Home Office

Equipment Theft (Prevention) Bill: Call for evidence

RESPONSE FROM: **DATATAG ID LTD**

Waterman's House, Waterman's Court, Lotus Park,

The Causeway, Staines-upon-Thames, TW18 3AG

DATATAG SECURITY

About this call for evidence

This call for evidence is targeted at those who may be affected by the proposals should they become legislation, including manufacturers, dealers, retailers, forensic marking companies, trade associations, tradespeople, and law enforcement practitioners.

It will run for 8 weeks from 18 May 2023 to 13 July 2023.

The Equipment Theft (Prevention) Bill

The Equipment Theft (Prevention) Bill is a private members bill which has Government support. It was introduced to Parliament by Greg Smith MP on 16 June 2022 and is sponsored by Lord Blencathra in the House of Lords, where it was introduced on 6 March 2023. The Bill is published here: Equipment Theft (Prevention) Bill - Parliamentary Bills - UK Parliament

The purpose of the Bill is to prevent the theft of machinery and equipment used by the agricultural sector, in particular quad bikes and All-Terrain Vehicles (ATVs).

It provides a power for the Secretary of State to make regulations requiring immobilisers and forensic marking to be fitted as standard to all new quad bikes and ATVs. The regulations will define the minimum standard that will apply to immobilisers and forensic marking. The Bill requires immobilisers and forensic marking to be fitted or applied before equipment is sold to the customer. In practice this is likely to take place at the dealership or store, but it could be done during the manufacturing process. In addition, there will be a requirement for the seller to maintain a record of the buyer from the date of sale for a specified period of time, likely to be ten years. This record will assist police to identify and prove ownership of stolen ATVs and other equipment once recovered.

The Bill also provides a power for the Home Secretary to extend the provisions to other equipment designed or adapted primarily for use in agricultural or commercial activities.

The Bill applies to England and Wales. The prevention, detection and investigation of crime is a devolved matter in Scotland and Northern Ireland.

This consultation seeks views on proposed details to be included in secondary legislation, should the Bill gain Royal Assent.

The responses to this consultation will inform our proposals for secondary legislation. The proposals in this consultation remain subject to change following the consultation process.

Why is the Government supporting this Bill?

The theft of agricultural machinery, and in particular All-Terrain Vehicles, is of great concern. The theft of agricultural machinery has a significant impact on businesses and those who rely on this equipment for their livelihood. Thefts of vehicles from farmers can cause severe disruption to essential cultivation work and risk to animal welfare and have a significant impact on livelihoods.

All-Terrain Vehicles (ATVs) in particular are desirable to thieves and are vulnerable largely due to a lack of security features. An estimated 900 -1200 quad bikes and ATVs are stolen in England and Wales each year. The National Farmers' Union (NFU) Rural Crime Survey 2022 highlighted that after a fall during the pandemic, ATV thefts are now on the increase and this trend is anticipated to continue. Latest data published by NFU Mutual in the Rural Crime Report 2022 shows thefts of quad bikes and ATVs cost their customers £2.2 million in 2021.

In addition to ATVs, there have been calls from the National Police Chiefs' Council (NPCC), NFU and trade associations for the legislation to be extended to larger agricultural equipment; and from groups representing tradespeople such as builders, plumbers, and electricians, to place a requirement for forensic marking on power tools used by tradespeople, to prevent theft and re-sale. These concerns were echoed by Members of Parliament when the Bill was debated in the Commons.[1]

The Government is aware of the significant impact theft of tools can have on victims, particularly those who rely on their tools to earn a living. A common area of vulnerability is tradespeople's vans, whereby thieves will target the van and remove the tools to sell on. The loss per theft can be significant when a number of tools are stolen. The *Tradespeople Against Tool Theft White Paper 'On the Tools'*, published in 2022,[2] states that the average UK tradesperson is likely to have between £1,000 and £5,000 worth of tools stolen from them in just one tool theft incident.

We therefore want to use this call for evidence to examine the feasibility of covering tools and larger agricultural equipment in our secondary legislation. Regulations will

1 Equipment Theft (Prevention) Bill - Hansard - UK Parliament Equipment Theft (Prevention) Bill - Hansard - UK Parliament Equipment Theft (Prevention) Bill - Hansard - UK Parliament

2 https://bit.ly/tradesagainsttooltheft

define minimum standards for the immobilisers, forensic marking and the type of database which may be used and the details to be recorded, as well as defining the equipment and tools to which the legislation will apply.

Summary of proposals

We are seeking views on the following matters:

- Definition of ATVs and agricultural equipment
- A requirement for removable Global Positioning Service (GPS) systems to be forensically marked
- Recommended Retail Price (RRP) threshold of tools to be marked
- Specifications of immobiliser, and any implications for type approval
- Specifications for forensic marking
- Specifications for registration on databases

PROPOSALS

A. A REQUIREMENT FOR AGRICULTURAL MACHINERY TO BE FITTED WITH IMMOBILISERS, FORENSICALLY MARKED, AND REGISTERED ON A DATABASE. A REQUIREMENT FOR REMOVABLE GPS TRACKERS TO BE FORENSICALLY MARKED AND REGISTERED ON A DATABASE

This legislation was initially intended to apply to ATVs, including quad bikes, due to the large-scale thefts of these vehicles. The term ATV includes quad bikes, Utility Task Vehicles (UTVs), 'side-by-sides' and buggies. This legislation will not apply to other types of light vehicle such as golf buggies or mobility scooters.

The legal definition for an ATV for the purposes of this legislation can be found at Clause 2(a) of the Bill and is as follows:

2(a) mechanically propelled vehicles that—

I. are designed or adapted primarily for use other than on a road,

II. have an engine capacity of at least 250 cubic centimetres or two kilowatts, and

III. travel on more than two wheels or on tracks.

The Bill provides a power for the Home Secretary to extend the provisions to other equipment designed or adapted primarily for use in agricultural or commercial activities. Having heard the debates in Parliament and discussions from police and the agricultural sector, the Minister for Crime, Policing and Fire, Rt Hon Chris Philp MP stated his intention to include larger agricultural equipment and high-value tradespeople's tools.

The legislation will need to include a definition of agricultural equipment. The types of equipment that are being stolen are tractors, excavators, mini dumpers, road rollers and woodchippers.

We want to ensure the definition used in the legislation covers the relevant equipment without being so broad that it unintentionally captures equipment that does not need to be protected. We recognise there is an overlap between equipment

used in the agricultural, construction and land management industries. It is proposed for the following definition of agricultural machinery to be covered by the legislation: “Mechanically propelled machinery designed or adapted primarily for use in agricultural activities; designed or adapted primarily for use other than on a road”

GPS units used on agricultural machinery are particularly vulnerable to theft. We propose there should be an additional requirement for forensic marking and database registration of GPS units used in agriculture. The requirements would only apply to GPS units that are easily removable. In some cases, the GPS might be integrated into the vehicle by the manufacturer and be very difficult to remove so would be unlikely to require any forensic marking.

Question 1:

Is there any further detail that needs to be added to the legal definition of an ATV as described above and at Clause 2(a) of the Bill, to avoid capturing vehicles that are not intended to be covered by this legislation?

Answer 1:

As a specialist forensic security marking company we feel we are unable to answer this question with any authority. The appropriate Industry Associations or ATV manufacturers of this equipment should provide the information required.

Question 2:

What are the fundamental features of an ATV that distinguish it from other types of vehicles?

Answer 2:

As a specialist forensic security marking company we feel we are unable to answer this question with any authority

Question 3:

“Mechanically propelled machinery designed or adapted primarily for use in agricultural activities; designed or adapted primarily for use other than on a

road" will be required to be fitted with an immobiliser, forensically marked and registered on a database.

Does this definition capture the machinery we aim to protect, without inadvertently capturing machinery it would not be appropriate to include? If not, how should the definition be refined?

Answer 3:

As a specialist forensic security marking company we feel we are unable to answer this question with any authority

Question 4:

Does the definition need to specify any exemptions? For example, are there any vehicles or equipment that would meet the definition but that are not vulnerable to theft and therefore do not need to be covered?

Answer 4:

As a specialist forensic security marking company we feel we are unable to answer this question with any authority

Question 5:

Should the definition of machinery also include a Recommended Retail Price threshold, above which the legislation will apply?

Answer 5:

Yes.

If yes, a) £5,000; b) £10,000; or c) other (please specify):

a) £5,000 as a minimum, but arguably lower

Please provide reasons for your answer:

All types of machinery and equipment are vulnerable to theft and the cost of security solutions are generally minimal compared to the value of an asset. The industry

should adopt best practice to minimise the risk and negative impacts of theft for its consumers. Additionally, in our experience, criminals target items which are not protected with security products such as forensic marking systems hence, our suggestion that ATV's with a lower retail value of £5,000 be included in this Bill.

Question 6:

Are you in favour of a requirement for Global Positioning Systems (GPS) used on agricultural machinery to be forensically marked and registered on a database?

Answer 6:

Yes

Please provide reasons for your answer:

Police reporting has already evidenced large scale theft of GPS systems as defined above. Due to the high value of these units and the ease in which they can be removed from a vehicle, it's essential for these expensive and unvaluable technologies to at least be permanently marked and registered with an approved marking system. The UK Survey Association and key manufacturers such as Leica, TOPCON, Trimble and Hitachi have specified the fitment of forensic marking systems and registration on Datatag's secure and accredited database. Other dealers and leading brands including New Holland and are fitting on request.

B. A REQUIREMENT TO FORENSICALLY MARK

The theft of hand-held power tools has a significant impact on tradespeople's business, such as plumbers, carpenters, and builders. These tradespeople tend to operate as small businesses or sole traders and the theft of tools can therefore have a significant impact on their ability to work.

Tools at the lower end of the price range are sold by a large number of manufacturers and retailers, some of whom are small businesses, for example independent hardware stores, and some operate online only.

In order to define the scope of tools to be covered by the legislation, we propose using the Recommended Retail Price (RRP) as a threshold. This is intended to ensure that the requirement is proportionate and doesn't apply to tools at the lower end of market, which are more likely to be used by the public for DIY. We intend to target the tools used by tradespeople, who are most impacted by tool theft, rather than individuals. We want to avoid unnecessary or disproportionate costs to individuals and businesses including retailers or manufacturers. We propose that tools with an RRP over the specified threshold will be required to be forensically marked and registered on a database before sale.

Question 7:

Where do you think the threshold should be set to require hand-held power tools to be forensically marked and registered on a database prior to sale?

a) £250; b) £500; or c) £750 d) other (please specify)

Answer 7:

Other – minimum £100 to £150

Please provide reasons for your answer:

Many SMEs and tradespeople's tools are of a value of between £100 and £150 per item. Therefore, even at the minimum suggested value of £250, Datatag estimates that a significant majority of tools would not be protected, hence the suggested lower price.

C. THE SPECIFICATIONS FOR IMMOBILISERS AND FORENSIC MARKING AND THE FUNCTIONALITY OF THE DATABASES.

The regulations will specify minimum standards for the immobilisers, forensic marking and the functionality of databases which may be used to meet the requirements of this legislation. The specifications will apply to any equipment or machinery to which the legislation applies.

The legislation will not endorse any particular product, product line or service. For example, a number of forensic marking products and databases are already widely used by the agricultural sector and construction industry. We are seeking to set an appropriate standard that ensures forensic marking is suitable for this purpose, whilst not excluding products unnecessarily.

Immobilisers

An immobiliser is an electronic device that allows a vehicle to start only if the correct key or fob is inserted. Immobilisers are required by law on all passenger cars, but this requirement does not apply to vehicles such as agricultural machinery.

Discussions with ATV manufacturers and trade associations during the development of the Bill suggested Thatcham Category 2 to be the appropriate standard to use as a basis for this requirement. Thatcham Research is a research body funded by the insurance industry and is recognised as the industry expert on vehicle technology.

The regulations will not refer directly to Thatcham Category 2, as it is not a statutory body, and therefore not appropriate for the legislation to refer directly to Thatcham Research or to Thatcham Categories. Instead, they will list the functions the immobiliser must have in order to comply with the legislation.

It is proposed it must be an electronic immobiliser which has the following functions and features:

- A permanently installed system – the whole immobiliser is permanently and securely fixed to the vehicle.
- The main source of power for the immobiliser must be the vehicle's battery.
- It must be passively set. Setting of the immobilisation function may be achieved by the ignition being off; or the ignition key being out of the ignition. Setting of the immobilisation function should be achieved within 60 seconds of the ignition being off and/or the ignition key being out of the ignition. In addition, the setting of the immobiliser may be achieved by a deliberate action or actions by the user.

- The immobiliser should be unset by the application of a coded signal or key to the system; it must not be possible to unset the immobiliser without the specific coded signal or key. This must not be a universal or generic code or key.
- The immobiliser must isolate or block a minimum of two operating circuits or systems; this may be two or more of the following: fuel supply, ignition, starter, engine management system, fuel pump assembly, or fuel cut-off solenoid; or a minimum of one control unit with coded intervention. If only one control unit with coded intervention is used, the control unit cannot be the starter motor, because this would enable the vehicle to be pushed and/or bump-started.
- The immobiliser must be concealed from view and accessible only by the removal of an access panel or trim panel which should require tools to access.
- The user/owner of the vehicle shall have no facility to directly change or override the functionality or performance of the immobiliser system. In particular, it shall not be possible for the user/owner to permanently isolate detectors or change the immobilisation function.
- The immobiliser should be visibly marked with the following information, which should not be visible from the outside of the vehicle:
    - The manufacturer's name or trademark
    - The model number or name
    - The serial number or batch number or date of manufacture.

Question 8:

Manufacturers/dealers: does this cover the appropriate requirements for an immobiliser? Yes / No / to some extent.

Answer 8:

As a specialist forensic security marking company we feel we are unable to answer this question with any authority

If no / to some extent, please provide further detail:

Question 9:

Manufacturers/dealers: Are there any features/functions missing from the list, or any on the list that are not needed? Do these requirements in relation to immobilisers expect you to do something which will be extremely difficult or will cause an increased burden as a result?

Answer 9:

As a specialist forensic security marking company we feel we are unable to answer this question with any authority

Potential impact on the 'type approval' of the vehicle.

Before being placed on the market and registered for use on the road, vehicles including many ATVs require type approval. This is a process used to test the roadworthiness of a vehicle and to demonstrate it complies with the relevant technical standards. Type approval is generally secured by the manufacturer, prior to being released to the dealer. Currently in Great Britain regulations for a full type approval scheme are being developed by the Department for Transport (DfT). In the meantime, a temporary approval scheme is in place for quadricycles intended for road use and manufacturers are required to hold a provisional approval issued by the UK's type approval agency.

To ensure installation of an immobiliser post-production will not invalidate the vehicle's type approval, we propose the regulations will state that the installation of the immobiliser must not invalidate the type approval already granted for the vehicle.

Question 10:

Dealers/manufacturers/retailers: do you foresee that installing the immobiliser will present any problems for the type approval already granted for the vehicle? Yes / No

Answer 10:

As a specialist forensic security marking company we feel we are unable to answer this question with any authority

If yes, what are these and how can they be overcome?

Question 11:

Dealers/manufacturers/retailers: do you foresee that installing the immobiliser will present any problems for your responsibilities under the Supply of Machinery (Safety) Regulations 2008 and/or the manufacturer's responsibilities under the Electromagnetic Compatibility Regulations 2016?

Yes / No

Answer 11:

As a specialist forensic security marking company we feel we are unable to answer this question with any authority

If yes, what are these and how can they be overcome?

Forensic marking

Forensic marking solutions invisibly tag valuable property, allowing it to be traced back to the owner if stolen. The benefit of using forensic marking is that it cannot be removed. Where a vehicle is forensically marked it can still be identified even if the Vehicle Identification Number (VIN) is removed. Microdots and forensic DNA have unique codes embedded in them which refer to the property marking company or database where the owner's information can be found. For example, when a police officer uses a UV light on property that has been marked, the marking will show up with the company utilised and the officer is then able to contact the company to retrieve the owner's details. Each marking kit has a unique DNA code, which is registered to the owner of the property.

It is proposed that ATVs and other agricultural equipment subject to this legislation must be overtly marked using a visible security label and forensically marked using a minimum of two of the techniques set out in column A of the table below.

The techniques used should comply with the standards listed in column B. Visible security labels must also meet the standard of Section 6.5 of BSI Kitemark BS10121. The visible security label will state that the equipment is forensically marked, which system/company has been used, and how to contact that company for details.

Column A	**Column B**
Forensic marking technique	**Standards**
Chemical or laser etching	Section 6.5 of BSI Kitemark BS10121
Stamping or Engraving Microdots and/or forensic DNA.	Section 6.5 of BSI Kitemark BS10121
Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) tags or Near-field Communication (NFC) tags.	Section 6.5 of BSI Kitemark BS10121
UV footprint or tracer.	Section 6.5 of BSI Kitemark BS10121

Question 12:

Manufacturers/dealers/retailers: does this cover the appropriate requirements/features of forensic markings?

Answer 12:

The new standard for the testing of forensic marking products is BS 10121-1:2022. The BSI Kitemark is a totally separate standard which runs independently of the new asset marking standard. Therefore, the above table is misleading since it lists as one the two distinct standards; BSI Kitemark and BS10121. The reference to BSI Kitemark should therefore be removed as this standard does not relate to the testing of the products listed.

The table of technologies in this document is not a true representation of the BS 10121-1:2022, the correct table of technologies has been inserted below for ease of reference.

Technology	Type	Attributes
Etching/engraving	A, C, D, I	Characters shall be legible to the naked eye.
Chemical (UV) etching	B, J	The material shall be readable with a UV light.
Microdots/forensic marking	E, F	The material shall be readable only with specialist equipment and attached to the marked item with an adhesive solution which contains a UV tracer to locate the mark. *NOTE 1 Where a UV tracer is not used, a note of the marked location should be noted in the SAR.*
RFID	G	The asset marked with a RFID transponder shall be readable when in the vicinity of a reader. *NOTE 2 A note of the marked location can be noted in the SAR.*
Security labels	H, I, J	The labels shall have a security feature, i.e. anti-destruction or anti-counterfeit measures. *NOTE 3 Examples of the anti-counterfeit measures might be holographic or covert mark or forensic coding material within the label.* Anti-counterfeit measures shall take into account client requirements, asset value, etc. Labels shall be tamper-evident when removed or attempts are made to remove. *NOTE 4 This might leave a permanent chemical etched or UV footprint on removal (recognized covert feature).*
Stamping	K	The depth of characters shall be a minimum of 0.5 mm.

Under the current proposed requirements and selection of grouped identification technologies in the table provided in this document, it would be possible for a manufacturer to select a very basic forensic marking system, potentially easily defeated or compromised and thereby allowing the integrity and the purpose of the Bill to be completely undermined.

For example, this Call for Evidence refers above to “a unique DNA code”, yet the table shows the DNA element as ‘optional’. The reason that Datatag uses a unique DNA code is because a unique forensic DNA is seen as critical as a final ID technology to prove beyond doubt the original identity of the equipment, machine or

vehicle should other "layers" or types of ID, stamping and technology be tampered with or removed.

The table also combines ‘Stamping or Engraving’ with ‘Microdots and/or forensic DNA’. Stamping and engraving are two separate marking technologies and should be treated as such. Most assets already come with some element of stamping or engraving; VIN or engine numbers as examples, provided by the manufacturer. Microdots are generally an additional security technology which may or may not contain a unique forensic DNA element in the adhesive they are applied by.

The requirements of the current Official CESAR forensic marking system were defined after consultation with what was then ACPO (now NPCC), various Police Services and departments including the Stolen Vehicle Unit of the Metropolitan Police Service, and in conjunction with the Home Office, The Plant Theft Action Group and trade associations representing the construction industry. This, after a rigorous and competitive tender process, resulted in the combination of technologies found in the existing system. The combination of technologies was also determined with the type of asset in mind, e.g. a hand tool requires fewer technologies to protect it compared to a large excavator or tractor.

The official industry CESAR Scheme marking system currently utilises three technologies in addition to two (in construction) or four (in agricultural) primary tamper evident, highly visible security registration plates / ID labels, depending on the asset to be marked. These can be read in normal daylight conditions from a distance of up to 100 metres. Other technologies include securely encrypted RFID transponders, microdots suspended in a UV trace adhesive and a unique forensic DNA code per machine or vehicle. Therefore, any proposal or system introduced not using a combination of technologies equal to those that were stipulated by the Police when the official CESAR Scheme was launched would be considered a backward step and would assist criminals.

In 2023, approximately 90% of agricultural and construction equipment machinery introduced by the majority of leading brands into the marketplace are already fitted with the official CESAR Security Scheme technologies, as referenced in the explanatory notes to the Bill (“90% of the CEA’s membership already voluntarily include these (forensic marking) as standard on their machinery.” HL Bill 112). This has resulted in a secure and highly accredited database with over 600,000 machines fitted and registered with these technologies since 2007

In essence, it is essential that a comprehensive multi layered marking system is adopted under the requirements of the Bill. It would follow, therefore, that the CESAR Scheme and its requirements, which are already referred to in the explanatory notes to the Bill, (HL Bill 112-EN 58/3) should be recommended as the minimum requirements. Anything less would be a dilution of what the industry and market has already adopted.

Question 13:

Manufacturers/dealers/retailers: Are there any features/functions missing from the list, or any on the list that are not needed?

Answer 13:

Stamping and engraving is not deemed to be a requirement for a forensic marking system designed to enhance the security of equipment or machinery as manufacturers often utilise such methods to mark their equipment with VIN or chassis numbers and experience has shown that these markers can be readily ground off or altered.

Question 14:

Do these requirements in relation to forensic markings expect you to do something which will be extremely difficult or will cause an increased burden as a result?

Answer 14:

As the delivery partner for the official industry CESAR Scheme, our experience has shown that fitment of the technologies in a CESAR system is simple and can take as little as 7 - 10 minutes. Since there is no requirement to undertake any work to the wiring system of a machine the installation process is very straightforward. The end consumer is not typically impacted by the installation of the forensic marking contained within the CESAR system as the selling manufacturer has to date fitted the system before handover of the machine to the end customer.

Database registration

Companies which provide forensic marking also operate databases to record details of the forensic marking and owner's contact details. Police officers are able to access these databases at any time in order to ascertain if they are dealing with a stolen item.

It is proposed the owner's information will be registered on the database maintained by the company whose forensic marking product has been used.

There will not be an ongoing responsibility for the manufacturer, dealership, or retailer to keep the owner's details up to date as we believe this would place a disproportionate burden on businesses. Even where information on the database is out of date, for example if the item has been sold to a subsequent owner who has then not updated their details on the database, the information can still assist police with their enquiries.

It is proposed the details to be recorded in the database are:

- The name and address of the owner (including where the owner is a business)
- The contact telephone number (if any) of the owner
- The make, model, and colour of the equipment
- The nature and location of the forensic marks applied to the equipment
- The date on which the owner bought the equipment.

The regulations will specify that this information must be held on an online database, and the information must be available at all times to police and law enforcement agencies.

Question 15:

Manufacturers/dealers/retailers/forensic marking companies: does this include all the information that should be recorded?

Answer 15:

NO

If no, what else do you think should be included?

The list of fields for the owner or keeper of the equipment should both a landline and mobile telephone number, particularly in the case of a business. Additionally, in the current climate of business being transacted online rather than via telephone, it would be advisable to list an email address for the company or individual.

The list of fields included for the asset fails to capture a number of critical fields for the effective identification of the machinery or equipment. The purpose of forensic marking is not only to deter theft but also to assist law enforcement in establishing the true identity of the equipment, especially since the criminal fraternity and OCGs will routinely remove or deface original identifying marks from the manufacturer. Therefore, it is imperative that the list of fields includes the following

- VIN / chassis / serial number as these are essential identifiers of any asset.
- engine number in the case of self-propelled equipment, is also a key identifier for law enforcement.

Other identifying serial numbers would also assist law enforcement.

The word “owner” should be substituted for “keeper” as per DVLA wording.

As part of the official industry CESAR Scheme Police officers regularly make use of the Datatag 24-hour secure contact centre to avail themselves of additional guidance and advice when endeavouring to identify equipment suspected of being stolen.

It is important that the type and location of the marks, should be not readily available to members of the public but should only be supplied to law enforcement with a legitimate interest.

Finally, a database containing such personal and critical equipment data should be accredited to the highest database standard. This is currently LPS issue 1224 issue 3 accredited and audited by BRE Global.

(https://www.redbooklive.com/download/pdf/LPS1224.pdf) the operator of the database company should also hold ISO 9001 and 27001 accreditations for quality management and information security respectively.

To conclude

We would like to hear any further thoughts you may have on the information and questions within this document. We would especially welcome any further input from manufacturers, retailers, and dealerships on the practicalities of the proposals within this consultation document.

Question 16:

Do you foresee any practical implications or unforeseen consequences of the legislation proposed in this call for evidence?

Answer 16:

Commenting solely on the forensic marking and database aspect of the proposed legislation, the only negative consequence of the implementation of the Bill would be to inadvertently lessen the impact of the existing industry supported scheme which has been in place since 2007 by potentially opening the market to weaker, less robust marking solutions potentially from companies that are also not suitably accredited.

Question 17:

Overall are you in favour of the proposed legislation?

Answer 17:

Yes, overall Datatag is in favour of the proposed legislation as the problem of theft affects all sectors and forensic marking has been seen to be effective in deterring theft of marked assets and in aiding law enforcement with identification and recovery of stolen assets. The number of assets recorded as stolen as a percentage of assets

forensically marked with CESAR and listed on the secure database is less than 1%, thereby demonstrating its powerful deterrent effect.

Question 18:

Please indicate which sector you are from or work in (retail, manufacturer, law enforcement etc)

Answer 18:

Datatag ID Ltd is the service provider for the official construction and agriculture industry CESAR Scheme. Datatag has specialised in forensic marking for over 30 years in the market sectors of motorcycles, cycles, trailers power tools and more.

Datatag technologies are the chosen security marking technologies for many industry backed schemes including

- the motorcycle industry
- the marine industry
- and the personal watercraft industry

Datatag is accredited to the following standards

- ISO9001
- ISO27001
- LPS1224; Issue3
- BS10121(in process of testing to meet this standard)
- Secured by Design (Official Police security initiative)

Datatag is a member of the following Associations and groups

- British Security Industry Association
- Motorcycle Industry Association
- British Marine Federation - BMF

- Personal Watercraft Partnership
- The Bicycle Association
- Combined Industries Theft Solutions – CITS
- Motorcycle Crime Reduction Group - MCRG
- Hire Association Group Europe - HAE
- Construction Plant Hirers Association – CPA
- European Rental Association – ERA
- International Association of Auto Theft Investigators – IAATI
- Vehicle Crime Investigators Association - VCI

Please see attached testimonials from Police and news and social media reports on vehicle recoveries facilitated by Datatag technologies.