

c/o PO BOX 481
Fareham
Hampshire
PO14 9FS

Tel: 02380 478922

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

12/02/2026

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST REFERENCE NUMBER: 2764/2026

Thank you for your request for information regarding CCC September 2025, which has now been considered.

Applicant Question:

I am writing to request information on the September 2025 Chief Constables Council meeting, which I have received the overall agenda and minutes from in a previous FOI (2710/2026).

Please provide me with the following:

1. From "Current Operational Demands" session, specifically relating to sections on protest/public order policing (Op Leste, Op Navette and the section numbered "1"); minutes, handouts, presentations and documents associated with these sessions
2. From Session 8: Immigration Risks; minutes, handouts, presentations, and documents associated with this session.

NPCC Response:

The NPCC does hold information for part of part one of your request.

1. The NPCC holds a letter authored by CC Hoborough, NPCC national policing lead for Public Order and Public Safety relating to Op Leste which includes **resourcing, capability and operational information and direction contact information.**

Further information can be found [here](#).

This information is withheld in full by virtue of Section 31 Law Enforcement.

In regard to Op Navette, this was not a specific agenda item for September's CCC. The minutes for September's CCC were submitted to December's CCC. The minutes reflect a verbal update as part of the Op Lest update, and as stated at '1' of the minutes under Current Operational Demands, the first key point stated 'first test of an operation against the Navette recommendations'.

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

In wishing to assist you, the information relating to those recommendations can be found [here](#).

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

The information held consists of sensitive operational information relating to national coordination, operational, capability and information relating to external stakeholders.

This information is withheld in full by virtue of S31 Law Enforcement and S23 Information supplied by, or concerning certain security bodies.

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

Yours sincerely
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.

Section 23 Information supplied by, or concerning, certain security bodies – the legislation:

(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.

Section 31 Law Enforcement – the legislation:

(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

Police forces work in conjunction with other agencies and information is freely shared in line with information sharing protocols. Modern day policing is intelligence led and this is particularly pertinent with regard to both Law Enforcement and National Security.

The public expect police forces to use all powers and tactics available to them to prevent and detect crime or disorder and maintain public safety. The prevention and detection of crime is the foundation upon which policing is built and the threat from terrorism cannot be ignored.

Any disclosure under FOI is a disclosure to the world and not just to the individual making the request. To disclose specific details of tactical planning could undermine the smooth delivery of operational law enforcement.

Section 31 is a qualified and prejudice-based exemption. This requires the production of evidence of what prejudice may be caused and consideration as to the public interest in disclosure.

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.

The lack of the enhancement to the public debate that the redacted points produce, coupled with the risks leave me in no doubt that the balance, at this time lies in non-disclosure.

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.

The police service primary performance indicator is the reduction of crime, and any disclosure which has a negative impact on that agenda affects public trust in policing.

With regard the evidence of harm itself, there is a threshold that requires the predicted issues to be 'more than likely'. It is difficult to evidence and articulate harm of an offender identifying investigative techniques or obtaining any information that would assist in offending behaviour. 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.

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.