

Date: 14th July 2026
Our ref: FOI/26/017085/Q

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST REFERENCE NO: FOI/26/017085/Q

I write in connection with your request for information dated 17/06/2026, received by Greater Manchester Police (GMP) for the following information:

I write on behalf of [REDACTED] to make a request for information under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. I am seeking information relating to databases and data analytics software being used in police departments in the UK.

1. Please provide a list of all databases, datasets or image repositories that your force can access, query, or search in connection with:

- 1.1. facial recognition searches; and***
- 1.2. analysis through an AI software; and***
- 1.3. generation of predictions through AI analytics.***

2. Please specify if each database is public or private.

3. Please specify how many times each of these databases, datasets or image repositories have been accessed or queried in the last twelve months.

3.1. For each database not internally owned, please specify the method of access, i.e whether you are able to directly access the database, dataset or image repository; whether a third-party runs a requested search on your behalf or via a system hosted or owned by a contractor or third-party which collates several databases?

2908decc95f92c%7Cdc8a542c40d46ab8f73e6023f45c7c5%7C0%7C0%7C639173141709478639%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJFbXB0eU1hcGkiOnRydWUsIlYiOiIlwLjAuMDAwMCIsIlAiOiJXaW4zMlslkFoljoiTWFPbClslldUljoyfQ%3D%3D%7C0%7C%7C%7C&sdata=NBF46MbbS0pXlcSfKoDO3wLgyxoDvDyLn4wHBwLF9Jo%3D&reserved=0).

4.1. Does your police force receive any information from Bedfordshire or Leicester Police that has been produced, analysed, or otherwise processed by Palantir's Nectar?

5. Is your police force contracted with any other company that provides software that uses AI to process data for policing purposes?

6. For what type of administrative duties, crime related or other policing duties are AI tools being used?

7. What legal and regulatory frameworks govern your access to and use of these databases, datasets, image repositories and privately-owned analytics software?

Result of Searches

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

Question 1 & 2

GMP has Live Facial Recognition (LFR) capability through vans.

GMP also operates Retrospective Facial Recognition (RFR) using the Police National Database (PND).

Both systems are law enforcement systems and are not publicly accessible.

Question 3

Information regarding GMP's use of LFR is publicly available on the GMP website. Please follow the link [Live Facial Recognition | Greater Manchester Police](#)

Regarding Retrospective, GMP do not hold or have access to this type of information. For the information request you would need to direct your request to the Home Office.

Question 4

GMP has no current or historic relationship with Palantir.

Question 5

No.

Question 6

AI-enabled productivity tools are used for administrative purposes including document drafting, summarisation and general business productivity. These are not used for operational policing purposes.

Question 7

The use of these technologies is governed by:

- Data Protection Act 2018
- UK GDPR
- Human Rights Act 1998
- Protection of Freedoms Act 2012
- College of Policing Authorised Professional Practice
- National Police Chief's Council Guidance
- Surveillance Camera Code of Practice
- Force Policies, DPIAs, Equality Impact Assessments and governance processes

In addition to the above, Greater Manchester Police neither confirms nor denies that it holds any other information relevant to this request, and that this response serves as a Refusal Notice under Section 17 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (the Act) by virtue of the following exemptions:

Sections 24(2) National Security

Section 31(3) Law Enforcement

Evidence of 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.

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.