



Date: 02/06/2026
Our ref: 01/FOI/26/016824/X

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST REFERENCE NO: 01/FOI/26/016824/X

I write in connection with your request for information dated 05/05/2026, received by Greater Manchester Police (GMP) for the following information:

*Initial - Is Verisure a Type A or Type B alarms provider in your region. Does it have a URN.
Clarification (comes with attachment) -
I would like to know whether Verisure is an accredited provider of Type A alarm systems.*

Alternatively, would you be able to provide a list of companies that can provide a Type A systems

The NPCC document (see attached on page 12) notes the following

2.3. LIST OF COMPLIANT COMPANIES INSTALLING AND MONITORING TYPE A SECURITY SYSTEMS

2.3.1 Each police force will:

(a) Maintain a list of compliant companies. Inclusion on the list does not infer that the company or its work has been inspected by the police. Only companies listed may install, maintain and/or monitor Type A Systems in the relevant 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, but I am not obliged to provide it as an exemption applies. 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 exemption applies.

The information requested in question 3 is exempt from disclosure by virtue of the following exemption: **Section 31(1)(a)(b) - Law Enforcement**. Section 31 is a prejudice-based and qualified exemption. There is a requirement to articulate the harm in disclosing such information as well as carrying out a public interest test.

Harm

A Freedom of Information request is not a private transaction, it is a release to the world as once the information is published the public authority, in this case Greater Manchester Police, has no control over what use is made of that information.

Releasing details of which companies work with the Police, or which are accredited particularly in relation to Type A alarm systems could enable the identification of premises that are protected. Crucially, it may also allow inferences to be drawn regarding premises that are not protected, thereby highlighting potential vulnerabilities.

By process of elimination, there is a risk that individuals could identify locations where a police response may be delayed, for example where a site is covered by an unlisted company or does not benefit from a Type A alarm system. This could increase the likelihood of those premises being targeted for criminal activity or unauthorised access. Such disclosure could not only contribute to an increase in crime but may also undermine the ability of the Police to detect offences and apprehend offenders.

Furthermore, consideration must be given to the cumulative impact of such disclosures. If similar information were released by multiple police forces, it could enable the creation of a “mosaic effect”, whereby disparate pieces of information are combined to build a more comprehensive picture of which premises are equipped with alarm systems capable of triggering a police response.

Public Interest Test

Factors favouring disclosure S31(1)(a)(b) - There is a public interest in transparency when any request is made for police information. In this instance there is public interest in knowing which installers are Type A alarm systems accredited, which assists the public in sourcing security systems fit for purpose.

Factors against disclosure S31(1)(a)(b) - The police only use Type A alarm system installers in accordance with British Standard regulations and as approved by the National Security Inspectorate (NSI) and the Security Systems and Alarm Inspection Board (SSAIB). Disclosing a list of companies used by the police exposes other unaccredited companies and the buildings / sites they are employed to protect, vulnerable, meaning those with the necessary intent could specifically target the areas covered by these companies with the hope of a delayed police response. Any release of information that risks increasing crime and impacting the likelihood of apprehending any person(s) responsible is not in the public interest.

Balance Test

Having considered your request, [Force Name] accepts that there is a public interest in transparency when any request is made for police information. The public interest favouring release must however be balanced against any associated risk and/or prejudice that would be caused through disclosure.

Having carefully considered this, I have found that the public release and publication of the names of these companies would be likely to reveal potential security vulnerabilities through a process of elimination. This means that those with the necessary intent could specifically identify and target the areas covered by unaccredited companies that don't install Type A alarm systems with the hope of a delayed police response. Given this I have found that the release of this information is not in the public interest at this time.