

There is something else I need to contribute, I would be very grateful if you could pass this on. **Once again I urge all of those addressed / copied to read this.**

The evidence that is available allows me to derive what has been going on at Dorset Police with some considerable confidence.

Lets' start with some numbers:

In 2010/11, over 20,000 people attended the driver awareness course, and the course fee was raised from £70 to £100. If there are 250 working days in the year, that means 80 a day, about 40 for each of the morning and afternoon sessions. This is some serious throughput, the economies of scale really kick in.

So how much **should** it cost to run the course? A quick google found that you could hire for example the Cygnets Conference Room and Restaurant (Capacity 130 theatre style) at Weymouth College for £180 per day, way more than needed. Even this would only come to £47,000 a year, and yet Dorset Police are claiming more than 3 times this for "premises", (hence my enquiries about premises costs). **It even includes a computer and projector, so no need to spend £71,000 on "IS services" !!!**

A salary of £50,000 is about £200 per day. So even if you had 4 people permanently delivering courses on a salary of £50k with 40 attendees at a time, this would be £800 per day.

So with a bit of fine tuning and care / bulk discount negotiation etc., it should easily be possible to get the cost down to £1000 per day to deliver the course, including premises, staff, materials, admin, tea and biscuits, etc.

But 80 people paying £100 produces £8000 a day. So the profit is actually about £7000, with a cost of £1000, **700%, yes, SEVERN HUNDRED PERCENT.**

So the very last thing Dorset Police needed was someone asking them about course costs / profits. If this happened, they would either have to:

1. Tell the truth – and if they were keeping costs reasonable, that would mean admitting totally obscene profits, if not, the inefficiencies / waste / incompetence would become apparent, either way something that would produce public outrage and possibly the end of the game.
2. Falsify i.e. vastly exaggerate the costs to try to hide the profits. High risk but if they could manage to prevent the detail from getting out, they could just get away with it altogether.

So when I asked, on the 26th April 2011, "Could you please detail to me the COST OF PROVISION of the course (per person), and what makes this up?" I'm quite sure the alarm bells started ringing. Every possible attempt would have to be made to dodge this one. Initially, there were delays and then Dorset Police went completely quiet, completely refusing to answer my enquiries about how the request was going. Even Annette Brooke MP was asking the same questions but not getting adequate answers (<http://www.dorsetspeed.org.uk/news/sog70.aspx>) After many months of this the Information Commissioner told them they must answer.

It seems that they chose option 2 above, even with these false and exaggerated costs, bringing a profit of 150%, pushing the envelope of what the public would find acceptable but perhaps not actually breaking it.

Perhaps they were hoping I was stupid enough not to see that the top level costs they gave were completely ridiculous but they should have known better. I asked for the detail.

Dorset Police were now in VERY SERIOUS TROUBLE. They had almost certainly lied under freedom of information, and their whole “road safety” empire was at risk of being seen for sure as a scam, the consequences too awful to think about. Once again, it seems they had 2 choices:

1. Come clean, try to limit the damage, start putting the whole thing right, but with what had **already happened**, difficult to come out of it with any kind of credibility or public trust.
2. With little to lose, simply dig the deep hole they were already in massively deeper. Fiercely protect the damaging information that would expose them, and shut down enquires into costs by declaring the person asking vexatious.

It seems again they chose option 2, perhaps again hoping that would put a lid on it. **Now the problem was too big to fail (a bit like the banks).**

So when the Information Commissioner got involved again, either it was too easily persuaded to protect Dorset Police, or DP put some serious pressure on IC to protect it. Now the IC had jumped into the same hole and was helping DP to dig. Then with a police force and the IC at risk, it seems the appeal had no choice but to jump in with them, almost lemming style, producing pitiful reasons for the decision quite clearly based only on the result that was absolutely essential now for DP and IC.

While all this was on-going, I was also progressing a formal complaint against Dorset Police, about the course money and a few other things, based on this article <http://www.dorsetspeed.org.uk/news/sog102.aspx> . This experienced the same kind of communications shutdown / avoidance techniques that my FOI enquiries were: The original complaint was ignored. I escalated it to the Chief Constable (then Martin Baker). It was ignored again. I escalated it to the IPCC who had it looked at by the Chairman of the Professional Standards and Diversity Committee Colin Weston. He ignored it as well. I referred it back to the IPCC and they upheld the complaint (I am waiting for the outcome of this).

This is where we are now. So what we see once again is a suggested scenario which fits with total precision the evidence and events that have occurred.

I found this on the Serious Fraud Office website:

What is fraud?

Fraud is a type of criminal activity, defined as:

'abuse of position, or false representation, or prejudicing someone's rights for personal gain'.

Put simply, fraud is an act of deception intended for personal gain or to cause a loss to another party.

The general criminal offence of fraud can include:

- *deception whereby someone knowingly makes false representation*
- *or they fail to disclose information*
- *or they abuse a position.*

It seems very much as though Dorset Police have done all 3. This cannot keep going on and must now be put right. I require an immediate and complete resolution.

Ian Belchamber