

SUMMARY

This study is one of the ten area studies within the ACTIF project, carried out between October 2000 and March 2001. The following three phases are reflected in the document structure: assessment of the current situation, in-depth studies and consequences for the ACTIF architecture

The first phase identifies the various resources which can be used to control (detection and identification) serious violation of the law, establishes a functional schema “in French” of “Law Enforcement”, area 7 in KAREN (basis of the area study) and identifies the initial technical and statutory constraints.

The second phase studies functional issues in more depth on the basis of two hypothetical cases:

- Automated “speeding” offence control.
- Automated prevention or pre-selection control.

These case studies specifically lay out the complete processing chain (dataflows, databases, actors involved) required for control automation. Comparison of these two studies with area 7 in Karen identifies the required modifications/improvements to the functional architecture.

On the basis of the results of the two phases above, recommendations have been drawn up which will handle automated control requirements better in the ACTIF architecture, whilst taking account of the constraints which must be respected. These recommendations have been grouped under three headings:

Functional recommendations

- They specifically involve the **modifications and additions** to be made to functions, databases and exchange information flows in the area studied;

Statutory recommendations

- Need for **hardware approval** in a sanction control chain;
- Need to **protect personal data**;

Organisational recommendations

- Study the implementation of a **traceability indicator** in the proceeding file;
- **Harmonise the information systems** between the different French actors involved in processing a violation;
- **Simplify and standardise the procedures**, especially by **de-criminalising** low class offence, as in some European countries;
- Offer **greater interoperability** between the different **control** and **proceeding** systems at the **European** level, so as to be certain of identifying and apprehending a foreign offender in the country of violation;