

c/o PO BOX 481
Fareham
Hampshire
PO14 9FS

Tel: 02380 478922

Email: npcc.foi.request@npfdu.police.uk

19/08/2025

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST REFERENCE NUMBER: 2423/2025

Thank you for your request for information regarding Palestine Action Briefing; which has now been considered.

Applicant Question:

I am writing to request information under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 regarding a briefing delivered by Chief Constable Gavin Stephens, Chair of the NPCC, to members of the House of Lords on 29 October 2024. This briefing concerned the police response to the activities of the group Palestine Action.

Please provide the following information:

1. Attendees

A list of all individuals and organisations who attended the briefing, including titles and affiliations where available.

2. Organisation of the Briefing

- Who requested or initiated the briefing?
- What was the purpose or stated aim of the briefing?
- Which individuals or departments within the NPCC were responsible for organising it?

3. Content of the Briefing

- Any materials used or distributed during the briefing (e.g. presentations, slides, briefing notes, handouts).
- A summary or transcript of the remarks delivered by Chief Constable Gavin Stephens.
- Any questions posed by attendees and responses given.

4. Correspondence and Internal Communications

Any emails, memos, or other communications within the NPCC or between the NPCC and external bodies (e.g. Parliament, Home Office) related to the planning, content, or follow-up of this briefing.

5. Follow-Up Actions

Any actions, recommendations, or further communications that resulted from the briefing.

NPCC Response:

1. The NPCC does not hold information captured by your request.

The NPCC does not hold a list of all individuals and organisations who attended the briefing, to include titles and affiliations.

In wishing to assist you, outside of the Act, I can confirm that the following confirmed attendance of NPCC representatives:

Chief Constable Gavin Stephens
Chief Constable Chris Noble
Assistant Chief Constable Mark Williams

2. The NPCC does hold recorded information captured by your request.

- The briefing was a task from a previous meeting with the House of Lords on 03 May 2024.
- The purpose of the meeting was to provide a short summary to the Peers group, setting out the ways that political and policy support could assist when dealing with these protest groups.
- The NPCC does not hold a record of individuals within the NPCC who were responsible for organising the briefing.

3. The NPCC does hold recorded information captured by your request. Briefing material consisted of the following:

- National Public Order – Public Safety Internationally-Inspired Thematic Group Assessment – Palestine Action September 2024.
- National Public Order – Public Safety Palestine Action Briefing September 2024
- NPoCC SIB Group Operation Model Options Paper

The above have been withheld in full by virtue of S31 Law Enforcement and S24 National Security.

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

4. The NPCC does hold recorded information captured by part of your request. The NPCC does not hold recorded information regarding content, save for the information contained at 3 above.

The following emails are captured by your request and are subject to minor redaction by virtue of S40(2) Personal Information:

Date	From	To	Subject & Text
14/10/2024 14:53	**S31(1)**@npcc.police.uk	**S31(1)**@parliament.uk	Meeting with Lords on 29 October Dear **S40(2)** I hope you are well. I just wanted to advise that CC

			<p>Stephens will need to leave the meeting re Palestine Action on 29 October with members of the House of Lords approx. 30 mins early as he has to get across to a meeting with the Home Secretary and others. I hope this is ok.</p> <p>Copied to ACC Williams & CC Noble for information.</p> <p>Regards and thanks.</p> <p>**S40(2)**</p>
15/10/2024	**S31(1)**@parliament.uk	<p>**S31(1)**</p> <p>Cc</p> <p>Mark Williams Chris Noble</p>	<p>Re: Meeting with Lords on 29 October</p> <p>Dear **S40(2)**,</p> <p>Thank you for this.</p> <p>Does that also apply to CC Williams and Noble?</p> <p>Or will they be able to stay for the full time?</p> <p>Best wishes</p> <p>**S40(2)**</p>
15/10/2024 10:54	**S31(1)**@npcc.police.uk	<p>**S31(1)**@parliament.uk</p> <p>Cc</p> <p>Mark Williams Chris Noble</p>	<p>RE: Meeting with Lords on 29 October</p> <p>Hi **S40(2)**</p> <p>Many thanks – this will be for Gavin only.</p>

			<p>Hope that helps</p> <p>Regards</p> <p>**S40(2)**</p>
16/10/2024 11:03	**S31(1)** @staffordshire.police.uk	Mark Williams (NPoCC)	<p>House of Lords meeting</p> <p>Morning Boss,</p> <p>Hope your well</p> <p>Mr Noble is currently on annual leave and just checking around the above,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preparation before hand that needs doing ? • Areas to cover or that likely to be covered to ensure get suitable pre brief for CC ? <p>Thanks in advance</p> <p>**S40(2)**</p>
16/10/2024 12:35	**S31(1)** @npcc.police.uk	**S40(2)** **S31(1)** @staffordshire.police.uk	<p>FW: House of Lords meeting</p> <p>Good afternoon</p> <p>**S40(2)**</p> <p>As per Dave's email below, have you been given any further information about the Meeting with the Lords on 29th Oct?</p> <p>Kind regards</p>

			S40(2)
--	--	--	-------------------

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

5. The NPCC does not hold recorded information captured by your request.

Yours sincerely

Sherry Traquair

Freedom of Information Officer & Decision Maker

www.npcc.police.uk

COMPLAINT RIGHTS

Internal Review

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.

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 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 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.

Some email addresses are contained within the correspondence and disclosure of direct contact details would enable an individual, intent on committing an offence to make contact with the department, pose as a police officer or member of police staff and try to glean information which would assist in their offending behaviour.

Disclosing information which may place the public at risk, or make it easier for crime to be committed cannot be in the public interest.

Disclosing information which may place the public at risk, or make it easier for crime to be committed cannot be in the public interest.

The police service primary performance indicator is the reduction of crime, and disclosure which has a negative impact on that agenda affects public trust in policing and in this case may make it more difficult to police.

With regard the evidence of harm itself, there is a threshold that requires the predicted issues to be 'more than likely'. In the case of an offender identifying full investigative techniques or gleaning information which would assist in offending behaviour can be difficult to establish and evidence the harm without actually disclosing exempt information. However, the principles are well established in terms of Freedom of Information legislation that to a certain extent the professional opinion of the police must be taken into account.

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 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.

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.