

[News story: Education Secretary visits School of the Year](#)

Education Secretary Justine Greening heard first-hand how the transformation of a school in Romford from the bottom 10% to the top 1% in the country has changed its pupils' lives.

[Broadford Primary School](#) hosted the visit on Thursday 30 November after it was crowned 'School of the Year' at the 2017 TES Schools Awards.

Meeting with pupils and teachers, the Education Secretary saw how the school, which rose from Special Measures in 2011 to Outstanding in 2014, gained this prestigious accolade.

To help raise standards the school introduced a training programme for phonics to help improve literacy levels for pupils, and has started a coaching scheme for its teachers to support their career development. Since July last year it has been a National Teaching School, helping to share its example of best practice with schools across the country.

As a result of the hard work of teachers like those at Broadford Primary School and the government's reforms, there are now 1.9 million more children being taught in schools that are rated good or outstanding than in 2010.

Secretary of State for Education Justine Greening said:

We want all children to get a world-class education and help create a Britain that is fit for the future. We already have 1.9 million more children in good or outstanding schools than in 2010 – standards are continuing to rise and by sharing best practice and celebrating excellence in our schools we can continue to build on this success.

Broadford Primary is a deserving winner of the TES School of the Year 2017 award. It has been a pleasure to meet with pupils and teachers today and to see how their hard work has transformed this truly outstanding school. We want every child to reach their potential, wherever they are growing up having access to a highly quality education – like that offered at Broadford – is at the heart of our ambition.

The TES School Awards ensure great schools are recognised for their efforts, and Broadford Primary is a deserving winner of School of the Year 2017.

Malcolm Drakes, Executive Headteacher at Broadford & Mead Primary said:

At Broadford Primary our vision is to ensure that no child's future is limited by their background. To be able to show Justine Greening the different strategies that we have used to raise aspirations and outcomes for some of Havering's most vulnerable pupils was a real privilege. For the Secretary of State to take the time to talk to teachers, listen to pupils and demonstrate a very clear understanding of some practical ways we can improve our system for the benefit of the most vulnerable was so encouraging.

Our Learning Federation has promoted meaningful links with businesses like Bloomberg and PwC. To hear today about the Skills Summit and the Department for Education's efforts to make these links more structured is very positive. To provide a golden thread all the way through a child's education, linking their experiences and lessons to future employment will only aid mobility.

Now in its ninth year, the [TES awards](#), which are run by the TES, a news outlet for the profession, recognise the outstanding contributions made by schools and teachers. Broadford Primary School was celebrated for its achievements at a gala event at London's Grosvenor House earlier this year.

Press release: UK-Taiwan trade talks boost agriculture, energy and pharmaceutical industries

UK – Taiwan bilateral trade grew to £5.35 billion last year and Ministers want to continue strengthening trade links. In today's talks (1 December), held in London, Ministers agreed to set up new sector 'dialogues' on trade in agriculture and energy.

They also signed an agreement to make it easier for UK specialist medicines to be used in Taiwan, and agree to build on the UK's £176 million of financial services exports to Taiwan last year.

The talks come on the same day that Taiwan's China Airlines' new London to Taipei flight begins, re-establishing a direct route between the UK and Taiwan for the first time in 5 years.

International Trade Minister Greg Hands said:

With its vibrant economy and thriving consumer base, Taiwan presents huge opportunities for British companies to strengthen our trade links. Exports to Taiwan grew 21% in the last 5 years, and

there's room for more growth as we satisfy Taiwan's demand for quality British goods like Scotch Whisky.

Our new trade dialogues in agriculture and energy will offer UK expertise in leading industries and I look forward to continuing to work together closely further deepen our trade and investment links.

During the talks, an agreement was signed which will make it easier for UK and Taiwanese businesses in biotechnology and pharmaceutical fields to protect their intellectual property. This will support leading UK industries like pharmaceuticals, helping companies export products like cutting-edge genetic medicines to Taiwan knowing their rights will be protected.

The new dialogues on agriculture and energy will also bring big opportunities to UK companies. Taiwan plans to increase its renewable energy production from 4% to 20% of supply by 2025, much of it from offshore wind farms, and as the world's leading offshore wind producer, the UK is poised to be a key partner in this.

The new agricultural dialogue is also a boost for UK farmers as Taiwan is the largest per-capita pork consumer in Asia. Both Ministers used the talks to underline their commitment to resolving the remaining steps that would see Taiwan lift its ban on British pork as soon as possible.

The ministers also agreed to deepen links between the UK and Taiwan's leading financial sectors, building on the UK's £176 million of financial services exports to Taiwan last year. In particular, the UK will offer its expertise in financing renewable energy projects and fintech development in Taiwan.

Vice Minister of Economic Affairs Mei-Hua Wang said:

The UK and Taiwan have a very strong trade and investment relationship, and as the UK leaves the EU, Taiwan looks forward both to strengthening bilateral trade flows and to expanding mutual cooperation. We have confidence in the UK economy, the world's fifth largest, and we consider it one of the priority destinations for Taiwanese investment in Europe.

We also hope more UK investors make use of Taiwan's excellent investment environment in the Asia-Pacific region. I look forward to working further with Minister of State Greg Hands and I hope we can together unlock new business opportunities and resolve our trade issues, including the UK's outstanding applications on agricultural exports to Taiwan.

Notes to editors

1. The first UK Taiwan trade talks took place in 1991 and have happened almost annually since.

2. UK-Taiwan bilateral trade grew to £5.35 billion in 2016, supported by a 60% growth in UK services exports to Taiwan in the last 5 years.
3. Taiwan is the third largest market for single malt whisky exports and the fourth largest overall worth £175 million in 2016.

Further information

Contact the DIT Media and Digital Team on 020 7215 2000

Follow us: [@tradegovuk](https://twitter.com/tradegovuk), [gov.uk/dit](https://www.gov.uk/dit)

[Press release: Green light for new Kent motorway junction](#)

Junction 10a will serve communities and businesses around Ashford, improving journeys by relieving pressure on the existing junction 10 and helping boost growth and jobs in the area.

Transport Secretary Chris Grayling announced the decision in a letter to the Planning Inspectorate, who reviewed the plans last winter. Today's news paves the way for construction work to begin early next year.

Chris Welby-Everard, Regional Delivery Director for Highways England in the South East said:

This major new motorway junction is the biggest boost for Ashford since the arrival of international rail services nearly 20 years ago. Junction 10a will unlock job-creating developments in the local area and will take pressure off the existing junction 10. It will bring jobs, better infrastructure for local services and help maintain the quality of life in and around Ashford.

Without Junction 10a in place, future economic growth would have been constrained. Today's news will bring real confidence that we will have the road capacity needed to enable a major programme of economic and commercial development and house building.

I am grateful to all the local authorities and stakeholders in the area who have worked with us to gain this planning consent, including the 900 local people who took part in our consultation last year. We will continue to work closely with our partners going forward, especially people with homes and businesses nearest to the proposed new junction.

The new junction is part of the Government's record £15 billion investment in

major roads. Junction 10a will be constructed about half a mile south of the existing junction 10. It will use two bridges and connect to the existing A20 and a new dual carriageway link road built to the A2070 near Sevington.

Work on the improvements will begin early next year and the new junction is expected to open to traffic in 2019.

General enquiries

Members of the public should contact the Highways England customer contact centre on 0300 123 5000.

Media enquiries

Journalists should contact the Highways England press office on 0844 693 1448 and use the menu to speak to the most appropriate press officer.

Speech: The long and winding road – the humble number plate

Hello, it's great to be invited back to speak at this meeting.

This is my fourth year as Surveillance Camera Commissioner and third time back at this conference.

Many of you will recall that first conference when I challenged the police on three counts;

- what is your legislative mandate to conduct ANPR?
- what is your governance of 9000 cameras?
- why is your transparency so opaque?

In essence, where is your legitimacy? – a crucial ingredient for the public to have confidence in not just what you do, but why you do it, how you do it and how you protect the civil liberties of our citizens.

Last year I raised the issue of data quality and type approval cameras. This year I have decided to, yes – do it again. Let me first acknowledge that there has been progress made against those challenges under the leadership of Assistant Chief Constable Paul Kennedy and Chief Constable Hall.

For those not familiar with my role as Surveillance Camera Commissioner I will firstly provide a brief resume.

Secondly, I will explain where I see ANPR currently, with a brief reflection from where you have come and a look to the future;

Finally, I'd like to touch upon the National Surveillance Camera strategy which I launched in March 2017.

My role:

A little background about my role as Surveillance Camera Commissioner :

- it was created under the Protection of Freedoms Act 2012
- I was appointed by the Home Secretary but am independent from government. My commission was extended for a further term of 3 years last March
- the role covers England and Wales
- I'm entrusted to ensure that surveillance camera systems are used to support and protect communities – not spy on them
- the Surveillance Camera Code of Practice was issued by the Secretary of State and contains 12 guiding principles which if followed will mean cameras are only ever used proportionately, transparently and effectively
- surveillance camera systems which fall within my remit are those operated overtly in public spaces in England and Wales by 'relevant authorities' and include CCTV, ANPR. Body worn cameras, helicopter/drone- borne cameras, dash cams, indeed more. The surveillance camera system definition goes beyond simply the camera itself and extends to the analytic systems, monitoring and storage media, reference systems, automatic facial recognition systems and indeed any technology which is integrated with those systems

My primary role is three fold, to:

- encourage compliance with the code
- review the operation of the code
- advise on any amendments to how the code should develop- Review of Impact of Code (recommendations made within that re ANPR)
- annual parliament report which was laid before parliament last week
- in addition chapter 5 of the SC code describes how I may regulate

How does it work

Well – 'relevant authorities'-police, local authorities, PCCs, NCA and non-designated police forces – must be able to demonstrate that they have addressed their statutory 'duty to have regard' to the code. It is a requirement of the Protection of Freedoms Act 2012.

Organisations who are not 'relevant authorities' are encouraged to voluntarily adopt the code. The code also considers your obligations as data controller under the provisions of the Data Protection Act.

So ANPR

ANPR in the UK must surely be one of the largest data gatherers of its citizens in the world. Mining of meta-data – overlaying against other data bases can arguably be far more intrusive than communication intercept in some

circumstances.

Drawing as my previous experience in the police, retiring as a Commander National Coordinator Pursue for the police service throughout the Olympics, I get operating in a benign environment and also consequence management – policing by consent or as the secretary of state's code refers to it, surveillance by consent. This is shorthand for 'get your system right, make it transparent, make it bullet proof in terms of integrity' and above all be transparent in terms of your legitimacy – your basis in law for doing what you do, your case of necessity, your balance of proportionality and a demonstrable assessment of both intended and collateral intrusion risk.

Yes what you do is profoundly important to protecting the public from some of the most serious risks facing communities today. But what you do is also profoundly intrusive and in a proud and civilised western democracy the public also need protection from disproportionate and unjustified intrusion by the state.

The secretary of state's code specifically states that I will be a source of advice as to the validation of such systems .

And so – lets start with the humble number plate!

The number plate is what this conference is all about.

In the language of the mnemonic – it puts the 'NP' in ANPR – without an accurate 'NP' (number plate), you have no accurate 'R' (recognition) – no matter how sophisticated your 'A' (automation) is!

When you distil it into its component parts – that's largely it, isn't it? If this bit isn't right it is your first point of failure, the consequences of which may be significant. Do you agree? As a former firearm commander and Counter Terrorism commander I can assure you ladies and gentlemen that if I am deploying officers with a lethal force option on the basis of an intelligence case which may include ANPR data....I certainly agree!

The stats

According to the NPCC fact sheet the national ANPR infrastructure grabs 25 to 40 million reads a day – 20 billion a year? 20 billion what – yes – you're getting it – number plates.

Now – I hear figures being quoted of ANPR accuracy of more than 97 percent, now that doesn't sound bad does it. But that is still, if the NPCC figures are to be believed, between 750,000 and 1.2 million misreads per day – so what actually is your tolerance for inaccuracy? What about the operational commanders in the room?.

Now some of the causational factors of misreads and missed reads of number plates are arguably beyond your control, particularly where the qualitative standards which govern number plate production and use are concerned. I know you are working hard on the issues which you can improve on....and I am determined to work hard on those you cannot.

I asked these questions last year!

1. If this database is to be acceptable how important is it that its accurate?
2. Has there ever been any adequate and deeply meaningful programme of sampling of information held in NADC or in local force servers?
3. And if there has, why is it that I have had to work so hard to unearth any form of meaningful empirical ANPR generated evidence that I can put under the noses of those who regulate the manufacture and testing of number plates and convince them that there is a problem here beyond the wherewithal of the police – which they DVLA/DVSA are not yet effectively contributing to a solution.

If this data is to be accurate what are the key determinants for that to happen – quality of camera (type approval), quality of installation? Quality of number plates being recorded?

A bit on cyber

Here is a challenge – how comprehensive and meaningful is your strategy to ensure that your national surveillance system is resilient to cyber attacks now, and in the future resilient to individual and state actors to access and manipulate or steal?

Under the umbrella of my strategy I am setting standards which will hopefully prevent the manufacture and sale of camera hardware and software with a proven past cyber vulnerability. I am advocating regular cyber intrusion testing of systems, to make sure cyber defences are up to speed and if not, are suitably patched, I am advocating appropriate cyber awareness and disciplines amongst camera operators to make sure a busy dedicated operative does not stick a pen drive in to a system and infect it, to make sure that operators know a cyber attack when they see one, and what to do about it. I could go on – you get the message.

So – is ANPR working properly ...legitimately?

ANPR is hot wired across society – it was previously a traffic management device that had a parallel use to support criminal intelligence operations. Its utility was recognised.

Now HMG raises vehicle revenue from it, enforces MOT and insurance enforcement and supports the private parking industry. (still I might add – no democratic oversight from Parliament)

Turning to the Surveillance Camera Code of Practice and the guiding principles within it; principle 8 – Surveillance camera system operators should consider any approved operational, technical and competency standards

relevant to a system and its purpose and work to meet and maintain standards.

Principle 12 – any information used to support a surveillance camera system which compares against a reference database for matching purposes should be accurate and kept up to date.

Now I know that all forces must comply with Standards 1 and 2 (data standards and infrastructure standards) respectively to connect to the NAI.

Last year I said, and I will reiterate here, that I understand currently NADC accept all data fed into their system when there must be some doubt that some forces cameras are not set up correctly. Such cameras should be excluded but who polices this? Perhaps the NASP standard is more a site acceptance test and does not constitute a product standard. I know industry believes NASP should have gone further and be developed into a performance standard that ANPR equipment should be tested and certified to meet prior to purchase.

In the current economic climate, there is significant pressure on organisations like the police and LEAs to purchase economically, and there is a risk that they will be offered equipment at an attractive price with claims that it is fit for their purposes where in reality it may not be. Once equipment has been purchased however, it is in the interests of both the vendor and the purchaser to get the equipment through the NASP test in order to bring it into service.

It is industry's view that the lack of rigour in the NASP test (it might be described as a "quick look see" test) enables it to be passed by equipment that does not necessarily meet all of the purchaser's requirements. As a result, the quality of the data delivered may be lower than required, with the consequential detriment to the purchaser's operations and to the protection of the public.

I am delighted to hear at this conference that the new national standards are still being worked upon and will further strengthen the operation – I look forward to seeing the details.

So therefore the importance of compliance with those standards and in particular the need for regular performance monitoring / evaluation and annual testing is imperative but the question lurks – is this enough? And how is it policed?

The police must robustly rebut the contention from industry about a lack of 'rigour'. Equally they should be in a position to rebut similar concerns from the public. They must evidence policing of the system is robust.

What performance monitoring – qualitative and quantitative – is carried out during the day and at night as required under the standard?

How do forces check for poor performing ANPR systems?

A key concern for me – is do we / you, fully understand the volume of misreads or missed reads on the database and the key underlying causes – ' in my experience these are not quantified to the extent that the public or

indeed regulators..would expect'.

In my opinion in the interests of legitimacy – in the interests of transparency – I said last year that this is a key and urgent piece of work for the police to undertake. Extract data from the NADC to help explain the picture relating to accuracy? But it's costly to do that!!

Well could somebody please tell me the totality of the cost of the ANPR system, cameras, officers to deploy, buildings to house back office, cost of NADC development, electricity, storage of data, installation, performance measurement of 8500 cameras – and then please tell me it isn't worth doing?

Help me out – how does the cost of success stack up against the cost of failure?

Quality of number plates

ANPR depends more or less absolutely on the quality of number plates it captures. The whole infrastructure, I would argue, is predicated against the fact that number plates does what it says on the plate – allows you to read the number! If they are frustrated by their design or people easily circumventing capture by screwing a deceptive screw between a 1 and a 1 making an H – then who should be concerned? Arguments have been advanced that the number of people manufacturing number plates should be limited. I think there is an argument to say that, production of number plates is so integral to the system – that even stricter controls need to be applied – akin to production of driving licences and passports – thereby providing the authorities with powers of examination and seizure.

So – we all know dodgy number plates can defeat the system, I understand there are 1000s of number plate suppliers in the UK. This, in an unregulated environment which seems tailor made to defeat the system. But the first imperative is understanding the position and the impact of manipulation of number plates. This is where an open and transparent review needs to be conducted-without which how can change be promoted. Intrinsically I am not naturally born to more and more regulation!

It was Winston Churchill who once said, "If you make ten thousand regulations you destroy all respect for the law" – House of Commons, 3 February 1949.

And who would argue with his wisdom?

However my concern around ANPR, its size and scale, its impact on the citizen, demands greater control to prevent inaccurate data reads – I don't think the police can do this, I don't think that the police should be expected to do this. I do think placing ANPR on a statutory footing can easily bring about this type of regulation. I will support any reasonable effort by the police to exert this pressure.

So what have I done?

I have convened a work group of Industry specialists, NMA representatives, DVSA, DVLA, Home Office Cast , Home office policy – ANPR.

Why – because it's important this system has integrity and they have key responsibilities which play in to the problem and the solution.

I have asked Home Office ANPR Policy team to research the misreads and missed reads issue to get an evidential, rather than anecdotal foundation on which to address the problem.

I have gleaned from Home Office research with police forces, there could be as much as a 3 percent error rate attributable to poor, delaminated, poorly constructed, difficult to read, ill-fitted plates. 3 percent of 20 to 25 million captures a day could equate to 75000 to 1.25 million misreads a day. I am very bothered by this. Very bothered indeed, because I know that errors on the hot list could negatively impact on the citizen.

Next who is responsible for this error rate continuing police for on road enforcement? DVSA for MOT standards when considering the quality of a number plate? DVLA for non introduction of a 3rd party certification process to better regulate manufacturers of number plates? – Industry standards? Manufacturers? Procurers? Installers?

Consultants to ensure cyber resilient and cyber savvy infrastructure and disciplines? The answer of course is 'all of the above'. This isn't a silo issue – it's a system issue and has to be addressed as such.

I have my fifth meeting this year to achieve my first objective of this whole system approach – that is to deal with the MOT issue and seek support to amend the wording of the MOT test standard where number plates are concerned to strengthen the test.

Running alongside this I am keen to explore stronger standards re certification (BS 145 has been introduced but is not mandatory).

So baby steps. Next term I look at type approval and related issues.

But it is appropriate that I acknowledge what you the police are doing. You have very determined and talented people working this problem on your behalf (as well as those in the Home Office). In Chief Constable Hall, his predecessor Paul Kennedy, and John Dwyer, to name but a few there has been tangible and demonstrable commitment to rise to the challenges which I have set.

I know that a defining characteristic of policing is that you always make things happen for good despite sometimes monumental challenges, and of course I acknowledge the overwhelming sense of determination in you to get things right. You have other challenges down the line with new data protection laws and GDPR, but a recent development in resolving a fundamental question of data retention periods, something which has inexplicably rumbled on for years, I think is an encouraging symptom of progress and one which I hope will stand you in good stead for the challenges to come.

In conclusion therefore:

The National Surveillance Camera strategy is working with police to drive up

standards. A survey of all police forces in England and Wales has delivered a 100 percent response – the compliance by police forces with their PoFA responsibilities to ANPR is 95 percent.

ANPR has greater capacity to move towards integrated platforms – indeed it was considered as such for the LEADS Home Office approach which I now understand is on hold.

Compliance with PoFA, DPA and new legislation coming in in 2018 is key and central to my regulatory approach.

Engagement with fellow regulators – ICO, IPCO and HMIC will continue to strengthen.

Thank you, and I look forward to seeing great progress over the course of the coming year in terms of transparency, compliance and engagement with the public on the use of ANPR.

Press release: Berkshire boater prosecuted for keeping unregistered vessel on Thames

This is contrary to the requirements of Article 4(1)(a) of the Environment Agency (Inland Waterways) Order 2010.

The defendant pleaded guilty at Reading Magistrates Court on Friday 17 November 2017, and was ordered to pay £797.65 to the Environment Agency in respect of unpaid registration fees and a victim surcharge of £20. Mr Gardener-Collins was given a conditional discharge for a period of 12 months and warned by the magistrates that if he offended again during the 12 month period, he could be re-sentenced for this offence.

A compensation order was made in the sum of £597.65 and the defendant agreed to pay £200 directly to the Environment Agency and provide the necessary documentation to enable the vessel to be registered for the remainder of 2017.

Mr Gardener-Collins' vessel UBIQUE II (also known as UBIQUE) was spotted by an Environment Agency Waterways Officer without a valid registration on Tuesday 21 February 2017 downstream from Cleeve Lock on the River Thames. The boat was served with a registration enforcement notice and the defendant was made fully aware, both verbally and in writing, that he was legally required to register his boat and failing to do so would risk prosecution.

Despite ample advice and guidance from waterways officers and acknowledgement

from Mr Gardener-Collins of receipt of the Environment Agency's boat registration direct-debit forms, the defendant had still not applied by June 2017 and therefore his boat remained unregistered for 2017.

The Inland Waterways Order 2010 requires all vessels 'kept' or 'used' on the River Thames, to be registered with the Environment Agency and display a valid annual boat registration plate (similar to a vehicle tax disc).

The Environment Agency carries out checks along all 135 miles of the navigable non-tidal River Thames to ensure that all boats kept or used on it have a valid registration plate. It takes enforcement action against all those that don't.

It also takes enforcement action against a wide range of other offences relating to boating, often working as part of a multi-agency approach with the police and local councils.

Nick McKie-Smith, Environment Agency Waterways Operations Manager for compliance, said:

All boats must have valid registration, boat safety certificate and minimum third party insurance at all times. Boaters must renew their annual registrations each year for the Environment Agency waterway they want to keep or use their boat on. If they need to renew their registration for 2018 then they must do so before 1 January. For genuine visiting boats it is also possible to buy a visitor registration for shorter periods.

The income we raise from boat registration is vital. It helps fund every aspect of the service our specialist River Thames Waterways Operations team provides to enable safe boating on all 135 miles of the non-tidal Thames. This includes maintaining and repairing 45 sets of locks and weirs – many of which are important heritage features – as well as providing a range of facilities to help enhance boaters' experience while out on the river. By not complying, we lose vital revenue, which hinders our ability to maintain the high standards of service we set ourselves, and which our customers expect.

Owners of boats not displaying valid registration plates could face prosecution, so it is important that they are aware of and adhere to this requirement. Ignorance is not an excuse.

[Further information on how to register a boat.](#)