



National DNA Database Strategy Board

Protective Marking	Restricted
Suitable for publication Scheme (Y/N)	No
Title & Version	National DNA Database Strategy Board Minutes – Meeting 12th March 2009
Purpose	Record of meeting
Author & Warrant/Pay No	Carole Ames/Gary Pugh
Date Created	14 th March 2009
Date Review	14 th March 2014

Redacted Minutes of Meeting

12th March 2009

10.30 a.m.

5th Floor Conference Room, New Scotland Yard

1 Welcome and Introductions

1.1 Attendees

Mr Gary Pugh (Chair)	Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO)
Mr Jim Munro	Home Office representing Stephen Webb
Mr David Money	Association of Police Authorities (APA)
Mr Andrew Rennison	Forensic Science Regulator
Dr Simon Bramble	Head of the Police Science & Forensics Unit, NPIA
Mr Eric Downham	NPIA
Professor Peter Hutton	Chair DNA Ethics Group
Ms Kirsty Faulkner	NPIA NDNAD Delivery Unit, deputising for Dr Mike Prior
Dr Doug Pearston	Scottish DNA Database Manager, SPSA
Mr Ian Miller	Information Commissioners Office (observer)
Professor Sarah Cunningham-Burley	Human Genetics Commission
Mr Mick Carling	Senior Policy Officer, NPIA (guest)
Mr Clive Brown	ACPO Criminals Record Office (guest)
ACC Duncan McCausland	PSNI (guest)

Dr Carole Ames Minutes

Mr Pugh welcomed everyone and said that, on behalf of the Board, he would like to note the significant contribution made by Ms June Guinness to the National DNA Database Strategy



National DNA Database Strategy Board

Board. Ms Guinness will be changing role in early April 2009 and so will no longer attend the Board meetings. He stated that Ms Guinness had not only been a member of this Board, but also its predecessor Groups including several Working Groups on DNA. He also noted his personal appreciation of the DNA advice Ms Guinness had given to him in recent years.

Mr Pugh then went on to introduce and welcome ACC McCausland to the Board. He hoped that Northern Ireland will be an important future member of the Board and he thanked ACC McCausland for his attendance.

Mr Pugh apologised for the late distribution of the Papers for the meeting. The Papers will be sent out earlier for the next meeting in June.

2 Apologies

Mr Stephen Webb	Home Office
Mr Keith Mannings	Association of Police Authorities
DI Stacey Dibbs	ACPO DNA Staff Officer
Professor Steve Bain	Human Genetics Commission

3 Minutes

3.1 Open Minutes

Mr Pugh referred to the Open Minutes of the last meeting (January 2009) and noted that whilst reviewing them he had deliberately left the content full. He felt this was appropriate as the Governance Rules were discussed in depth at the last meeting. He asked whether the Board would like to make any corrections of fact to the Open Minutes.

Mr Miller highlighted some amendments to the minutes of the last meeting:

Page 4, Line 31 - replace "the ECHR have now changed that." with "the judgement has now changed that."

Page 7, Line 38 - replace "in which data will be processed." with "in which a shared pool of personal data would each be processed independent of the others."

Page 10, Line 17 – insert "if that" so that the sentence reads "Mr Miller added to the discussion by expressing concerns about retaining DNA profiles from people on the basis of their consent, *if that* consent has no lawful basis so it may need further consideration."

3.2 Redacted Minutes



National DNA Database Strategy Board

Mr Pugh asked that any other points of accuracy or corrections for either the Open or Redacted Minutes be returned to him by the 16th March 2009. These would then be included in the final set of minutes produced for the January Board meeting.

New Action 09/09 – Mr Pugh to make final amendments to the Minutes from the January 2009 Board meeting.

4 Matters Arising and Actions Register

Mr Pugh mentioned that many of the outstanding actions would be covered by the agenda of this meeting. He also stated that he had tried to reduce the numbers of “Ongoing” actions.

Referring to the Action Sheet:

Action 16/08 and 18/08 – Mr Pugh suggested that these actions be combined, with Ms Faulkner as the nominated owner, as Ms Guinness is no longer contributing directly to these meetings. Ms Faulkner said that she would include a revision of familial searching of the NDNAD in light of the ECHR judgement on to the Work Package. Mr Pugh felt it was important to revise the familial searching procedures to make reference to the ECHR judgement. Dr Bramble asked whether the affect of the ECHR judgment on Familial Searching had been considered by the Home Office. Mr Carling said it had not formally been considered yet.

New Action 10/09 – Ms Faulkner to revise the Familial Searching Policy in light of the ECHR judgement. This will also need to incorporate the best practice for releasing demographics. A public version of the new Familial Searching Policy is also required.

Action 01/09 – This action is ongoing. Mr Pugh informed the Board that he would be consulting with his ACPO colleagues as to whether a second ACPO representative is required as a member of the Board. He personally did not see the need to have two ACPO members. He felt that membership of the Board was on an institutional level rather than an individual level. The Board agreed there was no need to have a second ACPO member of the Board. Mr Munro noted that the Board was set up with a tripartite structure and therefore shouldn't have two members on one part of the tripartite. Mr Money commented that it was unlikely that the APA representative would be able to attend all Board meetings and he would often attend in his place. Mr Pugh agreed that that whilst it was acceptable to send a second nominated person, in principle no one group should have two member positions on the Board. Mr Pugh raised a concern over who would deputise for him. Dr Bramble agreed that it was important for the Chair of the Strategy Board to have a deputy. Mr Pugh said that he would consider this.

Action 02/09 – This Action is discharged. Ms Faulkner had made sure that all the papers distributed before the meeting were in standard Microsoft formats.



National DNA Database Strategy Board

Action 04/09 – This Action is on this meeting’s agenda and so was not discussed at this stage.

Action 05/09 – This Action is ongoing. Mr Pugh mentioned that he did not see the need to record ethnicity data, but conceded that the recording of such data ensured transparency of the workings of the NDNAD. He said that considerations of the practicalities and implications of ethnicity data would be left to Ms Faulkner as owner of this Action. Ms Faulkner said she would report back to the Board on this Action at the June meeting, when other parts of the Work Package would also be discussed. She also mentioned that this topic was part of the QinetiQ project for the future version of the NDNAD.

Action 06/09 – This Action is on this meeting’s agenda and so was not discussed at this stage.

Action 07/09 – This Action is ongoing. DI Dibbs was not present at this meeting and so will report back to the Board at the next meeting.

Action 08/09 – This Action is discharged. Ms Faulkner has delivered the summary of sample classifications currently held on the NDNAD to Mr Pugh. Mr Pugh informed the Board that he would be reviewing this soon and he would then share these classifications with the rest of the Board members so that it can be discussed at a later date. Ms Faulkner said she thought this could be added in with the Trends Paper.

5 Governance, Policy and Legal Issues

5.1 ECHR S & Marper Update

5.1.1 Data

Mr Pugh highlighted that a lot of work had been done by the Home Office, in light of the ECHR judgment. He updated the Board in the work of an oversight group, headed by Peter Edmundson, on the implications of the ECHR judgement. Their current position is that they are required to formulate a retention policy in line with the directions from the judgement. The Group was considering approaches that would make retention of data proportionate but yet still effective. They were approaching a variety of sources for help to assess this. Mr Pugh highlighted the contribution of Professor Ken Pease who had been approached to give an opinion on “criminal concerns” based upon his knowledge of offender behaviour. Mr Pugh said Prof Pease would be looking at likelihood of re-offending in the arrested but not convicted pool of offenders compared with those arrested and convicted.

Mr Pugh thought that the Home Secretary had proposed a very common sense approach that was rooted in evidence and that met the requirements of the ECHR judgement but that didn’t impede our effectiveness.



National DNA Database Strategy Board

Mr Pugh added a future retention policy would be a matter for public consultation in Autumn 2009. After this, the legislation would be changed and implemented. Mr Munro added that the Policing and Crime Bill, that would give powers to change PACE provisions, should get Royal Assent by Autumn 2009 and then statutory instruments would be put in place to allow changes to be made to PACE. Mr Pugh said that the UK needed to be ready to remove data and this also included fingerprint data. He did however note that fingerprint versus DNA retention provoked very different public reactions.

Prof Hutton informed the Board that the Ethics Group had had an extra meeting to discuss the ECHR judgement and that a report would be produced, which he would share with the Board. He highlighted two main concerns from the Ethics Group:

- 1) Concern that if the changes to the retention policy are made through regulatory changes that this would inhibit proper debate. They felt that the consultation process needed to be thought through to ensure it is seen as fair and representative. Changes may actually be counter-productive if not debated fully.
- 2) They proposed a new body to oversee aspects of this activity. Prof Hutton felt it inappropriate for the Ethics Group as they only have an advisory capacity. He asked whether the Strategy Board would fulfil this function or whether a separate group should be established. He wouldn't want to see layers of bureaucracy however, but felt that currently the terms of reference for any such group are opaque and would need elucidation before any consultation occurs.

Mr Pugh said that he was very mindful that there needed to be oversight of and accountability for the National DNA Database. He agreed that there was a need to be clear on the governance work that the Board was doing as this may be covered in the consultation. He suggested that ministerial and parliamentary oversight needed to be clarified. Mr Pugh acknowledged that he would contribute to the debate but it was not his role to direct how the public consultation.

Mr Munro felt that opinions from all stakeholders were required to contribute to the debate. He mentioned that it was difficult to frame the questions that would be included in the public consultation and that this would need considerable thought.

Prof Hutton asked whether a newly appointed oversight group would then be part of the appeals process. He mentioned that it was the impression of the interested groups, the Ethics Group had spoken with, that the current arrangement, of appealing to Chief Constables for profile removal, would be difficult for the majority of people.

Madeleine Colvin of the Ethics Group had looked at the Scottish situation and found that it wasn't actually as supportive to the general population as one may have thought, as policies never get contested.



National DNA Database Strategy Board

Mr Money asked Mr Munro to clarify the process and timeline for the changes to retention policy. Mr Munro said that the Policing and Crime Bill was already going through before the ECHR judgement. In light of the judgement arrangements were made to add to this existing Bill. Mr Pugh added that clauses were included to change provisions in PACE legislation. Mr Munro then explained that this Policing and Crime Bill was now being debated in the House of Lords. The Bill would then get Royal Assent. Mr Money said that he appreciated that it was difficult to give fixed dates for these steps to occur. Mr Munro mentioned that a report was due to the Committee of Ministers later this month, with a more complete report to be delivered in June 2009, detailing the steps being taken to comply with the ECHR judgement.

Mr Pugh hoped that a changed retention policy would be achieved by summer 2009. He then highlighted that there would then be retrospective applications to remove existing data already on the NDNAD. He noted that the power to search the NDNAD would remain; all arrestees' profiles would continue to be searched against the NDNAD albeit the NDNAD would now consist of convicted persons' DNA profiles only. He mentioned that some clarity was needed on these two points and once obtained he would share them with the Board.

Dr Bramble raised the issue of cost, which he estimated would be £millions. The bulk of this money would be on the fingerprint side, as they would need to pay the fingerprint database service provider.

Mr Pugh noted that Professor Jim Fraser's report makes reference to the practicalities of data removal and Mr Pugh felt it would be a challenge to delete data record by record; instead a system-wide approach may be needed.

ACC McCausland brought to the Board's attention that the devolution of policing and justice in Northern Ireland could occur in October 2009, although it would be later in the year before any changes would occur. He wanted to bring to the Board's attention the possibility that if Northern Ireland deviated from the retention policy of England and Wales that people within England and Wales may appeal. He also noted that Northern Ireland had estimated costs of £3million for their data removal from a database much smaller than that of the NDNAD.

Mr Money felt that when the retention policy was sent for public consultation, it was the responsibility of the Board is to ensure that public confidence is retained in the NDNAD and this needed consideration. Mr Pugh said that currently the Home Office was handling the media. He is aware that there is significant media interest in this situation. Mr Pugh said that he had done a briefing a few months ago and was prepared to do the same again to try and clarify the situation to the media. He said he would confer with the Home Office about this.

5.1.2 Samples

Mr Pugh brought the Board's attention to the letter he had sent to Peter Edmondson about the need to consider sample retention as well as data retention. He appreciated that the



National DNA Database Strategy Board

retention of samples was a very sensitive subject with the public. He noted that under the ECHR ruling samples were also considered personal information. Mr Miller noted that it had been accepted in the government's evidence that samples were accepted as personal data (section 63 of the ECHR report). He said that previous to the ECHR judgement the UK did not consider samples as personal data but in light of the judgement this would need to be changed.

Prof Hutton said that if one was going to accept that samples were personal data then this would change the classification of "personal data" to include substances from which data can be extracted. This would have wider implications than DNA. Mr Pugh agreed that the ECHR judgement had moved the boundaries for personal data collection and would not only affect forensic science but also medical collections. He felt that assistance was needed to deal with this part of the ECHR judgment. Mr Miller acknowledged this and said he would raise this to try and come to a position on this issue. Mr Munro said that the Home Office had shifted the emphasis in their response to the ECHR, taking the initiative to include samples.

Mr Pugh felt it was logical to look at sample retention whilst considering data retention. His letter addressed all issues he is aware of with regards to sample retention. In 1995, when this was first discussed, the purpose for sample retention was clear. Samples were retained to be used for evidential purposes and to accommodate future DNA technologies. Mr Pugh noted that whilst there are instances that justify the retention of samples, are these sufficient to justify keeping 3.5million individual samples. Mr Pugh noted that if technology was to change it is unlikely that the NDNAD would re-analyse the historic samples as a matter of course.

Prof Hutton commented that he thought the letter was excellent and he was aware from the groups he liaised with that sample retention was usually top of their list of concerns. He felt that the public's fear for retention had been exacerbated by the presence other databases. He did note however, that all groups did make distinctions between serious and volume crimes and felt that retention policies should reflect these differences.

Mr Downham noted that the letter did not contain anything on mass intelligence screening. Volunteers providing DNA for elimination would expect to have their DNA sample destroyed after elimination. He said that the law however allowed the sample to be retained until conclusion of the case. In an undetected case, all the mass screening samples would still be retained. Mr Pugh asked why they would be kept if they had already been eliminated from the enquiry. Mr Downham replied that the law stated that they could be kept. Mr Pugh agreed that destruction of samples does leave the prosecution open to defence challenge to produce the original samples. This is true in all samples not just those from mass screen volunteers. ACC McCausland noted that it should be made clearer to volunteers that their sample would be retained until the case was closed. He felt that successful defence challenges were a bigger issue than the non-destruction of volunteer samples. Mr Downham commented that if volunteers were told that their sample would not be destroyed



National DNA Database Strategy Board

until the end of the case, would they still volunteer? Mr Brown said that some of these issues about volunteer samples are commented on in the ACRO volunteer sampling update paper. He noted that mass screens were usually only conducted in very serious cases but legislation said that these sample could be retained for up to 100 years. Mr Pugh said it was important to maintain public confidence to give volunteer samples. Prof Hutton noted that volunteer DNA samples were not within the excepted section of the Human Tissue Act so they could request their sample be destroyed at any time. There is therefore conflict in the legislation. ACC McCausland agreed that this was an opportune time to identify these conflicts between the legislation.

Prof Cunningham-Burley said that the HGC supported the destruction of samples but asked how this situation could be resolved. She suggested a deadline be put on defence challenge. Mr Pugh said he needed to consult the CPS as to whether there was some legislation that would mitigate the risk of technical challenge. At present, charges are based on a DNA match report not a statement but the defence can challenge if they wish. Safeguards would be needed to stop speculative defence challenges. Mr Pugh suggested that if a match was generated after the original sample was destroyed that another would be taken on charging but the defence could request the original sample. The defence is entitled to test all of the prosecution's evidence.

Prof Hutton asked whether the samples needed to be kept if the profiles existed. Both prosecution and defence needed to accept the DNA profile as evidence. He said that rather than retest the original sample, a second sample should be taken. Mr Rennison raised the concern that if the original sample no longer existed it could raise doubt in the prosecution's case. ACC McCausland said that this needed to be sorted before it reached the courtroom.

Mr Carling informed the Board that Ms June Guinness had read the letter to Peter Edmondson and wanted to highlight that the NDNAD needed to retain the samples for four months after loading to the database, for quality purposes.

Dr Bramble summarised the two options for retention. Either the retention of samples would mirror the policy decided for the retention for profiles or, whilst some of the profiles would be kept, all the samples would be destroyed. He also noted that if the decision is made to continue retaining samples, then the Board needed to consider the long-term storage implications of these samples. Storage outside of the commercial sector would inspire public confidence. This was agreed by the Board.

Mr Miller reiterated the ICO position, which is that the ECHR judgement does not differentiate between samples and profiles and so the ICO does not view them separately.

Prof Cunningham-Burley suggested that until a change is implemented in the legislation to stop defence challenges then sample destruction couldn't be considered

Mr Munro asked whether any work had been conducted to calculate the error rate between DNA sample and DNA profile. Ms Faulkner replied that the true rate of error needed



National DNA Database Strategy Board

consideration. Mr Munro thought a measure of this error would give confidence in the prosecution's evidence. Mr Pugh said that taking a second sample on charging would mitigate this. Prof Hutton highlighted that this wouldn't be applicable in cases where the subject was dead or missing. The suspect would need to be present to provide a sample.

Ms Faulkner brought it to the Board's attention that pre PACE intelligence samples could be destroyed as a second sample was taken as a matter of course.

5.2 Revision of the Governing Rules of the NDNAD

Mr Pugh thanked DI Dibbs and Mr Downham for their work on the Governance Rules.

Mr Pugh reminded the Board of the last meeting's discussions on member voting and the benefits of expanding the Board to include wider membership. He said that organisations and not individuals are members of the Board. He appreciated that there are some concerns about the voting rights. The need to have a vote would be rare and would only be on substantial topics. It was agreed that only the tripartite organisations would vote, as they are accountable for governance of policing the NDNAD. Mr Munro asked for reassurance that each of the tripartite would have only one vote each. Mr Pugh said that the updated version of the Governance Rules made it clear that each organisation in the tripartite had one vote.

Prof Hutton suggested that, wherever possible, decisions should be made by consensus within the Board and if resolution wasn't possible then it should be put to a vote. Prof Cunningham-Burley agreed that the non-tripartite members would be able to inform members but not have the final vote.

Mr Downham highlighted that in the Governance Rules that after a 2:1 vote the member in the minority had a recognised method to raise their concern with ministers.

Mr Money suggested that a limit be put on the number of representatives per organisation that could attend meetings. Prof Cunningham-Burley suggested this be put in the Governance Rules.

Prof Cunningham-Burley asked whether lay people could attend meetings in the future especially when the retention policy goes for public consultation. Mr Pugh felt that this had been included in the Rules for invited laypersons to attend e.g. criminalists.

Mr Munro raised a concern as to what would happen if the Chair of the Board were not available. He asked how this would fit in with the tripartite structure. Mr Pugh agreed that this needed to be looked into. He acknowledged that as data controller he needed to make decisions daily and that an ACPO member should do this.

Mr Pugh said that when the Board were happy with the Governance Rules he would write to the Home Secretary/Home Office with these and ask whether the Board should be advising



National DNA Database Strategy Board

ministers. Mr Downham agreed that the Chair of this Board should have a formal route to ministers.

Prof Cunningham-Burley asked that the objectives section (Section 4b) be changed to read "That the public are aware of the capability and limitations of the NDNAD and that confidence is maintained in its use across all communities and nature of its governance."

Mr Munro mentioned that Section 8.1c should be changed to read the "Crime and Policing Group"

Dr Bramble asked whether it was the role of the Board to oversee the use of DNA in police investigations. Mr Pugh agreed that Board couldn't oversee all use of DNA technologies but did have an interest in new and alternate DNA analysis. It was important for the Board to consider the ethical implications of any new technologies. Mr Munro added that if an alternate DNA technology were evidenced in court then the public would assume that the Strategy Board was aware of it. The Home Secretary would also come to the Strategy Board for advice on new techniques. Ms Faulkner said that this risk had been acknowledged on the register.

New Action 11/09 – All members to feedback on the Governance Rules to Mr Pugh, DI Dibbs or Mr Downham

Mr Pugh mentioned that the Counter Terrorism DNA database would have similar governance but the Strategy Board could not set its policy as other parties would do this.

5.3 Confidentiality, Integrity and Security of Data

Ms Faulkner updated the Board on the security assessment. She said that they were moving away from faxing communications to forces and were using email as an interim. They had a technical solution with a release to forces schedule of April 2009. Mr Pugh asked to be kept updated with any forces not included in this.

6 Operational Update

6.1 DNA Work Programme Review

6.1.1 Volunteer Sampling Update

Mr Brown distributed a sample of the new forms that will go with the new volunteer sampling kit. He mentioned that he had taken advice from the Ethics Group and the ICO about the new kit. The purpose of the new kit was to avoid volunteer profiles being loaded to the NDNAD.



National DNA Database Strategy Board

Mr Pugh felt that rather have separate forms within the same kit for genuine volunteers and those for taken for elimination, that two separate kits should be made - a Volunteer Kit and an Elimination Kit. Mr Brown said that it would be easy to change from one kit to two. Prof Hutton supported the use of two separate kits, as this would increase public confidence. Dr Bramble mentioned that the NPIA were looking at DNA Sampling kits at the moment and that they were considering keeping the forms separate from the kits.

Mr Brown pointed out the difference in consent on the new style form. Children below 10 years required the signature of an adult. Children between 10 and 17 can sign their own consent but an adult had to sign to confirm that the child was able to give consent. Mr Downham asked why the age to give consent was 10 years and not 17 years like PACE. Prof Hutton said that the Ethics Group found 10 years a reasonable age to give consent. It would be inappropriate for an adult to give consent in cases where a child is able.

Mr Pugh highlighted in the Volunteer Sampling Update paper that Mr Brown had proposed that there be a process for removal of volunteers from the NDNAD.

Mr Miller mentioned that he was working with Mr Brown on the wording of the forms. They would continue to work together on the volunteer sampling kits. Prof Cunningham-Burley suggested that if children were to give consent, that the language on the form should be made less complex.

New Action 12/09 – Mr Brown with advice from Mr Miller to complete the forms for the volunteer and elimination kits, and for there to be two separate kits.

Mr Pugh said that the legislation changes might help in those cases that previously bypassed PACE.

Mr Carling asked whether ethnic appearance needed to be recorded for volunteers. It was agreed that it did not.

New Action 13/09 – Mr Brown to remove ethnic appearance section from forms.

6.1.2 DNA Communications Strategy Update

Mr Pugh asked the Board what were the key messages they would be trying to communicate to the public using this strategy.

Prof Cunningham-Burley felt the paper was very helpful. She thought they could communicate details of the governance of the NDNAD to increase public confidence. The Board could use the website to discuss issues. This would show how the Strategy Board responds to issues that arise.

Mr Carling suggested cases of interest, Documents on DNA, Strategy Board minutes, NDNAD Statistics and public version of the DNA Practice Guide.



National DNA Database Strategy Board

Mr Pugh asked how they could show the communication strategy was a success. Prof Cunningham-Burley suggested a decrease in FOI requests and Parliamentary Questions or more accurate media stories.

Mr Carling said that if the Board were happy in principle then he would create a draft of the web page and present it to the Board

New Action 14/09 – Mr Carling to create a draft web page for DNA Communications.

Mr Munro said that this Communication Strategy should be put into the White Paper.

Prof Cunningham-Burley mentioned that the HGC was compiling a report on the Forensic Use of DNA to improve public education. They were intending to produce a documentary to show DNA being taken at arrest through to loading on the NDNAD. She suggested they could work together.

Prof Hutton said he would pass the presentations he has to Mr Carling to perhaps include on the web site.

7 Issues Relating to Scotland and Northern Ireland

7.1 Northern Ireland

Redacted

ACC McCausland asked the Board to consider two options for Northern Ireland membership to the Strategy Board:

- 1) Northern Ireland to create their own Strategy Board.
- 2) Northern Ireland to create a Management Board for their database and then apply to join the NDNAD Strategy Board as a formal member.

He personally felt it unnecessary to have a separate Strategy Board.

Mr Pugh has agreed that until formal Board membership, Northern Ireland will continue to be invited to Strategy Board meetings as an observer. He also said that he would formally write to invite Northern Ireland to become a formal member.

New Action 15/09 – Mr Pugh to write to ACC McCausland to invite Northern Ireland to become a formal member of the Strategy Board.

Mr Pugh reiterated that it was important for Northern Ireland and Scotland to be part of the Board to encourage consistency in standards and the flow of data.



National DNA Database Strategy Board

Dr Bramble asked what the situation was with Southern Ireland. ACC McCausland said that they were waiting to pass legislation to create a database but that there was some nervousness about this. Northern Ireland has a MOU with Southern Ireland to exchange data on sex offenders.

7.2 Scotland

Dr Pearston updated the Board the Scottish government had now published a consultation report which is available on the government's website. They have set up a working group to examine retention. Mr Pugh asked for feedback on whether Scotland was to become full Board members.

Mr Pugh asked Prof Hutton whether he thought it appropriate for Scotland and Northern Ireland to have full Board membership given that the two countries had their own ethics advisors. Prof Hutton said that he thought if there were representatives from Northern Ireland and Scotland, that Wales should be represented too. He also thought that it would be acceptable as long as it didn't interfere with the progress already made between the police and lobby groups. He thought that the Ethics Group should liaise with the ethics advisors.

Mr Rennison mentioned that he would be producing, after consultation, specific Scottish versions of some of his recent standards. But he said that he had no oversight over either the Northern Irish or Scottish Forensic Intelligence databases. Mr Pugh said that membership to the NDNAD Strategy Board would encourage the unilateral use of standards.

Prof Cunningham-Burley noted that the HGC was UK wide and so covered Scotland and Northern Ireland. Mr Pugh asked whether they advised the Scottish Executive. Prof Cunningham-Burley said that the HGC had observers from the medical field.

8 NPIA NDNA Delivery Unit Update

There were no outstanding issues raised.

9 Ethics Group

Prof Hutton told the Board that six people had been allocated an area of interest to take the lead on for the Ethics Group (Action 06/09). These are Suzy Walton, Julia Ayetey, Clive Richards, Madeleine Colvin, Andrea Pearson and Wendy Coates. He would send details of these six areas to Mr Pugh.

Prof Hutton thanked Mr Brown for taking the Ethics Group's suggestions for the Volunteer/Elimination kits.



National DNA Database Strategy Board

Prof Hutton asked the Board whether it would be possible for the Ethics Group to have sight of papers presented to the Board. If appropriate, Prof Hutton could liaise with Mr Pugh to get certain papers. Mr Pugh said he was content to provide non-sensitive papers to the Ethics Group. The rest of the Board had no objections to this.

10 Any Other Business

No issues were raised.

11 Dates of Future Meetings

- 11th June 10.30am to 2pm, 5th Floor Conference Room, NSY
- 10th September 10.30am to 2pm, 5th Floor Conference Room, NSY
- 10th December 10.30am to 2pm, 5th Floor Conference Room, NSY