

Cragg Ross Dawson

## IDENTITY CARDS

PEOPLE WITH  
SPECIAL ISSUES:  
RESPONSE TO THE PROPOSED  
CUSTOMER EXPERIENCE

REPORT

Prepared for:

COI Communications  
Hercules Road  
London SE1 7DU

On behalf of:

ID Cards Programme  
Home Office

December 2004

622 rp

Contacts at Cragg Ross Dawson:  
Tim Porter, Catherine Taylor,

---

Cragg Ross Dawson  
Qualitative Research  
18 Carlisle Street  
London W1D 3BX

Tel +44 (0)20 7437 8945

Fax +44 (0)20 7437 0059

research@crd.co.uk

www.craggrossdawson.co.uk

<b>CONTENTS</b>	<b>PAGE NUMBER</b>
MANAGEMENT SUMMARY	i
A. BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES	1
B. METHODOLOGY AND SAMPLE	3
C. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	6
D. DETAILED FINDINGS	13
1. Awareness of and initial reactions to ID cards	13
2. Overall perceptions of the customer experience	21
3. The application procedure	25
4. Enrolment	34
5. Receiving the card	47
6. The card and the National Identity Register	49
7. Using the card	51
8. Safety of the scheme and the process	56

## MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

### **Background and purpose**

Qualitative research was commissioned by COI Communications on behalf of the Home Office ID Cards Programme to examine perceptions of the customer experience in applying for, enrolling for and using ID cards. In particular the study focused on special issue and other minority groups. The purpose of this study was to identify issues that may require alteration to the generic process of applying and enrolling for an ID card (the customer experience) to ensure that vulnerable people's needs and issues are recognised.

### **Possible processes and procedures that were researched**

Briefly the intention is that applicants for ID cards would complete an application form (on paper, online, by 'phone or face-to-face), make an appointment, receive confirmation of this and then attend an enrolment centre. At the enrolment centre the applicant would have a short interview, present documents to verify identity and have biometric information recorded. Enrolment centres would be located at a number of places throughout the UK. After further checks on the information recorded, the ID card would then be sent to the applicant or made available for collection.

### **Sample and method**

The sample comprised 16 focus group discussions with people drawn from the main ethnic minority, faith and nationality groups and 18 individual interviews with disabled and other disadvantaged people and their stakeholders. The purpose was to obtain respondents' reactions to specific features of the proposed experience.

A Home Office video was used to outline the processes and procedures that may take place. Fieldwork took place in October and November 2004.

### **Conclusions**

There is broad support for ID cards in principle, among most race and faith groups. There is no gender bias towards ID cards. There are some misunderstandings about aspects of the proposed scheme, particularly compulsion, security and range of information gathered.

It is essential to provide the facilities (eg. language, signage, access) that people with special issues will require. The proposed customer experience tallies broadly with their expectations, though a number of concerns are evident, focused around enrolment. It will be important to reassure these people about the ease of the process, and demonstrate understanding and sensitivity to their particular needs.

### **Overall perceptions of ID cards**

There was high awareness of the proposal to introduce ID cards, but uncertainty about when this might take place. Knowledge was often inaccurate and the view that carrying the card will be compulsory (with penalties for not doing so) was widespread.

The predominant rationale perceived for an ID card system was the benefit to society: prevention of illegal activities, including terrorism, fraud and immigration. ID cards were expected to be most effective in tackling benefit fraud and illegal immigration; as such they were associated with people who are often regarded as being socially excluded. This led to some wariness among vulnerable groups. Perceived benefits to the individual were generally less tangible. The fact that ID cards are a Government initiative prompted some hostility and cynicism.

### **The customer experience**

The proposed customer experience largely tallied with expectations, apart from the inclusion of biometrics, and was generally considered at least acceptable. Race, nationality and faith did not affect views significantly; stakeholders for other vulnerable groups (eg disabled, homeless) were more likely to express concerns.

### Application

Intuitively people thought that the process of applying for an ID card would be inefficient. However, the video which outlines the process helped to address many concerns. The key requirements that people asked for of the application procedure was that a range of options were available (paper, telephone, internet, face to face, and for hearing-impaired video- or textphone); and that those with special issues had an opportunity to flag these in advance of enrolment.

### Enrolment centres

When attending the interview at the enrolment centre all groups wanted their physical and communication needs to be met by enrolment centres, their facilities and staff, and expected to be given reassurance and support during the process. The provision of mobile centres was welcomed. Enrolment was expected to be protracted, but the video provided reassurance that it could be relatively quick. Fast track application was welcomed. Using CCTV to ensure applicants' and staff members' safety was uncontroversial, but Sikhs and Muslim women wanted reassurance that removal of religious garments would not be required and would definitely not be captured on CCTV.

### Enrolment

The proposed enrolment procedure was regarded as reasonably simple. There were few objections to biometric procedures among the able-bodied, but those with special issues expressed anxieties about the physical process and how it might cause them difficulties. Muslim women also had worries about aspects of enrolment, particularly to do with possible physical contact and removal of hijab or burkha.

### Receiving and using the cards

The expectation was that there would be a choice of receiving cards in person or via secure post. Understanding of the verification process was very mixed and suggested a need for clarification. The principle of different levels of verification was broadly understood.

### The card and National Identity Register

Misconceptions about the ID card and the National Identity Register (NIR) were common; the assumption was that the card would be the focus of the system. Some were reassured by the limits on this. The proposed card design and information to be held on the card matched expectations. There was disappointment among some foreign nationals at the prospect of a visually distinct card.

### Security

Security was a major concern at all stages of the customer experience. There were widespread worries about loss or theft of cards and information on the system, where respondents' perceptions of impacts of security breaches are far greater than the reality; and information

was expected to be routinely available to more agencies than is proposed.

## A. BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES

The customer experience involved in applying and enrolling for ID cards is being planned. It is likely to entail an initial application with basic personal details, attendance at an enrolment centre to give biometric information and have a short interview, and receipt of the card once information has been checked.

Qualitative research was commissioned to explore expectations among a range of special issues groups of the procedure for applying for, enrolling for, receiving and using ID cards, perceptions of what is likely to be involved and identify any special issues groups. An outline of how the processes and procedure may work was given in a Home Office video showing an applicant applying and enrolling.

Specific objectives of the research were to explore...

- expectations of all aspects of the customer experience
- response to the proposed customer experience as described in the Home Office video
- special issues relating to the customer experience among minority ethnic groups, people of different faiths, people with disabilities, people in vulnerable situations and foreign nationals
- reactions to specific features of the proposed experience:
  - the different means of applying for an ID card
  - the length of time from applying to enrolment
  - the means of making appointments
  - the location and accessibility of enrolment centres
  - the possibility of mobile enrolment centres
  - the procedure for recording biometric information at enrolment centres
  - the provision of special services and staff at enrolment centres to deal with special issues

- the means of receiving ID cards
- usage of cards, including different tiers of verification
- safety and security of the cards and the database (NIR)

## B. METHODOLOGY AND SAMPLE

### 1. **Overall approach**

The sample comprised:

- 16 focus group discussions with people from a range of faith, race and nationality groups
- 4 individual interviews with people with disabilities
- 14 individual interviews with stakeholders representing people with disabilities and disadvantaged groups

Fieldwork was conducted from 20<sup>th</sup> October – 24<sup>th</sup> November 2004 by Rob Hartley, Africa Munyama, Tim Porter, Catherine Taylor and Ben Toombs.

### 2. **Discussion procedure**

Initial discussion focused on awareness and perceptions of ID cards in principle, and any features of ID cards that interested or concerned them. Respondents were then asked for their expectations of the customer experience involved in applying for an ID card: how they imagined the process would work, what they thought they would be asked to do. A short video film outlining the processes and procedures that may be involved was then used to give people an impression of the likely customer experience; statements on boards reiterating points made in the video were also used.

All aspects of the possible processes and procedures were discussed in detail. Respondents were asked for their views on each element, both in general terms and in relation to what it might mean for them. They gave their responses to each element, expressed any concerns they had and made suggestions for how they would like the processes and procedures to be handled. Where they had suggestions for the procedures these were often idealised, and did not always correspond to what might be feasible.

**NB** This research was qualitative: it was in depth and exploratory, and was intended to examine and identify detailed aspects of the customer experience. While the sample was relatively large for a qualitative

study – 130 people – it was **not** large enough to be regarded as statistically valid and the findings cannot be analysed statistically.

### 3. **Sample details**

#### Group discussions

- G1: Indian male 31-50 Birmingham
- G2: Pakistani/Bangladeshi female 21-30 Bradford
- G3: black African male and female 31-50 London
- G4: African-Caribbean male and female 31-50 London
- G5: Chinese/East Asian male and female 31-50 Manchester
  
- G6: Christian white 31-50 male and female London
- G7: Christian African/Af-Caribbean 21-30 male and female London
- G8: Muslim male 21-30 Bradford
- G9: Muslim female 31-50 Bradford
- G10: Hindu female 21-30 Birmingham
- G11: Sikh male 31-50 Birmingham
- G12: Jewish male orthodox 31-50 London
- G13: Jewish female non-orthodox 21-30 London
  
- G14: EU/EEA nationals male and female 30-50 London
- G15: other non-third world nationals male and female 30-50 SE
- G16: Somali women London

Among respondents in these groups...

- Christians included a mix of denominations
- Muslims, Hindus and Sikhs groups included a mix of those who regarded themselves as practising their religion and those who did not
- EU/EEA nationals included no more than two from any one country and at least one EEA country
- Commonwealth nationals included no more than two from any one country and at least two different continents
- Somali women had all arrived in the UK within the last two years

Locations for the groups were chosen as areas which have relatively large numbers of the relevant minority groups.

#### Individual interviews

D1 and D2: blind people's organisations

D3 and D4: deaf people's organisations

D5 and D6: arthritis and Parkinson's Disease organisations

D 7 and D8: elderly and physically disabled people's organisations

D9 and D10: mental health organisations

D11: person with hearing difficulties

D12: person with impaired sight

D13: person with mobility problems

D14: person with arthritis

D15: Gypsies' organisation

D16 and 17: homeless people's organisations

D18: representative of transgender people

#### 4. **Exclusions**

The following were excluded from the sample on the grounds that they would be better informed and/or have atypical views on the subject under discussion: anyone working in, or with close family or friends working in advertising, marketing, market research, public relations, journalism, the Police, the Home Office, Customs and Excise, the DWP, Citizens Advice Bureaux, organisations involved in civil liberties or welfare rights.

## C. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### 1. **Overall response to ID cards and the customer experience**

Support for the principle of ID cards remains strong: most of this sample felt it would be a good idea both before and after discussing the proposed customer experience.

Support tends to be expressed more in emotional terms than in rational terms: people worry about threats to the country's security, want to feel something can be done about it, and see ID cards as a helpful measure. The prospect of an 'official', publicly-held record of individuals' identities is seen as a powerful tool in efforts to counter a range of illegal activities.

People have rarely considered the practicalities of ID cards and how they might deal with these threats on a day-to-day basis.

Acceptance of the idea is consistent across demographics, regions and minority groups. Race and faith appear to play little part in attitudes to ID cards, either in principle or in relation to their day-to-day usage, but the more physically and emotionally vulnerable see risks to themselves and sought reassurance about these.

Overall the customer experience as proposed in the Home Office video is not greatly different from expectations, and appears to be at least acceptable to most special issues groups in the UK. If anything it is less daunting than expected: the description of the procedures makes them seem quicker, easier and simpler than most people imagine, even allowing for the inclusion of biometrics.

### 2. **Issues for minorities and special issues groups**

Though the proposed customer experience is generally accepted, aspects of it prompt concerns among many minority sectors, particularly those with disabilities, those who feel vulnerable and Muslim women.

They worry about: understanding information needs at the application stage; difficulties in meeting appointments; divulging certain information at application and enrolment stages; about how they will be treated at

enrolment centres; how verification procedures such as PINs and biometric checking will affect them; and among non-UK nationals, about how the fact of having visibly different cards will affect them.

Underlying these concerns is a general and widely-felt concern about the security of the personal information people will have to give. At all aspects of the customer experience there is a perceived risk that information will be vulnerable to loss, theft or forgery and that this could have serious consequences.

Some of these worries are based on significant misconceptions about aspects of: the range of information required of them; the enrolment procedures; the importance of the card as a component of the system; and the issue of compulsion.

Whatever is proposed, communication about the customer experience is particularly important for people with special issues, and especially those with difficulty in receiving or understanding information. The launch of ID cards needs to take all these into account, and offer as much reassurance as is possible.

### **3. Recommendations for the customer experience**

#### **3.1 General points**

It will be extremely difficult to put in place a system which satisfies all requirements among the general public and minority groups, from security to fine details of enrolment. The recommendations offered here are intended to specify a system that will meet the main needs of the key minorities and groups with special issues. It may well be impossible to provide for all these needs, but these recommendations will provide guidance on how best to improve the customer experience for them.

An underlying general need is to make all users, but particularly those with disabilities and vulnerabilities, feel confident about the entire customer experience. People need to believe that whatever their circumstances or situation, the scheme and the staff operating it will accommodate them with sensitivity, understanding and care; and without fuss or any suggestion that they are being singled out or excluded.

### 3.2 Application

Around application the ideal would be to:

- inform applicants of the need to provide biometric information at enrolment, and explain the value of this to guarding their identity
- let people know how quick, easy and non-threatening the process of enrolling is, by spelling out in advance what it will entail
- offer a choice of application options – in person, post, telephone, internet
- publicise these and the 'phone number and website
- make available a system for giving advice and help for those applying in person
- ensure that the application form (in all formats) is not too long nor too intrusive
- provide for application in different languages for those without English as a first language, in all application formats
- make a videophone or textphone service available for those wanting to make a telephone application, particularly visually impaired and hearing impaired people
- ensure that the language on the forms and any accompanying notes is simple
- reassure people that they will not have to send personal documents to enrolment centres before they enrol
- include explanatory notes to accompany the form, and an outline of the enrolment procedure
- provide at least one, preferably two, means of requesting special facilities and assistance at enrolment: blank space for requests **and** tick boxes

- offer an alternative means of identifying themselves for those who cannot sign their names
- reassure transgender people that they will not have to reveal their former gender
- confirm appointments in writing, or by whichever means applicants prefer
- give greater flexibility of appointment and changes to appointments to those with physical disabilities

### 3.3 Enrolment centres

As far as application and enrolment are concerned it will be important to:

- create enough enrolment centres to allow access within around 30-45 minutes' travelling time
- ensure that enrolment centres are well served by public transport, have good parking for physically disabled people and are well signed externally
- if possible, allow one-stop application and enrolment for homeless people
- keep enrolment centres open from 8.00am to 9.00 pm weekdays and 9.00am to 1.00pm Saturdays and Sundays
- allow elderly and other vulnerable people the choice of daylight appointments
- provide translators, linguists and deaf signers at enrolment centres, preferably at any where there is significant demand and at all centres on a regular basis
- ensure that public-facing staff have the experience, training, understanding and sensitivity to deal sympathetically with those who have any kind of disability, physical or mental
- provide clear written information about all aspects of the customer experience in relevant languages and Braille

- ensure enrolment centres are well signed internally, have good disabled access, space for disabled people, adequate lighting for disabled people and privacy for those who want it
- provide mobile enrolment centres and provide for enrolment at places frequented by those with limited mobility (such as drop in centres and community centres used by elderly people, disabled people, homeless people)
- ensure that mobile centres offer easy means of making appointments for those with limited mobility, that they provide for other special issues and that they are secure

### 3.4 Enrolment procedures

The needs in relation to enrolment are to...

- insofar as possible, ensure that the procedure is as quick, simple and stress-free as possible, particularly for the vulnerable and disabled
- reassure Muslim women that they need not have contact with a man for the biometric information recording procedure, nor that they need remove their hijab, assuming the face is uncovered
- inform Muslim women who wear burkhas that these will not have to be removed for photographs in the presence of men
- reassure Muslim women that CCTV images would not be viewed by men if they included shots of them without their burkhas or hijabs
- reassure Sikh men who wear turbans and Jewish women who wear wigs that they will not have to remove these during enrolment
- allow disabled people's carers to be present if wanted

- clarify that all three types of biometric information will not be needed for those who are unable to provide, or have legitimate reasons to be exempted from providing, a particular type (eg fingerprint and photo sufficient if it is not possible to provide iris images)
- consider offering a code of conduct or service guarantee covering all aspects of application, enrolment and use of cards, particularly for people with special issues
- offer fast track application and enrolment at a premium
- offer options for receiving the card – secure post or in person - and consider other options – cards activated after receipt, designated signers, collection from post offices

### 3.5 Cards, usage and verification

In relation to card usage, it will help to:

- explain that the database, not the card, is the more important part of the system
- explain that the range of information on the system will be basic and not intrusive
- explain to non-UK nationals the need to have a visibly different resident's card
- communicate that verification will not be difficult, awkward or threatening to people with special issues and is intended to make them feel included, not excluded
- confirm that there will be no compulsion to carry the card
- explain the value of PINs, and confirm that they can be personalised
- but do not make PINs compulsory for those who have difficulty using them
- explain the need for and role of different levels of verification

- reassure that low-level verification will not involve checking biometrics

### 3.6 Security

Here the need is to provide reassurance that:

- the system as a whole will be secure
- the hardware and software used for enrolment and verification are reliable and not prone to crashing or making errors
- staff will have been vetted for their trustworthiness and will ensure that people's information is held in confidence
- disclosure of information will not be routine and will be handled with regard to the law and the Data Protection Act
- loss of an ID card does not mean there will be a risk of information or identity being misused
- there are simple and reliable procedures for what to do in the event of losing a card
- measures will be in place to counter any attempt to forge cards and make sure that forged cards will not function with the verification service

## D. DETAILED FINDINGS

### 1. **Awareness of and initial reactions to the ID Cards proposal**

#### 1.1 Awareness and expectations

Awareness of the proposal to introduce ID cards was almost universal. Only a few people from minority ethnic groups said they were not familiar with the idea. Otherwise it was well known, though the impression was that it had not been in the news in the recent past.

It was notable that even when stories about it were in the media, these had not always registered. During the period of fieldwork, reports appeared covering several aspects of ID cards – problems with checking biometric information, the fact that ID cards were now to be separate from passports, and the possible cost of the system. Only a few respondents had noticed these stories, and they did not appear to have had much impact on general perceptions of ID cards.

As has been evident in previous research, confidence in ID cards being introduced varied widely. Many respondents felt it was inevitable in light of growing threats of terrorism and illegal immigration; they believed the government would have no option but to use ID cards to help address these issues. Others were more doubtful; they were not convinced ID cards would be launched, not because there was an inherent difficulty in doing so but because the idea had been suggested in the past and not reached fruition.

Even those who were most confident that ID cards would be launched had no feeling of certainty about when this would happen. Many felt impatient and frustrated at the apparent delay in going ahead with the idea.

*“I think David Blunkett has been scared off it by the left wing of the Labour party. I think the noisy minority in this country who get up to things they shouldn’t, I think they are making such a fuss about it that I’m not sure they are going to do it.”*

Non-orthodox Jewish female 21-30 London

*“You hear about it and then it never seems to come to fruition.”*

Orthodox Jewish male 31-50 London

*“Why don’t the government stop dilly dallying? Set a date for a year or 2 years time, make it compulsory, end of story. And you have to carry it.”*

Christian white male and female 31-50 London

Knowledge of specific proposals and features also varied considerably, but was often inaccurate and/or incomplete. Among the great majority who had heard about proposals to introduce ID cards, the features they thought they knew about it were typically focused on biometrics, though understanding of this was far from complete.

*“It has like a spec on it about you as a person and finger prints and things like that I think.”*

EU/EEA nationals male and female 31-50 London

*“We are going to have ID like eye scans so that they can’t be forged. I heard it in the news.”*

Muslim male 21-30 Bradford

There were a number of other assumptions and expectations about ID cards. The most widely held belief was that ID cards would be compulsory to have: many people thought they had heard this, or if not, assumed it was the case because they could not envisage the system working unless it was mandatory. Many also believed ID cards would be compulsory to carry; this perception again came from news stories, hearsay or was assumed.

Related to this it was often believed that if cards were compulsory to carry there would be fines for people found without their card; in the Midlands several respondents referred to local newspaper stories that people would be fined £1,000 if they were stopped by the police and found not to have their card with them.

*“...they were saying once the ID cards start and people are not carrying ID cards they can be fined up to £1,000...I read that in the newspaper, everybody has to carry the ID card once it has been set up and you have to have it all the time and everybody has to have that when they go out*

Sikh male 31-50 Birmingham

When told that ID cards would not be compulsory to have when first introduced, and would not be compulsory to carry, many respondents expressed surprise and disappointment. In any case, some also believed that the need to have an ID card before renewing a passport effectively made the system compulsory.

*“If it is not compulsory then it is absolutely pointless, the whole point they are doing it is to stop terrorism and illegal asylum and they are the people that are not going to apply for it obviously so what is the point?”*

Non-orthodox Jewish female 21-30 London

*“I can’t believe they’re not going to make it compulsory. It just won’t work unless everyone has to have one.”*

Christian white male and female 31-50 London

*“How can you have a national identity register which you can choose to go on or not? I think it’s disingenuous to say that it’s voluntary.”*

Orthodox Jewish male 31-50 London

Another major assumption was that the cards and/or the system (the database linked to the cards) will carry a large quantity of detailed personal information on each individual. Specific expectations here varied, but the information was believed to include one or more of: medical records; DNA; criminal records; employment details; and financial information.

There was also a widespread assumption, largely based on press stories, that individuals will have to pay for the cards. Not many had heard precise sums quoted, but those who said they had heard something about cost thought the amount involved was £75-£85.

## 1.2 Perceived purpose

Unprompted assumptions about the purpose of ID cards invariably focused on their benefits to society rather than benefits to the individual. Their primary function was seen as the prevention of a range of illegal activities, by requiring everyone to be able to prove their identity. Specifically people believed that ID cards were being proposed as a response to problems of illegal immigration, terrorism, international organised crime and benefit fraud.

Few respondents had concrete ideas about how ID cards would help address these threats, but many believed that somehow they would play a part. The common thread to this perception was the notion that ID cards would protect law-abiding citizens from threats from elsewhere.

This meant threats from outside the UK, particularly countries where terrorists are believed to be based; other parts of the UK, where people

believe there is more illegal activity than in their locality; and different sectors of the population, particularly asylum seekers, benefit claimants and criminals. A few respondents mentioned other possible benefits of ID cards unprompted, including health tourism.

*“There’s so much crime and fraud at the moment and if this is a way to a safer society I just think it’s something we have to do.”*

Orthodox Jewish male 31-50 London

*“It’s a good idea to have one because it will hopefully stop organised crime and terrorism. It’ll winkle out the people who shouldn’t be in this country; they won’t be able to hide or use false names. But it should be compulsory for everyone, or not at all.”*

Chinese/East Asian male and female 31-50 Manchester

*“It would help with a national database of who we have in the country. You’d be able to match a criminal to a particular identity, so if there are people out there whose life is all about committing crime, if you have a national database with biometric information it makes it more difficult for those individuals.”*

Black African male and female 31-50 London

*“One of the biggest things that would stop is people who claim to be five or six different people who claim housing benefit and cost the government an awful lot of money.”*

Muslim male 21-30 Bradford

*“The good side would always be that you can track down people in terms of actual nationality. You always have this problem with asylum seekers who are not genuine or are not national to the country so I mean I think it could make it a lot easier.”*

Sikh male 31-50 Birmingham

*“I do think they’re a good idea because there is so much going on in the world today and there is so many different ways of people taking your identity in a way, maybe like taking money or pretending to be you for certain things and I think it’s quite a good idea that it could stop some of that and stop terrorism, to stop illegal immigrants. So I think it’s a good thing.”*

Other non-third world nationals male and female 31-50 London

*“If they wanted to know who you were then they would just have to scan your card or take a fingerprint and they would know exactly who you were. So if there was a robbery for instance and there was a fingerprint left then they could track you down, whereas at the moment they can only track you if you have had a previous criminal record can’t they.”*

Non-orthodox Jewish female 21-30 London

*“I noticed in my doctor’s a notice saying to foreigners, ‘You must pay for your treatment’. I hadn’t seen that before. So*

*[the ID card] could make sure that you were a British national."*

Chinese/East Asian male and female 31-50 Manchester

*"We've got people living on the streets and they can't get to hospital and there was an incident in the papers where this multi millionaire from Egypt comes here for his blood pressure treatment and all the like. So he is scrounging on the health service and we've got people living on the streets and they can't get that sort of treatment. So it would save the money that goes to the wrong people and channel it into the right people."*

Black African male and female 31-50 London

ID cards were expected to be more effective in combating illegal immigration and benefit fraud than terrorism. On a practical level it was more difficult to envisage how ID cards could prevent terrorist activity, because terrorists were more determined, better organised and likely to be legally resident in the UK. A minority were less convinced that ID cards could protect the country from external threats generally, and felt that the government was using ID cards to support its policies on immigration and asylum.

*"I don't fall for it myself, I don't go for the fact that we are any more likely under threat than we were prior to September 11<sup>th</sup>. I just think the government want to focus on it and therefore scare the majority of people into believing that we are always under threat."*

Sikh male 31-50 Birmingham

It was also clear that ID cards were characterised as about exclusion, not inclusion and preventing, not allowing – about keeping threats away or at bay, not about making life easier for the law-abiding. This was at least acceptable to most UK members of the public, but could seem unsettling to vulnerable groups: recent immigrants; people with physical or mental disabilities or limitations; people with self-perceived lower social status, eg travellers, homeless people, some benefit recipients.

*"If you have got nothing to hide then you have no reason to be opposed to it. The reason that they are doing this is for the people who have got something to hide."*

Orthodox Jewish male 31-50 London

*"I'm concerned about how it's going to affect people like us. We get a hard time anyway. Is this going to give them another reason to go after us?"*

Gypsies stakeholder

The principle of ID cards offering benefits to the individual did not ring true for the majority of respondents. In part this was because it conflicted with expectations of ID cards: this was not what they were believed to be about. It was also because few had considered how ID cards might be of help to them: the first response was that there was no obvious need. This was reinforced when individual benefits were introduced in the discussions. These were often rejected because they were less plausible: it was harder to discern significant benefits of ID cards because proving identity was not currently a significant problem for most people in mainstream society.

Individual benefits were also seen by some people as a means of 'selling' the idea of ID cards, especially in the context of assumptions about paying for cards. The feeling here was that the government believed people would be more prepared to pay for cards if they felt there was a tangible benefit to themselves in having cards. Another aspect of this was a feeling that putting forward individual benefits was overly paternalistic and condescending – people did not want to be told that ID cards would be good for them.

On consideration and after further discussion, acceptance of the individual benefits of ID cards grew. The prospect of a simpler and foolproof system of proving their identity appealed to some respondents – if it really worked as promised. There was also some acceptance that the need for and purpose of an ID system, at both society and individual levels, would grow in future as it became more important to make places of work, commerce and public importance secure.

*"I think it's OK. I'd feel comfortable with an ID card. If you don't have an ID card somebody else might mistake you, you may be mistaken for somebody else. So ID would be ideal. You can prove who you are."*

Black African male and female 31-50 London

*"It's nice to know you can produce that and it's evidence of who you are, what you are, why you are."*

Hindu female 31-50 Birmingham

*"I mean nobody carries their passport around with them but this identity card if you carried it round with you and for instance, I don't know, you were involved in an accident at least someone would be able to identify who you are and where you are from."*

Sikh male 31-50 Birmingham

*“We’ve also had problems with low budget airlines who although you don’t need a passport to go from Scotland to England they require ID which essentially is a passport.”*

Elderly people’s stakeholder

Some respondents felt ID cards could plausibly act as a social leveller by placing all UK citizens on the same footing. This was particularly important for groups who felt that their status in society was low, for example travellers, who were keen to be accepted by society but felt demonised because of a criminal element within their community; and homeless people, who found it extremely difficult to prove their identity and access services.

Although organisations representing these groups often welcomed the ID card in principle, for similar reasons, they also identified a corresponding risk that, if the ID scheme is not introduced fairly and comprehensively, it could exclude vulnerable groups by failing to enrol them.

At a more specific level there was some belief that ID cards could be helpful to sectors of the population which do not have the forms of ID available to the majority, particularly elderly people, benefit claimants and recent immigrants. They welcomed the opportunity they felt ID cards would provide to prove their legal status more easily.

*“Well, ironically, it would actually solve a huge problem that a lot of older people have in that de facto ID has come down to passports and driving licences. Many older women didn’t learn to drive and so don’t have driving licences and also don’t have passports and, therefore, find opening bank accounts, for example, a real headache. They haven’t got this ID so an ID card would, in fact, be very helpful for those sorts of people.”*

Elderly people’s stakeholder

Among foreign nationals in our sample there was widespread bemusement that ID cards should have prompted debate in the UK. Virtually all were accustomed to having and using ID cards and other forms of identity in their country of origin and had no concerns about them. In addition they felt that an ID card or Residence Permit would make life in the UK easier for them because they would not have to carry passports. Against this the proposed inclusion of biometric information worried some; their own countries’ ID cards did not include this.

*“I was surprised that you could drive without a driving licence with a picture on it (in the UK), I mean that is like unthinkable in Spain.”*

EU/EEA nationals male and female 31-50 London

*“In Germany you always have it with you. Always...It’s just another card to put in your wallet.”*

EU/EEA nationals male and female 31-50 London

*“An ID card can prove your identity any time. So you don’t have to carry your documents.”*

Other non-third world nationals male and female 31-50 London

*“I wouldn’t have a problem to have an ID card because in Germany I had one, but I think this is too much. You don’t need my iris, my fingerprint.”*

EU/EEA nationals male and female 31-50 London

### 1.3 Role of government

The research did not set out to explore the role of government in introducing and running ID cards, but this came up in most discussions and had a significant influence on attitudes.

Many people had contradictory views about the government’s role in ID cards. They accepted that ID cards have to be from and of government or the state, for a variety of reasons. Though they did not express it in these terms, it was clear that ethically and philosophically most members of the public felt that only the government/the state has reason to introduce ID cards, and has the authority to do so. It was also generally understood, if not explicitly, that only the government could generate and push through the necessary legislation to introduce ID cards. Finally most people assumed that only the government or a government body would have the resources to set up and run the system.

Nevertheless, the fact of government involvement in ID cards prompted concerns, objections and sometimes hostility to the idea in principle. Part of this was probably to do with inherent suspicion of governments: it is not unusual for governments engender feelings of suspicion and distrust; it may be that the current government attracts more than the usual weight of negativity at the moment among some people.

The impression among many people was that ID cards were something that should benefit us all and that we should have, but that the government, as the proponent of the idea, was trying to take the lead

on. Related to this, there was a feeling among a substantial minority that the government was using ID cards as a smokescreen to mask perceived lack of progress in areas the system was trying to address, particularly illegal immigration. The logic here was that if the government had effective policies in place to stop illegal immigration (and other problems), ID cards would not be needed.

*“They would be better off sorting out the borders in the UK.”*

Non-orthodox Jewish female 21-30 London

*“Unless the Government give the police more authority to do things then it is just pointless.”*

Non-orthodox Jewish female 21-30 London

*“They’re spending a lot of money on this. Why don’t they sort out terrorism first?”*

Muslim female 31-50 Bradford

The consequence of this apparently contradictory thinking was that even those who accepted ID cards in principle were inclined to criticise the proposals presented to them. This was particularly reflected in response to the propositions, especially those offering benefits to the individual.

## 2. Overall perceptions of the customer experience

### 2.1 Summary

It was difficult to explore detailed issues surrounding the customer experience in isolation. The mistaken belief that ID cards would be compulsory to carry, and the knowledge or expectation that people would have to pay for their ID cards, informed much comment. Response to and acceptance of the application procedure and system of verification was often conditional on expectations in these areas.

The process of applying for, enrolling for and receiving cards was largely accepted. In most respects the proposals were much as expected; the assumption was that applicants would complete a form containing personal information, this would be checked and verified and the card sent out.

The proposal to include biometric information added in an unfamiliar element, which meant that other aspects of how the card would work in practice were more difficult to grasp. The application process was less

easy to envisage, and it was harder for people to anticipate and understand how the system of verification would work in practice since they were unable to relate it directly to their previous experience.

Most respondents were broadly happy with the proposals; they expressed many qualifications to this, but these seemed relatively minor, and/or not too difficult to address.

Race and nationality did not have a major influence on perceptions of the proposals. Faith was a factor in some respects, particularly Islam, but none of the issues raised appeared to involve insurmountable problems.

By far the greatest number of concerns came from other minorities, expressed by stakeholders representing vulnerable people, in particular those with disabilities or uncertain status. Stakeholders were very keen to give their views and to be involved in any further consultation on the customer experience.

Many expressed concerns with practical issues: the logistics of organising applications and sending out ID cards were expected to be huge and prone to problems. Many respondents were not convinced it could be achieved successfully; some referred to past negative experience of problems with large public sector databases.

*"I wonder how you would get these cards, and how many people would apply for them? There are 52 million people living in this country now. That would be a big worry."*

C2DE 31-45 core public service users London (Propositions sample)

*"I can't see how they're going to do it. They'll have 45 million people needing to apply."*

Black African male and female 31-50 London

*"That'll take many years to do. I think they have to do it systematically. Whether they'll go into different towns I don't know. They have to cover every property. It's going to take years and years."*

Orthodox Jewish male 31-50 London

*"Then you think about the size of the system needed to run it, all the staff they'll have to take on and train..."*

Indian male 31-50 Birmingham

*"Two years ago there was a whole debacle with child tax credit. Forms going astray, things not happening. The whole system went down, the computers were useless. If you've*

*got that only for a limited number of people what's going to happen when you do something on a wider scale?"*

Orthodox Jewish male 31-50 London

## 2.2 Overall expectations

Many people assumed the entire process would be handled in one, and did not expect two stages – because they had not considered how biometric information would be gathered and handled.

Expectations of the efficiency of the system were typically low: most people assumed there would be problems. In particular people expected that if they made an appointment at an enrolment centre this might be delayed or involve a long wait, they expected that appointments would take longer than planned anyway. It was also anticipated that delays would be caused by applicants themselves, making mistakes and omissions. People expected the delivery of the cards also to be slow.

*"The staff are probably not going to be friendly after the fifth person they have interviewed, there are going to be queues and queues of people, the equipment is going to be dirty! There will be nowhere to park, you won't be able to get an appointment and you will be queuing for God knows how long and that is what is going to happen."*

Non-orthodox Jewish female 21-30 London

*"Also I bet even though you have an appointment you will have a long wait when you get there. There will be teething problems won't there for definite."*

Non-orthodox Jewish female 21-30 London

*"There would be a big long queue. Five tills and one working."*

Christian African/African-Caribbean 21-30 London

*"If it's anything like going for a hospital appointment it's like half a day."*

Christian white male and female 31-50 London

*"It would have to be very well organised. If you have ever been to the driving and vehicle licensing place you're queuing all the way down the stairs."*

Muslim female 31-50 Bradford

These expectations were based on experience of other public services, particularly the NHS. The DVLA, Jobcentres and Benefits Agency offices were also mentioned. Delays were regarded as the norm.

A few had had more positive experiences, particularly of the Passport Service, which had been quick and efficient, especially for fast track applications.

### 2.3 Response to proposed procedures

The Home Office video was very helpful in outlining the procedure and addressing concerns that arose: for most, the procedure seemed straightforward, simple and not intrusive. Virtually all the concerns which arose after seeing the video came from stakeholders and those with disabilities; a few were raised by Muslim women. These concerns focused on enrolment centres: their locations, facilities and staff.

The key perceived need was to give these people the confidence that, for them, the system would be workable. Part of this involved creating a means of warning enrolment centres in advance of the need for particular facilities to be available. It was also important that provision of facilities was seen as a standard part of the offering, not as something exceptional.

Some of those with, or representing people with, disabilities, had other points to make. Stakeholders were vociferous in their demands for people they represented to have their specific needs met: if this was a major public project fostered by government, it should cater for all minorities. In practical terms, this would mean not only providing facilities for people with disabilities, but also staff who were aware of the implications of their problems, eg deaf aware, blind aware, and sensitive to disabled people's needs.

Adequate communication of the procedures was considered essential, given the likely difficulties facing people with disabilities or in problematic circumstances.

The security of the enrolment process was a common preoccupation, but the context of the discussion and the nature of the topic probably heightened worries about security. While people were keen in the research environment to demonstrate their awareness of security issues they may in fact be a lower priority than people claimed.

### 3. The application procedure

#### 3.1 Expectations

Expectations of the application procedure were generally common sense and fairly close to what has been proposed, on the basis of applying for passports and driving licences. The first step was expected to be completing an application form, then sending this off for the information to be checked, and an appointment would be made for enrolment.

*“You get an application form from the post office. You have to confirm that you live where you live.”*

*“You give some form of identification to verify it.”*

Orthodox Jewish male 31-50 London

*“Then you’d have to go somewhere with it to have your fingerprints or iris done. Or they book you a date to go somewhere.”*

*“I imagine it would be an office like the passport office that you go to.”*

Christian white male and female 31-50 London

As with applications for driving licences and passports, it was expected that forms for ID cards would be made available at post offices. People also expected that there would be a website and a telephone number from which application forms could be requested, or which could be used to make applications over the internet or by ‘phone. They also expected the ‘phone number and internet address to be well publicised.

*“I think for such a process to be foolproof it needs to work in the same way that they are doing now to get a driving licence. You get the form from anywhere, say the post office, go to a centre with all the details, leave the details there, they will cross check the information with the application and if they need any more information they will get back to you. They’ll return your originals and then initiate the process of getting you the licence. So the same thing with the card. You supply the information, they process it, then they send you the card.”*

Black African male and female 31-50 London

When it was explained that the ID card would involve biometric information, and that this would have to be provided in person, respondents generally understood that they would have to make a personal visit. They expected that the application form would contain information regarding making an appointment for enrolment, at which the biometrics would be given, and that all information given would

have to be verified. This was acceptable in principle, depending on what was involved in providing biometrics.

### 3.2 Filling in the form

The initial assumption, based on experience of other official forms such as passport or benefit claims, was typically that the paper application form would be long and detailed. Expectations of exact length were vague and varied, but the general feeling seemed to be that the form would be 6-8 pages. Alongside this the assumption was that the form would contain questions about a large volume of personal information, and could include some that were quite intrusive. People sought reassurance that completing the application would not be too demanding or time consuming.

*“I suppose it would be filling in a form like when you apply for a passport.”*

Non-orthodox Jewish female 21-30 London

*“I imagine it to be something like the passport form, and being quite clear. But if it’s like the passport form it can be a real nightmare if you get one thing wrong.”*

Hindu female 31-50 Birmingham

When asked if they would like the choice of completing applications in other formats (eg online or by ‘phone), most respondents said they would, though typically they had reservations about some formats. They were all able to choose one format which suited them; the underlying demand was for a choice of options.

*“That’s very good because they give you different options.”*

Muslim male 21-30 Bradford

The most important factors in preferences for different formats were the perceived security of the information and convenience of submitting the application. In relation to security, many people had concerns about sending a form with personal information through the post. Though in reality the information involved would probably be no more than might be on other forms, such as bank account applications or benefit claims, there was a greater worry about this sort of information in the context of applying for an identity card, probably because people believed there would be a higher incentive for fraudsters to attempt to obtain it. There were also worries, based on misconceptions, that people would have to

send important documents such as birth certificates through the postal system.

*"I think the internet and telephone are subject to a tremendous fraud opportunity. By post or in person is probably the most secure."*

Orthodox Jewish male 31-50 London

*"Post, too much fraud. Over the 'phone you'd have to use the post so that becomes irrelevant. Internet, no I don't like that. So it would have to be in person."*

Christian African/African-Caribbean 21-30 London

*"If I had the time I'd do it in person. By preference I'd do it by post but I'd send it registered."*

Muslim male 21-30 Bradford

*"They don't like sending original birth certificates by post. This would worry them."*

Elderly people's stakeholder

Convenience was more important for those in work or people with otherwise busy lives. Their need was to be able to submit their application as easily and quickly as possible. On consideration they tended to relegate security to a lower priority than convenience. For others, particularly elderly and vulnerable people, convenience was an issue if they had limited mobility, but some still regarded security as more important.

### Paper application

Many preferred the idea of a paper application, particularly older people and those who were less confident about using other forms of communication. They preferred to see the information and answers in black and white in front of them, and wanted the reassurance of seeing what they had written. Some younger people saw paper application forms as cumbersome, inefficient and somewhat dated.

*"I'm just happy to do it in writing. I can see what I've written, I know what I've put, where I've got to with it."*

Christian African/African-Caribbean 21-30 London

### Internet

The option of making applications using the internet had some supporters, who saw it as quick and efficient. It was convenient for those who were computer literate and had easy access to a computer.

However, it did raise concerns about security; many people who were less accustomed to using computers worried that computer systems and programmes might be vulnerable to hacking, and that their valuable personal information would be stolen and misused.

*“I’d prefer the internet, just because of time.”*

Christian white male and female 31-50 London

*“Doing it on the internet, well that’s not that secure is it, so if it’s something like this I would rather do it in person, and fill out the form at the same time, and then provide all this information.”*

Hindu female 31-50 Birmingham

*“On the internet, if there’s a very good hacker, he’s going to get all the information.”*

Other non-third world nationals male and female 31-50 London

The internet was not regarded as a suitable option for elderly people, primarily because few were believed to have access to computers, or to be computer literate. Elderly people were also more likely to be concerned than younger age groups about security of applications submitted over the internet.

*“In general terms most don’t have access to the internet.”*

Elderly people’s stakeholder

## Telephone

The telephone offered some advantages in terms of speed and efficiency, and was the only real option for those with sight problems, and those with limited manual dexterity. People with literacy problems also found the prospect of making a telephone application attractive because they could not write well; and there was interest in using the ‘phone among those who did not have English as a first language, provided they could speak to someone in their first language.

*“I’d assume you pick up the ‘phone and someone types in your details then you just turn up to have your photo taken.”*

Christian white male and female 31-50 London

*“I would prefer someone who speaks my language who you could ‘phone and talk to.”*

Pakistani/Bangladeshi female 21-30 Bradford

Others expressed reservations about using the ‘phone: they anticipated long calls with call queuing, automated call systems involving lists of options, and delays and frustrations in getting access to a real person

on the other end of the phone. Some were also worried about security: they wondered how trustworthy the staff running the system would be and whether they would be vetted.

### In person

Applying in person was the least preferred option for most, who saw it as time-consuming and inconvenient because there would be two trips required, one for the form and one to enrol. This was off-putting to those with limited time, particularly those in full time work or with young children at home. They would rather send or call in their application.

More positively, the prospect of making a personal application was thought to offer some advantages over other methods in terms of security, particularly among some of the elderly, the homeless and recent immigrants to the UK. These people felt that if they completed the form at the enrolment centre in person they could be sure the information had arrived and that there was no danger of it being misappropriated.

*“Older people always prefer face to face. The face to face option is always helpful for some older people.”*

Elderly people's stakeholder

There was also an element of emotional and practical support in applying in person: if they ran into difficulties finding the right answers, they could ask for help. In person application was also appealing to those with language problems who thought they would need help understanding the form and giving answers, or people with disabilities who would not be able to manage a paper or internet form. They imagined that being face to face with someone who could help them would be important.

*“The actual application process, the forms need to be provided in alternative formats, so people who use Braille or tape should be able to complete the form in Braille, or respond on tape. It's possible to have forms that are audible, or audio tape forms, where you have gaps for people to record information. So that people don't have to get someone else to help them. I imagine there would be a fair amount of private information that people might not want to share with other people.”*

Blind people's stakeholder

With these potential benefits in mind, some wanted to be able to make in-person applications at nearer locations than enrolment centres. They suggested application centres in local post offices, where they could get help with applications in a similar way to the Check and Send assisted passport application service.

It was occasionally suggested that applications, in whatever format, should contain a note informing applicants of which documents and information they should bring to the enrolment centre.

### 3.3 Special issues

Irrespective of their preferred means of applying, several important elements around the process of making the application were raised by people with special issues.

They wanted separate explanatory notes to accompany the form and an outline of the enrolment procedure to help applicants anticipate what they would need at their appointment. They also expected at least one means of flagging the particular needs that were likely to come up at enrolment, whether these were to do with facilities, staff or other aspects of the process. Ideally this meant both having a space on the form in which they could spell out their special issues in their own words and, for those who did not want to spell out their needs (and by implication their disability), a 'tick box' list of options to help them signal their requests.

*"It's best to put it on the form to say if you go to a centre for the biometric testing make sure you're got it on there that you require additional support, for example, sign language interpreter or whatever."*

Deaf people's stakeholder

*"Certainly there are very clear medical conditions which would mean the person couldn't do one or two of the things. If they could be identified on the application form then that would be very simple for the person to tick the box."*

Elderly people's stakeholder

This need to forewarn of their conditions conflicted with another important characteristic of people with disabilities that was identified by stakeholders: a reluctance to acknowledge and reveal their conditions. Stakeholders for elderly people and those with disabilities made the point that they did not want to be labelled as having certain conditions,

and that this might inhibit them from including this information on their forms.

Clearly there was a tension between providing these people with the facility to request special help and avoiding seeming insensitive about their conditions. Above all it seemed important that applicants with special issues would have more than one chance and more than one means to make their requests. When pressed, interviewees felt that it was better to risk their sensitivities at application stage than to fail to meet their needs at enrolment.

*"I think when people make the initial contact, either by post or over the phone or whatever, thought needs to be given as to how people either self select or say "Well actually I'm visually impaired."...Because a number of visually impaired people wouldn't necessarily consider themselves to be visually impaired, because they may be seeing their failing sight as part of ageing, so they don't identify as visually impaired."*

Blind people's stakeholder

There was also a range of more specific issues about the procedure which cropped up, based on individuals' specific needs.

Hearing-impaired people and stakeholders suggested a videophone or textphone service should be available for those wanting to make a telephone application, given their difficulty in using the 'phone in the usual fashion. One hearing impairment stakeholder also requested that the language on the forms and any accompanying notes was simple, to aid those who were deaf from birth, who often have language problems.

*"It depends really on the deaf person. We're not all the same. For example, myself I'd probably want to use the Internet. Another deaf person maybe would go face to face because that's accessible with an interpreter. It does really depend on their needs. It's a good thing if you've got the four options which means that people can choose what accessibility suits them."*

Deaf people's stakeholder

Literacy was a concern for a range of people throughout the application and enrolment procedure. In particular it was expected to be a worry at the application stage for people who did not have English as a first language, some Gypsies and some homeless people. The belief was that these people would encounter difficulties reading or completing forms, and in some cases, problems with signing their names.

*“For people like us who can speak English maybe it is OK but for our parents it would be different. It will be hard for people who don’t speak the language.”*

Pakistani/Bangladeshi female 21-30 Bradford

Some of the more vulnerable, such as homeless people, were expected to want reassurance about the destination of information on the forms. Stakeholders felt that homeless people would worry more than others about what would happen to the information once recorded.

The transgender stakeholder thought that transgender people were more concerned about confidentiality than most others. They would not necessarily want to reveal their previous gender on a form, nor would they want to have their gender on their card if they were going through a gender change. This was a potential worry for them.

*“Most trans people would be scared by definition of basic identity information and I think even once you have actually got a gender recognition certificate it will still be a very worrying thing.”*

Transgender stakeholder

*“With the ID card you will only be effectively allowed one name. That causes difficulty for trans people who are in the process of gender transition. In practice it is a long process to change gender...If someone asked that across a public counter have you any previous names, no way, arrest me first.”*

Transgender stakeholder

### 3.4 Making appointments

Expectations of appointment times were consistent across the sample: most people imagined that it would take between two and four weeks to get an appointment for enrolment, and saw this as a reasonable length of time for both parties. There was a general preference for a degree of flexibility and negotiation in making appointments.

*“Yeah it should have time brackets and you tick a couple of boxes that are suitable for you.”*

*“Perhaps on the initial form you could tick and say what days of the week when you are available. You could tick a time slot that would suit you.”*

Christian white male and female 31-50 London

*“If they send you an appointment and you can’t make it I assume it’s easy to ring and say you can’t, and rearrange it.”*

Hindu female 31-50 Birmingham

*"I think it would be reasonable if you were given a time but given the option to change it."*

Elderly people's stakeholder

*"To be able to negotiate would make it a lot easier."*

Other non-third world nationals male and female 31-50 London

The general assumption, based on making other appointments for public services, was that applicants would be able to state a preferred date and time for enrolment on their application and that they would then receive confirmation of this or a suggestion of an alternative date, with an invitation to telephone if the alternative was not convenient. This was considered important both for practical reasons and to encourage positive feelings about the system and the process.

*"I would say you should get it in the post, with dates given for you, a certain date has been booked for you to come to a certain centre – 'If you can't make it please ring'."*

*"Just like the driving test. You get a card telling you the date and then you can ring and change it."*

Black African male and female 31-50 London

*"I think that if you tell people they will attend that'll get their backs up. If they feel they are in the driving seat, with options, they are the one who says "Right I'm going to choose the time," I think people would be much more accepting."*

Orthodox Jewish male 31-50 London

Confirmation was expected to be made in writing rather than by 'phone, in order that applicants would have a tangible record of the appointment. A few people said they would be happy with confirmation by email or SMS.

A few issues arose with regard to making appointments. Some of those with physical disabilities or conditions wanted to be offered a choice of appointments, and/or to be able to change appointments at short notice if they woke feeling unwell. These people also wanted an accessible and easy-to-use postponement/cancellation service. The problem they anticipated was that conditions such as arthritis or Parkinson's varied from day to day, and sufferers could not anticipate how they might feel on the day of the appointment. If they woke feeling poorly and not able to travel, they wanted to be able to rearrange at short notice.

*“People never know how they’ll feel day to day. It’s important to be able to change arrangements at short notice. It’s not like it is for other people.”*

Arthritis stakeholder

The homeless stakeholders raised the issue of difficulties of making appointments specific to homeless people. These people had no address to confirm an appointment and, as a result of their chaotic lifestyle, were expected to have difficulty in keeping an appointment. It would be better for them if the application and enrolment stages took place together.

#### 4. Enrolment

##### 4.1 Locations and opening hours of enrolment centres

There were strong and consistent demands for centres to be sufficiently numerous that they could be fairly close by – no more than three miles from home or work, or 30-45 minutes’ travelling time. For those living in cities and towns this effectively meant that they were prepared to travel into their city centre or to their borough town hall or civic centre. It was also considered important that centres were well served by public transport, that they had good, easy parking for elderly disabled people who drove, and were well signed externally.

*“It’s got to be somewhere in the centre of your town. No more than a couple of miles away.”*

*“I’m not taking time off work for it.”*

Christian white male and female 31-50 London

*“It should be at the local town hall. Not more than two or three miles away. Thirty minutes travel time.”*

Orthodox Jewish male 31-50 London

*“If there aren’t enough of them and if they aren’t put in places that are accessible by public transport then people who don’t have a car aren’t going to be able to get there.”*

Elderly people’s stakeholder

The need for easy access was driven by time constraints for those in work: most working people wanted the choice of enrolling near work or near home so they could minimise the time impact. Some had concerns about having to take time off work to enrol; these would be diminished if they could go out of work hours.

*"You should have the opportunity to do it where you work as well, not just where you live. People lead very busy lives now and you've got to do it around them."*

Christian white male and female 31-50 London

*"I wouldn't want it to take ages because you would have to take time off work to do it."*

Pakistani/Bangladeshi female 21-30 Bradford

*"My employers are not going to let me take time off work, I'm going to have to take it out of my own holiday. You shouldn't have to do that! If the government make it that you have to have it, that's it."*

Christian white male and female 31-50 London

In terms of opening hours the common demand was for centres to be open outside working hours and at weekends – 8.00am-9.00pm weekdays, 8.00pm-12.00pm Saturdays; a few felt they should be open 24 hours. Orthodox Jewish people felt Sundays should be offered too, given that they would not be able to attend on Saturdays.

*"It would have to be open more than 9 to 5, it needs to be open most of the day."*

Pakistani/Bangladeshi female 21-30 Bradford

*"I think it should be from 7am to 9pm. Maybe 10-4 on Saturday and Sundays."*

Non-orthodox Jewish female 21-30 London

*"If they didn't work 9 till 5, if they did 7 till 10 that would be absolutely fine."*

Christian white male and female 31-50 London

*"Saturday mornings would have an impact on Jews. It would have to be Sunday."*

Orthodox Jewish male 31-50 London

*"If you work on the other side of town... that's going to be difficult to be able to make it during the day and make it to work, and things like that. So I think they should be very flexible on opening hours and things like that, and what day of the week."*

Other non-third world nationals male and female 31-50 London

Stakeholders for elderly people wanted priority to be given to elderly people for daylight appointments during winter. They felt that many older people avoided going out after dark and would not be happy to be given appointments that meant they could not get home in daylight.

*"It would definitely have to be before dark. No way will people come out after dark."*

Elderly people's stakeholder

Stakeholders and people with special issues and who wanted certain facilities such as translators or signing had mixed views about travelling further to different enrolment centres offering these services. In general, they did not consider this unreasonable in principle. The hearing impairment stakeholder thought that given the shortage of interpreters and signers these facilities might not be generally available, but that they could be sourced as appropriate.

*"If I say, for example, I made my appointment for one o' clock which means they could book an interpreter to come along for an hour or two hours, however long."*

Deaf people's stakeholder

The group of Somali women, who seemed uncertain of and anxious about their status in the UK, and keen to fit in and comply with requests, said they would be willing to travel further to an appropriate centre.

However, given that travel was difficult for some of those people with disabilities and could be physically demanding or emotionally stressful, they felt that making them travel further was unreasonable, and could be seen as discriminatory. The idea that people with disabilities might have to make long journeys at their own expense was particularly unacceptable. Some non-English speaking Asian women also thought this unreasonable.

*"Visiting an enrolment centre could be difficult. A lot of people with Parkinson's don't visit, don't go out. For many of them it's a real struggle to get out."*

Parkinson's Disease stakeholder

*"They'll have to make a special journey. Visually impaired people don't drive and sometimes mobility is a real issue for them and they may not be able to take buses or trains, they may need to take taxis. So will the costs for people providing that information be met by the government?... We're talking about people who are financially less well off than other sectors of society, significantly so amongst older visually impaired people."*

Blind people's stakeholder

*"I don't think that is fair. That's another type of discrimination. They need to make it easier for our communities, not harder."*

Pakistani/Bangladeshi female 21-30 Bradford

As an alternative some suggested that special facilities could be provided at enrolment centres at specified times. They felt that if this

was publicised sufficiently in advance, and appointments could be made to tie in with these, it should be possible for them to have their particular needs met. These people might be part time or could be peripatetic and operate at a number of different centres within a region, according to a rota.

In any case, it was also pointed out that certain services, such as people who spoke minority languages, could be provided by the local population. In areas with high concentrations of people who spoke certain languages there would not be a problem finding staff who were fluent in those languages (assuming they fitted other employment conditions).

*“You always have these people who are bi-lingual or multi-lingual who work at these centres therefore you can request that you were seen by somebody who speaks your language.”*

Sikh male 31-50 Birmingham

*“I think you have to look at the area you are dealing with as well. There are certain areas where it is heavily populated by Bangladeshi people so I think in those areas it would be ideal to have the majority of the staff who can understand the language and the same in parts of Handsworth there is a big Sikh population and so it would be common sense to have a lot of the staff to be of Sikh origin.”*

Sikh male 31-50 Birmingham

There were a number of other specific requests from those with special issues relating to enrolment centres. These were focused on culture and attitude as well as more tangible facilities. In particular they felt it was important to have friendly, welcoming, helpful staff, including doormen, to help make those who felt vulnerable as a result of their disability or uncertain status feel confident and positive about taking part in enrolment.

*“You’ve got to get the right people in there to do it. Make sure they are trained to know how to deal with people. There’s lots of people that don’t like people touching them.”*

Christian white male and female 31-50 London

At a more specific level people hoped that staff would have knowledge of and be able to anticipate difficulties created by their disabilities. This included understanding communication problems for blind and deaf people and more obscure issues such as contortion of the face caused

by Parkinson's or difficulties holding hands out straight for some arthritis sufferers.

*"And will the government ensure that people who use this data have sufficient training? Will there be some kind of compulsion that they have to provide a level of staff training? You don't want people suffering extreme embarrassment and humiliation, if the data is no longer correct or there's another kind of problem."*

Blind people's stakeholder

*"People with Parkinson's need a lot of time. There's a perception that, because they've got very poor body language, very hunched, poor facial expression, a lot of people either think they're totally apathetic or almost a bit antagonistic. It's just that they can't instantly raise a smile or a queried expression, or change their expression quickly. So it could be perceived that they are being difficult when in fact they're not."*

Parkinson's Disease stakeholder

*"The staff have to be deaf aware. I mean taking fingerprints it needs to be deaf aware and know how to communicate with a deaf person. Deaf people all have different ways. Some people speak themselves, some people use sign language interpreters, some like note takers or rely on lip reading so it's very, very important the staff are deaf aware so they know how to communicate with deaf people."*

Deaf people's stakeholder

*"Now we would need to have people assured that actually not only do they have diversity training overall but it was of a decent quality when it came to trans issues. Because the Home Office is not an organisation that trans people would trust on this stuff."*

Transgender stakeholder

In relation to the physical environment of enrolment centres people also wanted comfortable seating with enough space for all, guiding for people with sight or hearing problems, wheelchair access for those with mobility problems and good lighting in interview areas to help those with hearing problems. People with concerns around confidentiality hoped that interview areas would be appropriately private and that staff would not make an issue of their disability.

*"Simple things like signage have to be right. Presumably there will be a call out system so people will know. It's no good just having a number. Also guiding people in the centre, guiding them to seats and not just leaving them."*

Blind people's stakeholder

*"These sort of details shouldn't be exchanged around publicly in an open plan office. That should be done in a*

*private space not just with a side partition but in a separate room.”*

*“If I was trans and I walked in there and I hadn’t got my gender recognition certificate and my changed birth certificate then I would go back out the door again. Nor do you want to have to go to a place like that and be the one person out of 100 who gets frogmarched off as it would appear.”*

Transgender stakeholder

#### 4.2 Mobile enrolment centres

The option of mobile enrolment centres was well received. Though people often initially assumed these would be for general use, on consideration most accepted that they should be primarily for people with limited mobility, including the elderly and disabled.

Those with disabilities and stakeholders saw mobile centres as essential to meet the needs of people with mobility problems who would have difficulty reaching enrolment centres. They positioned them as dedicated facilities that were specifically intended to provide for less mobile or otherwise disadvantaged people and would not be available to the general public. Mobile centres were expected to have specialist staff who could cater for the special issues of those with disabilities. Their existence, the services they provided and their schedules were expected to be well publicised at the local level.

*“They could do them at day centres and luncheon clubs and so on.”*

Elderly people’s stakeholder

*“Is there any way you could do what we would call outreach? So where people go out to where homeless people are, you know a day in a hostel where – it’s an information day and if you want to fill out the forms we’ll do it.”*

Homeless people’s stakeholder

*“Would that be publicised or is it on a one by one basis, or they turn up at Tesco’s car park? Issues around making sure that people were aware of that are quite key.”*

Blind people’s stakeholder

*“Or they could take them to a medical centre where they could be taken via ambulance or even to the day centre, they hold one at the Civic Centre in Otley and I think that would be OK.”*

Hearing impaired person

Some queries were raised about mobile centres. People wanted to know how locations would be chosen and how frequently the mobile

units would visit them. They also wanted to know how appointment times would be decided and how they would be arranged: there would need to be a mechanism for tying up their own availability and physical capability to the mobile centre's and staff's schedule.

*"I think they should have enrolment centres within each borough and when you phone up for an appointment they should say 'OK on such a such day there is going to be a mobile unit in your area between these hours and would you like me to make you an appointment there?' so they can offer you the easiest place to go."*

Non-orthodox Jewish female 21-30 London

There were also some concerns about the security of mobile enrolment centres: while it might not be too difficult to protect a fixed site (ie a building or part of a building) from theft, a lorry or van would be easier to break into and to steal. This meant the information gathered in the mobile centre's equipment would be vulnerable. A few respondents said they would want reassurance on this.

*"There's going to be gangs of forgers and whatever. If someone is walking along and go in there, where there's a little computer with loads of people's iris or fingerprints and whatever, that's quite worrying, if it gets into the wrong hands."*

Orthodox Jewish male 31-50 London

*"How secure is the mobile unit though for like at night times if there were break-ins. I don't think they are secure enough."*

Non-orthodox Jewish female 21-30 London

### 4.3 The enrolment process

Expectations were that enrolment would be a long and quite complicated process, given the involvement of biometrics: the assumption was that it would take at least an hour and probably longer. News that it should take no more than half an hour was welcome: this seemed surprisingly quick. There was some scepticism about this, however: many people assumed that even if the process should take no longer than this, there would still be queues resulting from late arrivals, applicants forgetting to bring the appropriate documents with them, malfunctioning equipment and general inefficiency of the kind they associated with public services.

*"I can see what would be happening. If someone had an appointment for 10.30 am they'll only be seen at 12 o'clock or something. I can just see that happening. It'd be like the*

*traffic or when you get a doctor's appointment or something, they're always running late."*

Other non-third world nationals male and female 31-50 London

*"I wouldn't want to hang around. I'd expect the process to take twenty minutes and not be delayed because it's running late. Anything to do with hospitals or government, you have a nine o'clock appointment and you're still sitting there at half ten because the consultant is late."*

Christian white male and female 31-50 London

The impression from the video was that the procedure for giving biometric information was simple and straightforward: there was no sense of intrusion, discomfort, awkwardness or embarrassment, and for most people there appeared to be nothing that was likely to cause serious concern. Race and nationality generally did not appear to influence response to the process: those of different ethnic origins and nationalities had no more concerns than anyone else. Faith had little bearing on perceptions, with the exception of Muslim women, some of whom had worries about aspects of the biometric information gathering procedure.

*"Just watching the video... it looks very simple."*

Other non-third world nationals male and female 31-50 London

*"It makes it look quick and straightforward. Nothing to worry about with any of that."*

Christian African/African-Caribbean 21-30 London

Otherwise there were scattered reservations about it expressed by disparate minorities across the sample. There were some objections to the principle of providing and handing over personal information, including biometrics. Those with learning difficulties or mental health problems, including some homeless people, were expected to find the process difficult and stressful, especially if carers were not allowed to be present.

*"The chaotic lifestyles of homeless people often means that it can be quite hard for them to keep appointments."*

Homeless people's stakeholder

Homeless people were expected not to trust the process and would want reassurance regarding the confidentiality of the information. This related to a particular feature of homeless people's views about themselves: anonymity was one of the few things they had; getting an ID card would mean giving it up.

Another potential problem among some of those of other nationalities was language: some had poor English, so were worried that they would not be able to understand instructions and requests at the enrolment centre, either written or spoken. This applied particularly to people from third world countries and elderly UK residents of Asian origin; many younger respondents of Asian origin said their parents and/or grandparents would not be able to follow written instructions.

*"I think they should have people who can help with the language. Some people might not understand it."*

Pakistani/Bangladeshi female 21-30 Bradford

The potential issue of gender of staff at centres was not a problem for most respondents: if the procedure was as outlined in the video, it did not appear to be physically or emotionally intrusive, and few expressed concern over women dealing with men or vice versa.

*"They're looking at your eyes and fingers. They are not private parts particularly. It wouldn't make me feel any more comfortable about it if it were a woman or a man or any less comfortable."*

Other non-third world nationals male and female 31-50 London

There were some exceptions to this, however, among Somali (Muslim) women and some UK Muslim women. Somali Muslim women said they would be unwilling to deal with men at any stage of the process and wanted only women on duty. Other Muslim women had no objection to having an interview with male staff, but wanted reassurance with respect to the biometric stage (see below).

*"It depends what they are going to do. If it is not going to involve any touching then it should be fine."*

Pakistani/Bangladeshi female 21-30 Bradford

One other aspect of enrolment was raised by two different minority groups. Sikh men wanted to know in advance that it would be acceptable to wear turbans for photographs. Similarly orthodox Jewish men wanted to know that Jewish women would be able to wear their wigs in photographs. There were no major worries about this issue, but respondents felt it would be sensible to offer reassurance on it.

*"If they asked us to take the turban off...No, I wouldn't so if they said to us take it off that is impossible."*

Sikh male 31-50 Birmingham

*"It's something you should look into because in the orthodox community a woman will either wear a hat or some other way of covering her hair, and most wear a wig. Most passport photos the wig is worn and that's the end of the story. But there are times when security checks involve someone going through your hair."*

Orthodox Jewish male 31-50 London

Apart from this, the faith of staff did not appear to be a problem for those recruited for their religious beliefs: none was concerned that staff might be of a different faith from themselves.

*"It doesn't make any difference at all. As long as they do their job properly."*

Orthodox Jewish male 31-50 London

There were few objections to the idea of installing CCTV cameras in enrolment centres; some saw this as a reassuring additional level of security for the procedure, if it meant that applicants could be scrutinised on film in the event of any uncertainty about their identity, or any query about their application. In any case, many regarded CCTV as now part of life: they were accustomed to seeing cameras in public places.

*"I think it's quite good because if there was a contentious issue with staff then at least you can play the tape. I think the majority of government buildings, banks etc have all got CCTV anyway."*

Christian white male and female 31-50 London

*"They have them everywhere now" [CCTV]*

Sikh male 31-50 Birmingham

The one exception to this was Muslim women who wore burkhas or hijabs. If they would be required to remove their burkha or hijab for a photograph, they were not happy if this was caught on CCTV, assuming that the pictures might be seen by men.

#### 4.4 Biometrics

A number of specific concerns were mentioned about the procedure for recording biometric information, particularly given that such procedures were unfamiliar. If for any reason biometrics might not be appropriate for particular groups it was suggested that this be made clear at the outset.

*"A lot of people would imagine that iris recognition would have to be included. So that individuals are empowered and*

*know they don't have to give that information and the people at the registration points know that."*

Blind people's stakeholder

*"I don't see why you couldn't have a list of medical conditions previously identified which would make it impossible for you (to give biometric information)...most people are quite happy to tick the box, you know."*

Elderly people's stakeholder

A minority of able-bodied people raised objections to giving biometric information. A few people disliked the idea; they assumed this would involve a close of examination of the eyes and expected to feel uncomfortable with this (sometimes based on a belief that it would be more intrusive than is likely to be the case). Some with glasses or contact lenses wanted reassurance that this would not prevent them having their iris scanned. A few felt generally uncomfortable with the idea of having their fingerprints taken, either because they associated this with criminal investigations or because they assumed it would involve messy ink.

Muslim women preferred the idea of women handling biometrics; if men were on duty they wanted reassurance that they would not have to remove hijabs or burkhas for photographs in their presence. Also, the possibility of physical contact was worrying for Muslim women if men were on duty.

*"I don't think women who wear veils would want to remove them."*

Muslim female 31-50 Bradford

*"I never take it off. I don't think it should be necessary to do that."*

*"It is against human rights."*

Pakistani/Bangladeshi female 21-30 Bradford

*"It would have to be a woman."*

Muslim female 31-50 Bradford

*"It depends what they were going to do. If it is not going to involve any touching then it should be fine."*

Pakistani/Bangladeshi female 21-30 Bradford

A range of worries about aspects of the process were raised by special issues groups. Some of these were simply that the mechanics of obtaining biometric data might prove problematic for certain groups. Parkinson's disease sufferers were thought likely to be concerned about how they would be perceived and treated, given the physical

effects of the condition. They wanted reassurance that staff would be sensitive to these aspects.

*“This could be a problem for older people – holding their fingers down on the pad, holding their head in the right place.”*

Elderly people’s stakeholder

*“Biometrics becomes even harder because with a tremor, verifying it, is it static, if it’s shaking does that alter it? You can be very disknetic, wild thrashings, and to actually get an iris picture could be really quite tricky. And bending down to get that checked or verified.”*

Parkinson’s Disease stakeholder

*“What are they going to do about people with disabilities when they register, say for example someone like my grandmother is disabled and can’t move her hand, what are you going to do? She wouldn’t be able to give a fingerprint.”*

Non-orthodox Jewish female 21-30 London

For iris scanning, it was known that blind people with moving irises could not give iris scans and that irises can change. Blind people’s stakeholders were concerned about how this would be handled, and wanted to know whether other biometric information (fingerprints or biometric photos) would be sufficient instead.

*“Yes but because of my double vision the iris, my pupil gradually moves upwards if I stare at something. So that might be a problem.”*

Sight impaired person

*“There are some eye conditions that make it difficult to capture iris recognition data. So that needs to be flagged up.”*

Blind people’s stakeholder

Stakeholders for those with hearing difficulties said they would have problems with photograph and iris scan instructions asking the applicant to adjust his or her position, and would need them to be visible on screen. They also felt there should be interpreters/signers on hand to help in case of communication problems.

Some stakeholders were concerned that biometric data might not remain constant, and that changes could cause difficulties to elderly people and those with sight problems. It was also pointed out that some diseases such as Parkinson’s can cause short term deformities to the face, which was a possible problem with regard to biometric photos.

*“The photographs might alter, in fact your photograph would definitely change. I mean everybody’s photograph would alter but somebody with Parkinson’s can alter quite dramatically. Loss of facial expression, rigidity of the muscles so the face becomes very set.”*

Parkinson’s Disease stakeholder

*“In terms of the impact that sight conditions can have on an ongoing basis, on the integrity of the data that is held centrally, if you have an eye condition that fluctuates, or if you require surgery that can affect the iris, so if the iris is changed in some way it won’t match the database, so then what happens? If someone develops a condition, if they have had healthy eyes when they register initially, then a condition crops up, what happens then?”*

Blind people’s stakeholder

*“The other thing that we queried was just for reassurance that biometric information doesn’t change with age, I mean I know absolutely nothing about it frankly. We did actually seek some medical advice but they couldn’t help us...I mean we just would like reassurance that it’s not going to be affected as you get older thus causing more problems for older people because they won’t fit it anymore.”*

Elderly people’s stakeholder

Those with literacy problems, or with relatives who had literacy problems, were concerned that they would not be able to give a signature. These people were Somali women, elderly relatives of Asian respondents; they were apparently accustomed to using simple crosses when signing their names.

*“My grandmother’s never been able to even sign her own name. What’s she going to do?”*

Indian male 31-50 Birmingham

#### 4.5 Fast track application and enrolment

The option of fast track application and enrolment was accepted as a useful additional option to offer. It was familiar in principle from fast track passport applications, and experiences of this were generally positive among those who had needed to renew passports at short notice.

The principle of paying a premium for a fast track application was difficult to explore because it raised the issue of cost. Respondents wanted to know what the basic price would be and what the premium would be for fast track applications.

Those who thought this through imagined that the only circumstance in which they would need a fast track application was when they needed to renew their passport quickly. They saw this as compulsion by the back door if acquiring a new passport meant having to first apply for an ID card, not realising that the application processes would be combined.

*“So you are going to have to get one even though it is not compulsory?”*

Non-orthodox Jewish female 21-30 London

## 5. Receiving the card

There was some disappointment that cards would not be handed out on the spot, immediately after enrolment. For some there seemed to be an interest in getting the card as a reward for having gone through the application and enrolment process.

*“I think it should be a one stop shop. Once you’ve put your application in and paid your fee or whatever, you should expect to get the ID card.”*

Orthodox Jewish male 31-50 London

On consideration, the need to check information was generally accepted as a sound reason for delaying issuing cards: it was inevitable that personal details, including biometrics, would have to be verified. The interval between enrolment and receipt of the card was expected to be up to two weeks.

The options of secure post and collection in person attracted widely varying views, depending on people’s degree of confidence in the postal system and their personal circumstances. Secure post was convenient for those who were out during the day, provided there was someone at home to sign for the card. Some were happy to receive their card by secure post; they often pointed out that passports are delivered by post without problems.

Against this, people living on their own or with working partners or family wondered how they would be able to sign for their card if it was delivered during the day. Alternatives suggested occasionally were the option of signing for and collecting the card at the local post office or receiving the card at place of work.

*"If it is sent by secure post or recorded delivery then who is going to sign for it?"*

Non-orthodox Jewish female 21-30 London

*"I think you should have a choice, including being able to get it at the post office... They could be shipped to post offices and then you have to pick it up from there."*

Christian white male and female 31-50 London

*"You should also be allowed to receive it at your place of work. Or another address that you nominated."*

Orthodox Jewish male 31-50 London

Others said they would prefer to collect their ID card in person for maximum confidence that it would not be lost or stolen. Some had anxieties about loss and theft of important documents in the postal system and several repeated anecdotes and press stories they had heard about this.

*"I heard about these scams of people working in post offices where they get the passports. As soon as the passports leave the passport office in Victoria or whatever it disappears. I had to get a passport and I was just about to travel and I expected the passport to come within a week and it never appeared. They said they had sent it two weeks before. So I think if they sent us the IDs they would still disappear."*

Black African male and female 31-50 London

*"The post is so bad at the moment and loads of stuff get lost."*

Non-orthodox Jewish female 21-30 London

*"I would personally prefer to collect it...because I don't think that secure post is secure."*

Other non-third world nationals male and female 31-50 London

Homeless people's stakeholders pointed out that receipt of the card would be difficult for homeless people, since they would have no address for delivery. This was likely to make them choose to collect it in person.

*"You don't have an address, it can be hard...Often homeless organisations like hostels will act as an address for people... but you would need to be organised, it wouldn't happen automatically."*

Homeless people's stakeholder

The underlying demand was for choice. People wanted to have the option of collection in person or postal delivery, as it suited them. As an alternative, a few respondents suggested a system similar to that

used by some credit card companies which would involve calling a number to activate the card using a code such as previous address or mother's maiden name, after delivery. This would mean the cards had no value if stolen en route.

## 6. The card and the National Identity Register

### 6.1 Information on the card and the NIR

Assumptions about information on the card and on the NIR were often inaccurate. Expectations were typically that information on the card and the database would be wide ranging and detailed – far more so than is intended. Many also assumed the information on the card would be the same as on the database – though they had not considered how it would all fit on the card.

Most imagined that in addition to basic details (name, date of birth, identification number of some kind), the system would also record a criminal record if relevant, their DNA (for criminal investigation purposes), blood group, medical information, employment record and financial information, including bank account details.

Some also assumed that this information would be routinely accessible to the police in the event of any investigation they made. A few of those who were more negatively disposed to ID cards on principle believed all the information on the card or database would be available to all users.

*"Basically we will be a number and if they put it in a computer they can get every single detail about us."*

Muslim female 31-50 Bradford

*"Points on your licence could be recorded on there. The bank manager doesn't need to know that!"*

Other non-third world nationals male and female 31-50 London

Response to the range of information proposed was typically surprise. It was far more basic, less wide-ranging and less intrusive than most people had expected. There was some disappointment at this – those who were most enthusiastic about ID cards felt that the more information they contained, the more valuable they would be. Others, who had worries about the extent of information in the system, were reassured that it would be more limited than they had assumed. If this

was all that would be included, the system was less threatening than they had anticipated.

*"I think once they're in circulation they should be used for lots of things, otherwise there's no point to them."*

Other non-third world nationals male and female 31-50 London

*"If it's purely this, it sounds good to me."*

Other non-third world nationals male and female 31-50 London

*"This sounds better because all it's doing is holding very core information."*

Elderly people's stakeholder

## 6.2 Card design

Few people gave much consideration to the design of the card, and it did not generate detailed discussion. There was a general assumption that the card would be similar to a credit card in size and weight, and would contain a photo and chip. The biometric trial card broadly matched these expectations when it was shown. There were some concerns among stakeholders that credit card sized cards were difficult to use for people with disabilities.

*"Size is important, because people with Parkinson's have great difficulty getting money out of a purse. A business card is difficult to manipulate and grasp. So size is tricky. Also worried a little bit about confidentiality, in that if you are having to ask somebody to get your ID card out for you, it's one thing losing it in response to an official request or a professional request, but to rely on others and "I can't get my ID card out of my purse"."*

Parkinson's Disease stakeholder

A few foreign nationals expressed concern that the Residence Permit would be different in design and appearance from the ID card for British nationals. Their concern was that when they were using the card it would be immediately obvious that they were not UK citizens. This raised anxieties that they would be singled out as different, and possibly suffer discrimination as a consequence. This reaction came from those with range of nationalities, including Commonwealth countries and (secondhand) from first generation Asian immigrants to the UK.

*"Then certain places are going to see you as different."*

*"They might treat you differently."*

Other non-third world nationals male and female 31-50 London

*“I don’t think that it’s right if the card says you are a foreign national. I would say the database can hold that information that the person hasn’t got a British passport, but the card shouldn’t tell any different.”*

EU/EEA nationals male and female 31-50 London

*“Don’t make it so obvious. They must link us with the population that we live with because we’re UK citizens. We’re born there, but we’re still living here. We’re not temporary here. You make a temporary one and you make a UK one for all members of the citizenship would be more beneficial and we’re all treated the same, whether we’ve got different accents or what, it doesn’t matter. We’re all still UK citizens.”*

Other non-third world nationals male and female 31-50 London

## 7. Using the card

### 7.1 Principle of verification

Understanding of the principle of the verification system was variable. There was a general assumption that the card would be the key element of verification and that users would show their cards to prove their identity. The use of biometrics in verification was less widely understood: it was not clear to all how the information on the cards would be checked.

Some felt that the need to prove identity was only occasional and not a frequent occurrence, but others perceived this need as growing, to counter increasing threats of crime and identity fraud.

*“Using the card to prove you are who you way you are, that could be a good thing in terms of accessing services.”*

Homeless people’s stakeholder

At this stage another major misconception emerged. There was a strong and widespread feeling that the system, and particularly usage and verification, revolved round the cards themselves, and that carrying the card would be essential to proving their identity and accessing services. A very small number understood that verification could be possible without the card by those with access to the NIR, using scanning equipment to check the user’s biometric information. If this was understood it addressed two important concerns – the compulsion to carry cards and the consequences of lost or stolen cards.

*“Surely if they had the finger print and if you were out and got stopped by the police then surely all you would have to do is have your finger print taken rather than have your card with you.”*

Non-orthodox Jewish female 21-30 London

This is clearly a difficult feature of the system to explain, and could raise concerns about the prevalence of scanning equipment and about access to the NIR. Many people queried whether most outlets wanting to check ID would have scanning equipment, and could not imagine how the system would work if people were not able to produce their cards.

Given the likely difficulty that many people were expected to have in understanding the verification process, some stakeholders suggested that the enrolment procedure could finish with face-to-face explanation of verification and usage procedures. This might make the system and its procedures seem less worrying to the more vulnerable users.

A specific issue in relation to using the card was raised by orthodox Jewish men: if, as they expected, it would be compulsory in future to carry ID cards, this would cause a problem for them on the Sabbath, given that Jewish people are not allowed to carry things on them on the Sabbath.

*“There could be a Jewish dimension to this if one would have to carry the ID card at all times in terms of breaching the Sabbath, whereby you’re not allowed, in most parts of London, to carry things on you.”*

Orthodox Jewish male 31-50 London

## 7.2 PINs

There were mixed views on whether ID cards should have PINs. Some saw a PIN as a useful additional level of security for situations where a card alone would not be enough but a scanner was not available or not needed. Others were not keen, primarily for convenience reasons: it meant another PIN to remember. PINs also called into question the security of the system: people wondered why they would be needed if the system involved biometrics.

*“If it’s got your iris then why do you need a pin number?”  
“You don’t need a pin number. You got your fingerprints.”*

Christian white male and female 31-50 London

However, when told that they would be able to customise PINs most became less resistant to the idea.

PINs were expected to be a particular problem for blind people and those with Parkinson's. Stakeholders for these people knew that it was very difficult for them to use the machines, on the basis of current and recent experience of chip and PIN. The main problems were that it was not easy for them to use the machines themselves, particularly if they had no audio facility to guide them to the right keys; and that if they had to ask for help from other people they did not feel they had full security over their card and PIN. Problems using a PIN could make these groups feel excluded from the system and unable to participate with confidence.

*"That would be a real nightmare. What should happen is that when you apply for a new card, or when they send you out a chip and pin card, you ring them say "I'm visually impaired, I can't use it." So they then should supply you with a chip and signature card."*

Blind people's stakeholder

*"Is there any way they will be able to differentiate between that card and other cards they might have? People with credit and debit cards will have the sort of triple pin cards...but people with diabetes, for example, who maybe have visual impairment as a complication, are likely to have less sensitivity of their fingertips, and older people generally might, and maybe people with arthritis may find it difficult. So some thought needs to be given to that."*

Blind people's stakeholder

*"Remembering a PIN could be difficult, and you've got privacy issues if you've got to share it with someone else to type in your PIN."*

Parkinson's Disease stakeholder

### 7.3 Different levels of verification

The principle of different levels of verification was understood and accepted, once biometric verification was clear. Most people accepted that certain transactions would not be sufficiently important to require more verification than showing their card, and that other services where security is more of an issue would need higher levels of verification.

When asked, most respondents were able to envisage how different levels of verification would be stratified.

*"I mean there should be limitations as to when you have to give biometric information, as you're saying there are certain levels, just a card, then the PIN, then the biometric..."*

Elderly people's stakeholder

*"I imagine supermarkets would scan it. I wouldn't have thought they'd have a fingerprint or iris scanner. But banks could."*

Christian white male and female 31-50 London

As examples, they understood that situations requiring a low level of verification, in which the card only could be shown, might include age related purchases (alcohol and tobacco) and use of services such as libraries, leisure centres and video shops. Situations requiring an intermediate level of verification (showing their card and using the PIN), could be such as joining a library or leisure centre etc, paying for goods up to specified level - £100/£200, and signing on for benefits.

*"When you use your credit card I suppose, to me that would be quite a good idea, if you have a credit card and you have done your shopping and you are paying for a lot of goods, and you have a card that has your name, your photo, that's good."*

Hindu female 31-50 Birmingham

Examples of high level verification (showing the card, biometrics checked by a scanner) were expected to be when making higher level purchases (more than £200), opening bank accounts, setting up long term financial arrangements such as direct debits, registering with a GP, having hospital treatment and applying for benefits.

*"If you are unemployed and need to go to the DSS. Or going to your GP, to a hospital, or you've been stopped by police for a routine check and they want to verify who you are."*

Black African male and female 31-50 London

*"Once the information comes from the Home Office and the banker is sharing the same information then there is a big problem there. Banks should only use the physical card. When you have committed an offence and the government or civil bodies or other organisations are involved, that is where I would be happy to provide a fingerprint and my biometric, because they are acting with the government. Not banks."*

Black African male and female 31-50 London

The use of ID cards or the ID system to verify identification when making financial transactions raised a query about internet banking and shopping: people wondered how they would be able to prove their identity in this situation.

*“Maybe you have a bank card and you give information over the telephone and no one would have to look at that biometric information in order for them to be able to do things with your identity card?”*

Christian African/African-Caribbean 21-30 London

#### 7.4 Day-to-day use of ID cards

Usage of ID cards did not pose significant problems not already raised in relation to enrolment. The main concerns were around checking of biometric information, and possible difficulties for people with disabilities. Problems getting irises scanned and fingerprints read were worrying for those who were physically disabled; again the possibility of physical contact at verification caused concern for Muslim women. Also there were some reservations about intrusiveness and/or insensitivity of service providers’ staff in requesting checks – for the disabled, Muslim women and people with mental health problems.

More generally there were queries about how easy it would be for service providers and retailers to acquire and use scanning equipment, and some felt uneasy at not knowing what biometric information would be wanted at different outlets – whether it would be fingerprint, iris or photo. People also expressed concerns that if for some reason the system broke down and the biometric information, for example, was not recognised, there would be clear protocols in place to deal with the situation.

*“There need to be correct procedures for occasions when someone’s data doesn’t match, for whatever reason. For example, if you go into a bank or somewhere where you are required to give iris recognition data and you can’t, or the data differs, for whatever reason, from the information in the database, people need clear information about what they do in that circumstance. Who do you ring? How do you get it sorted? Because each time you then go to complete a transaction, or you need to use your card, you’re always going to be worried about what’s going to happen. So there needs to be clear information about how you go back and start again.”*

Blind people’s stakeholder

*“For that to be beneficial all these places would have to have finger scanning and eye scanning facilities. Otherwise it’s pointless.”*

Christian white male and female 31-50 London

*“As long as there are facilities for them to check the biometrics. All these places where it could be used, will they have facilities to check the biometrics?”*

Christian African/African-Caribbean 21-30 London

*“Does that mean that other organisations have to invest in either fingerprint scanning machinery or iris scanning machinery? Is the government expecting organisations to acquire this sort of machinery?”*

Orthodox Jewish male 31-50 London

Awareness of fingerprint checking on ATMs in the US was useful in making day-to-day biometric checking seem commonplace and workable. Several respondents who had been to the US in the last year had seen these in use and felt that they were simple and non-threatening.

## 8. Safety of the scheme and the process

Many people raised worries about possible risk regarding loss or theft of information and lost or stolen cards. To a large extent these worries were based on misconceptions about the proposed system, but they still needed addressing.

At the application stage there was a risk of information being leaked from the system – in the post, via the web, or on the telephone. It will be important to reassure applicants that loss of their card is not necessarily a major problem; this could be a particular positive for homeless people worried about theft and loss.

People were concerned that when appointments were made there might be a possibility of information being misappropriated, and at the point when biometric information was provided, that it might be possible for this to be illicitly taken and used or forged.

*“Someone could send in all your details and then go in as you. It worries me that people could take your place.”*

Muslim female 31-50 Bradford

*“People need to be made very clear that it was being handled with due process and that the form was not just being put in a pile in the middle of an open plan office and all that sort of stuff so that there were safeguards around that sort of thing, so that is the first thing there.”*

Transgender stakeholder

As noted, there was anxiety that the card could be lost or stolen in delivery, even if it was sent by the secure post.

*“If it was posted to me obviously it would have to be recorded because if it got lost in the post, that’s a problem. Maybe it’s best to go and pick it up if there was a local station.”*

Deaf people’s stakeholder

People also identified potential risks when the card was being used. They wanted reassurance about the procedure for reporting loss or theft, the speed with which their card would be replaced in this event, and what access to information in the system could be conferred by a stolen card.

*“What about if you lost the card or it was stolen, to get it back would you have to go through all this (verification) again?”*

Hindu female 31-50 Birmingham

*“It’s another thing to worry about, keeping safe. It’s bad enough taking your passport away for a week, if you had to wander round with an identity card all the time. I don’t carry my driving licence around with me and I drive every day.”*

Non-orthodox Jewish female 21-30 London

*“What happens when someone gets burgled or they lose it? How easy is it going to be for someone to contact the police and they will immediately put a stop on the card?”*

Orthodox Jewish male 31-50 London

*“If I lost mine I’d want to be able to ring a number. Tell them my card has gone and I don’t want anyone else using it.”*

Christian African/African-Caribbean 21-30 London

There were general concerns about the security of information in the scheme, though these were often based on mistaken assumptions about the range of information gathered. There was an assumption that if this information was required for the scheme, it would be made available to the police, and that it would have a high value to criminals, so would attract attempts to steal it. People wanted to know exactly who would have access to the information in the system and in what circumstances. Some wondered if there would be cross-over access, in the sense of someone from, for example a bank, being able to retrieve other non-financial information. This raised a general point about staff – respondents wanted reassurance that staff running the system would be properly vetted.

*“As long as it is only the correct authorities that can find out about you because you don’t want people hacking into your details and knowing everything about you.”*

Non-orthodox Jewish female 21-30 London

*“If one was a particularly good hacker there would be an opportunity to break into something like this and make use of it. The same way as you hear about hacking into banks via the internet, this would be a goldmine.”*

Orthodox Jewish male 31-50 London

*“If this swiping is only to verify the validity of the card that’s fine. Unless of course it leads to revelations about other information. That I wouldn’t be happy with.”*

Orthodox Jewish male 31-50 London

*“The thing is still what is going to be done with that information, is it going to be available to private sectors, when are they using it, are they going to be selling it?”*

Hindu female 31-50 Birmingham

Technical issues which concerned people were how foolproof the NIR would be against hacking, and what safeguards would be in place to prevent forgery of cards. Reassurance was wanted on all these issues, but many respondents seemed unlikely to be reassured easily.