

Date: 09th April 2026
Our ref: FOI/26/016168/O

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST REFERENCE NO: FOI/26/016168/O

I write in connection with your request for information dated 14/01/2026, received by Greater Manchester Police (GMP) for the following information:

I am submitting an FOI request seeking to understand how public bodies are exploring or applying Artificial Intelligence (AI) to support service delivery. These questions are intended to gather insights into current practice, governance, and future planning. They should not be interpreted as critical; we are simply researching how public services are approaching emerging technologies.

Please provide answers to the following:

AI Use in Operations

1. Does your organisation currently use any form of Artificial Intelligence (AI) or automated systems in its operations?

1a. If yes, please list the tools or systems in use and provide a brief description of their purpose (e.g., administrative support, triage, analytics, chatbot services, etc.).

1b. If not, please state whether your organisation has explored or piloted any AI-based technologies in the past 3 years.

AI for Decision-Making

2. Does your organisation use AI or algorithmic systems to support or inform decision-making in any area (e.g., resource allocation, risk assessments, case prioritisation)?

2a. If yes, please describe the type of decision-making supported and the nature of the AI's role (e.g., advisory, automated assessment, automated decision).

2b. Please also confirm whether human oversight is applied.

AI Chatbots and Customer Interaction

3. Does your organisation currently use chatbots or virtual assistants—AI-driven or rules-based—to support public enquiries or internal staff functions?

3a. If yes, please specify their purpose, whether they are AI-based, and when they were implemented.

Policies and Governance

4. Does your organisation have any formal policy, strategy, or guidance relating to the use of Artificial Intelligence or automated decision-making? If yes, please supply a copy or provide

4a. If not, please indicate whether such a policy is in development.

Data Protection and Ethics

5. If AI systems are used, what measures or frameworks does your organisation have in place to ensure:

Compliance with data protection and privacy obligations

Transparency for service users

Ethical or responsible use

(For example, DPIAs, algorithmic impact assessments, ethical guidelines—if applicable.)

Trials, Pilots, or Future Plans

6. Has your organisation run any pilots, trials, or exploratory projects involving AI in the last 3 years, or does it plan to do so in the next 12–24 months?

6a. If yes, please provide brief details of the purpose, timeline, and status of these initiatives.

Staff Training and Awareness

7. Does your organisation provide any training, guidance, or internal communications to staff relating to AI, its use, or its implications?

7a. If yes, please describe the type of training or include documents if available.

Result of Searches

Following receipt of your request searches were conducted within Greater Manchester Police (GMP) to locate the requested information. I can confirm some of the information requested is held by GMP. However, I am not obliged to provide all the information requested as exemption applies.

When refusing to provide such information because an exemption applies, Section 17(1) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 requires GMP, 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 exemption applies.

The requested information is exempt under **section 21 – Information accessible to applicant by other means**. The information referred to is already available in the Public Domain. Please follow the links below.

Question 1 – Yes

Question 1a – CoPilot Chat – used for general enquiries and questions.

Question 2 – No

Question 2a – N/A

Question 3 – No

Question 3a – N/A

Question 4 & 4a – [IT Artificial Intelligence Policy | Greater Manchester Police](#)

Question 5 – GMP have adapted our review process to incorporate AI requirements into vendor and 3rd party assessments, DPIAs and technical reviews of platforms for use within GMP.

Question 6

Evaluation of AI assistants for Policing - College of Policing

GMP are working with a supplier who plans to develop a Large Language Model aimed specifically at policing for the assessment of multiple crime thematics. Currently in project initiation with a plan for delivery in 12-18 months.

Working with another UK force, GMP are investigating the use of OpenAI to retrieve salient evidential points from an interview transcript with the offender which is then presented to an officer to assess the risk level. Currently in evaluation, no timescales set for delivery as this has just started within GMP.

Question 7

GMP currently do not have or deliver any formal training - Policies and guidance are published and promoted on GMP's intranet.

Further Information

HARM

Having disclosed high-level information about routine, non-sensitive uses of Artificial Intelligence (AI), Greater Manchester Police *will neither confirm nor deny* whether it holds any further information that would indicate whether AI is, or is not, used in connection with counter-terrorism, serious and organised crime, covert intelligence activity, or specialist digital forensics supporting those functions.

The duty to confirm or deny is disapplied by virtue of **Sections 24(2) National Security** and **Section 31(3) Law Enforcement** of the Freedom of Information Act 2000. This response should not be taken as an indication of whether any additional information is held.

Confirming or denying whether AI is used by Greater Manchester Police in counter-terrorism, serious and organised crime, covert intelligence or specialist digital forensics would enable hostile actors to infer the presence, absence or maturity of particular policing capabilities. This type of capability insight is of practical value to adversaries who routinely adapt their behaviour to exploit perceived weaknesses, overwhelm less technologically equipped forces, or adjust methods to avoid detection. Even a single confirmation or denial could be combined with publicly available information from other forces to build a detailed national picture of capability. This mosaic effect represents a realistic and actionable risk, providing information that could materially undermine national security and the effectiveness of law-enforcement operations.

Public Interest Test – Section 24(2) National Security

Factors in favour of confirming or denying - There is a strong public interest in openness and transparency about the use of AI in policing. Confirming or denying the existence of information could contribute to informed public debate about how emerging technologies are deployed, the safeguards in place, and whether they align with legal and ethical standards. Disclosure can enhance accountability, promote trust, and reassure the public that AI use is subject to appropriate oversight.

Factors against confirming or denying - There is an overriding public interest in protecting national security. Confirming or denying the existence of information about AI deployment in CT, SoC, covert intelligence, or linked specialist forensics would provide adversaries with useful insights into operational capabilities and priorities. Even a simple confirmation or denial could enable hostile actors to adjust methods, exploit potential gaps, or test thresholds. The resulting risk to national security would be real and more than trivial, and is not mitigated by partial or local confirmations, because the cumulative mosaic effect across multiple forces would still disclose sensitive capability at a national level.

Public Interest Test – Section 31(3) Law Enforcement

Factors in favour of confirming or denying - There is a general public interest in understanding how AI is used to support policing functions, including the efficiency and effectiveness of core processes, and in ensuring that novel technologies are used lawfully and proportionately. Confirmation or denial could support external scrutiny and promote confidence in policing practice.

Factors against confirming or denying - Confirming or denying the existence of information relating to AI use in CT, SoC, covert intelligence, or specialist digital forensics would be likely to prejudice the prevention and detection of crime, the apprehension or prosecution of offenders, and the operation of law enforcement tactics and methodologies. Knowledge of whether specific capabilities exist, or do not exist, enables offenders to adapt behaviour, exploit capability gaps, frustrate investigations, and increase the cost and complexity of counter-measures. The public interest strongly favours maintaining an NCND to preserve the effectiveness of law enforcement and the safety of the public.

Balance Test

For the reasons set out above, Greater Manchester Police will neither confirm nor deny whether it holds information indicating AI is used in CT, SoC, covert intelligence activity, or specialist digital forensics supporting those functions.

The public interest in maintaining the NCND position under sections 24(2) and 31(3) outweighs the public interest in confirmation or denial. This response should not be taken as an indication of whether any relevant information is held.

A separate response has already provided high-level information about routine, non-sensitive AI use. To go further would risk disclosing sensitive capability by inference.