



Date: 03/11/2025
Our ref: 01/FOI/25/015625/T

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST REFERENCE NO: 01/FOI/25/015625/T

I write in connection with your request for information dated 07/10/2025, received by Greater Manchester Police (GMP) for the following information:

The Conservative party conference took place at Manchester this year from Sunday 5th until Wednesday 8th October 2025.

Accreditation was carried out in line with national accreditation standards through NAT (National Accreditation Team).

For that event, how many accreditation requests were dealt with by the police, and how many before the event and how many on each day of the event?

Of these accreditation requests how many were media ones?

How many in other categories?

In respect of the various categories, how many were accepted and how many failed?

How many accreditation requests were from those without British passports?

Of these, how many passed, and how many failed?

How many accreditation requests were in respect of those with British passports?

Of these, how many passed, and how many failed?

How many accreditation requests were in respect of white British people?

How many of these passed, and how many failed.

How many accreditation requests were in respect of non-white British people?

How many of these passed and how many failed?

Of the accreditation requests in respect of the media, how many were members of Police recognised media bodies?

How many of these passed and how many failed?

Of the accreditation requests in respect of the media, how many were not members of Police recognised media bodies?

How many of these passed and how many failed?

With regard to media who are not members of Police recognised media bodies, but have a record of regular party conference attendance, is this factor taken into account when deciding on whether checks need to be made, or the type of check?

It seems the description of the numerous areas in which an individual could be failed on accreditation is so wide, that there is the danger that perfectly safe people could be unreasonably failed.

In view of this, should not this whole process be reviewed, so it can be seen as fair, not politically biased, and is totally impartial?

This new format is allowing people to be failed when they have successfully attended party conferences previously.

In respect of any other information relevant to this FOI request, please supply it.

Result of Searches

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

However, GMP does not hold the information that you have requested in an easily retrievable format. To provide the data requested regarding when the accreditation was issued, the nationality and ethnicity of the requester would involve a manual search of all accreditation requests.

A search of the accreditation records shows that 10,097 accreditation requests would have to be manually reviewed. At a very conservative estimate of 5 minutes to locate, retrieve and review each file it would take approximately 841 hours to ascertain the data required.

Therefore, to comply with the whole of your request the process would take over 18 hours' work which exceeds the appropriate limit of £450.00, the amount to which we are legally required to respond.

As per section 12(1) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000, the cost of providing you with the information is therefore above the amount to which we are legally required to respond i.e. the cost of locating and retrieving the information exceeds the 'appropriate level' as stated in the Freedom of Information (Fees and Appropriate Limit) Regulations 2004.

In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act 2000, this letter acts as a Refusal Notice.

In this instance, Greater Manchester Police will be unable able to provide advice for you to reduce the request for the force to keep this within the fees limit in accordance with Section 16(1), the duty to provide advice and assistance, of the Freedom of Information Act 2000. The information you seek is not collatable without a manual review of each accreditation request, which is not feasible within the FOI cost limit.