



Professionalism, Integrity, Discretion & Trust

POLICY AND GOOD PRACTICE GUIDE

USE AND DEPLOYMENT OF GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (GPS)

ELECTRONIC TRACKING DEVICES

CONTENTS

Chapter	Title	Page
PART A	POLICY Use & deployment of global positioning systems (GPS) Electronic tracking devices	3-4
PART B	GOOD PRACTICE GUIDE	5-13
1	Introduction & Copyright	5
2	Purpose & Disclaimer	6
3	GPS Electronic Tracking Devices	7
4	The Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000	8
5	The Data Protection Act 2018	9-10
6	Trespass	11
7	Harassment & Stalking	12
8	Human Rights Act 1998	13

PART A
TITAN INVESTIGATIONS LTD
POLICY

Use & deployment of global positioning systems (GPS)
Electronic tracking devices

1. **LAWFUL** - All surveillance activities should be lawful, that is justified, accountable, proportionate (and reasonable), appropriate, necessary (JAPAN).
2. **DPIA** – Whether by the investigator or the client, a Data Protection Impact Assessment must be carried out prior to considering any investigation and this applies too prior to considering deploying a GPS Electronic Tracking Device.
3. **CONFIDENTIALITY** –

- 3.1. A GPS Electronic Tracking Device is a covert surveillance aid and its use / deployment should be treated with respect and strict confidentiality.
- 3.2. No reference to the use or deployment of a GPS Electronic Tracking Device needs to or indeed should be made outside the confidentiality of the client and surveillance deploying operatives.
- 3.3. Under no circumstances must GPS Electronic Tracking Device data records or software access (log-in details to access the mapping programme) be provided to the client or anyone outside the surveillance team.
- 3.4. Details of the data gathered with the aid of a GPS Electronic Tracking Device should in the interests of both transparency and compliance, be recorded and retained by the investigator after every surveillance deployment.

4. **PRIVATE LAND** –

At no time should a GPS Electronic Tracking Device be deployed on private land without the proprietor's permission. A device may only be deployed when the subject vehicle is in a place to which the public have legitimate access, whether on payment or otherwise.

5. **PHYSICAL SURVEILLANCE AID** –

- 5.1. Save in exceptional evidence gathering circumstances, a GPS Electronic Tracking Device must only be used in conjunction and as an aid to physical surveillance.
- 5.2. Any data obtained from a GPS Electronic Tracking Device is a covert aid to the physical surveillance - the data is to be used and classified as 'intelligence only' and should not be communicated or introduced as unsupported 'evidence' in any investigation

6. DATA LOGs –

The data logs produced by a GPS Electronic Tracking Device should not form the sole basis of any evidential statement, or report.

7. PUBLICATION OF USE / DEPLOYMENT –

7.1. The use and deployment of GPS Electronic Tracking Devices is covert and therefore an investigator should not openly advertise their use or availability other than in hardware or software sales, without reference to compliance with this Policy.

7.2. For the avoidance of doubt requests for the deployment or recovery of such devices **must not** be made in any group forum, outside the confines of the surveillance team.

7.3. A GPS Electronic Tracking Device is a covert aid to physical surveillance and any reference to their availability, use or deployment should be qualified to be compliant with this Policy.

THE POLICY SET OUT ABOVE IS BINDING TO ALL TITAN INVESTIGATIONS AFFILIATES & SUBCONTRACTORS.

PART B
TITAN INVESTIGATIONS LTD
GOOD PRACTICE

Use & deployment of global positioning systems (GPS)
Electronic tracking devices

1. INTRODUCTION & COPYRIGHT

1. 1.1. Formed in 2014, Titan Private Investigation Ltd has been upholding professional standards for this period. Titan Private Investigation Ltd campaigns tirelessly for regulation for investigation in the private sector and promotes excellence, integrity and professionalism within its resourcing group.

2. 1.2. The utilisation of GPS Electronic Tracking Devices on vehicles by private sector investigators is often discussed and there are many misunderstandings.

3. 1.3. In January 2012 the Information Commissioner’s Office (ICO) written evidence to the Parliamentary Home Affairs Select Committee stated that the ‘ICO would support any industry initiatives aimed at promoting informational best practice amongst investigators.

4. 1.4. It is the ICO view that the deployment GPS Electronic Tracking Devices as a surveillance tool may constitute processing personal data within the meaning of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and Data Protection Act 2018 (DPA). Titan Private Investigation Ltd accepts this view, however, there is no specific government-sponsored regulation to assist private sector investigators with regards to the use and deployment of GPS Electronic Tracking Devices.

5. 1.5. It is essential for any investigation that involves the processing of personal data that the client provides the lawful basis for commissioning the investigation. To reach that point the investigator carries out and records a **data protection impact assessment**. It is usual for investigators to rely largely on the client’s “Legitimate Interest” providing it outweighs the data subject’s rights under the GDPR.

6. 1.6. Copyright of this Guide and Policy is vested by Titan Private Investigation Ltd, except where otherwise acknowledged, and no part of this document shall be copied, printed or distributed by way of photographs, printed matter, website, e-mail or in any other manner without express permission from Titan Private Investigation Ltd.

2. PURPOSE & DISCLAIMER

1. 2.1. Titan Private Investigation Ltd believes that this policy will give professionally minded and responsible investigators in the private sector a clear understanding of the use and deployment of GPS Electronic Tracking Devices **where the vehicle-owner's consent is not present**.
2. 2.2. The Policy set out in section A above is specifically aimed at Titan Private Investigation subcontractors who are bound by Titan Private Investigations Ltd Code of Ethics & Professional Standards and accountable to abide by all Titan Private Investigation Ltd subcontractors. This is demonstrated by Titan Private Investigations Ltd's robust and independently adjudicated discipline process that could see substantiated evidence of a Titan Private Investigations Ltd subcontractor breaching this Policy face expulsion.
3. 2.3. The contents of this Guide are intended as helpful but not legal advice and Titan Private Investigation Ltd does not warrant or make any representations regarding the correctness, accuracy or reliability of the comments and observations in this publication. Readers of the Guide should obtain their own independent legal advice on any matter referred to in the Guide and be satisfied as to the legal position should they consider using or deploying a GPS Electronic Tracking Device.

3. GPS ELECTRONIC TRACKING DEVICES

3.1. A GPS Electronic Tracking Device is normally carried by a moving vehicle or person. The device relies on the Global Positioning System to determine and track its precise location within a relatively small area sufficient to enable the operator (surveillance operative) to determine the likely geographic address (locality) of the device and the vehicle under surveillance.

3.2. The recorded location data can be stored within the GPS Electronic Tracking Device, or it may be transmitted to a central location database. This allows the device's location to be displayed against a map backdrop either in real time or when analysing the data later, using GPS Electronic Tracking Device software (recorded history of device locality/movement).

3.3. GPS Electronic Tracking Devices provide intelligence on the movement of an object and particularly on a living person. They are not too dissimilar to one person actually following another person ('subject') and are an extension of that capability, as is using a camera to capture what you see.

3.4. Any data or information collected by the use of a GPS Electronic Tracking Device should never be considered in isolation as 'evidence' and introduced into the evidential chain without corroborated evidence. The data merely supports the location of a vehicle, the details of which would be corroborated by physical surveillance.

4. THE REGULATION OF INVESTIGATORY POWERS ACT 2000

4.1. The Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 (RIPA) only applies to public bodies and is intended to provide safeguards in the manner in which evidence to support a prosecution is obtained.

4.2. RIPA does apply to private investigators that are working for a public body that is covered by the legislation (e.g. local authorities, the Environment Agency etc) and the directed surveillance being conducted requires RIPA authority. Since 2012 local authorities require judicial authority for directed surveillance (local authorities cannot authorise intrusive surveillance under RIPA).

4.3. In the deployment and use of a GPS Electronic Tracking Device the ABI encourages RIPA compliance in the private sector as good practice. Save in exceptional evidence gathering circumstances, this will be achieved by only utilising the device as a covert aid to physical surveillance.

4.4. RIPA compliance would demonstrate that every attempt was made to deliver evidence within 'the spirit of the Act' in order to minimise the possibility of such evidence later being ruled as inadmissible under such legislation as Section 78 of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 (PACE) or Article 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998 (HRA) – 'Right to Respect for Private and Family Life', during any subsequent resulting litigation.

4.5. Every effort should be made to comply within the provisions of RIPA during all aspects of the proposed operation including any periods of directed surveillance.

4.6. There is no current legislation that prevents the use of a GPS Electronic Tracking Device (for example on a vehicle) by an investigator in the private sector, without the consent of the owner or user of that vehicle, providing that the physical surveillance it's use supports is lawful with JAPAN (mnemonic) applied and the processing of such personal data captured in its use complies with the GDPR. The investigator usually relies on the client's Legitimate Interest outweighing the rights of the data subject. It is at the very least good practice for the investigator to carry out a documented data protection impact assessment to include the assessed lawful basis on which the client relies to commission the investigation.

4.7. Reference is made at Section 26 (4) RIPA - which states:

For the purposes of this Part, surveillance is not intrusive to the extent that — It is carried out by means only of a surveillance device designed or adapted principally for the purpose of providing information about the location of a vehicle.

4.8. It follows therefore that surveillance using a GPS Tracking Device is considered directed surveillance under RIPA.

5. THE DATA PROTECTION ACT 2018

5.1. The Data Protection Act 2018 (DPA) came into force on 25th May 2018 and replaced the Data Protection Act 1998, which came into force on 1st March 2000. DPA made it an offence to unlawfully obtain or disclose personal data (s.170, previously s.55 of the 1998 Act).

5.2. The DPA applies to personal data held in all formats, whether electronic, paper, audio, visual or digital records.

5.3. Processing, under the terms of the DPA, covers all conceivable manipulations of personal data including collection, use, storage, disclosure and amendment.

5.4. Mere possession of such data amounts to processing.

5.5. The DPA sets out what may or may not be done with personal data.

5.6. Any business, which determines the manner and the purpose personal data is processed, must be registered as a Data Controller with specific purposes, with the ICO and have a DPA notification number.

5.7. As stated above, the ICO expresses the view that data obtained from a GPS Electronic Tracking Device identifies the individual (within the vehicle) or his activities and it is therefore personal data within the meaning of the DPA.

5.8. However, even though the use of a GPS Electronic Tracking Device may be processing personal data where it records the movements of an individual, Titan Private Investigation Ltd does not consider their use in within the terms of this Policy & Guide is unlawful.

5.9. If a GPS Electronic Tracking Device is deployed purely as an aid to physical surveillance, then any personal data that is gathered would be no different from that which would have been gathered without it. The following example is given using the simplest of scenarios:

5.9.1. In contemplation of matrimonial proceedings, an investigator is tasked to verify the client's suspicion that the spouse (the 'data subject') is committing adultery and to further explore whether the subject may be possessed of assets the client may not be aware of.

5.9.2. It is decided that physical surveillance is lawful and meets the JAPAN (mnemonic) to confirm or deny the suspicion.

5.9.3. The investigator follows the data subject and notes the data subject calls into a bank and later meets with a female in a car park who gets into the subject's vehicle and where they are observed engaged in inappropriate behaviour, which the investigator records with camera or video footage. The female then leaves and the

investigator follows her to an address, which the investigator researches from public, or shared registers and identifies the female.

5.10. The physical surveillance probably identified the location of where the subject holds a bank account (either known or unknown to his wife) and revealed that the subject appears to be having a clandestine (improper) relationship, which has been recorded. If the GPS Electronic Tracking Device had been deployed without the physical surveillance it would not have identified the above. The log for the physical surveillance would note the female's vehicle and home address and subsequent research would identify her.

5.11. In the circumstances described above the investigator had not done anything unlawful and the data gathered, if used correctly and for the purpose for which it was obtained, would not breach the DPA or other regulation.

5.12. Adding a GPS Electronic Tracking Device (as a tool to assist the physical surveillance) does not alter anything other than recording the data (locality movements of the vehicle).

5.13. Whilst it could be argued that the above physical surveillance could have been conducted without the aid of a GPS Electronic Tracking Device, it is fair to counter argue that without the device the prospects of losing the data subject are increased and it also diminishes the risk of committing moving road traffic offences.

6. TRESPASS

6.1. A civil trespass to land occurs where a person directly enters upon another's land without permission, or remains upon the land, or places or projects any object upon the land. This tort is actionable per se without the need to prove damage.

6.2. A civil trespass, however, is not a crime.

6.3. It may be a civil trespass to deploy a GPS Electronic Tracking Device onto a vehicle not belonging to you or your client but in a 2007 restricted report given by the Office of Surveillance Commissioners (OSC), the OSC's Chief Surveillance Commissioner, Sir Christopher Rose, stated 'putting an arm into a wheel arch or under the frame of a vehicle is straining the concept of trespass'.

6.4. The judiciary has described this concept of trespass as 'de minimis' (*the law cares not for small things*) and would not countenance a complaint.

6.5. This could be further bolstered if the investigator could provenance the lawfulness of the surveillance and demonstrate integrity in addition to having applied JAPAN (mnemonic).

6.6. However, on the basis as recommended above that investigators in the private sector should be RIPA compliant, to enter the private land of anyone in order to deploy a GPS Electronic Tracking Device would be moving away from directed surveillance and exceeding the acceptable boundaries of RIPA and the human rights regulations. This is unacceptable practice and contrary to Titan Private Investigation Ltd's Policy.

6.7. Surveillance from a common area is not intrusive surveillance due to the definition of 'residential premises'. Under RIPA (Part II), surveillance is not intrusive to the extent that it is carried out by means only of a surveillance device designed or adapted principally for the purpose of providing information about the location of a vehicle. As long as the device is supported by physical surveillance the device will do no more than give a location of the vehicle corroborated by physical surveillance and the direct evidence of the investigator(s). Evidence of the location of a vehicle at a specific location at a specified date and time on private land would be provided by the investigator(s) and supported by their choice of media.

7. HARASSMENT & STALKING

7.1. Surveillance in all of its forms can sometimes be misinterpreted by the public as stalking.

7.2. Stalking is a term used to describe a particular kind of harassment. Generally, it is used to describe a long-term pattern of persistent and repeated contact with, or attempts to contact, a particular victim. Recent legislation criminalises this form of harassment.

7.3. Examples of the types of conduct often associated with stalking include: direct communication; physical following; indirect contact through friends, work colleagues, family or technology, or, other intrusions into the victim's privacy. The behaviour curtails a victim's freedom, leaving them feeling that they constantly have to be careful.

7.4. In many cases, the conduct might appear innocent (if it were to be taken in isolation), but when carried out repeatedly so as to amount to a course of conduct, it may then cause significant alarm, harassment or distress to the victim.

7.5. If the subject of enquiry is aware of the surveillance, then this may amount to harassment under the Protection from Harassment Act 1997.

7.6. It is also possible that if the subject of enquiry becomes aware of a GPS Electronic Tracking Device, this may amount to harassment under the Protection from Harassment Act 1997 if those deploying the device pursue a course of conduct:

7.6.1. Which amounts to harassment of another, and

7.6.2. Which he knows or ought to know amounts to harassment of the other.

7.7. Conducting any surveillance should only be contemplated based on the guidance provided within the legislation enacted to control the covert activities of public bodies such as police, government agencies etc. RIPA.

7.8. Therefore using a GPS Electronic Tracking Device without contemplating the need for manned surveillance may be construed as harassment / stalking or even voyeurism in some cases.

8. HUMAN RIGHTS ACT 1998 (HRA)

8.1. For professional clients the principal consideration in the use of a GPS Electronic Tracking Device is likely to be reputational in that whilst their use is lawful, there is a widely held view, that it could be considered distasteful, underhand or unethical.

8.2. There is only ever a need for public authorities to consider RIPA authorisation where the covert surveillance is likely to breach Article 8 of HRA and a criminal prosecution is contemplated.

8.3. Police may use a GPS Electronic Tracking Device deployed on the exterior of a vehicle but must have a warrant to place one inside a vehicle. Intrusive surveillance is covert surveillance in residential premises or private vehicles where someone would have a greater expectation of privacy than in a public place. The surveillance is intrusive if it involves the presence of either an individual or a surveillance device on the premises or inside the vehicle. It does not include a tracking device fitted to the vehicle's exterior - 'The use of a mere tracking device does not equate to intrusive surveillance as it is excluded from the definition'.

8.4. Jones v Warwick

8.4.1. Anyone could breach the human rights of another. The case on this is for investigators that of Jean F Jones v University of Warwick (2003) - Whilst the video footage was admitted into evidence, as it went to disprove the claim, the deception perpetrated by the investigators was held by the court to amount to a breach of the claimant's human rights.

8.4.2. By virtue of Section 6 of the HRA only public authorities are prohibited from acting incompatibly with the Act. The Court is a public authority but insurance companies and investigators in the private sector patently are not (unless acting as agents for a Public Authority). The Court, however, would consider the HRA when weighing up the evidence.

8.4.3. In the above case, investigators, acting on behalf of an insurer gained useful video footage of the claimant, the investigators having tricked their way into her house using a pretext. The Court criticised the tactics of the investigators, particularly around the trespass to land, but it did not, and could not, rule that the investigators had breached HRA. The matter before the Court was about the admissibility in subsequent proceedings of the evidence obtained. The Court dismissed that claim. The potential significant impact of this case is worthy of greater scrutiny when considering the human rights position on deploying a GPS Electronic Tracking Device. A useful article on the case was written by Barrister, Rosalind English, 1 Crown Office Row.