

c/o PO BOX 481
Fareham
Hampshire
PO14 9FS

Tel: 02380 478922
Email: npcc.foi.request@npfdu.police.uk

14/11/2025

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST REFERENCE NUMBER: 2529/2025

Thank you for your request for information regarding July 2025 CCC Minutes & Papers, which has now been considered.

Applicant Question:

Can I please have papers related to the following:

Session 1-

Minutes for approval – July 25 Meeting
Reform implications for NPCC functions Hub Funding 26-27
Orgreave Inquiry
Op Leste
Casey Recommendations
Armed Policing Capability Review
Continuous Integrity Screening Update
Police Race Action Plan (PRAP) Update
National Protected Characteristics Code Schemes

- **Session 2** - National Police Reform – White Paper
- **Session 3** - NABIS 2 Year Funding 2026-27 and Year 3 Funding 2027–28 (Regional Paper)
- **Session 4** - Angiolini Inquiry Recommendations, including decision on Recommendation 8C
- **Session 6** - Finance Update, Pay Award Funding, National Landscape Funding and Analysis Mapping, Operating Budget update
- **Session 10** - Investigations in the Online Space and Crime Recording, Non-Hate Crime Incidents and Recording, Accountability Review, Secure Connected Autonomous Vehicles

NPCC Response:

The NPCC does hold recorded information captured by part(s) of your request.

The following information is not held in recorded form and whilst on the agenda for discussion, there is no supporting paper(s). Searches have been conducted across the Chief Constables' Council indices and the final

Chief Constables' pack which was circulated to all attendees of Chief Constables' Council prior to the meeting with a negative result. I have also made checks with NPCC Business Support who facilitate and manage Chief Constables' Council who confirm that no such papers were submitted, presented or circulated prior to, or during September 2025 Chief Constables' Council.

Normal Standard of proof to apply in determining whether a public authority does hold any requested information is the civil standard of the balance of probabilities. In deciding where the balance lies, the Information Commissioner considers the scope, quality, thoroughness and results of the searches carried out by the public authority as well as considering where appropriate, any other reasons offered by the public authority to explain why the information is not held.

I have undertaken all the necessary checks in establishing whether information is held which is captured by your request and any necessary steps with regard to retrieval of such information and I am satisfied that the search conducted to locate the information that you have requested has been robust. The following information is not held by the NPCC:

Chairs Update

Reform implications for NPCC functions – **verbal update**

Ogreave Inquiry – **verbal update**

Current Operational Demands

Armed Policing Capability Review – **verbal update**

Session 2 National Police Reform – White Paper

Slides released in full – **no paper presented**

Two documents at Session 5 – Angiolini Inquiry have been withheld in full citing Section 31(1) Law Enforcement.

All other information requested has been released to you, save for information which has been redacted by virtue of the following exemption(s):

S23 Information supplied by, or relating to security bodies

S24 National Security

S31 Law Enforcement

S38 Health & Safety (Welfare)

S40 Personal Information

S43 Commercial Interests

For further information relating to the legislation, please see Annex A.

Yours sincerely

Sherry Traquair
Freedom of Information Officer & Decision Maker

www.npcc.police.uk

COMPLAINT RIGHTS

Internal Review

Any request for an internal review will be acknowledged and responded to, based on the specific wording of your initial request only.

We ask that any rationale to request an internal review, does not include any requests for new information and ask that these be submitted by separate email. We will acknowledge as a new request and may aggregate to your initial request in compliance with the legislation.

If you are dissatisfied with the response you have been provided with in compliance with the Freedom of Information legislation, you can lodge a complaint with NPCC to have the decision reviewed within 40 working days of the date of this response.

The handling of your request will be looked at by someone independent of the original decision and a fresh response provided.

It would be helpful, if requesting a review, for you to articulate in detail the reasons you are not satisfied with this reply.

If you would like to request a review, please write or send an email to NPCC Freedom of Information, c/o PO Box 481, Fareham, Hampshire, PO14 9FS.

Annex A

Section 17 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 requires the NPCC, when refusing to provide information by way of exemption in question and (c) states why the exemption applies. In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act 2000 this letter acts as a refusal notice to those aspects of your request.

The legislation: Section 23 Information supplied by, or relating to security bodies

(1) Information held by a public authority is exempt information if it was directly or indirectly supplied to the public authority by, or relates to any of the bodies specified in subsection (3)

This is an absolute exemption and there is no requirement to consider the public interest test.

The legislation: Section 24 International Security – the legislation:

(1) Information which does not fall within section 23(1) is exempt information if exemption from section 1(1)(b) is required for the purpose of safeguarding national security.

Information will not be released if the information, where if to do so, would result in the information potentially being used to help one or more individuals circumvent for criminal and/or other reasons including those that would put at risk national security.

The information would allow individuals to infer the level of ability police forces maintain in regards to safeguarding national security. There is a significant risk that knowledge and understanding of any capabilities that the police have would allow terrorists or individuals to undermine or circumvent the police thereby prejudicing the ability to maintain national security.

Any disclosure under FOI is a disclosure to the world at large. Release of the information would limit operational capabilities as criminals / terrorists would gain a greater understanding of the police's methods and techniques, enabling them to take steps to counter them; and provide an indication to any individual who may be undertaking criminal / terrorist activities that the police service may be aware of their presence and taking counter terrorist measures.

It is understood that the public are entitled to know where their public funds are being spent and a better informed public can take steps to protect themselves.

Confirming the use of techniques, capabilities, methodology and resources could render security measures less effective. This could lead to the compromise of ongoing or future operations to protect the security or infrastructure of the UK and increase the risk of harm to the public.

The legislation: Section 31 Law Enforcement

(1) Information which is not exempt information by virtue of section 30 is exempt information if its disclosure under this Act would, or would be likely to, prejudice -

- (a) the prevention or detection of crime
- (b) the apprehension or prosecution of offenders

Disclosure of this information would enable those with criminal intent to target specific areas of the UK to conduct their criminal or terrorist activities. This would also enable criminals to take measures to counteract the tactical capabilities of police forces.

Disclosure of this information would have the likelihood of identifying specific vulnerabilities, which would ultimately compromise police tactics, operations and future prosecutions. Any information identifying the focus of policing activity could be used to the advantage of terrorists or criminal organisations. Information that undermines the operational integrity of these activities will adversely affect public safety and have a negative impact on law enforcement. Public safety would be put at risk if criminals were able to counteract police tactics. The NPCC is committed to demonstrating proportionality and accountability.

Any information that could impact or undermine ongoing investigations or any future investigations would enable targeted individuals / groups to become tactically aware of the police capabilities. This would help subjects and avoid detection, and inhibit the prevention and detection of crime.

The NPCC will not disclose information which may hinder the effective management of law enforcement or place staff or officers at risk. Whilst there is a public interest in the transparency of policing operations and in this case providing assurance that the police service is appropriately and effectively managing this area of policing, there is a very strong public interest in safeguarding the tactical abilities.

The prevention and detection of crime is the foundation upon which policing is built and the police service have a clear responsibility to prevent crime and arrest those responsible for committing crime or those that plan to commit crime. Disclosure of information captured by this request could directly influence the stages of that process, and jeopardise current investigations or prejudice law enforcement.

Additionally, the NPCC works with other external partner agencies in order to combat a variety of threats and issues. Release of the redacted information relevant to this request would seriously undermine this partnership approach in respect of measures concerning the formulation of policing policy.

Disclosure would inhibit the ability of partner agencies to express themselves openly, honestly, and completely, or to explore options when providing advice or giving their views as part of the process of deliberation leading to media handling issues. Those involved in the free and frank provision of advice and provision of views for deliberation should be afforded the space to think freely and express views without worrying about the consequences.

Additionally, disclosure of this information would lead to colleagues and partners becoming more circumspect in providing free and frank advice and views in the future. Individuals should feel confident that there is a safe space to air their professional views, debate live issues and give advice. This process would be inhibited if it became known that these discussions could be released into the public domain later under a Freedom of Information request.

Releasing the information in scope of this request would have a detrimental, chilling effect on the future ability of officials to discuss the handling of the formulation of policing policy and subsequently the quality of any future advice may deteriorate. Consequently, the effectiveness of deliberations and decision making would be harmed

generally. It is vital that colleagues and partner agencies can provide free and frank exchange of views to others regarding changes to the media handling plan and be able to adapt their views and advice without fear that those outcomes or conversations will be released later into the public domain.

The legislation: Section 38 Health & Safety

- (1) Information is exempt information if its disclosure under this Act would, or would be likely to—
 - (a) endanger the physical or mental health of any individual, or
 - (b) endanger the safety of any individual.
- (2) The duty to confirm or deny does not arise if, or to the extent that, compliance with section 1(1)(a) would, or would be likely to, have either of the effects mentioned in subsection (1).

S38(1)(a) Health and Safety is engaged to protect the physical or mental health of any living individual; to a request made for a deceased persons criminal record, where disclosure may impact upon their mental wellbeing. The police service is charged with enforcing the law, preventing and detecting crime and protecting the communities we serve. The police service will never divulge information, if to do so may place the health and safety of an individual(s) at risk or undermine the policing purpose in the effective delivery of operational law enforcement.

The legislation: Section 40 Personal Information

(1) Any information to which a request for information relates is exempt information if it constitutes personal data of which the applicant is the data subject.

(2) Any information to which a request for information relates is also exempt information if
(a) it constitutes personal data which does not fall within subsection (1), and
(b) the first, second or third condition below is satisfied.

(3A) The first condition is that the disclosure of the information to a member of the public otherwise than under this Act—

- (a) would contravene any of the data protection principles, or
- (b) would do so if the exemptions in section 24(1) of the Data Protection Act 2018 (manual unstructured data held by public authorities) were disregarded.

(3B) The second condition is that the disclosure of the information to a member of the public otherwise than under this Act would contravene Article 21 of the GDPR (general processing: right to object to processing).

Any information to which a request for information relates is also exempt information if it constitutes personal data which do not fall within subsection (1), and either the first or the second condition is satisfied.

S40(2) applies to third party personal data. Any release would breach the data protection principles contained within the Data Protection Act 2018. S40(2) has been engaged by virtue of S40(3)(a)(i). Any disclosure of withheld information would breach the first data protection principle of fair and lawful processing.

This is an absolute exemption and there is no requirement to apply the public interest test.

The legislation: Section S43 Commercial Interests

(2) Information is exempt information if its disclosure under this Act would, or would be likely to, prejudice commercial interests of any person (including the public authority holding it).

The disclosure of the exempt information would provide greater transparency on how the police service spends public money. It would provide greater clarity on the propositions made by the UK police service and what resources will be allocated in order to ensure that the proposals are successfully tendered and completed.

However, relationships would undoubtedly be damaged by the disclosure of the redacted information. It is important that information is protected which would undermine any such relations as this would not only have an effect on the police service but also any future engagements and proposals the police service may have. The papers concern also the strategic position of the police service in relation to both financial and commercial and operational risk.

Although there is a public interest in understanding how the police service determine whether a service / product is suitable, there is risk of compromise and the trust and confidence between the parties is not in the public interest.

Although there is a public interest and accountability in knowing details of individuals who make decisions on behalf of the police service, the information should not be disclosed where there is a strong possibility that the disclosure would undermine the decision making process.

There is always a public interest in knowing how the police service allocates finances and the disclosure of this information may undermine the tendering process in securing contracts.

Disclosure of the information would have a negative effect on the relationship of the supplier and individual police forces, as well as the NPCC.

Where public funds are being spent, there is a public interest in accountability and justification. In this case, there is an increase in public interest in how Senior Police Officers come together and debate national issues. S43 protects information which, if disclosed, may adversely affect someone's business interests. The NPCC feel it would be inappropriate on our part to release any information that may adversely affect the business interests of an individual and reputation.

Legislation – Section 16

- (1) It shall be the duty of a public authority to provide advice and assistance, so far as it would be reasonable to expect the authority to do so, to persons who propose to make, or have made, requests for information to it.

