

2 February 2022

Reference: IR-01-21-30415

Amanda Murtagh
fyi-request-17122-c146a087@requests.fyi.org.nz

Dear Amanda

I am writing in response to your request dated 15 October 2021, which stated:

This OIA is not a PIR because it is a matter that is in the public interest. All supporting information provided will have personal information redacted.

This OIA is in reference to 111 phone calls made to Police, in particular the ECLI recording of phone calls made from mobile devices:

With ECLI, how is it possible that two 111 phone calls are made from the same location using a mobile device that Police claim never to have received these calls?

Did the Police operative obtain the mobile device in point one above, in an attempt to destroy proof of evidence of these two phone calls?

How does a third phone call made from the same location using a different mobile device, have the Police 111 call operator classify the caller as a 'regular caller' (inconsistent with strictly monitored protocols in place for the call centre and the National Recording Standards for data integrity) in the so-called first ever chronology of 111 calls, when Police professed there were no prior calls as described in point one above?

Why and by whom was the decision made to deliberately deceive and mislead a member of the public, the IPCA and Privacy Commissioner, regarding the existence of the first two phone calls (despite ECLI assurances that protect people in New Zealand)?

Below are links to the Police letter claiming that Police do not have the first two 111 phone calls and a call chronology of the third call (that police claim is the first call received) showing the labelling of the caller as a 'regular caller':

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/z3vz4ojr17v49au/43834754%20Regular%20Caller%20redacted.pdf?dl=0>

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/tl0x64h9fyb5bhc/Police%20confirmation%2021.12.20%20no%20111%20calls%20on%2017..pdf?dl=0>

Police National Headquarters

180 Molesworth Street. PO Box 3017, Wellington 6140, New Zealand.
Telephone: 04 474 9499. Fax: 04 498 7400. www.police.govt.nz

In reference to call chronologies and files that the Police provided and then in turn requested back contrary to Police operating procedures (confirmed by Police).

What investigations, actions and activities have Police undertaken subsequently in relation to the duplication of call chronologies that show Police systems have been doctored?

i.e. The impossibility of two differing call chronologies to 111 at the same time and date contrary to protocols and system integrity.

Police have not attempted to destroy proof of evidence or made any attempt to deceive or mislead.

The description 'regular caller' may be used to describe someone who has made regular calls to Police over a period of time not necessarily limited to one day.

As previously advised, there is no reason for you to return any information provided to you by Police.

Police have not found any reason to investigate the matters raised by you here.

Please note, agencies are not obliged to form an opinion or create information to answer an official information request. Information must be held, i.e. in existence, when it is requested. The legislation is not a mechanism that can be used to force agencies to engage in debate or generate justifications or explanations in relation to a matter of interest to the requester.

The Official Information Act 1982 is not the appropriate avenue for you to raise concerns about this matter.

If you want to express your dissatisfaction or make a complaint about Police's conduct, you may:

- Provide feedback to Police expressing your dissatisfaction; or
- Make a complaint to the Independent Police Conduct Authority (IPCA), or alternatively, directly to Police.

More detailed information may be obtained from <https://www.police.govt.nz/contact-us/give-feedback-about-police>

Yours sincerely



Inspector Marianne Whitfield
Acting Director: Emergency Communications Centres
Police National Headquarters
