

<u>Data Breaches</u>						
<u>Reference</u>	<u>date reported</u>	<u>Brief details</u>	<u>date of breach</u>	<u>Reported to ICO</u>	<u>mitigating actions taken</u>	<u>Status</u>
<u>DS-005</u>	<u>08/11/2018</u>	<u>Notification advising an individual that he was being considered for listing was sent to his old address. Notified when the individual received formal listing letter.</u>	<u>08/11/2018</u>	<u>yes</u>	<u>Processes and training reinforced. No action required by ICO and informed to note on internal log</u>	<u>Closed</u>
<u>DS-006</u>	<u>13/11/2018</u>	<u>Certificate sent to CSG in error after details were changed in error by operator</u>	<u>13/11/2018</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>mitigating actions had been put in place to prevent this happening again. as all CSG's are aware of their duties on processing any personal data received including that received in error - no further action was required - certificate destroyed and reprocessed</u>	<u>Closed</u>
<u>DS-007</u>	<u>13/11/2018</u>	<u>email sent in error via auto complete to HR advisor instead of the recipient it was intended for</u>	<u>13/11/2018</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>contacted the recipient immediately asking them to delete the email - confirmed she deleted the email without reading the contents on 14/11/18. mail sent to advise SG policy of no "auto complete" on outlook with instructions on how to disable - recommendation that all staff who deal with any personal</u>	<u>Closed</u>

					<u>information should disable "auto complete" on their outlook.</u>	
<u>DS-008</u>	<u>14/11/2018</u>	<u>Individual contacted DS to advise he had not received his own notification letter but someone else's court referral paperwork.</u>	<u>14/11/2018</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Individual asked to return documents - investigated and confirmed the other individual received all appropriate information</u>	<u>Closed</u>
<u>DS-009</u>	<u>23/11/2018</u>	<u>Due to technical glitch in system a certificate was sent to individuals old work address</u>	<u>23/11/2018</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Certificate returned and re-issued</u>	<u>Closed</u>
<u>DS-010</u>	<u>10/12/2018</u>	<u>2 x individual application forms sent to wrong organisations in error</u>	<u>07/12/2018</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Mailroom have put in place a QA system to ensure forms are checked before issue</u>	<u>Closed</u>
<u>DS-011</u>	<u>17/12/2018</u>	<u>2 x PADS returned to wrong CSG</u>	<u>17/12/2018</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>speaking to staff involved - QA process had been initiated to prevent this error</u>	<u>Closed</u>
<u>DS-012</u>	<u>19/12/2018</u>	<u>dubiety over customer address not challenged - address changed to old address by operator</u>	<u>19/12/2018</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Feedback/training provided to operator to ensure this type of case is appropriately dealt with in future -apology issued to customer</u>	<u>Closed</u>
<u>DS-013</u>	<u>21/12/2018</u>	<u>certificate issued to wrong address</u>	<u>19/12/2018</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>records updated to show correct address</u>	<u>Closed</u>

<u>DS-014</u>	<u>24/12/2018</u>	<u>Application form returned to wrong employer in error</u>	<u>26/11/2018</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>QA process did not pick this one up. Reviewed process and training for staff</u>	<u>Closed</u>
<u>DS-015</u>	<u>31/12/2018</u>	<u>Application form returned to wrong employer in error</u>	<u>24/12/2018</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>QA process did not pick this one up. Reviewed process and training for staff</u>	<u>Closed</u>
<u>DS-016</u>	<u>31/12/2018</u>	<u>application form returned to wrong individual - returned to office from Lawyer asking what happened to clients info</u>	<u>15/01/2019</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>issued prior to improved QA in mailroom.</u>	<u>Closed</u>
<u>DS-017</u>	<u>04/01/2019</u>	<u>email containing customer details sent to wrong email address due to autocomplete</u>	<u>04/01/2019</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Email sent advising of SG policy - disable Autocomplete</u>	<u>Closed</u>
<u>DS-018</u>	<u>07/01/2019</u>	<u>Application form returned to wrong employer in error</u>	<u>07/01/2019</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>QA process tightened up to state on TL's to QA</u>	<u>Closed</u>
<u>DS-019</u>	<u>11/01/2019</u>	<u>Notification of PVG scheme sent to umbrella body rather than specific organisation</u>	<u>11/01/2019</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Not sent to ICO as CSG's all aware of duties under DPA</u>	<u>Closed</u>
<u>DS-020</u>	<u>14/01/2019</u>	<u>certificate sent to applicants old address in error - data cleanse info not picked up</u>	<u>14/01/2019</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>QA process reviewed</u>	<u>Closed</u>
<u>DS-021</u>	<u>21/01/2019</u>	<u>letter clearly marked for payroll and containing personal staff information was opened by mailroom before being forward to Corporate governance</u>	<u>21/01/2019</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>email requesting process for mailroom dealing with personal staff mail to avoid re-occurrence</u>	<u>Closed</u>

<u>DS-022</u>	<u>22/01/2019</u>	<u>CSG sent copy of certificate prior to the 10 day appeal period had elapsed</u>	<u>22/10/2019</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>The applicant was contacted and advised on the appeals process. SG IT have seen contacted to add an auto responses to each to the respective RELEASE & APPEAL mailboxes to alert customers specifically to whom they are contacting. Staff who manage the above noted mailboxes have been informed of the due vigilance they should be applying when working in this area.</u>	<u>Closed</u>
<u>DS-024</u>	<u>24/01/2019</u>	<u>Applicant changed her address and then submitted an application a few days later but the change was made the day after processing so issued to previous address</u>	<u>24/01/2019</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>n/a</u>	<u>Closed</u>
<u>DS-025</u>	<u>25/01/2019</u>	<u>Application sent to employer in error</u>	<u>16/01/2019</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Mitigations from previous breach was implemented on 16/01 just before this occurred</u>	<u>Closed</u>
<u>DS-030</u>	<u>18/02/2019</u>	<u>Email sent to supplier containing customer information and was not encrypted. On further investigation each server that the email went through had sufficient encryption</u>		<u>No</u>	<u>Training provided to staff to remind them of following encryption process</u>	<u>Closed</u>

<u>DS-031</u>	<u>22/02/2019</u>	<u>Certificate issued to applicants old address. No convictions were on certificate</u>	<u>22/02/2019</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Training and quality control checks</u>	<u>Closed</u>
<u>DS-034</u>	<u>11/03/2019</u>	<u>Certificate sent to wrong CSG - apparent system error reported to Service desk</u>	<u>07/03/2019</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Reported to service desk - as PVG seems to have overlapped</u>	<u>Open</u>
<u>DS-035</u>	<u>08/03/2019</u>	<u>Employer received listing information but had not informed DS that the applicant no longer worked for them</u>	<u>08/03/2019</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Processes updated</u>	<u>Closed</u>
<u>DS-036</u>	<u>25/03/2019</u>	<u>Certificate sent to wrong address in error</u>	<u>25/03/2019</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Details updated in error by processor - this has been highlighted and raised with Training team to prevent any further issues</u>	<u>Closed</u>
<u>DS-038</u>	<u>18/04/2019</u>	<u>Excel file provided to CSG organisation - which noted details of other CSG also listed on individuals record.</u>	<u>03/04/2019</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Area will advise staff to double check that any information shared with CSG is relevant and accurate before issuing. No personal data shared- just reference number for other CSG.</u>	<u>Closed</u>
<u>DS-039</u>	<u>24/04/2019</u>	<u>Wrong house number keyed when applicant updated their address and certificate was sent out to wrong address. No conviction details on certificate and certificate being returned unopened. Address corrected and new certificate issued.</u>	<u>13/04/2019</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Area will inform members of staff to be extra vigilant when performing USMs and double check anything they are unsure of</u>	<u>closed</u>

<u>DS-040</u>	<u>26/04/2019</u>	<u>Certificate issued to applicants old address. No convictions were on certificate</u>	<u>20/04/2019</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Area will advise staff to ensure that updates provided by customers are actioned immediately to prevent similar incident</u>	<u>Closed</u>
<u>DS-041</u>	<u>03/05/2019</u>	<u>It is in relation to an application processed on our PASS system whereby conviction information was attached to the applicant that belonged to their sibling. The applicant has therefore, had conviction information belonging to their sibling.</u>	<u>01/04/2019</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>The mitigation that has been put in place is to ensure that the procedure for handling possible records in Pass if followed as was previously followed for applications that were processed through PVG.</u>	<u>closed</u>
<u>DS-042</u>	<u>23/05/2019</u>	<u>Applicants name, address, DOB shared with wrong CSG</u>	<u>15/05/2019</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>Staff reminded of importance of double checking any information of which they are unsure .</u>	<u>Closed</u>
<u>DS-048</u>	<u>31/05/2019</u>	<u>application and letter sent to the wrong CSG.</u>	<u>23/04/2019</u>	<u>no</u>	<u>training</u>	<u>closed</u>
<u>DS-046</u>	<u>01/06/2019</u>	<u>letter received by individual that was not the addressee. The addressee vacated the premises in 2017 and the USM update on the 30/5 appeared to fail to update the correct address. Their were multiple system failure the week before that may have contributed to this.</u>	<u>01/06/2019</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>None taken as believed to be system error that caused this</u>	<u>closed</u>

<u>DS-047</u>	<u>12/06/2019</u>	<u>certificate sent to wrong address. Applicant sent in updated address details after the certificate had been completed. The reprint also went to the old address.</u>	<u>08/05/2019</u>	<u>no</u>	<u>processes re-emphasised to staff</u>	<u>closed</u>
<u>DS-050</u>	<u>13/06/2019</u>	<u>information disclosed to the victim of a non-violent/non-sexual criminal offence. This included, name and address details not known by the individual. The information was sent to the individual s home address on 19/01/19. The victim was contacted to advise of the breach. The victim contacted DS to advise he had not been contacted by the individual since the offence was in court. The victim was assured to note that there had been no contact in the 5-6 months since the breach and that the information was likely to have been concealed within a wealth of other text and therefore not noticed by the individual before returning the documentation.</u>	<u>07/02/2019</u>	<u>no</u>	<u>Contact made with victim to notify them and apologise for sharing of information - due to time lapse since information was shared and it being highlighted - there was thought to be no risk - individual content with apology and no further action</u>	<u>closed</u>

<u>DS-045</u>	<u>11/07/2019</u>	<u>Certificate was sent to neighbours address. The agent has incorrectly updated the address. The address was updated and reprocessed. The neighbour passed the certificate to the individual.</u>	<u>09/07/2019</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>AP have spoken to the agent involved to reiterate the importance of updating customer details, it was an administrative error. An email was sent out to the whole department about the breach and potential breaches as a result of not updating details accurately. They have spoke with other team leaders as well to raise awareness and to actively seek any potential training issues in relation to this matter.</u>	<u>closed</u>
---------------	-------------------	--	-------------------	-----------	---	---------------

DS-044	12/07/2019	<p><u>We have sent a notification of listing to an employer when we were made aware in September 2018 that the individual was no longer employed by them. Therefore, they should not have been notified of the individual's listing status. The error has been caused as the status was not updated on our case management system at the time to show that they were a former employer. The letter does not contain any other sensitive information, such as conviction details. It simply informs the employer that the individual is now barred from doing regulated work with children and adults.</u></p> <p><u>As you will see from below, the Assistant Caseworker who noted the error attempted to retrieve the letter from the mail room but was too late. He has been in contact with the organisation and has asked for them to return the letter to us or to confirm that it has been destroyed.</u></p>	12/07/2019	no	<p><u>The letter has been sent to an organisation rather than a member of the public and the organisation were aware already that the individual was under formal consideration for listing as they had been notified of this, correctly, while he was still employed with them.</u></p>	closed
--------	------------	---	------------	----	--	--------

<u>DS-054</u>	<u>12/07/2019</u>	<u>Employer received listing information but had not informed DS that the applicant no longer worked for them. The employer was contacted and they refused the letter from royal mail so was returned to DS unopened</u>	<u>12/07/2019</u>	<u>no</u>	<u>processes re-emphasised to staff</u>	<u>closed</u>
<u>DS-055</u>	<u>26/07/2019</u>	<u>CSG code was changed. This resulted in the certificate being sent to the wrong counter signatory. Both CSG's were contacted and the application was reprocessed to the correct counter signatory. The wrong certificate has been returned and destroyed on return.</u>	<u>21/05/2019</u>	<u>no</u>	<u>process re-emphasised to staff</u>	<u>closed</u>
<u>DS-049</u>	<u>31/07/2019</u>	<u>Information sent to the wrong CSG</u>	<u>29/07/2019</u>	<u>no</u>	<u>reports will be double checked before issued.</u>	<u>closed</u>
<u>DS-056</u>	<u>01/08/2019</u>	<u>INFORMATION REGARDING A CONSIDERATION HAS BEEN SENT TO THE INDIVIDUAL at the wrong address. The individual is in prison and should have been sent there. It was however sent to his previous home address. This is the address his wife still currently resides at.</u>	<u>31/07/2019</u>	<u>no</u>	<u>ACW's have been reminded of the importance of checking and reading all documentation including notes.</u>	

<u>DS-057</u>	<u>01/08/2019</u>	<u>Information about an individual under consideration was shared with a relevant third party. It was sent however to their home address and not their business address. It wasn't delivered to their home address and the individual had to collect it from the post office. The error occurred as the home address was recorded erroneously and saved on the lead countersignatory's record by the ACW.</u>	<u>30/07/2019</u>		<u>Address details have now been updated correctly. The ACW involved will have a discussion with managers on the importance of retrieving the appropriate address information from PVG</u>	<u>closed</u>
<u>DS-058</u>	<u>01/08/2019</u>	<u>formal consideration letter sent to an incorrect third party who had been a previously notified third party during the consideration . They were the employer but who subsequently dismissed them. The employer information was updated on the EOR case however the OM case ref was not updated at the same time, therefore the employer remained a third party on the EOR record. The employer contacted DS to advise they received in error and agreed to return it. The determinations manager signed off the case not checking this</u>	<u>01/08/2019</u>	<u>no</u>	<u>devised a checklist which is now required to be completed in all cases. There is a checkpoint about the third party information being correct.</u>	<u>closed</u>

		<u>aspect assuming that the information was correct.</u>				
<u>DS-059</u>	<u>06/08/2019</u>	<u>In this case, the Police pushed ORI into the mailbox relating to a female Scheme Member DG. The information related to her and referenced her Scheme Membership number. On the same date, the Police then pushed in ORI relating to a male Scheme Member (who happened to be the husband), however they failed to update the Scheme Membership number on their form and this resulted in the original ORI for the female being overwritten by the husbands ORI being applied to her record. This was not picked up by the ACW.</u>	<u>05/08/2019</u>	<u>no</u>	<u>the impact of this particular case has been reduced due to the husband and wife, , having ORI detailing very similar conduct and likely being aware of each other's conduct (there has been no challenge by the wife as to the ORI she was sent)</u>	<u>closed</u>

<u>DS-062</u>	<u>14/08/2019</u>	<u>A police record belonging to the applicant's sister was matched to the applicant. The police record contained the applicant's name and date of birth as alias details, along with an address match and area of birth match. processes followed should have been investigated as a "possible" record by Exceptions.</u>	<u>09/08/2019</u>	<u>no</u>	<u>There is an existing process to refer such cases with alias details to exceptions. A reminder will be sent out to staff to raise the profile of this process, and the individual has been fed back.</u>	<u>closed</u>
<u>ds-063</u>	<u>14/08/2019</u>	<u>we received an email from an employer asking for a progress report on a current application. the case has been completed and sent out. It was returned to the office by Royal mail unopened as "addressee not at this address" . This was noted on the account as per process and filed as a returned certificate. When we processed the email we then realised that the certificate had been sent to a different address. Upon investigation, the applicant had made a mistake on his application and gave "the wrong address". This should have noticed and queried as documents were sent in confirming ID and address. This</u>	<u>12/08/2019</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>We have spoken to the agent involved to reiterate the importance of checking documents and matching details.</u>	<u>closed</u>

		<p><u>was therefore an operator error.</u></p> <p><u>We have had to get the case recreated with the correct details and send the certificate to the correct address.</u></p>				
<u>DS-064</u>	<u>15/08/2019</u>	<p><u>Business mail on 2 occasions has been sent to a CSG's home address rather than her business address. She is no longer resident at the home address on her CSG account but her parents are and they have given her the mail. This has happened when the person preparing the outgoing mail has accessed the CSG account details on PVG and has looked at the 1st address listed which is marked as the home address, the business address is listed 2nd. Individual advised</u></p>	<u>15/08/2019</u>	<u>no</u>	<p><u>I have raised this with the Mailroom TL and asked that all staff be made aware of the correct procedure to ensure that this does not happen again.</u></p>	<u>closed</u>

		<u>however that her parents are moving at the end of this month and therefore there will be no family connection to that address.</u>				
<u>DS-065</u>	<u>15/08/2019</u>	<u>application was recreated at the request of the Higher Level Certificate team from the Vetting department . At the time of receiving the original application & the reprocess request there was no indication of the applicant's address changing; on 05/08 we received an e-mail regarding a change of address which was promptly carried out. A note was left on the reprocessed case for the vetting department to terminate the case when possible so that the application could again be reprocessed (Once this type of application is with the vetting department, changes to address will not be added to the</u>	<u>15/08/2019</u>	<u>no</u>	<u>Team leader to call the applicant and inform them of the error. Application reprocessed</u>	<u>closed</u>

		<p><u>application). On Monday 12/08 the application was sent for printing with the old address still attached. accessed the case to check on it's progress and see if reprocess could be carried out today but discovered the application had already been sent for printing more than 48 hours ago.</u></p>				
<u>DS-066</u>	<u>16/08/2019</u>	<p><u>The PVG member had 2 membership numbers . When we find 2 accounts for the same person we merge them together and use the oldest PVG number as the live account and delete the latest one. To merge these accounts together all cases attached to a/c no were processed i. When we perform this function the resultant certificates are shredded shortly after being printed.</u></p>	<u>16/08/2019</u>	<u>no</u>	<p><u>I have contacted both parties and explained that the certificates they received were as a result of this "housekeeping" procedure and have asked them to securely destroy the certificates. The certificates did go out to the correct parties and addresses, however, the application was made 2 years ago.</u></p>	

		<u>however, in this instance this did not happen despite clear notes being present on all corresponding cases and emails.</u>				
<u>DS-078</u>	<u>19/08/2019</u>	<u>Applicant called for update on application and it was noticed that the wrong address had been inputted - 98 rather than 9B. Application passed for reprocessing. It was checked whether the original application had been processed and confirmed it had been and the certificate issued to the wrong address. The certificate has since been returned to DS.</u>	<u>17/08/2019</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Processes reinforced to staff about checking applications</u>	

<u>DS-067</u>	<u>19/08/2019</u>	<p><u>the Assistant Case Worker (ACW) prepared a letter for the individual notifying him of the fact that he was now under formal consideration. That letter was dated 1/8/19. The letter referred to enclosures including Copies of Court Information. Whilst the letter was correctly addressed to the individual it has transpired that the ACW mistakenly emailed it to to the wrong Court on 1/8/19. Only the notification letter was emailed (and not any of the enclosures referred to in the notification letter). It appears that the ACW had intended to send an information request to the Court and attached the notification letter in error. The Court did not respond to the initial email dated 1/8/19. The Sheriff Court then emailed the PU Correspondence Mailbox on 16/8/19 at 9.20am stating "<i>With regards to your request, the attached letter is addressed to Mr xx and is not a letter of request for information. Please send a request for information</i></u></p>	<u>19/08/2019</u>	<u>no</u>		<u>closed</u>
---------------	-------------------	---	-------------------	-----------	--	---------------

		<u>detailing the case charges, date of conviction and whether the information is prescribed information and is not chargeable or chargeable”.</u>				
<u>DS-068</u>	<u>20/08/2019</u>	<u>An operational error has resulted in an incorrect certificate being issued to a B2B CSG; The certificate went to the correct address and the conviction included was correct. There was however a conviction incorrectly excluded. We have not put out any information that should not have gone out.</u>	<u>20/08/2019</u>	<u>no</u>	<u>Customer Liaison team is dealing with this now.</u>	<u>closed</u>

<u>DS-070</u>	<u>22/08/2019</u>	<u>An application form has been returned to an applicant but the registered body and counter signatory codes and signature were not redacted as per our procedures</u>	<u>22/08/2019</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>after an investigation we found that this error was made by a newer member of staff with whom we have clarified the procedures and have put steps in place to carry out extra checks of their work as a quality assurance procedure to ensure their understanding to avoid this mistake in the future. I have spoken to the CSG on the phone and sent out a follow up email confirming our procedures and the steps we will take to ensure that this does not happen again.</u>	<u>closed</u>
<u>DS-071</u>	<u>22/08/2019</u>	<u>a letter of notification of formal consideration was sent to the registered umbrella body instead of the interested party. The letter identified the individual who is the subject of formal consideration and detailed his date of birth and address. The letter set out that the individual was under formal consideration for the children's list.</u>	<u>22/08/2019</u>	<u>no</u>	<u>Due to an oversight she sent the wrong supplier the notification of formal consideration rather than a request to confirm the address. The HUB Team leader has this afternoon revisited the correct procedure with the ACW and directed her to the guidance on One Note. 2. liaising with the HUB team leader to ensure that all ACW's are reminded of the guidance in relation to issuing formal consideration notifications to the employer and not the umbrella body. The guidance</u>	<u>closed</u>

					<u>from OneNote will be recirculated.</u>	
<u>DS-072</u>	<u>02/09/2019</u>	<u>The mailroom received a returned application form back from a counter signatory today advising that this was not for them, the application should have been returned to a different organisation.</u>	<u>02/09/2019</u>	<u>no</u>	<u>I am arranging to have refresher training sessions scheduled as a priority for those staff who carry out QA on returns to highlight this issue. We will also be extending the guidance on data protection to highlight how important it is that we get this right and the consequences if we don't.</u>	<u>closed</u>
<u>DS-076</u>	<u>06/09/2019</u>	<u>Call received from an individual informing DS that certificate had been sent to his address in error. Upon checking the system, the address on the application had been for 26 but was sent to 27. Caller agreed to return the certificate. Application was passed to reprocess.</u>	<u>06/09/2019</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Team members informed of the error and data breach conversations are taking place within the team to highlight the consequences of these types of errors.</u>	<u>Closed</u>

<u>DS-073</u>	<u>10/09/2019</u>	<u>The applicant's PVG account on pass was updated with their previous address in error, and their certificate was sent to the wrong address.</u>	<u>26/08/2019</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>The error was made as part of the workaround for the existing member applications which is no longer in place. The applicant's account was updated with their correct address and the application recreated to issue a certificate to the correct address. Contact was made with the applicant and she is happy that the matter has now been resolved and she does not wish to make a complaint.</u>	<u>Closed</u>
<u>DS-075</u>	<u>11/09/2019</u>	<u>Returned application form sent to the wrong person.</u>	<u>11/09/2019</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Incident happened prior to a new QA/Return process being instigated. New system involves a selected team of staff who concentrate on returns. This should prevent such an incident re-occurring.</u>	<u>Closed</u>
<u>DS-077</u>	<u>13/09/2019</u>	<u>Certificate received in error. Application was sent to a different supplier in error.</u>	<u>13/09/2019</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Staff reminded of QA checks prior to issuing</u>	<u>closed</u>
<u>DS-079</u>	<u>16/09/2019</u>	<u>JIRA tickets raised which included members' personal information. The system is not secure and no DOB or other sensitive information should be included but in this instance it was.</u>	<u>16/09/2019</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>New processes have recently been introduced and operators are adjusting to these changes. Team members will be reminded of the procedures in respect of security.</u>	<u>closed</u>

<u>DS-080</u>	<u>16/09/2019</u>	<u>Email was sent to wrong recipient. The incorrect CSG code was used leading to the incorrect recipient being used.</u>	<u>13/09/2019</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>staff reminded of the correct process</u>	<u>closed</u>
<u>DS-081</u>	<u>19/09/2019</u>	<u>Certificate sent to the wrong recipient. She had previously resided at the old address. There is a message on her account noting that "Basic Disclosure address. Do not send HLC to this address". Recipient asked to return the certificate.</u>	<u>19/09/2019</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>The old is the most recently verified address on PASS f. The new address is not a verified address as it was provided by a PASS B2B application which is which is why it has the note attached not to send HLC correspondence to that address. The application has not updated their Scheme Account address and the paper application form did not contact an address update. PASS, therefore, behaved as appropriate and in line with policy. The applicant's current address will need to be verified before any further applications are processed.</u>	<u>closed</u>
<u>DS-086</u>	<u>19/09/2019</u>	<u>Certificate sent to incorrect address. Address was wrongly inputted on to system due to operator error. Have arranged for application to be recreated to show the correct details.</u>	<u>05/08/2019</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Will take up the matter with the operator involved directly. Certificate re-issued</u>	<u>Closed</u>

<u>DS-083</u>	<u>20/09/2019</u>	<u>Certificate sent to incorrect recipient. Call received from individual to confirm he had received a PVG certificate for someone else at his home address, . Investigation showed that there had been an error inputting the applicant's address to the system. The applicant lives at 57 not 47. Requested individual to return the certificate. Arranged for the application to be recreated, ensuring certificate goes to correct address. There were no convictions on the certificate.</u>	<u>20/09/2019</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>QA process reemphasised</u>	<u>closed</u>
<u>DS-090</u>	<u>20/09/2019</u>	<u>Application issued to incorrect address (sent to number 1 instead of 7). Application in process of being recreated so it can be issued to the correct address. No convictions disclosed</u>	<u>20/09/2019</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>QA process re-emphasised</u>	<u>closed</u>
<u>DS-097</u>	<u>20/09/2019</u>	<u>Supplier gave device to the wrong courier - DHL instead of UPS so device was sent to a DL location in Bristol and not to where intended. Device is an appliance for transferring data to the supplier from clients. Supplier have located the</u>	<u>20/09/2019</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>device had multiple layers of encryption and tamper seals and these were all intact. Supplier has changed their security process for courier collection</u>	<u>Closed</u>

		<u>device and was directed to correct address.</u>				
<u>DS-085</u>	<u>20/09/2019</u>	<u>Notification sent to umbrella body, which should have gone to employers. This is due to an assumption that as PASS is rectifying an existing PVG system error, recording accurately when an application has been signed on behalf of another, that this would also be corrected in cases where the application was made pre-PASS during migration of that case over to PASS.</u>	<u>20/09/2019</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Staff have been asked to revert to using the PVG system to check for an umbrella body status before issuing notification until a solution is found to the system error. Requesting that someone checks each of the OM notifications that have been issued against the application on the PVG system to identify if this has happened in any other cases.</u>	<u>closed</u>
<u>DS-089</u>	<u>23/09/2019</u>	<u>Notification sent to incorrect recipient. individual called to advise she had received a notification in error for . It was sent to her home address instead of to her to the business address. CSG's husband did open the letter but gave it to CSG right away.</u>	<u>23/09/2019</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Matter will be raised with the agent who sent the notification as a training issue.</u>	<u>Closed</u>
<u>DS-082</u>	<u>24/09/2019</u>	<u>Applicant's certificate sent to previous address as it was the last verified address on PASS. System is disregarding</u>	<u>24/09/2019</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Discussions taking place to resolve issue.</u>	<u>closed</u>

		<u>addresses that are provided B2B. This is a system error.</u>				
<u>DS-084</u>	<u>24/09/2019</u>	<u>Email containing customer details sent to wrong email address.</u>	<u>24/09/2019</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>staff training and QA implemented</u>	<u>closed</u>
<u>DS-087</u>	<u>01/10/2019</u>	<u>Certificate issued to incorrect address. Address was wrongly inputted on to system due to operator error. Have arranged for application to be recreated to show the correct details. There were no convictions on the certificate.</u>	<u>01/10/2019</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>staff training and QA implemented</u>	<u>closed</u>
<u>DS-091</u>	<u>01/10/2019</u>	<u>Certificate sent to the wrong address due to USM on account. The name, DOB and PVG number on the PVG request is for xxxx but the application was for xxxx. Address for xxx account was updated correctly before case completed (USM used by person processing the application before progressing it) so that will have been sent to the correct address.</u>	<u>17.26</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Staff involved have been made aware of the error. The application has been corrected.</u>	<u>Closed</u>

<u>DS-093</u>	<u>07/10/2019</u>	<u>Two forms were sent to the wrong CSG for a payment query. The forms should have been sent back to xxxx but were sent to another organisation. The forms were returned by an xxx who advised she had called in to inform DS of the error and was advised to return the forms. Updated the log and passed to finance to investigate.</u>	<u>07/10/2019</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>After investigation, breach was identified as human error. A new process has been created with an additional QA control in place to ensure a similar incident doesn't happen in future.</u>	<u>Closed</u>
<u>DS-094</u>	<u>09/10/2019</u>	<u>Application was updated on system with incorrect PVG number, resulting in the certificate going to the wrong address.</u>	<u>09/10/2019</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Both affected PVG accounts will be amended and a new certificate issued. Certificate issued with error has been destroyed.</u>	<u>Closed</u>
<u>DS-096</u>	<u>14/10/2019</u>	<u>Breach relates to a spreadsheet with information about various individuals. Spreadsheet was sent in error to DS's tracing agents. This is information that the supplier may obtain anyway and the majority of the data was anonymised and would need access to DS's system to identify any personal details</u>	<u>10/10/2019</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Matter will be raised with staff member as a training issue. Consideration will be given to whether all individuals need to be notified given information was sent to a professional agency with whom DS has a working relationship. Guidance will be reviewed to ensure similar does not happen again.</u>	<u>Closed</u>
<u>ds-098</u>	<u>14/10/2019</u>	<u>Letter sent to umbrella body and employer in error</u>	<u>14/10/2019</u>	<u>no</u>	<u>Process reinforced to be followed.</u>	<u>Closed</u>

Security Breaches

Date DS Security notified	DS Incident Ref - title	Short description	Priority	Cause
16/01/2019	2019-01	Email sent in the clear	P2	A
26/02/2019	2019-02	Laptop left out overnight	P3	A
07/03/2019	2019-03	BT moved PII without adhering to the agreed policy.	P2	P
11/03/2019	2019-04	Email sent in the clear	P2	A
29/03/2019	2019-05	S3 server access logging	P1	S
12/03/2019	2019-06	List of B2B Email addresses sent to TerraQuest	P2	A
18/04/2019	2019-07	Access given to the DS Security Trello board to unknown resource	P1	A
16/05/2019	2019-08	BJSS Laptop left at airport.	P2	A
14/05/2019	2019-09	Wrong account privileges given to user	P2	A
07/06/2019	2019-10	BJSS Laptop left on a bus.	P2	A
14/06/2019	2019-11	Security Pass missing	P3	A
18/06/2019	2019-12	Snapshots of the database backup volume have not been taken for 21/2 weeks	P2	S
19/06/2019	2019-13	Laptop left out overnight	P2	A
19/06/2019	2019-14	Logs containing PII being pushed into Splunk	P2	S
19/06/2019	2019-15	Presenter from the WiseGroup had shown a PVG cert found on google at a DS event.	P2	A
08/07/2019	2019-16	General log not enabled on core databases	P1	P
31/07/2019	2019-17	AMD extract has been sent to a non-secure email address:	P1	A
07/08/2019	2019-18	Email containing unidentifiable info sent to the wrong person via CJSM.	P3	A
07/08/2019	2019-19	Conviction data being made available to all staff using PASS	P1	P
21/08/2019	2019-20	PVG PII information shared on confluence	P2	A
27/08/2019	2019-21	IIR datasync wasn't working	P1	P
28/08/2019	2019-22	Conviction data shared on JIRA	P1	A
29/08/2019	2019-23	Password showing on a confluence document	P3	PO
04/09/2019	2019-24	BJSS resource rolled off the project, but 2 week delay in removing their access	P3	P
05/09/2019	2019-25	FreeIPA servers have not been logging events to the audit log.	P1	S
05/09/2019	2019-26	Applicants data shared on a JIRA ticket.	P3	A
10/09/2019	2019-27	Details relayed to Person Profile not updated on PASS	P2	A
16/09/2019	2019-28	5 JIRA tickets raised with customers PII	P2	A
20/09/2019	2019-29	PU sending PII to umbrella bodies who are not entitled to have it.	P1	P
20/09/2019	2019-30	Snowball #5 was given to the wrong courier by BT	P1	A
26/09/2019	2019-31	S3 Buckets set to Public	P2	S
26/09/2019	2019-32	Bastion Host Private key Issue	P2	S
26/09/2019	2019-33	Patching Using External Repo for Centos	P2	S
28/10/2019	2019-34	JIRA tickets raised with customers PII	P3	A

Priority	
P1	Immediate Response
P2	Quick Reponse
P3	Normal Response
P4	Short Term Response
P5	Long Term Reponse

Cause	
A	Accidental
D	Deliberate
BC ,BI, BA	Breach of CIA
P	Process failure
S	Security control failure
PO	Policy needs updated
PO	Policy needs updated