

Date: 01/12/2025
Our ref: 01/FOI/25/015568/B

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST REFERENCE NO: 01/FOI/25/015568/B

I write in connection with your request for information dated 30/09/2025, received by Greater Manchester Police (GMP) for the following information:

I am writing to request information about your provision of Policing and Security Services to Political Conferences and large-scale events, specifically:

1. Pass Management Systems

Screenshots on Twitter/X have shown that you have a portal for the management of access passes

Could you please answer the following questions relating to this software/infrastructure.

1.1 - What is the name of this software/solution?

1.2 - Who provides this software/solution, how much did it cost to purchase and who from?

1.3 - Who has access to this software/solution to issue/amend/manage passes, is this done by GMP and if so is it done by a Constable upon request of the event organiser?

1.4 - When is the software/solution due to be replaced/upgraded?

2. Use of Police Time

2.1 - Do the Labour Party or other Political Parties pay for use of the software/solution mentioned above, how much does this cost?

2.2 - What agreement does GMP have with Merseyside Police / the Police and Crime Commissioner for mutual aid in relation to conference security outside of the GMP Police Area?

Result of Searches

Following receipt of your request searches were conducted within Greater Manchester Police (GMP) to locate the requested information and I can confirm the information requested is held by GMP.

However, I am not obliged to supply all the information as exemptions apply.

Section 17 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 requires GMP, when refusing to provide such information (because the information is exempt) to provide you, the applicant, with a notice which: (a) states that fact, (b) specifies the exemption in question and (c) states (if that would not otherwise be apparent) why the exemptions apply.

The exemptions that apply to this request are:

Section 31 (1)(a)(b) Law enforcement

Section 24 (1) National Security

Section 24 and Section 31 are qualified prejudice-based exemptions and therefore require evidence of harm and consideration of the public interest test.

Section 31 Harm

Disclosure of information relating to questions 1 and 2 would allow individuals with criminal intent to research vulnerabilities or bypass mechanisms associated with the identified software. Disclosing which software/solution is used and who provides it would enable the creation of false information to be designed to exploit known software behaviours.

This information, if released to the wider world could encourage targeted cyber-attacks against systems known to be in operational use by GMP.

The safety of the public is of a paramount importance to Greater Manchester Police and to release the requested information would compromise the safety of the public that Greater Manchester Police serve to protect.

Furthermore, this would impact the future law enforcement capabilities of Greater Manchester Police in the prevention and detection of crime as criminals intent on committing crime will have an insight on how and when police resources are used.

Section 31 – Factors in favour of disclosure

Disclosure would encourage public awareness and debate and may reduce crime or lead to more information being provided to Greater Manchester Police from the public for the prevention and detection of crime. Disclosure would also show Greater Manchester Police's use of resources to prevent crime.

Disclosure would reassure the public that Greater Manchester Police takes "Policing and Security Services to Political Conferences and large-scale events" seriously and the impact any policing decision will have upon the public. This would also adhere to openness and transparency.

Section 31 – Factors in favour against disclosure

Any disclosure would undermine the integrity of any screening processes in place to protect the public safety. The information being made public could expose operational security measures to exploitation

by criminals or hostile actors. This would require GMP to divert resources to mitigate increased risk's arising from any disclosure.

A fear of crime will be realised as criminals may identify vulnerability and target and exploit GMP, resulting in the public being in fear of more criminal activity occurring.

Public confidence would be damaged if disclosure enabled individuals to gain unlawful access to restricted or sensitive event areas.

Section 24 – Factors in favour of disclosure

It is recognised that there is a public interest in knowing the scope, focus and extent of the threat posed by offenders including terrorists. Any disruption to the security of the software in question would completely undermine the reliance on any current intelligence the Police Service are actively dealing with in relation to terrorist offenders.

Disclosure would also promote transparency around the tools used by GMP and enhances public confidence in policing practices and the fairness of screening procedures.

Section 24 – Factors in favour against disclosure

Any disclosure would increase the risk of individuals defeating and exploiting relevant processes. There is a strong public interest in ensuring that screening at major events remains robust and resistant to manipulation.

The use of specific software forms part of a broader national-security framework, supporting counter terrorism and major event safety. Public interest in safeguarding these systems outweighs the value in transparency.

GMP would not release any information to the world if this was to weaken national security measures used to safeguard crowded places such as political events.

Balance test.

There is a public interest in the disclosure of any systems used for this request, and although transparency is important, the integrity of law enforcement operations vastly outweighs the benefits of disclosure.

Revealing such information would increase the risk of crime, undermine operational policing and compromise the safety of major events.

Furthermore, disclosure of the requested information would meaningfully assist individuals seeking to compromise protective measure and exploit security systems.

Considering all the circumstances of this request, it is determined that the balance of the public interest favours withholding the information for these parts of the request.

Please see the remaining information for disclosure.

Question 1 and 1.2.

See exemptions above.

Question 1.3.

This is Completed by National Accreditation Team, a National Police function based in GMP funded by the Home Office for National events.

Question 1.4.

The solution infrastructure is continually maintained and upgraded.

Question 2.1.

Party Conferences commission the National Accreditation Team and costs are met by the Home Office.

Question 2.2.

All mutual aid requests for any other Police Service are considered on a case-by-case basis by the Senior Leadership Team. Responses are provided at the end of each question.