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Public-Private Partnerships to Address Identity-Related Crime

I. Introduction

1. As identity-related crime has become an increasingly global problem, public-private partnerships to combat identity-related crime through various means are becoming more prevalent in several regions of the world. This paper will summarize the key elements of a number of such partnerships, focusing on four types: (1) General partnerships to combat identity-related crime; (2) Partnerships concerning reporting of identity-related crime by the public; (3) Partnerships concerning victim assistance; and (4) Partnerships concerning prevention and public education. Each of these partnerships reflects one or more “best practices” that states should consider in developing national strategies to combat identity-related crime. The available examples of such partnerships are drawn from Australia, Brazil, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and the United States.
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II. General Partnerships to Combat Identity-Related Crime

A. United Kingdom: Fighting Fraud Together

Facts:

- **Partners involved:**
  - **Public institutions:** Attorney General’s Office; Cabinet Office; Department for Business Innovation & Skills; City of London Police; Crown Prosecution Service; Financial Services Authority; HM Revenue & Customs; HM Treasury; Home Office; London Metropolitan Police; Ministry of Justice; National Fraud Authority; Serious Fraud Office; and the Serious Organised Crime Agency.4
  - **Private institutions:** Association of British Insurers; Association of Chief Police Officers; British Bankers Association; Federation of Small Businesses; the Law Society; Solicitors Regulation Authority; UK Cards Association; and Victim Support.5

- **Brief description of the partnership:** Fighting Fraud Together brings together 38 public- and private-sector entities, including numerous national government and law enforcement organizations and business associations representing multiple commercial sectors, to combat all types of fraud, including identity-related crime, in a collaborative manner. The organizations in Fighting Fraud Together committed to combat fraud with six objectives: (1) “Continue with measures to prevent, detect, disrupt and punish fraudsters both within our sectors and by working collaboratively across sectors, sharing intelligence, information and good practice”; (2) “Commit to a new set of cross-cutting initiatives to provide fresh impetus in our fight against fraud”; (3) “Widen our partnership working to involve other sectors who are less advanced in their approach to fighting fraud”; (4) “Strengthen the institutional arrangements for co-ordinating our work”; (5) “Ensure that our work is informed by the best intelligence picture we can develop and continually review future as well as current threats”; and (6) “Publish regular reports on our progress.”6

- **Type of partnership:** As described above, Fighting Fraud Together represents an especially broad-based partnership between the public and

---


6 Ibid. at 6.
private sectors, in which public-sector and private-sector entities pursue each of the means listed above within the scope of their respective authority.

- **Identity-related crime aspects of the partnership**: Identity-related crime (identity theft and identity fraud) represents one of the types of fraud that Fighting Fraud Together has committed to pursue. In particular, Fighting Fraud Together reported that “multi-agency programs of work are in place to prevent and disrupt the highest priority fraud enablers such as identity crime and enablers to mass-marketing fraud.”

**Analysis:**

Fighting Fraud Together represents an effort of unprecedented scope to harness the authority and resources of multiple national government agencies and representatives from multiple commercial sectors in a voluntary partnership to pursue prevention, detection, disruption, and punishment of fraud offenders, including those involved in identity-related crime.

**Outcome/Impact:**

- **Outcome (with a focus on identity-related crime aspects)**: In 2011, Fighting Fraud Together issued a detailed strategic plan to combat fraud, including identity-related crime. The strategic plan specifically reported that “[w]e will also continue with and introduce new initiatives on identity crime, corrupt professionals and cyber enablers of fraud.” More recently, in November 2012, the National Fraud Authority and RAND Europe organized a conference in London to mark the first year of the Fighting Fraud Together Strategy. The conference “included keynote speakers, panel discussions, and breakout sessions with the aim of generating innovative solutions to common issues and future collaborations in the fight against fraud.” In its January 2013 update on the strategy, the National Fraud Authority stated that it “and the Serious and Organised Crime Agency (SOCA) have embarked on a project to identify, prioritize and map cross-cutting fraud enablers,” and that it is also “working with the Home Office to produce a strategy and action plan to deal with identity crime, which regularly features as an enabler within the mapping of fraud crime types.”

- **Impact (with a focus on identity-related crime aspects)**: As outlined above, Fighting Fraud Together has continued to bring together public- and private-sector entities in sharing information and collaborating on fraud and identity-related crime responses.

---

7 Ibid. at 14.
8 Ibid.
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III. Partnerships Concerning Reporting of Identity-Related Crime by the Public

A. Australia: Crimestoppers

Facts:

- **Partners involved:**
  - **Public institutions:** Australian Federal Police; Attorney General’s Office, Australian Government; Stay Safe Online (Department of Broadband, Communications and the Digital Economy, Australian Government)
  - **Private institutions:** Crimsafe; Crime Stoppers International; DataDot Technology Ltd.; Lockwood/Assa Abloy; and PayPal

- **Brief description of the partnership:** According to the Crime Stoppers website, Crime Stoppers, a national program operating throughout Australia, facilitates reporting of crime, including identity theft and fraud, by members of the community for crime fighting and crime prevention. “Crime Stoppers Australia comprises a board of directors who represent their respective States or Territories as well as key members of the Government and private enterprise who are able to make a contribution to the safety of Australians.” Stakeholders include police forces from each State and Territory in Australia; State and Territory Governments; the Australian Federal Police; the Australian Government – Department of Home Affairs; the media; and the public. Members of the public call Crime Stoppers when they have information that may help stop, solve or prevent criminal activity in the community. Callers are never asked to identify themselves and there is no equipment in Crime Stoppers offices that records voices or traces telephone numbers. Anonymity is guaranteed. Members of the community who call Crime Stoppers receive a code number that allows them to claim a reward, if desired, once an arrest has been made.

- **Type of partnership:** Government officials and private-sector representations collaborate in the general management of Crime Stoppers. Crime Stoppers itself does not investigate crimes that are reported by the public, but ensures that the information is provided to the appropriate police service.

- **Identity-related crime aspects of the partnership:** Identity-related crime is one of the types of crime that are reported to Crime Stoppers and made known to the police.
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Analysis:
Crime Stoppers provides the public with a uniform and widely publicized means of reporting crime and ensuring that not only the police but other government agencies and the media are engaged in responses to such reports.

Outcome/Impact:
- **Outcome (with a focus on identity-related crime aspects):** Crime Stoppers reports that it has paid out more than US $100 million in rewards since 1976. Crime Stoppers Australia reported that its parent organization, Crime Stoppers International, was granted Special Consultative Status by the United Nations Economic and Social Council.
- **Impact (with a focus on identity-related crime aspects):** Crime Stoppers continues to serve the Australian public with ready means of reporting identity-related crime and other types of crime to police.

B. Netherlands: Fraudehelpdesk

Facts:
- **Partners involved:**
  - **Public institutions:** Authority for the Financial Markets (AFM), ConsuWijzer, Central Reporting and Information Identity Fraud (CMI), Cybercrime Hotline, Hotline Internet Scams, Police, Public Prosecution Service
  - **Private institutions:** Advertising Code Committee (RCC), Association of Insurers (DoS), Chambers of Commerce, Dutch Bankers’ Association (NVB), Fulcrum Fraud, Legal Aid Council, Legal Desk, Netherlands Health Insurers (ZN), SME Netherlands, Victim Support Netherlands, VNO-NCW
- **Brief description of the partnership:** Fraudehelpdesk is a national helpline for members of the public to obtain information about and report fraud, including identity-related crime.
- **Type of partnership:** Both public and private-sector entities support the operations of Fraudehelpdesk and participate on its Board of Trustees. Fraudehelpdesk is affiliated with Stichting Aanpak Financieel-Economische Criminaliteit in Nederland (SafeCin), a registered foundation established in 2003.
- **Identity-related crime aspects of the partnership:** Fraudehelpdesk takes complaints from the public about possible identity-related crime and provides
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the general public with warnings about new types of fraud and identity-crime techniques that the public reports.\footnote{See www.fraudehelpdesk.nl/home.}

Analysis:
Providing a single national means for the public to report fraud and identity-related crime is more efficient for the public and law enforcement, and involving a variety of public and private institutions in the operations of Fraudehelpdesk improves the ability of government and the private sector to coordinate in taking action against fraud and identity-related crime.

Outcome/Impact:

- **Outcome (with a focus on identity-related crime aspects):** Fraudehelpdesk is a fairly new program, but one that promises to provide the Dutch public with an efficient means of reporting fraud, including identity-related crime, and to learn additional information to protect themselves from such crime.

- **Impact (with a focus on identity-related crime aspects):** See above.

\section*{C. United Kingdom: Action Fraud}

Facts:

- **Partners involved:**
  - Public institutions: City of London Police; Home Office; National Fraud Authority (NFA); National Fraud Intelligence Bureau (NFIB)
  - Private institutions: Association of Chief Police Officers; GetSafeOnline; Victim Support

- **Brief description of the partnership:** Action Fraud is the national reporting center in the United Kingdom for reporting all types of fraud and financially motivated Internet crime, including identity-related crime. Members of the public can report crime to Action Fraud both online and by telephone. Action Fraud ensures that specific reports reach the proper law enforcement entity through the NFIB, a component of the City of London Police.\footnote{See Action Fraud, \textit{Who is Action Fraud?}, available at http://www.actionfraud.police.uk/about-us/who-we-are.}

- **Type of partnership:** The NFA, which helps to coordinate the response to fraud in the United Kingdom, runs Action Fraud.\footnote{See Action Fraud, \textit{Partners}, available at http://www.actionfraud.police.uk/partners.}

- **Identity-related crime aspects of the partnership:** Action Fraud’s reporting process can be and is used by the public to report identity fraud and identity theft as one category of fraud.

\footnote{Ibid.}
Analysis:

Action Fraud not only provides a single national point of contact for the public across the United Kingdom to report fraud, including identity-related crime, but also provides a single point of referral, through the NFIB, to direct such reports to the appropriate police service. In addition, Action Fraud has recently been conducting a survey of its customers, to measure their satisfaction with various aspects of the service that Action Fraud delivered and to enable customers to provide feedback and suggest improvements.

Outcome/Impact:

- **Outcome (with a focus on identity-related crime aspects):** From October 2009, when it became operational, to October 2012, Action Fraud received 118,549 crime reports. Those reports were sent for analysis to the National Fraud Intelligence Bureau. In addition, there have reportedly been more than 1 million unique visitors to Action Fraud.

- **Impact (with a focus on identity-related crime aspects):** It is expected that by April 2013, all police forces in England and Wales will be able to direct the public to Action Fraud. This will be of substantial value to those departments in providing the public with readily accessible means of reporting identity-related crime and other fraud.

D. United States: Internet Crime Complaint Center

Facts:

- **Partners involved:**
  - **Public institutions:** Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI)
  - **Private institutions:** National White Collar Crime Centre (NW3C) (non-profit organization)

- **Brief description of the partnership:** Since 2000, the FBI and the NW3C have conducted a partnership to operate the Internet Crime Complaint Centre (IC3). IC3 receives online complaints about all forms of online crime, including online identity-related crime, from the public, analyses those complaints, and in appropriate cases makes criminal referrals stemming from
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those complaints to appropriate federal, state, local, or international law enforcement agencies for further action.28

- **Type of partnership:** The FBI, as a federal law enforcement agency with extensive jurisdiction to investigate federal crimes, works with the NW3C, which is a non-profit organization that provides research, training, and other support (not including actual criminal investigation in the field) to numerous state and local law enforcement agencies across the United States, to provide the necessary personnel and fiscal resources for day-to-day operations. FBI and NW3C personnel work together in analysing complaint data and assembling “packages” of criminal referrals to law enforcement.

- **Identity-related crime aspects of the partnership:** Many of the complaints that IC3 receives involve instances of identity-related crime with a relationship to computing or the Internet. IC3 provides copies of such identity-crime complaints to the Federal Trade Commission, which maintains its own call-centre and online reporting system for frauds and consumer deception, including identity-related crime, Consumer Sentinel.

**Analysis:**

The IC3 has operated successfully for more than a decade to receive, analyse, and refer as appropriate complaints about all forms of online crime, including online identity-related crime.

**Outcome/Impact:**

- **Outcome (with a focus on identity-related crime aspects):** During each of the calendar years 2009 through 2011, the IC3 received more than 300,000 complaints about all types of online crime.29 In 2011, the adjusted dollar loss reported by complainants was $485.3 million.30 Identity theft constituted the second-highest category of complaints in 2011.31

- **Impact (with a focus on identity-related crime aspects):** IC3 has become a substantial resource for the general public and for all levels of law enforcement throughout the United States for reporting and referral of online crime. In particular, since 2011 IC3 data are available through remote access to more than 30,000 FBI employees, including investigative agents and intelligence analysts.32
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IV. Partnerships for Victim Assistance

A. United States: Identity Theft Assistance Center (ITAC)

Facts:

- **Partners involved:**
  - Public institutions: Federal Trade Commission; United States Postal Inspection Service
  - Private institutions: 29 leading banks, credit-card associations, securities brokerages, and other financial sector entities

- **Brief description of the partnership:** ITAC’s website states that “the Identity Theft Assistance Center is a non-profit organization supported by its members, who offer ITAC as a free service for their customers. These companies work with each other, and with law enforcement, to help victims and protect consumers from identity theft.”

- **Description of the objective and outcomes:** ITAC’s website states that “ITAC provides victim assistance and identity management services. ITAC Victim Assistance® is available at no cost to customers of ITAC member companies.”

- **Type of partnership:** When a customer contacts an ITAC member, ITAC states that the ITAC member refers the customers directly to ITAC’s Assistance Center, where an ITAC agent reviews the customer’s credit bureau report to detect additional fraud and connects the consumer to the company where, for example, new account fraud or account take-over may have occurred. Using reports from the three major credit reporting agencies, ITAC helps consumers detect additional fraud perpetrated by the identity criminal. ITAC then shares information about the identity theft crime with the Federal Trade Commission and U.S. Postal Inspection Service to help federal and state law enforcement investigate and prosecute identity crime.

- **Identity-related crime aspects of the partnership:** The exclusive focus and direction of ITAC is to facilitate victim assistance to ITAC customers who believe they have become identity-theft victims, and to provide information to federal law enforcement and regulatory authorities about the reported crime.

Analysis:

ITAC demonstrates that private-sector entities can collaborate, not only across sectoral lines but within the same sector (e.g., banking), to provide, on a uniform and noncompetitive basis, a free victim-assistance service to financial-institution customers who have been victimized by identity-related crime.

---
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Outcome/Impact:

- **Outcome (with a focus on identity-related crime aspects):** As of March 2012, ITAC reported that it had assisted its 100,000 customer in recovering from identity theft, and that millions of customers of ITAC member organizations have access to ITAC’s victim-assistance services.\(^{36}\)

- **Impact (with a focus on identity-related crime aspects):** The full-time commitment of resources to provide specific and extensive assistance to victims of identity-related crime provides a substantial benefit to both the financial institutions participating in ITAC and their customers. Federal law enforcement authorities also benefit from the specific information that ITAC provides to them about instances of identity-related crime.

V. Partnerships Concerning Prevention and Public Education

A. Australia: National Identity Fraud Awareness Week Campaign

**Facts:**

- **Partners involved:**
  - **Public institutions:** Australian Federal Police
  - **Private institutions:** Fellowes, Norton by Symantec, Crime Stoppers, and Veda Advantage (data intelligence firm)

- **Brief description of the partnership:** According to the campaign’s website, “National Identity Fraud Awareness Week is an initiative of leading security products company, Fellowes®, aiming to educate Australians and New Zealanders about the dangers of identity fraud.”\(^{37}\) The campaign has been conducted for six years, most recently during the week of October 8-14, 2012.\(^{38}\)

- **Type of partnership:** Partners collaborate in coordinated messaging, through websites and public events, to publicize the problem of identity-related crime and offer suggestions to the public to reduce their risks.

- **Identity-related crime aspects of the partnership:** See above.

**Analysis:**

Because the partners have diverse commercial interests (and, in the case of the Australian Federal Police and Crime Stoppers, altogether non-commercial interests), the approach of allowing each agency or organization to issue its own individually tailored message, while reinforcing the basic awareness approach of the campaign, allows all participants to play a unique role in supporting the larger messaging campaign.

---


\(^{38}\) Ibid.
Outcome/Impact:

- **Outcome (with a focus on identity-related crime aspects):** In 2012, a variety of agencies and organizations created web-pages to publicize the campaign, including the Australian Federal Police, Consumers Federation of Australia, Telstra, and Veda, or used the campaign’s standardized messaging. In addition, various websites publicized the campaign.

- **Impact (with a focus on identity-related crime aspects):** A unified public-education campaign such as this allows agencies and private-sector entities to use their education and prevention resources directed at identity-related crime more efficiently, and to improve the visibility and reach of the consumer messaging conducted during the campaign.

**B. Brazil: Prevention of Identity Abuses as a Deterrent to Electoral Fraud – Electronic Voting System**

**Facts:**

- **Partners involved:**
  - **Public institutions:** Superior Electoral Court (TSE)
  - **Private institutions:** Modulo Security Solutions

- **Brief description of the partnership:** A pool of public and private parties has developed and continues to maintain a wholly electronic voting system for elections in Brazil for the offices of President of the Republic, Governors, Mayors, Senators, and Deputies, at the Federal and State levels.

- **Type of partnership:** Private and public parties collaborated from the outset to develop the electronic voting system. Also, splitting the works among the different parties was a way to ensure that no one possesses all pieces of the secrecy which protects the voting system.

- **Identity-related crime aspects of the partnership:** The pool of public and private parties share the software and secrecy of the respective technological solution, and help prevent theft of the personal identity of each voting person (which could be misused in several ways, as the electoral number is recognized as identification for many purposes).

---

Analysis:

The collaboration of public and private parties was designed to provide the benefits of private-sector expertise in electronic voting technologies with public-sector commitment to adoption of a system that would both ensure the accuracy and integrity of voting processes and protect identifying data of voters.

More specifically, with regards to the identity-related crime aspects of the partnership, public-private collaboration was essential to testing and adoption of a system that could safeguard voters’ identifying data.

Outcome/Impact:

- **Outcome (with a focus on identity-related crime aspects):** The benefits of this electronic voting system reach 138 million Brazilians, who can use more than 500,000 electronic voting devices.

- **Impact (with a focus on identity-related crime aspects):** In view of the large numbers of Brazilian voters who can take advantage of this system, assurance that their identifying data will be safeguarded enhances the confidence of voters in the voting process, and prevents misuse of the electoral identity number, in several ways.

C. Netherlands: Information Verification System

Facts:

- **Partners involved:**
  - Public institutions: National Police of the Netherlands (KLPD), Central Unit
  - Private institutions: Verificatie Informatie Systemen B.V. (VIS); Experian; other private entities

- **Brief description of the partnership:** VIS provides a system for information exchange concerning only the numbers of lost and stolen documents (i.e., no privacy-sensitive information such as individuals’ names). A private party that queries the system receives a hit/no hit answer (i.e., the number in question is either legitimate or not), and the Dutch Government receives information about which document number has been checked, when, and by whom.

- **Type of partnership:** Private parties conduct the information check between them, while the Dutch Government is kept informed about that query.

- **Identity-related crime aspects of the partnership:** See above.

Analysis:

This arrangement strikes a balance between the need to comply with European Union-wide and national privacy protections and the need to assist the private sector.

---

45 See Verificatie Informatie Systemen B.V., Algemeen Reglement Verificatie Informatie Systeem (April 2012), available at 130401 algemeen_reglement_vis_april_2013.PDF.
in promptly obtaining information about the possible criminal abuse of a particular identifying number.

Outcome/Impact:

- **Outcome (with a focus on identity-related crime aspects):** This process results in timely and expeditious information exchanges between private parties without infringing on individuals’ legitimate privacy interests.

- **Impact (with a focus on identity-related crime aspects):** This process should result in reducing the incidence or frequency of identity-related crime in the Netherlands.

### D. United Kingdom: Operation Amberhill

**Facts:**

- **Partners involved:**
  - **Public institutions:** Metropolitan Police Service (London) and other government agencies in the United Kingdom
  - **Private institutions:** Financial institutions in the United Kingdom

- **Brief description of the partnership:** Operation Amberhill, an initiative led by the Metropolitan Police Service, shares the details of false identities with financial institutions to help identify and prevent identity-related frauds.  

- **Type of partnership:** Amberhill has been described as a unique police operation tasked with combating the use of forged, counterfeit and fraudulently obtained genuine identity documents to commit crime. It receives details of false documents in various formats from organizations and law enforcement agencies across the UK. These are assessed, processed and enhanced before shared with partners in the Public and Private Sector via bespoke Information Sharing agreements. This data is cross-matched and the positive matches investigated to identify prevention, disruption and enforcement opportunities.  

- **Identity-related crime aspects of the partnership:** See above.

**Analysis:**

Amberhill has been identified as a best practice with respect to cross-government information-sharing.  

---
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Outcome/Impact:

- **Outcome (with a focus on identity-related crime aspects):** Amberhill has shared the details of more than 12,000 false identities with financial institutions.\(^{49}\) It also has led to prosecution of 80 individuals found to have obtained enhanced Criminal Records Bureau disclosure to gain employment with children and vulnerable adults, while disrupting another 500.\(^{50}\)

- **Impact (with a focus on identity-related crime aspects):** Amberhill has had a substantial effect on identity-related crime by analysing and disseminating information involving false documents and identity-related crime to a wide range of institutions and organizations, which can in turn use the data for crime prevention and other appropriate responses.

E. United States: Identity Theft Assistance Centre (ITAC)

Facts:

- **Partners involved:**
  - Public institutions: Federal Trade Commission; United States Postal Inspection Service
  - Private institutions: 29 leading banks, credit-card associations, securities brokerages, and other financial sector entities

- **Brief description of the partnership:** In addition to its victim-assistance service (see above), ITAC has actively supported or sponsored a variety of initiatives for public prevention and education on identity theft. These include periodically issued consumer advisory releases on various identity-theft topics; a survey of customers it has assisted; and most recently, sponsorship of a survey on child identity fraud.

- **Type of partnership:** ITAC not only issues its own consumer advisory releases on identity-theft topics, but in some cases partners with other organizations to issue such releases.

- **Identity-related crime aspects of the partnership:** See above.

Analysis:

ITAC’s support for continuing public education on identity-theft issues, including its financial support for research on types of identity theft and fraud, provide the public with timely information that can assist them in avoiding or mitigating the risks of identity theft.

\(^{49}\) See NATIONAL FRAUD STRATEGIC AUTHORITY, supra note 24.

\(^{50}\) See BCS, supra.
Outcome/Impact:

- **Outcome (with a focus on identity-related crime aspects):** In December 2012, ITAC announced the results of the ITAC-sponsored Child Identity Fraud Survey, which Javelin Strategy & Research conducted. In October 2011, ITAC issued the results of its survey of ITAC customers who had been victims of identity theft. In October 2012, ITAC issued a consumer advisory press release with BITS (the technology policy division of the Financial Service Roundtable), on using strong passwords; and in March 2011, it issued a consumer advisory press release with the Consumer Federation of America, on consumers who buy identity-management services having access to clear and accurate information about the scope of fraud prevention and recovery services they will receive.

- **Impact (with a focus on identity-related crime aspects):** The ITAC-sponsored Child Identity Fraud Survey received extensive media coverage, in both general and information-security publications and websites. Other ITAC-issued reports and release help to inform the public about important preventive measures to guard against identity-related crime.

F. United States: National Consumer Protection Week

**Facts:**

- **Partners involved:**
  - **Public institutions:** In 2013, 45 federal, state, and local government agencies, including the Department of Justice’s Civil Division, the Department of State, the FBI, the U.S. Postal Inspection Service, the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Social Security Administration, 13 state attorneys general, and various state, county, and local consumer protection agencies and other government agencies.

---

Private institutions: In 2013, numerous private-sector entities and associations, including AARP, Better Business Bureau, Consumer Federation of America, Consumers Union, the National Association for the Advancement of Coloured People, the National Consumers League, the National Cyber Security Alliance

Brief description of the partnership: National Consumer Protection Week (NCPW) is an annual coordinated campaign, involving both public- and private-sector entities, “that encourages consumers nationwide to take full advantage of their consumer rights and make better-informed decisions.”

Type of partnership: Each participating entity chooses its own initiatives for public education and prevention, as well as the other entities with which it chooses to partner for specific initiatives. Role assigned to the public and the private The 2013 NCPW took place March 3-9, 2013.

Identity-related crime aspects of the partnership: Identity theft is one of the 11 consumer topics on which the 2013 NCPW focused. The NCPW website included numerous links to information on various identity-related crime topics, such as child identity theft, credit freezes, filing complaints, medical identity theft, online privacy, and shopping online.

Analysis:

Like the Australian National Identity Fraud Awareness Week Campaign described above, the NCPW’s approach of allowing each agency or organization to issue its own individually tailored consumer messages, while reinforcing the basic awareness approach of the campaign, allows all participants to play a unique role in supporting the larger messaging campaign.

Outcome/Impact:

• Outcome (with a focus on identity-related crime aspects): To highlight the significance of NCPW, President Barack Obama issued a Presidential proclamation. A variety of federal, state, and local government agencies also issued public statements about NCPW and public advisories directed at various types of consumer fraud and consumer protection concerns, including identity theft.

---

• **Impact (with a focus on identity-related crime aspects):** The statements and public advisories reached numerous local, regional, and national media organizations and generated substantial public attention to fraud, including identity-related crime.\[^{60}\]

---