Cabinet Secretary for Justice
Neil Gray MSP

Scottish Government
Riaghaltas na h-Alba

T: 0300 244 4000
E: scottish.ministers@gov.scot

David Linden
Convener
Criminal Justice Committee
criminaljustice.committee@parliament.scot

11 November 2026

Dear David,

ELECTRONIC MONITORING BY GPS – EVALUATION PUBLISHED

I would like to draw the Committee's attention to the Scottish Government's recently published *Evaluation of GPS Monitoring of Home Detention Curfew (HDC)*, and I have shared a copy alongside this correspondence. The evaluation examines the implementation and operation of GPS monitoring within the HDC context and provides a summary of the evidence on its use, including the experiences of those involved in delivering and managing the service. I wished to make you aware in advance of my appearance before the Committee on 18 November to give evidence on the Electronic Monitoring (Use of Devices and Information) (Scotland) regulations. Those regulations will enable the proposed pilot of GPS monitoring as a condition of bail, and this evaluation may help provide context to our thinking in development of the GPS service in Scotland.

I trust this is helpful, and look forward to discussing with the Committee next week.

NEIL GRAY

Scottish Ministers, special advisers and the Permanent Secretary are covered by the terms of the Lobbying (Scotland) Act 2016. See www.lobbying.scot

Scottish Government
Riaghaltas na h-Alba

GPS Monitoring for Home Detention Curfew

Phase 1 Evaluation and Lessons Learned

November 2026

Purpose

This document is designed to provide an evaluation of the phase 1 use of GPS with HDC, setting out process learning and findings against the initial aims set as part of the success criteria. This evaluation has been carried out by the Scottish Government with the support of operational delivery partners.

Introduction

Powers enabling the use of GPS monitoring of Home Detention Curfew (HDC) came into force in January 2025 as the first phase of a potential wider rollout. Following refinement of the operational model between partners, the first GPS-monitored HDC case commenced in March 2026. Use of radio frequency monitoring capability (the current form of electronic monitoring used in the wider service) remains available for HDC cases for monitoring curfew (to home address). GPS is available as a non-standard licence condition where the Scottish Prison Service (SPS) (following an individual-level assessment), determines that an exclusion zone is necessary and proportionate to manage a specific geographical risk. Use of GPS during this first phase has shown that it has not been applied extensively, and at the time of publication of this lessons learned report, 10 people have been released from Scottish prisons on GPS-monitored HDC.

Whilst numbers are currently low, this was not unexpected nor is it unduly limiting in terms of drawing conclusions from Phase 1, particularly since on the majority of insights were expected to relate to process learning. SPS report that low usage is largely due to the requirement for a specified geographical exclusion zone to be identified, and a lack of relevant information either held by SPS or provided by partners such as justice social work as part of the process, often limiting up-to-date victim information. SPS considers GPS for every HDC case, and Assessors have been briefed from the outset and encouraged to use GPS where when deemed appropriate, proportionate and defensible.

The process followed in identifying, applying, and monitoring GPS with HDC is set out in Figure 1 below.




Figure 1 - GPS HDC Process

Phase 1 of GPS use with HDC was established to address the following Outcomes and aims:

Outcome: improved learning about GPS and processes needed in support of a GPS service in Scotland.

> **AIM:** to establish a process of integrated exchange of geographical mapping information, to establish a shared tool that justice partners could use in support of GPS (in anticipation of wider roll out)
>
> **AIM:** to establish a battery charging regime and learn how compliance with charging is influenced by reminders
>
> **AIM:** to establish a way in which GPS data can be used in support of the process of compliance enforcement (breach of HDC) but also in evidencing any further offending (evidential proof standard established)

Outcome: improved learning about how GPS functionality might support the aims of certain policies, in this case HDC.

> **AIM:** to establish where greater flexibility in monitoring can support the aims of HDC, in terms of reintegration on release
>
> **AIM:** to optimise the use of HDC more generally through introduction of GPS functionality and potentially increase opportunities for eligible individuals to successfully obtain release on HDC

As well as evidence of the above outcomes and aims, this evaluation reflects on learning gathered on the following cross-cutting operational observations as we consider further use of GPS monitoring in Scotland:

- Signal Drift and Alert Interpretation
- Case Selection, Proportionality and Defensibility
- Training and Operational Familiarity
- Alerts and Responses
- Operational Response to Non-Compliance
- Tier 1 and Tier 2 Arrangements to ensure proportionate police response

This evaluation assesses Phase 1 against these original aims and focuses on whether the rollout has generated the intended learning.

Scope and Limitations

This review has been undertaken as a proportionate process evaluation to support the iterative development of the service. Phase 1 was designed primarily to assess the operational implementation of GPS monitoring within HDC and to support the introduction of the technology, rather than to evaluate longer-term outcomes. The

review considers whether arrangements were implemented as intended, the factors that supported or hindered delivery, any early or unintended effects, and the changes required as implementation progresses. Consistent with the distinctions set out in the Magenta Book,[1] it is not intended to provide an impact or value-for-money assessment.

Given the small number of cases and limitations in the available management information, there are limitations about the conclusions that can be drawn about the impact of GPS monitoring within HDC, particularly in relation to the second outcome and sub-aims set out above. The findings should therefore be understood as an assessment of implementation to date, operational insights, and lessons learned. These lessons have already informed continuous improvement activity for use of GPS within HDC, and will be considered in the development of the forthcoming geographical pilot of GPS monitoring of bail conditions in the Sheriffdom of Tayside, Central and Fife ("the GPS bail pilot"). This scope of evaluation is proportionate to the current stage of implementation and reflects the limited evidence available at this stage.

Review of Outcomes and Aims

This section assesses each Outcome and aim in turn; highlighting evidence, identifying lessons learned, and considering how learning can be applied.

Outcome sought: improving learning about GPS and processes needed in support of a GPS service in Scotland.

Phase 1 of the GPS HDC rollout has provided valuable learning in relation to the practical operational delivery of a GPS monitoring service in Scotland, albeit on a relatively small scale to date. The primary aim of Phase 1 was to better understand the processes and protocols required for successful delivery. Overall assessment of this outcome shows that Phase 1 has successfully generated operational learning on:

- Mapping and exclusion-zone creation.
- Charging compliance.
- Alert interpretation.
- Compliance management.
- Multi-agency delivery arrangements.

Phase 1 also generated learning about the guidance, training and decision support required to maintain operational familiarity where case volumes are low.

[1] https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/6a3157a0141f0690ad5fa438/CCS0126982978-001_PN10541411_Magenta_Book_Update_V2_Accessible_2__1_.pdf

AIM: to establish a process of integrated exchange of geographical mapping information, to establish a shared tool that justice partners could use in support of GPS (in anticipation of wider roll out)

Assessment of delivery against this aim draws on the following evidence:

- Qualitative feedback from partners (SPS and G4S) through structured conversations on their experience in creating exclusion zones; and
- Feedback from SPS and G4S on the mapping process and software.

Phase 1 successfully established operational learning around the creation and management of GPS exclusion zones. Evaluation materials and partner discussions demonstrate that SPS, G4S and Scottish Government officials were able to work through and resolve practical issues relating to mapping, exclusion-zone design and associated system functionality. Phase 1 also informed consideration of buffer zones and wider geographical restrictions, generating learning that would support any future scaled deployment of GPS monitoring in Scotland.

Phase 1 has also demonstrated that the mapping arrangements required to support GPS monitoring can be delivered in practice. No technical barrier was identified that prevented mapping information from being exchanged between partners during Phase 1. Mapping information could be reviewed by the organisations involved in the process. The evaluation also confirmed that exclusion zones can be created and implemented within live HDC cases, with specialist mapping support available and utilised to develop exclusion zones that are both operationally deliverable and technically workable.

Operational partners have developed practical experience in specifying, reviewing and amending geographical restrictions throughout the lifecycle of a case. This experience has improved collective understanding of the considerations involved in translating policy intent and license conditions into enforceable geographical restrictions, and has provided valuable insight into the interaction between operational requirements and the technical capabilities of the monitoring solution, policy intent, and license conditions.

The established Map Check process between SPS and G4S supported discussion and refinement of proposed exclusion zones to ensure that they were clearly defined and capable of being monitored. Decisions on the necessity and proportionality of the licence condition remained for SPS. The timescales available within the HDC assessment process have provided sufficient opportunity for these considerations to be explored prior to implementation.

This learning also highlights that the operational timescales associated with other licence and order types, particularly bail, may provide less opportunity for iterative review and refinement. This should be considered in future service design and operational planning.

Alongside these positive findings, Phase 1 generated additional operational learning in relation to the design and monitoring of exclusion zones. This included challenges associated with monitoring small exclusion areas where curfew and exclusion boundaries are in close proximity, particularly in light of signal drift, as well as learning relating to boundary effects and the characteristics of technically robust exclusion zone design. In a small number of cases, exclusion zones had not taken account of proximity to arterial travel routes, and this led to conflict for monitored people accessing certain services.

These findings have reinforced the importance of early engagement with the monitoring provider and technical review when developing geographical restrictions.

Overall, a functioning mapping process has been established and used successfully during Phase 1. However, further evidence will be required to assess its consistency, timeliness and scalability as the volume and complexity of cases increase. This will be particularly important as planning progresses for the GPS bail pilot. Further consideration is required as to the process for addressing any necessary change to an exclusion zone after commencement, including the respective responsibilities of SPS and the monitoring provider.

AIM: to establish a battery charging regime and learn how compliance with charging is influenced by reminders

Assessment of delivery against this aim draws on the following evidence:

- Review of management information and case notes relating to monitored people, including charging compliance patterns and action taken where GPS device charge drops to 0%; and
- Qualitative feedback from partners (SPS and G4S) about experience of response to charging compliance and action taken.

Phase 1 established and tested a charging-monitoring regime, which was refined as operational experience developed. Available evidence indicates that charging compliance was generally observed across the cohort, with only a small number of low-battery and battery depletion compliance events recorded. This provides an initial indication that monitored individuals on GPS HDC were, in most cases, able to comply with the charging requirements associated with the technology. This review does not include views or experiences of monitored individuals (as issues of consent to provide those views and follow up after monitoring had finished were limitations) and findings presented here are based on operational evidence, compliance data and the views of delivery partners (which may include second hand views of monitored individuals) rather than direct feedback from monitored individuals themselves. Any future evaluation of GPS monitoring should seek to consider the experience of monitored people.

Operational information indicates that charging generally commenced following low - battery alerts. However, the small number of cases and absence of direct feedback from monitored individuals do not allow firm conclusions about the extent to which reminders influenced charging behaviour or whether the reminder regime was optimised. Although one monitored individual was reported to the SPS following full battery depletion of their GPS device at the same time as they were in an exclusion zone, and the wider circumstances resulted in recall. We understand there were no recalls to prison arising solely from battery charging compliance issues during Phase 1. This distinction is important in understanding how charging-related incidents have been managed operationally and how compliance responses have been applied in practice.

Phase 1 has also provided useful learning on the practical operation of charging compliance monitoring, reporting arrangements and enforcement responses. Experience gained through live operation has improved understanding of the relationship between GPS monitoring and concurrent radio frequency monitoring of the same individual, as well as the impact that device configuration choices can have on compliance management and operational workflows. This has generated a number of tangible and actionable lessons which can be applied to future service development.

Operational partners reported that the experience of managing charging compliance has also helped clarify the role of reminders, notifications and SPS decision-making processes when responding to compliance concerns. Practical use of the technology has provided opportunities to test and refine these arrangements, and the lessons identified will inform future development of operational guidance and processes.

Operational feedback indicated that the charging compliance observed within the small HDC cohort should not be assumed to apply to other cohorts or order types, whose circumstances, legal status and support arrangements may differ.

Phase 1 generated important operational learning regarding charging compliance. SPS, G4S and Scottish Government partners developed and tested a structured charging-monitoring regime, including agreed thresholds, reminders and escalation pathways. These findings provide a clearer basis for managing charging-related risks in any future GPS service.

AIM: to establish a way in which GPS data can be used in support of the process of compliance enforcement (breach of HDC) but also in evidencing any further offending (evidential proof standard established)

Assessment of delivery against this aim draws on the following evidence:

- Management information on compliance;
- Qualitative findings, gathered through structured conversation and case conferences, on SPS experience of GPS HDC;

Phase 1 established the operational processes required for GPS information to support compliance monitoring, exclusion-zone enforcement and recall activity. Through implementation, G4S, SPS and Scottish Government partners developed reporting arrangements that linked GPS monitoring activity with Police Scotland operational responses and SPS recall procedures. While Phase 1 generated valuable operational learning regarding reporting processes and information flows, it also highlighted areas requiring further consideration, particularly in relation to evidential standards and the role of GPS information in supporting criminal investigations and prosecutions.

A key lesson from Phase 1 is that GPS information can be successfully incorporated into operational decision-making. Throughout Phase 1, GPS data was used within established processes to inform partner responses and support the management of individuals subject to GPS-monitored HDC. This demonstrated that the technology can provide actionable location information within an operational setting and that partners were able to integrate this information into existing decision-making frameworks.

Implementation experience also reinforced the importance of considering GPS information as one component of the wider evidence and information picture. Operational partners consistently highlighted the need to interpret GPS data alongside radio frequency (RF) monitoring information and the broader circumstances of the case. Phase 1 therefore underlined the value of a holistic approach to decision-making, recognising that location information should be understood within its operational context rather than considered in isolation.

Phase 1 further clarified the distinct but complementary responsibilities of SPS, G4S and Police Scotland within the operational model. Experience gained through live implementation improved understanding of the respective roles of each organisation in monitoring, reporting, assessing and responding to GPS-related information. The establishment and testing of these arrangements during Phase 1 has provided a clearer basis for future operation and development of GPS monitoring.

Early implementation also highlighted the importance of proportionate interpretation of alerts and careful handling of location information. Operational experience demonstrated that GPS-generated alerts require appropriate contextual assessment and that responses should take account of the circumstances surrounding an event, rather than relying solely on the existence of an alert. Similarly, Phase 1 reinforced the importance of handling location information carefully, reflecting its operational significance and the need for appropriate interpretation by trained practitioners.

Overall, Phase 1 demonstrated that workable processes can be established to support the operational use of GPS information. At the same time, it identified the need for further learning and evidence in relation to how GPS information may be used beyond compliance monitoring and operational decision-making, particularly

where evidential requirements associated with criminal investigations or prosecutions may apply.

The enforcement element of the aim was tested operationally, but the potential evidential use of GPS information in the investigation or prosecution of suspected further offending was not tested during Phase 1.

OUTCOME: improving learning about how the GPS functionality might support the aims of certain policies, in this case HDC.

> **AIM: to establish where this greater flexibility in monitoring can support the aims of HDC, in terms of reintegration on release**
>
> **AIM: to optimise the use of HDC more generally through this new functionality and potentially increase opportunities for eligible individuals to successfully obtain release on HDC**

Assessment of delivery against these aims draws on limited evidence gathered through:

- Qualitative reports from SPS on usage and impacts;
- Management information on monitored cases; and
- Case conference outcomes.

Overall, the evidence available from Phase 1 indicates that GPS monitoring can operate alongside Home Detention Curfew (HDC) and can be used to apply geographically focused restrictions where this is considered necessary and proportionate. Phase 1 demonstrated that GPS monitoring can be integrated into existing HDC processes and that geographical restrictions can be incorporated into licence conditions through the use of exclusion zones. However, given the limited number of cases included within Phase 1, it has not been possible to assess a number of the longer-term outcomes originally associated with the introduction of GPS monitoring. In particular, the current evaluation cannot determine whether GPS monitoring improves reintegration outcomes, expands access to HDC, or leads to improved overall HDC outcomes. These remain important areas for future assessment as the evidence base develops.

Direct feedback from monitored individuals, including through the proposed end-of-licence survey, was not available for this review. It has therefore not been possible to assess monitored individuals' experiences of charging requirements or perceived effects on sleep, daily structure and reintegration.

A consistent theme emerging from stakeholder engagement was that GPS monitoring provides functionality that differs from, and potentially complements, traditional radio frequency (RF) monitoring. Whereas RF monitoring is primarily focused on compliance with curfew conditions at a fixed address, GPS monitoring

introduces the ability to apply geographically targeted restrictions linked to identified locations and risks. Stakeholders considered that this additional flexibility has the potential to support reintegration by allowing individuals to move within the community whilst continuing to manage identified risks through exclusion zones and ongoing location monitoring. This potential benefit was not assessed through outcome data or direct feedback from monitored individuals during Phase 1.

Phase 1 demonstrated that exclusion zones can be applied as part of HDC licences and that GPS monitoring can be used in cases where a specific geographical risk has been identified. Phase 1 therefore established a practical mechanism through which geographically focused restrictions can be incorporated within existing HDC arrangements. Operational partners successfully developed, implemented and monitored exclusion zones, with successful identification of incursion into Tier 1 and Tier 2 exclusion zones. This demonstrates that GPS technology can provide capabilities beyond those available through RF monitoring alone.

Phase 1 also demonstrated the potential for GPS monitoring to expand the range of risk management options available to SPS when considering HDC applications. Stakeholders anticipated that the ability to apply and monitor exclusion zones could provide an additional means of managing risk in circumstances where traditional RF monitoring may not be sufficient on its own. As a result, GPS was viewed as a potentially valuable addition to the suite of monitoring options available within existing HDC decision-making processes.

However, while Phase 1 has demonstrated that GPS can be used in this way, the available evidence is not sufficient to determine the extent to which this translated into measurable changes in HDC outcomes. The cohort remains too small to support meaningful comparison with existing RF-monitored cases, and no robust conclusions can currently be drawn regarding whether GPS monitoring increased access to HDC, enabled individuals to remain on HDC for longer periods, reduced recall rates, or altered overall outcomes compared with comparable cohorts. Although stakeholders identified potential benefits and future opportunities associated with the technology, these remain matters for further evaluation rather than findings which can be evidenced through Phase 1.

Accordingly, the principal lesson from Phase 1 is not that GPS monitoring has demonstrably improved HDC outcomes, but that it has been successfully established as an additional monitoring option within existing HDC processes. Phase 1 has shown that geographically focused restrictions can be designed, implemented and monitored in practice, and that the technology provides capabilities which differ from those associated with RF monitoring. Determining whether these capabilities result in improved operational or rehabilitative outcomes will require a larger evidence base, further piloting activity and continued longitudinal monitoring as implementation develops.

As noted during stakeholder review, SPS perspectives on the extent to which GPS has influenced HDC decision-making and risk management practice may provide additional context to these findings and should be reflected in the final assessment where available.

Cross-Cutting Operational Lessons

Experience of operational delivery, alongside assessment of the outcomes and aims set out above, provides a number of cross-cutting lessons which are instructive in considering how GPS use can be used elsewhere in the justice system.

Signal Drift and Alert Interpretation

Operational experience demonstrated the importance of interpreting GPS alerts in context. One early Tier 1 breach alert was subsequently attributed to signal drift of circa 2 miles, with RF monitoring indicating the individual remained at their curfew address. Learning from this incident reinforced the need to consider GPS information alongside RF status, device accuracy indicators and wider case circumstances before determining operational responses. SPS report the need to impose significantly larger areas in some cases to mitigate issues of signal drift, rendering some cases unsuitable for GPS due to the proximity of the HDC monitored address to the exclusion zone around a victim's address. This reinforces learning from other jurisdictions as to why GPS should not be used for monitoring curfew to a place.

GPS alerts require careful interpretation and should not be viewed in isolation, as a location point near an exclusion-zone boundary may reflect either genuine movement or normal variation in positioning. Effective decision-making therefore depends on considering GPS information alongside RF data, device status, contact with the monitored individual where appropriate, and the wider case context to ensure responses are timely, proportionate and evidence-based.

G4S used learning from live delivery to refine the assessment of GPS alerts, including consideration of timing, distance of travel and the apparent accuracy of location information. Further evaluation of one alert led G4S to withdraw a non-compliance report, reinforcing the importance of verification and consideration of all available information before escalatory action is taken.

The operating model provides clear separation of responsibilities, with the monitoring provider identifying and reporting potential non-compliance, SPS investigating the circumstances and determining the appropriate response, and Police Scotland undertaking a defined role in Tier 1 incursions and post-recall activity.

Introducing GPS monitoring has required additional professional judgement and analytical assessment by the monitoring provider, particularly when interpreting location information and apparent exclusion-zone incursions. Staff training and

decision-support tools are essential to avoiding false escalation, and the accuracy and robustness of the initial notification from the monitoring provider to the SPS is of paramount importance to effective operation. Regular review of SPS recall guidance to ensure it is clear and unambiguous will continue to support decision-making here.

Case Selection and Proportionality

GPS monitoring within HDC is intended as a targeted rather than routine intervention, used only where SPS determines that a geographical restriction is necessary and proportionate to manage a specific identified risk. All GPS cases must include a clearly defined exclusion zone, whether linked to an individual (Tier 1) or a location associated with offending behaviour (Tier 2), and the key test is not the presence of a victim or court order but whether the risk can be effectively managed through a practical and enforceable geographical restriction. Clear and consistent recording of the identified risk, the rationale for using GPS, the proposed exclusion-zone design and relevant Justice Social Work information would support proportionate decision-making and future evaluation. In doing so, it is important to distinguish the complementary functions of GPS and RF monitoring: RF confirms compliance with the curfew address, while GPS enables monitoring of exclusion zones.

Training and Operational Familiarity

Guidance, training and operating processes were developed to support implementation and were refined as operational learning emerged. Initial live operation nevertheless highlighted the challenges associated with low case numbers, limited practical exposure, process complexity and the interval between training and live use. In one early incident, limited operational familiarity contributed to overly cautious interpretation of GPS information, however through effective partnership working between G4S and SPS this was resolved without the need for recall.

The evidence indicates that the materials provided a basis for delivery, but that concise refresher material and continued access to experienced staff are required while case volumes remain low. G4S concentrated relevant expertise among trained supervisors because the number of cases did not support wider rollout of training.

This highlights the importance of maintaining access to experienced staff while providing concise refresher training for those likely to encounter GPS cases only occasionally.

There were also early operational challenges in reporting alerts and obtaining timely confirmation of the SPS response. These continue to be addressed through communication and joint review between SPS and G4S.

Alerts and Responses

Delivery of Phase 1 benefited from close collaboration between SPS, G4S, Scottish Government policy officials and contract-management colleagues. Joint consideration of incidents and operational processes provided opportunities for shared learning. A ‘case conference’ approach to emerging issues has also allowed partners to identify and address opportunities for continuous improvement in response to specific incidents. Experience also demonstrated the importance of maintaining clear communication channels and common understanding of protocols across agencies.

Operational Response to Non-Compliance

Early operational experience reinforced the importance of proportionate and evidence-based responses to apparent non-compliance. Learning from initial incidents highlighted the value of escalation processes and managerial oversight before formal enforcement action is initiated, particularly where alerts may have alternative technical explanations.

Partners continue to hold *ad hoc* ‘case conferences’ to identify and action learning from specific non-compliance events.

Tier 1 and Tier 2 Arrangements

Phase 1 has provided initial operational experience of both Tier 1 and Tier 2 exclusion-zone arrangements (in other words a differentiated compliance response). While incidents have demonstrated the distinct response pathways associated with each tier, the number of cases remains too small to support firm conclusions regarding comparative effectiveness or operational impact.

To date, two GPS HDC cases have resulted in recall to prison for breach of exclusion zone requirements – one subject to Tier 1 conditions and one subject to Tier 2 conditions.

Summary and Conclusions

Phase 1 has successfully achieved its primary objective of generating operational learning about the implementation of GPS monitoring within Home Detention Curfew. Phase 1 established and tested the core processes required to support GPS-monitored HDC, including exclusion-zone design and mapping, charging compliance arrangements, alert assessment, compliance management, and multi-agency working between SPS, G4S, Police Scotland and Scottish Government partners.

The evaluation demonstrates that GPS monitoring can operate effectively alongside existing radio frequency monitoring and can be used to impose and monitor geographically focused licence conditions where these are considered necessary

and proportionate. Exclusion zones were successfully created, implemented and monitored in live cases, while operational partners developed practical experience of managing alerts, interpreting GPS information, and responding to potential non-compliance. Phase 1 also clarified the distinct responsibilities of delivery partners and generated valuable learning regarding signal drift, alert interpretation, staff training, operational decision-making and escalation processes.

Phase 1 further demonstrated that GPS monitoring provides functionality beyond that available through RF monitoring alone. Stakeholders considered that the ability to monitor exclusion zones may offer additional risk-management options within existing HDC processes and has the potential to support more flexible release arrangements in appropriate cases.

However, the small number of GPS-monitored HDC cases means that the evaluation cannot reach firm conclusions regarding the wider impact of GPS monitoring on HDC outcomes. It remains too early to determine whether GPS monitoring increases access to HDC, improves reintegration, reduces recalls, or delivers better overall outcomes than comparable RF-monitored cases. Operational processes were established for the use of GPS information in compliance monitoring and enforcement activity. The potential evidential use of GPS information in criminal investigations or prosecutions was not tested during Phase 1.

The next phase of work should focus on consolidating the operational learning generated through HDC, continuing to refine guidance, training and mapping processes, and building a larger evidence base through ongoing use. The forthcoming GPS Bail Pilot provides an important opportunity to apply these lessons within a different operational context, particularly in relation to shorter decision-making timescales, charging compliance, exclusion-zone management and operational responses to non-compliance. Together, continued GPS use within HDC and the GPS Bail Pilot will help determine the scalability, effectiveness and longer-term role of GPS monitoring within Scotland's justice system.