

July 2018

Freedom of Information Request - Reference No: 20180893

REQUEST

The date, location (postcode or longitude and latitude) and outcome (i.e arrest, charge, not enough evidence) of every individual incident of modern slavery (Offence Code 106) recorded by your force for the calendar years 2016, 2017, and to date in 2018.

RESPONSE

I approached our Crime Management Data Returns Officer for assistance with your request. The CMS system and Connect System is used to record complaints or allegations of those matters, which the Home Office specify should be recorded as 'crimes'.

She conducted a search of the two crime management systems. (CMS - our legacy system which provides data up to 4th December 2017 and our new CONNECT system which records crimes from that date onwards) and provided me with the data in relation to your request.

Section 17 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 requires South Yorkshire Police, when refusing to provide such information (because the information is exempt), to provide you the applicant with a notice which:

- a. states that fact,
- b. specifies the exemption in question and
- c. states (if that would not otherwise be apparent) why the exemption applies.

The following exemption applies to the disclosure of some of the information:

Section 40(2) Personal Information

This is an absolute exemption and therefore a Public Interest Test is not relevant. However, for clarity, I will explain my rationale for engaging this exemption. Section 40(2) provides that information is exempt if it is the personal data of someone other than the applicant and disclosure would breach any of the data protection principles. The term 'personal data' means data that relates to a living individual who can be identified. Although not explicitly naming individuals, the cumulative effect of a full disclosure (date, location, outcome of each record on an line by line basis would be likely to lead to the identification of those involved in the incident; not only the person(s) subject of the complaint, but potentially the person(s) making the complaint.

I have therefore provided the month instead of the actual date, the area instead of the postcode (which is not a mandatory field) and disassociated the different categories requested into separate tables in order to anonymise the information that would otherwise be exempt from release under Section 40(2) *Personal Information* of the FOI Act.

Please see the enclosed spreadsheets / tables and the following search criteria:

CMS(ii) data

I have provided a count of offences recorded on the CMS(ii) crime register between 01-Jan-2016 and 04-Dec-2017 where the offence was recorded under the Home Office offence class _ Modern Slavery. I have provide a breakdown by month and year the offence was recorded.

Of this count, I have also provided a breakdown of the offence outcome, the scene of crime area and district and the premise type. Please note – we expect a count of premise types to exceed a count of offences as more than one can be recorded on any offence.

CONNECT data

I have provided a count of offences recorded on CONNECT for crime between 05-Dec-2017 and 30-Jun-2018 where the offence was recorded under the Home Office offence class _ Modern Slavery, I have provided a breakdown by month.

Of this count, I have also provided a breakdown of the offence outcome, ward desc and bcu ward and if the MO DESC 1 is Location, I have provided the MO DESC 3.

- In addition, the outcomes CHARGED, SUMMONS and CAUTIONS changed in 2017 and we now specifically record for what offence, the offender was charged i.e. CHARGED is now recorded as either CHARGED WITH OFFENCE RECORDED Or CHARGED WITH AN ALTERNATIVE OFFENCE, therefore the outcomes are applicable depending on the year recorded the offence was recorded.*
- We have had to take a slightly different approach to extracting the data from CONNECT as the data is not recorded in the same format as the legacy system CMS(ii). SYP have changed their central crime management system in December 2017. Therefore data from the new system cannot be used as a direct comparison due to the different ways in which crimes are recorded. However, the data has been given to comply with original request and displayed here to show an outline trend.*
- I have provided both accused and suspect status – some suspects may be duplicated i.e. if we record a suspect description and then go on to identify a suspect we could possibly record both on the crime report which could result in duplication however because the requestor is only interested in offenders under 18 they may not be dealt with by an accused outcome i.e. charged, summonsed etc. so it was necessary to include offenders with a suspect status.*