Matthew Scott

Kent Police and Crime Commissioner

Office telephone: 01622 677055 Email: contactyourpcc@kent.police.uk

www.kent-pcc.gov.uk

The Office of the Kent Police and Crime Commissioner Sutton Road Maidstone Kent ME15 9BZ



Record of Decision

ORIGINATO	DR: Chief Finance Off	cer F	REFERENCE:	OPCC.D.033.23	
TITLE: Sale of IP Addresses					
OPEN ⊠ (CONFIDENTIAL	Reason if Co	onfidential:		

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY – Retrospective Decision Notice for information of the PCP

All devices are connected to the internet using an Internet Protocol, of which Version 4 (IPv4) is currently the most widely used. Devices can exchange data with each other because they have an assigned IP address which allows them to be identified and located.

IPv4 addresses were originally distributed free of charge by Regional Internet Registries and Kent Police own the rights to the 151.129/16 address range (a total of 65,536 IP addresses). Through the work undertaken to date by the Data Centre Programme and supplementary work by the application remediation programme, the need for externally routed 151. addresses has been removed and a significant number of internal 151. services are in the process of being decommissioned.

As a result, Kent Police want to sell the 151/129/16 address range as there are no public facing addresses in use and the new Data Centre has been designed to not use the 151.129/16 address range in the future.

Kent Police have suggested selling the addresses to a preferred buyer at a cost of circa £36 per address, raising approximately £2.4m.

However, whilst a substantial sum, the PCC's Chief Executive and CFO have determined it would be difficult to demonstrate best value for money by selling to a preferred buyer. Therefore, they recommend the most appropriate method to demonstrate best value to the Kent taxpayer is to sell via a public auction, even if there is a risk the initial offer price will not be met.

[Update: Kent Police were directed to sell the addresses at a public auction. The auction took place in early 2023 and the final price received per IP address was circa £42.5, raising £2.8m - an additional £0.4m on the original estimate.]

RECOMMENDATION

The PCC is recommended to sell the IP addresses through a public auction to demonstrate best value for money.

DECISION

To sell the IP addresses at public auction and not through a preferred buyer.

Chief Finance Officer:

Comments: This reflects great value for money for the Kent taxpayer. The most appropriate route for disposing of the IP addresses has yielded a significant sum which will help support policing services in the coming year.

Signature:

Date: 6 October 2023

Chief Executive:

Comments: Commissioner, the ability to sell the IP addresses was an opportunity to receive a significant capital receipt. Notwithstanding the potential value of the 'preferred buyer offer', both the CFO and I did not believe we could demonstrate best value. Having personally briefed you, we agreed the only suitable process was that of open market auction. On your authority I gave this direction to the force. The outcome as described was an additional 0.4m on the original estimate.

Signature: 7

Date: 6 October 2023

POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER FOR KENT

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS: Held by Kent Police.

Comments: After discussion with my Chief Executive and CFO, I directed the sale of the IP addresses via open public auction. This achieved best value for the public purse.

Signature:

Date: 6 October 2023

BACKGROOM BOOOMENTO.	Tion by North Circle.			
IMDACT ACCECMENT.				
IMPACT ASSESSMENT:				
Police and Crime Plan (please indicate which objectives decision/recommendation supports)	Supports delivery of the Commissioner's priorities by securing value for money on behalf of the Kent taxpayer and providing additional income to support policing in the county.			
Has an Equality Impact Assessment been completed?	Yes ⊠ No □ (If yes, please include within background documents)			
Will the decision have a differential/adverse impact on any particular diversity strand? (e.g. age, disability, gender reassignment, race, religion/belief, sex, sexual orientation, marriage/civil partnership, pregnancy/maternity)	Yes □ No ⊠ The decision is administrative in nature. Therefore, it does not have a differential/adverse impact on any particular strand of diversity.			