



Date: 30/04/2026
Our ref: 01/FOI/26/016504/K

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST REFERENCE NO: 01/FOI/26/016504/K

I write in connection with your request for information dated 05/03/2026, received by Greater Manchester Police (GMP) for the following information:

I am a student currently researching the use of artificial intelligence and automated technologies within UK policing. As part of my research, I am trying to understand how police forces are using these systems and what policies or safeguards are in place. Under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, I would be grateful if you could provide the following information.

- 1. A list of any artificial intelligence, machine learning, or algorithmic decision-making systems currently used by the force. If possible, please include the name of the system, its purpose, and when it was first introduced.*
- 2. A list of any AI or algorithmic systems that were previously used by the force but are no longer in use.*
- 3. Copies of any policies, guidance, or internal documents relating to the use of AI or automated decision-making tools within the force.*
- 4. Copies of any impact assessments relating to these systems.*
- 5. Any reports, evaluations, or testing that have been carried out to assess the accuracy, reliability, or potential bias of these systems.*
- 6. Details of any partnerships with external organisations (for example technology companies, universities, or other agencies) relating to the development or use of AI systems.*

7. *Copies of any strategies, roadmaps, or plans relating to future adoption of AI technologies within the force.*

If it helps with the request, I am primarily interested in information held between January 2020 and the present.

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 some of the information you have requested is held by GMP. However, I am not obliged to supply you with all the information as an exemption applies.

Section 17 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 requires Greater Manchester Police, when refusing to provide such information (because this 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. Where redactions occur in the attached policy and equality impact assessment documents, that is because the redacted information is exempt from disclosure by virtue of **Section 40(2) – Personal Information**.

Section 40(2) represents information that identifies a living individual. To disclose this information would breach the principles of the Data Protection Act 2018. Personal data is defined by Section 1 of the Data Protection Act 2018 and means data that relates to an individual who can be identified directly or indirectly from that data.

Section 40 is an absolute exemption and there is no requirement to conduct a public interest test for such data.

The remainder of your request is not exempt and can be answered as follows:

1. *CoPilot Chat – Used for general enquiries and questions – Has been running since July 2025*

We also have in Pilot a tool College of Policing Assistant (CoPA) - Currently deployed in a trial to Rochdale and Tameside districts.

CoPA is a grounded AI tool, designed to provide specific, targeted guidance to users on policing in accordance with GMP's AI policy and the NPCC AI covenant. It has the ability and capability to search a hand-crafted, pre-loaded library, pooling information and providing answers from only trusted sources: national and local policies, College of Policing, Gov.UK, Crown Prosecution Service; and National Police Chiefs' Council. This library is populated by GMP's very own IT architects, with updates initiated on a regular basis to ensure that only the most up to date information is provided in response to clear user prompts and searches.

CoPA gives officers and staff 24/7 access to real-time information, helping them apply correct policy, procedure, and best practice to policing duties, crime recording, investigations, and administration. All data remains within UK borders, meeting essential security and data protection requirements for policing.

Operating strictly within NPCC and official AI guidance, it ensures reliable, policy-compliant support, and ethical safeguards.

CoPA uses OpenAI to retrieve answers from the document library only, it will not provide an answer if it cannot find something but can be used to rewrite, summarise etc.

Officers are responsible for validating the accuracy of the response and each answer provides citations, linked to the full policy in the library.

2. No information held by GMP.
3. Please see the attached policy document.
4. Please see the attached equality impact assessment document.
5. No information held by GMP.
6. *We are currently working with a company called Chorus to develop some analytical tools.*
7. *No information held by GMP.*



GREATER MANCHESTER
POLICE

Equality Impact Assessment

Artificial Intelligence Policy

Greater Manchester Police

Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) for Strategies, Policies and Procedures

All public bodies, including the Chief Constable have a legal duty under the Equality Act 2010 (called the 'Public Sector Equality Duty' or 'PSED') to have due regard when exercising their functions of the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and other prohibited conduct, advance equality of opportunity, and foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not.

The aim of an equality impact assessment (EIA) (or an updated EIA) is to enable the consideration of the equality implications of your strategy, policy or procedure on those groups detailed below, to consider if there are ways to proactively advance equality and consider how adverse risks could be eliminated. The EIA must be completed regardless of whether the policy may appear neutral in its effect.

1. EIA Version Control			
Version no.	Date	Author	Comments
1	11/9/24		

2. Policy Details	
Name of the strategy, policy or procedure being assessed, and a brief overview of its aims and objectives	IT Artificial Intelligence Outlines the framework that applies to the use of generative AI platforms such as ChatGPT, Google Bard, Dall-E, Google AI, Microsoft co-pilot or other similar AI platforms using "large language models" (LLMs) for work tasks of any kind. The purpose of the document is to ensure that GMP data is not intentionally or inadvertently transmitted to such platforms or related third parties in breach of data protection controls to which GMP must adhere to
Is it new or existing?	New
Policy owner (role, branch/district)	IT – ACO
EIA carried out by (role, branch/district)	IT – Security –
Date of completion	11/9/24

3. Evidence Gathering and Engagement

a. What **evidence** has been used for this assessment? For example, national statistics, demographic data, research statistics

IT security - Industry standard policy which is technical in nature and applies equally to all staff, whether or not they share protected characteristics.

b. Who have you **engaged and consulted with** as part of your assessment? For example, community groups, Independent Advisory Groups, staff associations/networks

IT Security industry groups / Other police forces.

4. Impact on different groups of the public and/or officers and staff

Specific groups to consider ¹	Potential impact on this group and actions taken to mitigate impact and advance equality, diversity and inclusion
Age People of different ages	It is expected that younger people are more likely to employ such mechanisms due to increased levels of ability in this area.
Disability Disabled people, including those with mental health issues.	AI is being used increasingly as adaptations for people with disabilities, so there may be an overlap and any issues raised will be monitored and considered.
Gender reassignment Trans and non-binary people	None
Marriage and civil partnership A person has the protected characteristic of marriage and civil partnership if the person is married or is a civil partner.	None
Pregnancy and maternity	None
Race People from minority ethnic backgrounds and communities	None

¹ All of the terms in bold reflect the terminology used in the [Equality Act 2010](#).

Religion or belief People with different religions and/or beliefs	None
Sex Both men and women	None
Sexual orientation LGBTQ+ people	None
Other groups Not defined as protected characteristics, but who may be impacted by your policy (e.g., travelling/gypsy community, ex-armed forces, people from lower socio-economic backgrounds, carers etc.)	None

5. Action Planning

Complete this section if the EIA has identified additional steps that need to be taken to address adverse outcomes for particular groups (either by way of eliminating or minimising this risk), or to collect additional evidence to inform the EIA.

Issue Identified	Planned Action	Lead and Timeframe

6. Outcome of EIA

An EIA has been undertaken on this policy as part of the requirements under the PSED. The policy will be submitted to Chief Officers on the following basis (please tick one box):

X	Approve – no change	Your analysis demonstrates that the policy is robust and the evidence shows no potential for discrimination and that you have taken all appropriate opportunities to advance equality and foster good relations between groups.
	Amend the policy	This involves taking steps to remove barriers or to better advance equality. It can mean introducing measures to mitigate the potential effect. This should be done before the policy is implemented. Where this cannot happen the action plan must outline how you are going to achieve this
	Continue with the policy	This means adopting your proposals, despite any adverse effect or missed opportunities to advance equality, provided you have satisfied yourself that it does not unlawfully discriminate. In cases where you believe discrimination is not unlawful because it is objectively justified, it is particularly important that you record what the objective justification is for continuing the policy, and how you reached this decision.
	Stop and remove the policy	If there are adverse effects that are not justified and cannot be mitigated, you will want to consider stopping the policy altogether. If a policy shows unlawful discrimination it must be removed or changed.

7. Monitoring and Review

How will you monitor the impact of your policy/process once it has been put into effect?

The impacts will be continually monitored and a formal review of the policy and EIA form will take place every two years.

Sign off from Head of Department or Service: SCT 29th January 2025

Review Date (must match next review date of the policy): September 2025



GREATER MANCHESTER
POLICE

IT Artificial Intelligence

Policy

March 2025

DATE THIS VERSION IMPLEMENTED: March 2025

DATE NEXT REVIEW IS DUE: September 2025

CHIEF OFFICER SPONSOR: [REDACTED]

POLICY OWNER: ACO Henderson

POLICY AUTHOR: [REDACTED], IT Security

APPROVED BY: Senior Command Team, 29th January 2025

GOVERNMENT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION: Official

IS THE POLICY NEW OR REVISED: New

VERSION NO	DATE	SUMMARY OF CHANGES	AUTHOR(S)	PUBLISHED ON CCOs
1.0	Mar 2025	New document.	[REDACTED]	

Table of Contents

1. Policy Statement	1
1.1 Aims	1
2. Scope	3
3. Terms and Definitions.....	3
4. Associated Documents.....	4
5. Statutory Compliance & Consultation	4
5.1 Statutory Compliance	4
5.1.1 Equality Act (2010)	4
5.1.2 The UK General Data Protection Regulation (UK GDPR) and Data Protection Act (2018).....	5
5.1.3 Freedom of Information Act (2000)	5
5.2 Consultation	5

1. Policy Statement

Artificial intelligence (AI) is technology that enables computers and machines to simulate human intelligence and problem-solving capabilities. On its own, or combined with other technologies (e.g., sensors, geolocation, robotics), AI can perform tasks that would otherwise require human intelligence or intervention. Digital assistants, GPS guidance, autonomous vehicles, and generative AI tools (like Open AI's Chat GPT) are just a few examples of AI in the daily news and our daily lives.

Greater Manchester Police (GMP) is aware of the opportunities for innovation and efficiency offered by AI models and tools. Where GMP intends to incorporate AI into its operations, this needs to be done in a safe, ethical, and legally compliant manner.

GMP's preferred AI technology is Microsoft Co-pilot and Azur Open AI, given that all interactions stay within GMP's network.

1.1 Aims

This document outlines the framework that applies to the use of generative AI platforms which are not Microsoft Co-Pilot or Azure Open AI, such as ChatGPT, Google Bard, Dall-E, Google AI, or other similar AI platforms using "large language models" (LLMs) for work tasks of any kind. The purpose of the document is to ensure that GMP data is not intentionally or inadvertently transmitted to such platforms or related third parties in breach of data protection controls to which GMP must adhere.

Governance

Before accessing AI technology, staff members must first obtain explicit, documented authorisation from their line management/unit leadership and conduct a comprehensive risk assessment. The risk assessment should consider potential impacts including legal compliance, bias and discrimination, security (including technical protections and security certifications), and data sovereignty and protection.

On completion, staff members must notify the IT Security team, describing the intention for use, the reason for use, and the expected information to be input, as well as the examples of generated output and distribution of content.

Approval for use based on the information provided will be the responsibility of IT Security and the IT Senior Leadership Team where appropriate. Any costs associated with the AI usage must be approved in advance of such requests and should be emailed to:

[REDACTED]

Vendors

Any use of AI technology in pursuit of GMP activities should be done with full acknowledgement of the policies, practices, terms, and conditions of developers/vendors.

Accuracy

All information generated by AI must be reviewed and edited for accuracy prior to use. Users of AI are responsible for reviewing output and are accountable for ensuring the accuracy of AI generated output before use/release.

Ethical use

AI must be used ethically and in compliance with all applicable legislation, regulations and organisational policies. Users must not use AI to generate content that is discriminatory, offensive, or inappropriate.

Disclosure

Content produced via AI must be identified and disclosed as containing AI-generated information, e.g. via a footnote such as:

- **Note:** *This document contains content generated by Artificial Intelligence (AI). AI generated content has been reviewed by the author for accuracy and edited/revised where necessary. The author takes responsibility for this content.*

Or

- **Note:** *Produced using AI tools, verified by a GMP Officer/member of staff" and in the case of MG forms, for example, checked and signed by witness, victim, accused to ensure it is an accurate representation of events.*

Guidelines

Staff members should:

- Consider whether the tool used may have been trained on, reflect, and/or via its output perpetuate any biases (e.g. discriminates against a group of people).
- Understand that AI tools may be useful but are not a substitute for human judgment and creativity.
- Understand that many AI tools are prone to "hallucinations," false answers or information, or information that is stale, and therefore responses must always be carefully verified by a human.
- Treat every bit of information provided to an AI tool as if it will go viral on the Internet, attributed to themselves or GMP, regardless of the settings selected within the tool (or the assurances made by its creators).

Staff members should not:

- Use AI tools to make or help make employment decisions about applicants or employees, including recruitment, hiring, retention, promotions, transfers, performance monitoring, discipline, demotion, or terminations.
- Upload or input any confidential or sensitive information into any AI tool.
- Upload or input any personal information (names, addresses, likenesses, etc.) about any person into any AI tool.
- Represent work generated by an AI tool as being their own original work.
- Integrate any AI tool with GMP systems without first receiving specific written permission from IT.
- Upload information that is deemed as being evidential, such as a statement, points to prove, etc (using AI to summarise, for example).

As a reminder, GMP staff and employees must not upload or input any confidential, sensitive or personal information from GMP or police systems into any external sites without explicit permission. Failure to follow these instructions may result in a data breach and could also lead to criminal and/or disciplinary consequences.

2. Scope

This policy applies to relevant third-party suppliers and all GMP officers and staff (including contractors).

3. Terms and Definitions

Anthropomorphism: The tendency for people to attribute humanlike qualities or characteristics to an AI chatbot. For example, you may assume it is kind or cruel based on its answers, even though it is not capable of having emotions, or you may believe the AI is sentient because it is very good at mimicking human language.

Bias: A type of error that can occur in a large language model if its output is skewed by the model's training data. For example, a model may associate specific traits or professions with a certain race or gender, leading to inaccurate predictions and offensive responses.

Emergent behavior: Unexpected or unintended abilities in a large language model, enabled by the model's learning patterns and rules from its training data. For example, models that are trained on programming and coding sites can write new code. Other examples include creative abilities like composing poetry, music and fictional stories.

Generative AI: Technology that creates content - including text, images, video, and computer code - by identifying patterns in large quantities of training data, and then creating original material that has similar characteristics.

Grounded AI: In generative AI, grounding is the ability to connect model output to verifiable sources of information (such as GMP policies, College of Policing policy and similar sources). If you provide models with access to specific data sources, then grounding tethers their output to these data and reduces the chances of inventing content associated with OpenAI models.

Hallucination: A well-known phenomenon in large language models, in which the system provides an answer that is factually incorrect, irrelevant or nonsensical, because of limitations in its training data and architecture.

Large language model: A type of neural network that learns skills - including generating prose, conducting conversations, and writing computer code - by analysing vast amounts of text from across the internet. The basic function is to predict the next word in a sequence, but these models have surprised experts by learning new abilities.

Natural language processing: Techniques used by large language models to understand and generate human language, including text classification and sentiment analysis. These methods often use a combination of machine learning algorithms, statistical models and linguistic rules.

Neural network: A mathematical system, modelled on the human brain, that learns skills by finding statistical patterns in data. It consists of layers of artificial neurons: The first layer receives the input data, and the last layer outputs the results. Even the experts who create neural networks don't always understand what happens in between.

Parameters: Numerical values that define a large language model's structure and behaviour, like clues that help it guess what words come next. Systems like GPT-4 are thought to have hundreds of billions of parameters.

Reinforcement learning: A technique that teaches an AI model to find the best result by trial and error, receiving rewards or punishments from an algorithm based on its results. This system can be enhanced by humans giving feedback on its performance, in the form of ratings, corrections and suggestions.

Transformer model: A neural network architecture useful for understanding language that does not have to analyse words one at a time but can look at an entire sentence at once. This was an AI breakthrough, because it enabled models to understand context and long-term dependencies in language. Transformers use a technique called self-attention, which allows the model to focus on the particular words that are important in understanding the meaning of a sentence.

4. Associated Documents

[ICO Guidance - AI tools](#)

[AI and cyber security: what you need to know - NCSC.GOV.UK](#)

[NPCC guidance](#)

5. Statutory Compliance & Consultation

5.1 Statutory Compliance

5.1.1 Equality Act (2010)

An Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) has been completed for this policy and can be found [here](#) *[insert link once published]*.

Once the policy and associated EIA have been considered by Chief Officers at Senior Command Team (SCT) meeting, you must complete the below tables.

Date of SCT meeting where Chief Officers reviewed the EIA	29 th January 2025
Summary of Chief Officer discussions/considerations at SCT	

State below whether Chief Officers agreed with the EIA, or selected a different outcome:

Outcome	EIA recommended	Chief Officer Decision
Approve – no changes. The policy is robust, and the evidence shows no potential for discrimination. All appropriate opportunities to advance equality and foster good relations between groups have been taken.	X	
Approve – subject to amends. Changes are required to remove barriers, better advance equality or mitigate		

potential effects. This should be done before the policy is implemented.		
Approve – continue with policy. Despite any adverse effect or missed opportunities to advance equality, provided that it does not unlawfully discriminate. The objective justification must be recorded.		
Reject – stop the policy. If there are adverse effects that are not justified and cannot be mitigated, or any unlawful discrimination.		

5.1.2 The UK General Data Protection Regulation (UK GDPR) and Data Protection Act (2018)

Greater Manchester Police has a duty to ensure, so far as is possible, that all staff comply with the provisions of the UK GDPR and the Data Protection Act 2018, particularly relating to their access to a wide variety of personal information.

This policy has been assessed for compliance issues by the Information Compliance and Records Management Unit (ICRMU). There are no Data Protection compliance issues with this policy, and it should be read in conjunction with GMP's Data Protection Policy and guidance issued on the Data Protection Intranet pages.

5.1.3 Freedom of Information Act (2000)

The Freedom of Information Act 2000 grants a general right of access to all types of recorded information held by public authorities.

As this Policy document contains policing methods, some parts of it may not be suitable for disclosure. Requests for data will be assessed carefully by the Information Compliance and Records Management Unit in consultation with the Policy Owner. All requests will be carefully assessed taking into account the requirement for transparency under the Act, alongside any potential risk of harm in disclosing information into the public domain.

For advice and assistance on the Freedom of Information Act, or any requests for the disclosure of this document should be directed through the Information Compliance and Records Management Unit via the [Freedom of Information mailbox](#).

5.2 Consultation

The following parties have been consulted in the drafting of this policy:

Consulted	Date	Feedback
Unions:		
Police Federation	10/10/24 & 11/02/25	Changes requested to EIA in respect of age and disability protected characteristics. Documents updated accordingly.
GMB	10/10/24 & 11/02/25	No comments received.
UNISON	10/10/24 & 11/05/25	Approved.

Staff Associations:		
AWP	10/10/2024	No comments received.
BAPA	10/10/2024	No comments received.
Catholic Police Guild	10/10/2024	No comments received.
Christian Police Network	10/10/2024	Reviewed by [REDACTED]. No comments.
Disability Support Network	10/10/2024	No comments received.
Deaf and Hard of Hearing Support Network	10/10/2024	Reviewed by [REDACTED]. No comments.
GMP Pride Network	10/10/2024	No comments received.
Jewish Police Association	10/10/2024	No comments received.
Muslim Police Association	10/10/2024	No comments received.
Sikh Police Association	10/10/2024	No comments received.
Superintendents' Association	10/10/2024	No comments received.
Branches:		
Force Crime & Incident Registrar	10/10/2024	Reviewed by [REDACTED]. No comments.
Health & Safety	10/10/2024	No comments received.
Human Resources	10/10/2024	No comments received.
Information Compliance	20.09.24	Reviewed by [REDACTED], section 5 completed.
Organisational Learning Hub	10/10/2024	No comments received.
Legal Services	10/10/2024	Reviewed by [REDACTED]. No comments.