

Date: 9th June 2026
Our ref: FOI/26/016891/I

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST REFERENCE NO: FOI/26/016891/I

I write in connection with your request for information dated 14/05/2026, received by Greater Manchester Police (GMP) for the following information:

I request the following information, relating to body-worn camera (BWC) footage recorded by GMP officers on 22 May 2017 in connection with the Manchester Arena attack.

- 1. Does GMP currently hold any BWC footage recorded by officers at or near Manchester Arena on 22 May 2017? If so, how many recordings are held, what is their approximate total duration, and what time period do they cover?***
- 2. How much BWC footage was disclosed to or reviewed by the Manchester Arena Inquiry? Was any played in open session or admitted as evidence, and is any of it now part of the public record?***
- 3. Was BWC footage reviewed by the IOPC as part of its investigation into GMP officer conduct on 22 May 2017? Has any of it been published or cited in IOPC reports?***
- 4. Was BWC footage from 22 May 2017 retained beyond the standard 31-day period? If any has since been destroyed, on what date and under what policy?***
- 5. Given the conclusion of the Manchester Arena Inquiry on 8 June 2023 and all related criminal and misconduct proceedings, does GMP consider any BWC footage from 22 May 2017 to be disclosable now, in whole or in part - particularly footage of command and control decisions, cordon management, or outer-area deployments not showing graphic casualties or identifiable victims?***

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. However, I am not obliged to provide all the information requested as an exemption applies to question 5.

The Freedom of Information Act is a piece of legislation designed to give the public access to information held by public authorities. It exists to make the decisions of those authorities transparent and to keep the populace better informed regarding matters which affect them.

A Public Authority is able to refuse requests which can divert resources away from more deserving requests and other public business, or threaten to undermine the credibility of the freedom of information system. It is recognised that dealing with unreasonable requests can place a strain on resources and get in the way of delivering mainstream services. This is particularly relevant at this time due to the ongoing demand on GMP's FOI unit which is currently experiencing high workloads and reduced levels of staffing.

When identifying potentially vexatious requests the indicators contained within the Information Commissioner's guidance on Section 14(1) should be considered. In this case we feel the following indicator applies specifically to question 5 of your request:

Burden on the Authority

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 14(1) of FOIA a request deemed as overly burdensome does not oblige GMP to comply with a request for information.

The ICO confirms within their guidance that they consider there to be a high threshold for refusing a request on such grounds if there is a viable case in line with the below recommendations:

- 1) The requester has asked for a substantial volume of information and
- 2) The authority has real concerns about potentially exempt information, which it will be able to substantiate if asked to do so by the ICO and
- 3) Any potentially exempt information cannot easily be isolated because it is scattered throughout the requested material.

As such question 5 of your request is being refused due to the amount of time required to review and prepare the footage for disclosure, which would impose a grossly oppressive burden on the organisation.

To determine if any footage is appropriate for disclosure would involve manually reviewing all the footage. The footage contains a large amount of sensitive and personal information which could identify directly/indirectly a living human therefore Section 40(2) Personal Information will be engaged as this represents information that identifies a living individual, to disclose this information would breach the principles of the GDPR and the Data Protection Act 2018. Personal data is defined by Article 4 of the GDPR and Part 1 of the Data Protection Act 2018, and means any information relating to an identified or identifiable natural person ('data subject'). An identified natural person is one who can be identified directly or indirectly from that data. In addition, due to the sensitive nature of the footage Section 38(1)(a)(b) Health and Safety is engaged.

There is a total of 28 hours of footage which would need to be manually reviewed to determine if any footage can be released into the public domain under the Freedom of Information Act.

For this reason, any further requests of this nature will be refused under Section 14(1) of the Act, which states that requests that are considered to be vexatious do not have to be complied with.

However, please see below the results for all the other questions.

Question1

In total 90 separate BWV which totalled approximately 28 hours. The parameters are 22:00hrs 22/05/17 to 07:00hrs 23/05/2017.

Question 2

All footage was made available to the Manchester Areana Inquiry. To our knowledge no live footage was played throughout the PI.

Question 3

To our knowledge this information is not recorded by GMP. For this information you would need to redirect your request to the IOPC.

Question 4

All BWV footage has been retained as per MOPI guidelines. None has been destroyed.

Question 5

Exempt. Please see above.