

Kathy O'Hanlon
Room 242
Parliament Buildings
Ballymiscaw
Stormont
Belfast
BT4 3XX

By email only: Kathy O'Hanlon and [REDACTED]
(committee.justice@niassembly.gov.uk)

CC'd: [REDACTED];

18 August 2026

Dear Kathy,

Re: Criminal Justice (Sentencing Etc.) Bill

Dear Kathy,

Thank you for forwarding the Department of Justice's response to the points raised by the Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) in relation to the Criminal Justice (Sentencing Etc.) Bill.

We are grateful for the detailed and comprehensive response provided and welcome the Department's engagement with the data protection considerations highlighted in our submission.

Provisions about community requirements

We note the Department's view that these provisions largely mirror existing community sentence requirements and are therefore unlikely to necessitate the processing of new categories of personal data. We also welcome its commitment to keep under review any data protection implications arising from increased referrals, including the volume of personal data processed and the involvement of partner organisations in delivering community requirements.

Provisions about the duty to give reasons when determining a tariff

We welcome the clarification that these provisions are intended to formalise existing practice and are not expected to lead to an expansion in the volume or scope of personal data processing associated with sentencing decisions. We also note the Department's commitment to continue monitoring the operation of these provisions in conjunction with the Lady Chief Justice's Office as implementation progresses.

The extension of the application of arrangements for the review of unduly lenient sentences

We note the Department's assessment that no new evidence or data categories will be required as part of the expanded arrangements, and that the existing process for reviewing unduly lenient sentences will remain unchanged. We also welcome the commitment to keep the operation of the scheme and associated data handling practices under review as implementation progresses.

Charlotte's Law

We appreciate the Department's recognition that disclosures made under these provisions may involve sensitive information and welcome the commitment to ensure that data protection considerations continue to inform the development of regulations and operational processes associated with the scheme.

We also note the Department's confirmation that information disclosed under the scheme will be handled in accordance with established data protection policies and that data protection considerations will inform the development of future regulations.

However, as implementation progresses, careful consideration of the handling of sensitive information relating to victims, offenders and third parties will remain important. We also wish to highlight that any future regulations which engage the processing of personal data will need to be considered in light of the Department's obligations under Article 36(4) UK GDPR, where applicable.

A new offence of assaulting a public worker

We note the Department's response regarding the risk of direct or indirect identification of victims and welcome the intention to ensure that any occupation-related data collected for statistical or operational purposes is defined at an appropriately aggregated level to safeguard individual privacy.

We also recognise the Department's view that, in practice, sentencing outcomes are likely to be recorded by reference to the relevant statutory provisions rather than detailed descriptions of aggravating factors, and that the proposed offence of assaulting a public worker replaces existing occupation-specific offences. Taken together, these measures may help reduce the extent to which specific occupational information is reflected in formal records and support a more privacy-conscious approach to the recording of such information.

Sentencing aggravations for assault on public workers, protected characteristic groups, and vulnerable victims

We welcome the Department's acknowledgement that implementation may require further consideration of information collection and recording practices and its commitment to work with relevant stakeholders, including the ICO, to ensure that only information necessary for the purposes of the criminal law is processed.

As implementation arrangements are developed, we note the Department's position that additional operational guidance is not required, given the existing data protection obligations and policies that apply across the criminal justice system. It will nevertheless be important to keep these arrangements under review to ensure that existing policies, procedures and safeguards remain adequate to support the consistent recording of aggravators at an appropriate level of detail and to minimise any residual risk of identification arising from combinations of data.

Special category data

We welcome the Department's recognition of the sensitivities associated with protected characteristic data and vulnerable victims' information, together with its commitment to continue considering whether any additional data protection measures, system changes or safeguards may be required as implementation progresses.

We note the Department's position that the Bill does not introduce new categories of special category data and largely reflects existing practice across investigation, prosecution and sentencing. In particular, we recognise that protected characteristics relevant to hostility-based aggravation are already recorded by PSNI and referenced in court proceedings under existing legislative provisions.

In relation to vulnerable victims, it is our understanding that the Bill does not require courts to specify the nature of a victim's vulnerability when recording aggravation, and that outcomes may instead be recorded by

reference to the relevant statutory provision. We believe that this approach may limit the extent to which detailed special category data is reflected in formal court records.

In this context, it does not appear that the Bill introduces new categories of special category data at this stage, and we recognise that much of the underlying information is already processed as part of evidential practice.

We note, however, that provision is made for further protected characteristics to be added by way of secondary legislation. Should such powers be exercised in future, it will be important to ensure that any additional processing of special category data is accompanied by appropriate safeguards and assessed in accordance with the Department's data protection obligations, including under Article 36(4) UK GDPR where applicable.

Data minimisation

We note the Department's emphasis on the principle of data minimisation and its expectation that agencies will continue to ensure that only personal data that is adequate, relevant and necessary for law enforcement purposes is processed.

We also note the Department's position that implementation of the Bill is not expected to require the routine collection of information beyond that currently sought during criminal investigations, prosecutions and sentencing proceedings.

Disclosure, fairness and proportionality

We appreciate the Department's consideration of the implications of disclosure arrangements, particularly in relation to offences aggravated by hostility, and its explanation of the safeguards and review mechanisms available through the existing disclosure framework.

Based on the Department's response, we understand that these provisions are not expected to require the disclosure of personal data beyond that already processed and disclosed as part of existing criminal proceedings.

The Department has explained the operation of the court system in this context, including the role of reporting restrictions and existing safeguards, and has set out its position that the provisions will not result in additional detailed information being made public.

Children's data

We welcome the clarification that the Bill is not expected to require the processing of additional information relating to child victims beyond that already collected within existing criminal justice processes and that established data protection policies will continue to apply.

We recognise that this approach limits the extent to which detailed information relating to children is reflected in formal records. Given the inherent sensitivity of children's personal data, it will be important to ensure that such information continues to be handled in a proportionate and privacy-conscious manner as implementation progresses.


Conclusion

We are pleased to note the Department's commitment to continue liaising with the ICO as implementation of the Bill progresses and, in particular, its intention to keep under review whether a Data Protection Impact Assessment may become necessary as operational requirements become clearer.

We have no further comments at this stage and are content that the points raised in our submission have been substantively addressed. We would be pleased to continue to be consulted as implementation work progresses, particularly where secondary legislation, new data recording practices, information-sharing arrangements or other data protection considerations arise. We would especially highlight that any future secondary legislation engaging personal data considerations will need to be assessed in line with the Department's obligations under Article 36(4) of the UK GDPR.

Thank you again for the opportunity to contribute to the Committee's scrutiny of the Bill.

Yours sincerely,



**Senior Policy Officer – Northern Ireland
Information Commissioner's Office**



**Northern Ireland Assembly
Committee for Justice**

[REDACTED]
Senior Policy Officer – Northern Irish Affairs
Information Commissioner's Office

By email: ni@ico.org.uk

7 July 2026

Criminal Justice (Sentencing etc) Bill – Convention Rights memorandum

Dear [REDACTED]

At its meeting on 2 July 2026, the Committee for Justice considered a response from the Department of Justice to matters raised in the written submission from the Information Commissioner's Office in respect of the above Bill.

The Committee agreed to forward the response to your office for your information and for any further comment you may wish to make.

I should be grateful if any further comments could be received by 28 August 2026.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]
Kathy O'Hanlon
Clerk to the Committee for Justice

Enc.

FROM THE OFFICE OF THE JUSTICE MINISTER



Department of
Justice

An Roinn Dlí agus Cirt

Máinnystrie O tha Laa

www.justice-ni.gov.uk

Minister's Office
Castle Buildings Block C
Stormont Estate
Ballymiscaw
Belfast
BT4 3SG

JCP\26\138

Kathy O'Hanlon
Clerk to the Committee for Justice
Room 242
Parliament Buildings
Ballymiscaw
Stormont
Belfast BT4 3XX

17 June 2026

Dear Kathy,

**INFORMATION COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE - CRIMINAL JUSTICE (SENTENCING
ETC) BILL**

Thank you for your letter of 5th June with which you forwarded a written submission from the Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) on the Criminal Justice (Sentencing Etc) Bill with a request that the Department respond to the points raised.

Please see the Department's response below.

The ICO's submission

The ICO's views are summarised at pages 2 and 3 of their submission where they say:

"Our submission highlights two overarching data protection considerations for the Committee's attention.

"First, the Bill is likely to significantly increase the volume, scope and duration of offender personal data processed across the justice system, including through expanded community orders, enhanced sentencing explanations and retrospective sentence review mechanisms. While systems, governance arrangements and data-sharing frameworks are already in place to support

existing processing, the Committee may wish to assure itself that these arrangements remain fit for purpose in light of this expansion — including whether oversight, guidance, resourcing and safeguards are sufficient and consistently applied across all bodies involved.

“Second, the Bill is also likely to result in a substantial increase in the collection, recording and disclosure of data about victims, including special category data and, in some cases, data relating to children. Given the sensitivity of this information and the potential risks associated with identification or re-identification, we recommend that the Committee satisfy itself that:

- any disclosure of victim data will be at a sufficiently aggregated and proportionate level to avoid direct or indirect identification;
- any new or adapted systems required to collect, manage or disclose this data are robust, secure and subject to appropriate governance and oversight, including protections against accidental or malicious breaches; and
- the Department’s assessment that a Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA) was not required remains appropriate, given the scale, sensitivity and potential public visibility of the processing envisaged.”

The submission goes on to detail the clauses of the Bill which the ICO considers may have data processing implications.

Department’s response

Provisions about community requirements

As the provisions about community requirements mirror existing community sentence requirements it is the Department’s view that these provisions will not necessitate the processing of new types of data. It is accepted that the information provided to PBNI may, as a result of implementation of these provisions, result in larger numbers of offenders being referred to PBNI. Offenders’ data processed by PBNI and any other agencies involved in the provision of community requirements will be subject to existing data protection policies within those agencies. It is considered that any additional cases

referred to PBNl and data processing associated with these is justified in terms of the prosecution and punishment of offences.

The Department does not consider that any expansion of the use of community requirements will lead to an increase in the duration of data collection related to suspended sentences and community orders, however, data processing implications of these provisions will remain subject to review.

Provisions about the duty to give reasons when determining a tariff

The Department does not consider that the introduction of a duty to give reasons when determining a tariff will lead to an expansion in the volume and scope of offender personal data processed in connection with sentencing. The provisions of the bill formalise current practice in the higher courts and is not expected to lead to any change to the processing of personal data. The Department will continue to monitor this in conjunction with the Lady Chief Justice's Office.

The extension of the application of arrangements for the review of unduly lenient sentences

As with the provisions about community requirements, the extension of the application of arrangements for the review of unduly lenient sentences will not introduce the processing of any new types of data. It is anticipated that very small numbers of additional referrals will be made. At present the average number of referrals per year amount to around 5 or 6. It is projected that the extension of the arrangements may result in up to a 50% increase in these numbers.

No new evidence is examined as part of an unduly lenient sentence referral. Accordingly the range and sensitivity of personal data re examined as part of that process is unlikely to increase as a result of these changes.

As the process for unduly lenient referrals will remain unchanged the Department does not consider that current arrangements will need to be updated to ensure the lawful,

proportionate and secure handling of personal data under the expanded scheme, however this will be kept under review.

Charlotte's Law

Any disclosure made under Charlotte's Law will be made to the Department. As the offender will be under the care of NIPS at the point of disclosure it is not considered that the Department will be required to process new personal data relating to the prisoner.

Any potentially sensitive third party or victim adjacent information revealed connected to victims' remains in any disclosure will be treated in accordance with the Department's data protection policies which will be kept under review so that any necessary updating is identified and actioned should any issues arise.

Any regulations made by the Department governing the form and manner of disclosures will be subject to data protection considerations during their development.

A new offence of assaulting a public worker

The ICO submission raises concerns about the risk of third party disclosure including the possibility that media reporting of court proceedings may identify victims through contextual information. ICO asks how DOJ has assessed and will mitigate the risks of indirect or mosaic identification.

As the Committee is aware, all adult criminal proceedings are conducted in public and may be reported upon unless a reporting restriction is imposed by the court. The fact that the offence was committed against the victim whilst they were working would typically be a pertinent factor which would form part of the prosecution case at present. Current sentencing guidelines specify as an aggravating factor that the offence occurred in the victim's workplace. It is therefore not considered that this new offence will alter the information which typically is revealed over the course of a prosecution.

The victim is the primary witness who must give evidence to substantiate the prosecution. Except for children and victims of rape and other serious sexual offences, whose identity generally must not be reported, the victim's identity does not enjoy any protection unless a reporting restriction is imposed by the court – as often happens to protect vulnerable

witnesses. Where a reporting restriction is imposed the nature of any reporting would be a matter for the court and may constitute contempt, for which there are criminal penalties.

As outlined above, the Department does not anticipate that the new offence will result in any new detailed information being made public. Police officer victims have been identified by ICO as victims of particular concern in this regard. It should be noted, however, that the new offence of assaulting a public worker will replace existing offences of assaulting a police officer, assaulting an ambulance worker and assaulting a Fire and Rescue services officer. It is therefore the Department's view that this new, more general, offence reduces the visibility of the particular occupation of the victim.

It is anticipated that there may be a desire on the part of the victim representatives to capture data illustrating the prevalence of offending against their members. It is also likely that the criminal justice system will seek the capability to record certain categories of victims' occupations for statistical purposes. In working to develop data sets for recording and disclosure purposes the Department will ensure that occupation categories are defined at a sufficiently high level to protect individuals' privacy.

Given that each of the criminal justice agencies is required to comply with data protection laws and maintains its own data protection policies, the Department does not consider it necessary to develop operational guidance to ensure that any disclosure of public sector worker or victim data in sentencing remarks, court listings or other related documentation is carried out in a manner that minimises the risk of inadvertent identification or disclosure of personal information that is not necessary for the purposes of transparency or administration of justice.

Sentencing aggravations for assault on public workers, protected characteristic groups, and vulnerable victims

The Bill allows for these provisions to be commenced by way of a Departmental order. This is to allow time for any necessary operational preparations for implementation to be worked through with the key stakeholders who will be responsible for collecting and processing the information needed to give effect to these provisions.

As the information is already data that is processed in the investigation, prosecution and sentencing of offences under existing practice it is not clear at this stage whether any new data fields or categories will be introduced or whether existing forms etc will require modification in terms of data capture. It may be that reference to the relevant new provision is the only new information that needs to be recorded. We will remain in contact with ICO as the operational preparation proceeds and will work to ensure that no information above and beyond that which is required for the purposes of the criminal law is processed, or, where any change is necessary, that any essential upgrades are considered.

As regards victim vulnerability or the fact that the victim is a public worker, current sentencing guidance directs the court to treat the fact that the victim was a vulnerable person or a public servant as aggravating factors. The creation of these new provisions effectively places into legislation the current practice followed in investigations, prosecutions and sentencing.

It is anticipated that, in relation to the new duty on the court to record the sentence in such a way as to show the sentence has been aggravated, the court will record outcomes with reference to the relevant clause number of the bill, rather than recording the particular vulnerability or occupation of the victim.

In relation to offences aggravated by hostility, it is already a statutory requirement for the court to treat offences aggravated by hostility on the basis of any of the four characteristics set out in clause 33 of the Bill as more serious and to state that the offence was so aggravated in open court, under The Criminal Justice (No. 2) (Northern Ireland) Order 2004 . Clause 33 provides for the hate crime element of any crime to be formally recorded from investigation through prosecution and sentencing. Clause 35 provides the Department with the power to add further protected characteristics by way of secondary legislation however at present, the protected characteristics that will be recorded remain the same as within the 2004 Order.

Special category data

Victims with protected characteristics (Aggravation by hostility)

PSNI currently record statutory protected characteristics relating to race, religion, disability and sexual orientation in relation to criminal offences, and also record information on transgender crime and that relating to sectarian motivated crimes. As noted, the Bill at present includes only those characteristics currently captured by the Criminal Justice (No. 2) (Northern Ireland) Order 2004. Provision has been made that further characteristics can be added via secondary legislation at a later date. This will be subject to further data protection consideration if/when that secondary legislation is taken forward.

Under the existing hate crime provisions the courts are required to treat aggravation by hostility as a factor that increases the seriousness of the offence and to state in open court that the offence was so aggravated. The Bill enhances existing legislation by requiring the court also to make reference to the types of hostility evidenced and to record the sentence in such a way to show the offence is so aggravated.

At present to satisfy the existing legislation the courts need to hear evidence of the hostility alleged. Courts are public arenas and, unless a reporting restriction is imposed, the details of any prosecution can be reported in the media. Accordingly, it is not anticipated that the new provisions will lead to increased identification of victims' special category data.

Vulnerable victims

Where a victim is considered to be vulnerable this information will currently form part of the evidence presented to the court. Unlike the hostility aggravator the Bill does not impose a requirement for the court to state the vulnerability alleged when stating that the offence has been aggravated by reason of vulnerability, so it is not anticipated that processing of additional special category data of vulnerable victims will be required when it comes to implementation of these provisions.

The Department is conscious of the need to ensure that any data collected is limited to what is necessary and proportionate for the operation of the statute and will continue to work with criminal justice partners and liaise with ICO to ensure that any new structured data fields, systems or information flows to support the identification and recording of aggravating factors or other processes will be adapted to collect, verify and record these special category data items if necessary.

Data minimisation

The Department is aware of the requirement to process only such personal data for law enforcement purposes as are adequate, relevant and not excessive. Each agency involved applies its own data protection policies with data minimisation as one of the key principles. It will be a matter for each agency, exercising its expertise in the investigation, prosecution and sentencing process to ensure that only the information which is required is processed.

It should be noted that it is not anticipated that any information in excess of that currently sought in the course of criminal investigations, prosecutions and sentencing will be processed.

Disclosure, fairness and proportionality

Under the proposed new model, offences aggravated by hostility will be indefinitely disclosed on AccessNI Standard and Enhanced Disclosure Certificates as such offences will be regarded as non-filterable under the Police Act 1997. It is important to note that similar arrangements apply to the existing enhanced sentencing regime for hate crimes under the Criminal Justice (No.2) (Northern Ireland) Order 2004. It is accepted, given that the new process intends to more accurately record hate crime offences on conviction, that there may well be an increase in individuals convicted as such and therefore subject to indefinite disclosure.

However, this is balanced against (i) the need to reflect that the criminal justice system is taking and tackling hate crime more seriously, (ii) reassuring our communities that crimes against them are being taken seriously and (iii) the fact that the aggravation appearing

on the defendant's record will allow the individual access to appropriate and relevant rehabilitation programmes.

It should be recognised that if the offence is spent under The Rehabilitation of Offenders (NI) Order 1978 this allows an applicant to raise an appeal with the Independent Reviewer for Criminal Record Certificates (IR)¹ who can remove any spent conviction, providing the removal of such doesn't undermine safeguarding or protection of children and/or vulnerable adults, or the risk of harm to the public.

It is also proposed that the provisions of The Rehabilitation of Offenders (NI) Order 1978 will apply to AccessNI Basic Disclosure Certificates, therefore such offences aggravated by hostility will be disclosed until they are considered spent within this Order. The nature of the disposal of the offence will determine the rehabilitation period. This is also similar to the existing enhanced sentencing arrangements under the Criminal Justice (No.2) (Northern Ireland) Order 2004.

Children's data

As stated above, it is not intended to record as part of sentences aggravated by reason of the vulnerability of the victim any details about child victims other than the fact that they are vulnerable. Where a child is the victim of an offence at present this information forms part of the criminal investigation file and accordingly no new information is expected to be processed as a result of the vulnerable victim aggravator.

Any information gathered and processed in relation to criminal proceedings will be subject to existing data protection policies operated by criminal justice agencies as is the case at present. No new agencies will be required to process children's data as a result of the bill's provisions.

Conclusion

It is the Department's view that the provisions of the Sentencing Bill will not necessitate the collection and processing of data which is not currently collected and processed in

¹ The Independent Reviewer (IR) of Criminal Record Certificates is a statutory role introduced through Schedule 4 of the Justice Act (NI) 2015.


connection with existing criminal proceedings. Any increase in volumes of data processed will be dependent upon the volume of offences investigated.

The investigation into criminal offences requires the processing of significant volumes of data relating to the offence the offender the victim or victims and witnesses. Each of the criminal justice agencies involved maintains its own data protection policies which will continue to apply and be revised in line with any changes that are required.

The Department is conscious of the data protection concerns raised by ICO in its submission and has undertaken to continue to liaise with ICO (as it has done both during policy development of particular aspects of the bill and, prior to and since introduction, on the bill as a whole) as preparations for implementation of the bill proceeds and arrangements for the formal recording of certain data as required by the provisions of the bill are taken forward.

It is the Department's intention to keep its decision whether an impact assessment is required under review during the implementation phase when it will become clear what operational changes need to be made in order to implement the various provisions of the bill.

We trust this information is of assistance to the Committee.



DALO