

Sample City, USA

Independent ALPR Usage Audit

REVIEW OF LICENSE PLATE READER SEARCH RECORDS

Review period: 2026-03-02 through 2026-08-29

Issued: 2026-08-28

PUBLIC VERSION · PERSONNEL PSEUDONYMIZED



Verification hash (SHA-256)

5de251eae48879b3bdb200a655a736a6731cdb817dd143ea53db89195af2f8aa

Executive summary

This review identified 1 item recommended for first review, alongside 1 additional item noted for context.

378	10	30%	1	1	0
SEARCHES REVIEWED	USERS	NO CASE NUMBER	REVIEW FIRST	REVIEW	NOTED

Every item in this report is a statistical pattern presented for human review, together with an explanation of how the same pattern could arise from entirely routine police work. Nothing in this report is a finding of misconduct by any person.

Personnel in this public version are identified by stable pseudonyms (Subject A, Subject B, and so on). The corresponding identifiers are held in the sealed version of this report, which carries the same verification hash.

Scope and data

This review covered the search audit export provided by the agency (sample-log.csv (built-in demonstration data)). 378 records were readable and reviewed; 0 rows could not be read and are listed in the working papers.

Rules applied in this review:

- Repeated searches of one vehicle
- Search volume outliers
- Sharp behavior changes
- Off-hours activity
- Policy and offense code checks
- Isolated search bursts
- Outside agency monitoring
- Missing case numbers
- Broad network scope
- Outside account concentration

What this tool cannot see. License plate identifiers are converted to one-way codes the moment the file is read; the tool can recognize that the same vehicle was queried twice without ever holding the plate itself. The analysis runs entirely on the reviewing computer. No record in the export is transmitted anywhere.

Findings

FINDING 1

REVIEW FIRST

Searches outside established working hours

Observed. Subject A ran 7 searches outside their usual hours at times when no other officer was active in the system. Searches falling outside a person's own established pattern, with no other officer working at the same time, are not explained by a shared incident. Hours involved: 02:00, 03:00, 04:00. Of these, 7 had no case number.

Possible innocent explanation. Overtime, a shift swap, court preparation, a call-out, or a period of working a case alone all produce this. Check the duty roster for the dates involved before drawing any conclusion.

Recommended follow-up. What duty, call-out, or approved overtime placed these searches outside the user's usual hours?

Records involved: 7

Repeated queries of one vehicle without a case

Observed. Subject B searched the same vehicle 9 times over 56 days, and 8 of those searches had no case number attached. Repeated queries against a single vehicle spread across weeks, with no case number tying them to an investigation, is the pattern most commonly associated with personal use of the system. This warrants asking the officer what investigation these searches belonged to.

Possible innocent explanation. A long-running investigation, a repeat offender the officer encounters often, or an ongoing neighborhood complaint can all produce this pattern legitimately. Case numbers are also commonly left blank through simple habit rather than intent.

Recommended follow-up. What investigation did these queries belong to, and can a case number be attached retroactively?

Records involved: 9

Methodology

Each rule below is deterministic arithmetic over the records provided: the same export, reviewed again with the same settings, produces the same findings. No artificial intelligence or statistical model is involved in detection.

Repeated queries of one vehicle

Counts how many times each user queried the same vehicle key across the period, and whether those queries carried a case number. Vehicle identifiers are one-way hashed, so the report can say “the same vehicle” without knowing which vehicle.

Search volume

Compares each user's total searches to the department median for the period. Users far above the median are listed for context, not accusation; assignment differences routinely explain high volume.

Change in activity

Splits the period in half and compares each user's activity between halves. A sharp increase is noted so a reviewer can ask what changed.

Working hours

Builds each user's own typical working window from their record, then notes searches well outside it — but only when no other user was active at the same time, since a genuine incident produces several people searching together.

Reasons and offense codes

Checks each search's stated reason and offense code against the purposes the agency's policy permits, and checks whether the written reason and the selected code agree. Department-wide patterns are reported once, as configuration items, rather than once per officer.

Bursts

Looks for dense clusters of searches by one user in a short window with no corroborating activity from anyone else.

Outside agencies

Compares each outside agency's use of this agency's cameras to its peers, and notes concentration on a small number of vehicles.

Outside account concentration

Looks at each outside account's queries of this agency's cameras and notes accounts that devote most of their searches to a handful of specific vehicles, since routine outside use touches many different plates once.

Network scope

Compares each search's shared-network count to the roster's typical value and notes users who repeatedly search far beyond it. Wide scope is legitimate for statewide alerts; the flag asks which case required the reach.

Missing case numbers

Reports users whose searches chronically lack a case number, and reports a department-wide rate.

Certification

WilWell Technologies is independent of the agency reviewed and of any license plate reader vendor. WilWell holds no interest in the outcome of this review and had no role in creating the records reviewed. This review was engaged and paid for by the agency, in the same manner as an independent financial audit; the engagement does not extend to the content of findings.

The verification hash on the cover page is computed from the findings themselves. Any change to the findings produces a different hash. The sealed and public versions of this audit carry the same hash, confirming they reflect the identical underlying review. To verify, re-run the audit on the same export with the same settings and compare hashes.

Prepared by: WilWell Technologies



5de251eae48879b3bdb200a655a736a6
731cdb817dd143ea53db89195af2f8aa