Annual Surveillance Report for Surveillance Technology

Department of Violence Prevention Apricot Data Management System
June 2025

A.   System Use

- Prompt: Provide a description of how the surveillance technology was used, including the type and quantity of data gathered or analyzed by the technology.

- Response: The Apricot data management system (Apricot) was used by approximately 20 staff from the Department of Violence Prevention (DVP) and 180 staff from community-based organizations funded by the DVP to deliver violence prevention and intervention services. Direct service staff used the system to track enrollment, service engagement, milestones, and outcomes for individual services as well as attendance, duration, and content of group services. Supervisory staff used the system to ensure that services were delivered with the expected scope and reach. Fiscal and grant staff used the system to store grant documents, track budget spenddown, track progress on scope of work deliverables, and process invoices based on completion of deliverables. DVP service coordination staff used the system for program monitoring and implementation support. Lastly, the DVP's data and evaluation staff used the system to summarize service delivery and outcome data for external reports, monitor completion of participant consent forms, and identify challenges with data entry that require remediation.

  Many services funded by the DVP and delivered by direct service staff require the collection of individual-level data. Users enter individual-level data in Apricot by first completing a participant record and then completing forms related to the type of service delivery. Table 1 provides the number of participant records and related service forms entered by users in Apricot from January 1, 2024, to December 31, 2024.

  Table 1. Apricot forms completed for individual services from January 1, 2024, to December 31, 2024.

Apricot form	Approximate number of records entered
Participant record	3,115
Program enrollment	3,340
Service notes	60,000
Referral	3,850
Life map goals and incentives	3,260
Intake and needs assessment	235
Housing placement	190
Emergency relocation	45
Work experience/job placement	290

Users also enter data in Apricot related to group services or outreach and response activities. Table 2 provides the approximate number of forms completed for these services.

Table 2. Apricot forms completed for group services or outreach and response activities from January 1, 2024, to December 31, 2024.

Apricot form	Approximate number of records entered
Group activities and events	2,500
Hospital response	100
Mobile and bedside advocacy visits	90
Neighborhood and community teams outreach	2,000
Shooting and homicide response	315
Violence interruption	900

B.   Data Sharing

- Prompt: Please provide information about whether and how often data acquired through the use of the surveillance technology was shared with outside entities, the name of any recipient entity, the type(s) of data disclosed, under what legal standard(s) the information was disclosed, and the justification for the disclosure(s).

- Response: Deidentified data on services delivered and personally identifiable information (PII) for participants who provided their consent was shared with the following two parties, as approved in the use policy:

    a) Urban Institute, for the independent third-party evaluation of Measure Z spending and programs, as authorized by the City Council Resolution No. 89139, Professional Services Agreement 18001, and the corresponding data-sharing agreement.

    b) Urban Institute, for the independent third-party evaluation of the DVP's Board of State and Community Corrections' California Violence Intervention and Prevention (CalVIP) grant, as authorized by the City Council Resolution No. 89367, Professional Services Agreement 13898, and the corresponding data-sharing agreement.

C.   Installation & Application

- Prompt: Where applicable, provide a breakdown of what physical objects the surveillance technology hardware was installed upon; using general descriptive terms so as not to reveal the specific location of such hardware; for surveillance technology software, a breakdown of what data sources the surveillance technology was applied to.

- Response: Not applicable as Apricot is a cloud-based software.

D.   Deployment Breakdown

- Prompt: Where applicable, provide a breakdown of where the surveillance technology was deployed geographically, by each Police Area in the relevant year.

- Response: Not applicable as Apricot is a cloud-based software.

E.   Community Complaints

- Prompt: Provide a summary of community complaints or concerns about the surveillance technology, and an analysis of the technology's adopted use policy and whether it is adequate in protecting civil rights and civil liberties. The analysis shall also identify the race of each person that was subject to the technology's use. The Privacy Advisory Commission may waive this requirement upon making a determination that the probative value in gathering this information to evaluate the technology's impact on privacy interests is outweighed by the City's administrative burden in collecting or verifying this information and the potential greater invasiveness in capturing such data. If the Privacy Advisory Commission makes such a determination, written findings in support of the determination shall be included in the annual report submitted for City Council review.

- Response: There have been no complaints or concerns raised about Apricot related to its protection of civil rights and civil liberties. DVP data and evaluation staff have communicated with numerous grantees to integrate their feedback regarding ways to improve the user-friendliness of the system.

  The adopted use policy is adequate in protecting civil rights and liberties. Service delivery information entered in Apricot is limited to high-level information about the number and duration of service contacts and service outcomes. Entry of PII is only required for adult services related to group violence; it is not required for services related to gender-based violence or for youth services. For services that involve the collection and entry of PII, data are only visible to staff within the agency entering the data and select DVP staff who perform data and evaluation or service coordination roles; they are not visible to other agencies funded by the DVP. PII is only shared with external evaluation partners for clients who consent to having their data shared externally for the purposes of evaluation. Table 3 provides race and ethnicity data for participants whose data was entered in Apricot from January 1, 2024, to December 31, 2024.

  Table 3. Race and ethnicity data for participants who data was entered in Apricot from January 1, 2024, to December 31, 2024.

Race	Percentage
African American	53%
Asian	4%

Race	Percentage
Hispanic or Latino	25%
Multi-Racial	4%
White	4%
Other	3%
Missing	6%

F.   Internal Audits & Compliance

- Prompt: Provide the results of any internal audits, any information about violations or potential violations of the Surveillance Use Policy, and any actions taken in response unless the release of such information is prohibited by law, including but not limited to confidential personnel file information.

- Response: DVP data and evaluation staff regularly review record audits of Apricot. There have not been any violations or potential violations of the use policy to date.

G.   Data Breaches or Other Unauthorized Access

- Prompt: Provide information about any data breaches or other unauthorized access to the data collected by the surveillance technology, including information about the scope of the breach and the actions taken in response.

- Response: There have been no data breaches or unauthorized access to the Apricot system.

H.   Efficacy

- Prompt: Provide information, including crime statistics, that help the community assess whether the surveillance technology has been effective at achieving its identified purposes.

- Response: Data collected through Apricot have allowed DVP staff to perform the following tasks:

  a) **Monitor service delivery to ensure alignment with best practices.** In 2024, the DVP reimplemented the Ceasefire approach to gun violence reduction, which focuses intensive life coaching and violence interruption services on individuals who are at highest risk of being victims or perpetrators of gun violence in the near term. Weekly performance reports generated through Apricot using data entered by DVP direct service staff allowed DVP leadership to monitor service delivery and ensure services were delivered with the expected intensity. Oakland ended 2024 with a reduction of over 30% in homicides and shootings, suggesting that the reimplementation of Ceasefire with model fidelity was highly successful in reducing group-driven violence.

Additionally, DVP staff were able to review services delivered by funded community-based organizations to ensure they met expectations outlined in grant scopes of work. In cases when service delivery was not happening as expected, DVP staff were able to provide technical support and guidance to agencies. For example, after reviewing data entered by a transitional housing agency, DVP data and evaluation staff realized that participants were only staying for an average of five months rather than the expected 12 to 18 months. DVP grant management staff had conversations with the agency about strategies for improving retention and extending length of stay, which has since increased. This is one of many examples of how reviewing service data on a regular basis has allowed DVP staff to support enhanced service delivery from funded agencies.

b) **Coordinate group violence services.** DVP staff who coordinate group violence services, including violence interruption activities, relocation, and life coaching, were able to access data entered by funded and referring agencies to coordinate service response across agencies. For instance, supervisors who coordinate violence interruption activities were able to access information entered by each of the four agencies funded to perform violence interruption work to monitor the status of these activities and determine next steps. Additionally, the program officer who coordinates emergency relocation services was able to review referral requests and approve or deny them, after which approved requests were sent to a funded agency to process.

c) **Understand coordinated access to services.** The DVP strives to engage participants in multiple services funded through its network of community-based organizations to address multiple needs that clients have related to their vulnerabilities to violence. Apricot allows the DVP to determine how many funded services each participant accesses; Table 4 provides the percent of clients engaged in one or more group violence services from January 1, 2024, to December 31, 2024. In the next year, the DVP intends to facilitate stronger referral pathways and coordination across agencies to achieve higher percentages of participants accessing more than one service.

Table 4. Number of services accessed by participants in the group violence strategy from January 1, 2024, to December 31, 2024.

Number of services accessed	Percent of clients served
1	81%
2	18%
3 or more	1%

d) **Summarize and share service data with public oversight bodies and external funders to justify continued funding.** DVP data and evaluation staff created reports that summarized aggregate service data for

councilmembers and commissioners who oversee the allocated of DVP funding for community-based contracts. These data have been instrumental in justifying continued financial investments in violence prevention and intervention services in Oakland by providing a clear picture of the services delivered and the demographics of people served. Additionally, data and evaluation staff used data collected through Apricot to complete quarterly and biannual grant reports for external funders in order to justify a continued financial investment.

e) **Evaluate services to assess impact.** Data collected in Apricot have served as the primary source of data for impact evaluations of violence intervention services funded by public ballot measures, as well as evaluations of external grants from the California Board of State Community Corrections and Kaiser Permanente.

I.   Public Records Requests

- Prompt: Provide statistics and information about public records act requests regarding the relevant subject surveillance technology, including response rates.

- Response: There have been no public records requests pertaining to Apricot.

J.   Total Annual Costs

- Prompt: Provide the total annual costs for the surveillance technology, including personnel and other ongoing costs, and what source of funding will fund the technology in the coming year.

- Response: The total annual cost for Apricot is approximately $124,919. In Fiscal year 2025-2026, $100,919 will be funded by Measure NN and $24,000 will be funded by external state and private grants.

K.   Requested Use Policy Amendments

- Prompt: Please describe any requested modifications to the Surveillance Use Policy and provide a detailed basis for the request.

- Response:

a) In the approved use policy, Table 1 presents examples of the types of data collected by the different Apricot forms. We would like to separate this table into two tables (Table 1a and Table 1b) to identify the forms completed and data collected for individual services versus group services and outreach or response activities.

b) The approved use policy references four strategies through which the DVP organizes its funded services: Group Violence, Gender-Based Violence, Community Healing, and the School Violence Intervention and Prevention (VIP) Program. Going forward, the DVP will only organize its services into two strategies: Group Violence and Gender-Based Violence. There are minor text edits throughout the use policy that eliminate reference to the Community Healing and School VIP Program strategies. Additionally, we have deleted Tables 4 and 5, which identified whether individual or group-level data are collected for each service within those strategies.

c) The approved use policy states that DVP staff who coordinate services delivered by community-based organizations can access service data entered by those agencies. We would like to amend this language to say that DVP staff who "coordinate or monitor" services delivered by community-based organizations can access service data entered by those agencies. This will allow staff who manage community grants to review service data on a regular basis to determine whether services are being delivered in accordance with scopes of work and best practices.

d) The approved use policy states that DVP staff who can access individual-level data entered by community-based organizations in Apricot maintain current certifications in HIPAA and Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI) research, ethics, and compliance training. After further consideration, we have determined that the HIPAA and CITI trainings are not relevant for individuals who access data in Apricot since HIPAA-protected data are not collected and DVP staff are not using the data for research purposes. We would like to amend the use policy to say that DVP staff who have access to individual-level data entered into Apricot by community-based organizations will complete a training called *About Privacy and Confidentiality for Non-HIPAA Covered Entities* from Relias Academy at least once every two years.

e) "Apricot 360" has been changed to "Apricot" throughout to reflect the database's more common public name.