? |
| 2 | The vision | The term feel | POFA focused. Removed the term | Measurables will |
| 2 | Page 3 paragraph 6 and page 15 paragraph 36 | safe' in the vision is too subjective and therefore un measurable | feel to enable a more objective measurable | be outlined in detail in the delivery plans. |
| | paragrapes | , incussing the second | | 3. Do we need to mention how the vision will be achieved or point to the deliverables in the various plans? |
| | | | | 4. Are we happy with the vision as it currently is? |
| 3 | Definitions | A better explanation on | Moved the reference to the | 5. Are you content with |
| | Page 16 paragraph 40 | what we mean by surveillance | definition of surveillance | the explanation of |
| L | | cameras | cameras to the | surveillance |

| | | | h - de af O- | |
|---|------------------|-------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|
| | | | body of the document rather | cameras? |
| | | | than the footnotes. | 6. Do we need to |
| | | | Listed most common types of | talk about |
| | | | surveillance such | capability and the back office, |
| | | | as BWV. ANPR, | data etc. |
| | | | Drones | data cto. |
| | | | | |
| | | | Also have referred | |
| | | | to how data can or | |
| | | | could be | |
| | | | manipulated one | |
| 4 | Background | A number of | captured This section has | 7. Do you agree |
| | Dackground | written | been re written and | that this |
| ŀ | Page 9 paragraph | responses | forms a | section covers |
| | 19 | expressed | background/history | relevant |
| | | concern over the | of surveillance and | surveillance |
| | | absence of a | the relevant | camera |
| | | mention of other | legislations. | regulations? |
| | | regulations such as the HRA | Due to the level of detail and length of | 8. Are you |
| | , | and the DPA. It | this section it is now | content that |
| | | was suggested | an annex to the | this section be |
| | | that to balance | document | moved to an |
| | | the strategy out | | annex? |
| | | from being a | | |
| | 11/1/1 | POFA focus , the | | |
| | | progress to date section should | | |
| | A.() | include reference | | |
| | | to other | edda | |
| | | regulations and | | |
| | | codes. | | |
| 5 | Terminologies | A few concerns | This term is one | Surveillance by |
| | Dogo 7 norozenh | around the term 'surveillance by | used by | consent is used in the code and |
| | Page 7 paragraph | consent' with a | government in the code. | therefore needs to |
| | | suggestion to | oodo. | feature in the |
| | | use something | We have attempted | strategy. This will |
| | , the | like – | to explain what | be fed back to the |
| | | 'surveillance | surveillance by | Home Office for |
| | | that enjoys | consent means and | consideration in |
| | | public support' | referred back to | any amendment of the code. |
| | | · | what it says in the code. | or the code. |
| | | | 55451 | 9. Are you |
| | | | | content with |
| | | | | the current |

| | | | | explanation of |
|---|-------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| | | | | 'surveillance |
| | | | | by consent'? If |
| | | | | not can we |
| | | | | have some |
| | 3 | | | suggestions? |
| | | | | ouggeonone: |
| | | | | |
| 6 | Terminologies | Concern around | Removed the term | 10. Are you |
| | Page 17 paragraph | some of the | 'soft levers' and | content with |
| | 6 | language e.g. | replaced with | this slight |
| | | 'soft levers' | incentives and | amendment or |
| | | | enablers | is there |
| | | | | another way to |
| | | | | explain 'soft |
| | | : | | levers? |
| 7 | Objectives | Some concern | Consideration of | 11. Should we |
| | Page 16 paragraph | around the | merging the | consider |
| | 41 | number of | objectives | merging the |
| | • • | objectives - are | , | objectives in |
| | | they too many? | | order to |
| | | | \$ | reduce the |
| | | | | number of |
| | 4 | | | overall |
| | | | | objective while |
| | | | | keeping the |
| | | | | strands as |
| | | | | they are? |
| | | | | andy ard. |
| | 4° ''Y | | | 12. Alternatively |
| | | | in a set the title | should we |
| | | | | leave them as |
| | | | | they are? |
| 8 | Objectives | Not SMART | No change – the | 13.Do we need to |
| | | | details, measures | re write to |
| | | | and so on are in the | consider re |
| | | | delivery plans | writing the |
| | | | donvoiry planto | objectives to |
| | | | | make them |
| | | | | SMART or are |
| | | | | we content |
| | | | | that the |
| | · | | | delivery plans |
| | | | | will cover this |
| | | | | |
| | Ohiootiyoo | If was suggested | Cyber ecourity has | concern? 14. Does this |
| 9 | Objectives | It was suggested that we have to | Cyber security has now been included | suffice? |
| | What is missing? | | | Sunice! |
| | | include cyber | in the standards | |
| | | security as this | strand | |
| | | is a real concern | | |

| 10 | Governance Page 18 paragraph 45 | going forward with advanced technology. Concern around the frequency of meetings of the Strategy Working Group? | This will be changed to quarterly. | 15. Do we think that quarterly and as when required will alleviate concerns around how frequency and accountability? |
|----|---------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--|
| | | | | |
| | | | | 78.832 |



