

Here is the article I complained about:

<https://www.dorset.police.uk/news-information/article/6850#:~:text=Since%202012%2C%20the%20number%20of,has%20shown%20a%20sustained%20fall.>

Here is my original complaint:

<http://www.dorsetspeed.org.uk/2019/complaint.aspx>

I have followed the full complaints process, explaining with complete clarity how this complaint has been mishandled at every step. Not one of the points I have made has been properly considered or answered. The full overview of this can be seen here:

<http://www.dorsetspeed.org.uk/2019/fakenews.aspx>

I will for the sake of this appeal keep it simple and focus on a subset of the failures, it is more than enough if there is a genuine intention to put this right:

1. The D&C response only ever looked at the first point in the complaint and completely ignored all the others. For example, what the "Alliance" has announced is a clear example of cherry picking from volatile data to provide the result required, the biggest drop, claiming it to be "sustained" when just picking the year before for the start and end would have shown an increase, and then claiming the entire false benefit to have only resulted from what they did, when there are so many other factors. This cannot be accidental, but a deliberate abuse of their responsibility to be honest, transparent and professional.
2. The first point was that the simple figures were wrong. There has been no simple, clear, unambiguous statement stating that the figures were or were not correct.
3. There has been only an apology to me "if" there were errors, look up conditional apology, it is a well-known way of pretending to say sorry without actually doing so or admitting any wrong.
4. In the letter from Inspector Thomas of the 23rd Jan, point 2, the explanation for the error is so vaguely written that I did not originally read it as an explanation, but as a way of fudging the issue, in fact I am still not sure. Why is such an attempt made to hide the simple point "we got this wrong"? In reality, it seems that the figures provided for 2010 and 2011 were KSI, the figures provided for 2012 to 2016 were KSI collisions, and the figures for 2017 and 2018 didn't match up with anything and remain unexplained. Why was this not clearly stated, rather than trying to excuse it only with the ridiculous statement "As such, they were believed accurate at the time of publishing" as if that means that everything is ok?
5. In the point above if there really is an understanding that the figures were wrong, why are the wrong figures still on display? Why have they not been put right?
6. Clearly no notice has been taken about this and the Alliance will continue to publish misleading information. Already, there has been more news from Dorset Police incorrectly claiming the full benefit for incorrect casualty reduction figures: Assistant Chief Constable Sam de Reya has announced just recently "Over the last ten years, we've worked in partnership to reduce the number of casualties by 20 per cent and while every collision can be devastating, I am pleased that we are making constant progress in making our roads safer." The opportunity to improve and be more accurate and honest as a result of this complaint has been lost.
7. In the first response, D&C seemed to distance itself from Dorset Police. However Adrian Leisk is the Head of the Alliance Road Policing Department. Neither he, nor D&C should try to shirk responsibility for clear and honest statements to the public and putting things right if there are genuine mistakes. There was only the shocking statement "Chief Inspector Leisk is not responsible for the

interpretation of the data that is produced". My question about who was actually responsible was ignored.

8. Incredibly, the false statement is STILL on view to the public (link at top). It is STILL misleading the public and others who may be in a position to improve standards in the police if they knew the truth. This utterly unacceptable and demonstrates the extent to which this complaint has been ignored and demonstrates that the misrepresentation is (certainly now) deliberate.
9. Naturally there has also therefore been no attempt whatsoever to publish a correction to the public or any attempt to correct the "misunderstanding" that so many people will have.
10. I have on 2 occasions listed the intended outcomes of Local Resolution (as published by the Police) and pointed out that not one of them has been met. Every time I have been ignored.
11. Absolutely no clear statement has been made about any "mistake" made by any person.

This is only a part of the failure. You should review all of the communications of this case to understand the full depth of this and the extent to which D&C has dodged, buried, covered up this complaint to protect a senior police officer and department, not to mention the Chief Constable and Police and Crime Commissioner for Dorset, from dishonest statements announced to the public misrepresenting failures they are responsible for as success.

The bottom line is that there will be many who have read this article, and who continue to read it, who will be persuaded that the Alliance has single handedly driven down casualties by 30% when this could not be further from the truth, asked for more money as a result, and the "professional standards" departments of 2 police forces have chosen, rather than to put it right, to fiercely protect it, I am not sure which is worse. **In most normal situations organisations deliberately misrepresenting their success to increase income would be considered fraudulent.**

It is difficult to avoid the conclusion, unless there is a complete change in direction on this now, that Dorset and Devon & Cornwall Police have at the very top level, deliberately misled the public and others who influence police funding (and used this to justify asking for more money), have been caught out, and have comprehensively shut down the entirely legitimate and simple complaint that has resulted, and stuck their heads firmly in the sand, and that deciding to deal with such a serious complaint by "Local Resolution" (against the criteria) was the first crucial step.

Please explain what you would like to happen

1. There must be a clear and simple statement: were the figures in the article correct or incorrect?
2. If they were correct, please explain the discrepancy (for each year 2010 to 2018) with DfT stats19 confirmed data (as detailed in my original complaint). Just to make it clear, all the figures are death and serious injury counts, NOT collisions.
3. If they were incorrect, please properly detail each year's figure that was wrong, explain how the "mistakes" were made, and who was responsible.
4. Explain the actual procedures put in place to ensure statements are accurate in the future.
5. Properly consider and answer ALL the points in the original complaint, not ignore everything after the first.
6. Most importantly, take down the incorrect statements, publish a proper (non- conditional) apology and correction to the public and demonstrate that every attempt has been made to provide the truth to those who may have been deceived.

Ian Belchamber.