

Please reply to:

Email: rocco.labellarte@rbwm.gov.uk
My ref: APRP/laptops/388/response/070514
Your ref:

Corporate Services

Rocco Labellarte
Head of Technology and
Change Delivery
Town Hall
St Ives Road
Maidenhead
SL6 1RF

The Royal Borough



Windsor &
Maidenhead

Mr R Reeves (Chairman)
Windsor Labour Party
c/o 4, Knights Close
Windsor, Berkshire SL4 5QR

Maidenhead, 7th May 2014

Dear Mr Reeves,

Subject: Audit and Performance Review Panel 14 November 2013

In response your letter of 28th November 2013 expressing concern over 388 'lost laptops' I was asked to investigate the matter. Having now completed that investigation I attach the summary of findings report in addendum to this letter. For completeness I have included in Appendix 1 below, replies to the questions you raised. The key findings of that investigation were that:

1. The figure of 388 reported in the 2011 was a snapshot in time, relating to asset records, and based on a partial reconciliation exercise between records and laptops. The figure quoted did not reflect missing laptops, rather it highlighted:

- a. those laptops that could not be matched to records,
- b. those records where no laptop was found;

A subsequent reconciliation exercise of those same documents, carried out in 2014 reduced the figure of mismatches between laptops and records down to 251. As stated in the relevant report of 28th March 2014 to the ICO: it was thought that those [laptops] unaccounted for were either stored away in user areas or had been destroyed. There was no evidence that the laptops were lost or stolen but not reported."

2. The records used in the 2011 audit were incomplete because:

- a. laptop purchases were decentralised, through various cost centres, and
- b. at the time there were no formal processes in place to track laptops;
- c. a full stock take of laptops was not carried out in the Audit review of 2011;

Two key observations reported to the ICO were that "there is no evidence that personal data has been placed at risk", and "there is no evidence that there has been a consequential breach" of regulations.

I hope this letter addresses your concerns and I apologise for the time taken to respond. I hope you can appreciate that this matter has required a significant amount of officer time to carry out a thorough investigation.

Rocco Labellarte
Head of Technology and Change Delivery

Appendix 1 - Replies to Mr. Reeve's questions in his letter of 28th November 2013.

1. Has the breach been reported to the Information Commissioner's Office?

The Information Commissioner's Office was contacted on 28th March 2014 in relation to this matter as a consequence of the findings from the investigation carried out.

2. Was the data on the missing laptops encrypted?

Laptops were not encrypted until 2011. Partitioned encryption was implemented in 2011. Since early 2013 laptops have been fully encrypted.

3. What personal data of residents were held on any lost or stolen laptops?

Council policy was to not save any data to laptops. Network drives and business applications were used to store data. As a consequence the risk of data loss would have been significantly reduced.

4. For missing laptops attributed to schools, what information about school children is contained on these laptops?

Laptops issued to schools were brand new. Schools have their own staff policies to ensure security. They are also separately registered under the data Protection Act. Please refer this question to schools directly.

5. Have the Police been informed?

When Council officers suspect or have suffered a theft they must report the incident to the Police and obtain a Crime Reference Number. This was done for all reported losses/thefts in 2012 and 2013.

6. How many missing laptops were assigned to agency staff?

None of the reported missing laptops in the past two years were registered to agency staff.

7. What disciplinary action has been taken?

None.

8. What steps are being taken to find the missing 388 laptops?

As reported to the ICO, there are no procurement records prior to 2003, disposals prior to May 2006, and no records of lost/stolen devices prior to December 2008. As such it is not possible to draw a definitive conclusion as to the whereabouts of the laptops. It was thought that those unaccounted for were either stored away in user areas or had been destroyed. There was no evidence that the laptops were lost or stolen but not reported.

9. What controls are in place for secure destruction of electronic equipment?

The Council uses two companies for destruction services. DataShred destroy USB sticks and CD/DVDs and Corporate Max destroy PCs and erase data on hard disk drives using special security software.

10. Why do the council think the 388 laptops report is not a big security breach?

The reasons are those articulated at point 8 above. The key conclusions from the investigation are that "there is no evidence that personal data has been placed at risk", and "there is no evidence that there has been a consequential breach" of regulations.