Date: 06/10/2026
Our ref: 01/FOI/26/017686/J

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST REFERENCE NO: 01/FOI/26/017686/J

I write in connection with your request for information dated 18/09/2026, received by Greater Manchester Police (GMP) for the following information:

1. The monthly costs (including allowances and overtime), since July 2026 for Greater Manchester Police officers deployed for the protection of the Prime Minister and other cabinet ministers at 'Number 10 North' as well as any Public Order operations supporting it. Please include a breakdown that shows costs for overtime and other allowances.

2. The monthly costs since July 2026, charged by other Police Forces to Greater Manchester Police pursuant to section 24 or 25 of the Police Act 1996 for police officers deployed to Greater Manchester for the protection of the Prime Minister and other cabinet ministers at 'Number 10 North' as well as any Public Order operation supporting it.

3. The estimated cost of additional training for Greater Manchester Police officers in 'close protection' that can be attributed to protecting the Prime Minister or other cabinet ministers at 'Number 10 North' since July 2026 and for the next 12 months.

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 some of the information requested is held by GMP.

As a matter of policy GMP do not discuss or release information relating to the protection of the Prime Minister.

Although GMP does hold some information within scope, we are not releasing the information for **question 1 and 2 relating to the Prime Minister** as the duty at Section 1(1)(a) Freedom of Information Act 2000, does not apply by virtue of the following exemptions: -

Section 24 (1) National Security
Section 31 (1)(a)(b) Law Enforcement
Section 38 (1)(b) Health & Safety

Reasons for Decision

Section 17 of the Act provides:
(1) A public authority which, in relation to any request for information, is to any extent relying on a claim that any provision in Part II relating to the duty to confirm or deny is relevant to the request or on a claim that information is exempt information must, within the time for complying with section 1(1), give the applicant a notice which-
(a) States the fact,
(b) Specifies the exemption in question, and
(c) States (if that would not otherwise be apparent) why the exemption applies.

As the above exemptions are qualified exemptions, I am obliged to conduct a harm test and public interest test with regards to the use of these exemptions. These are set out below.

Section 24 Harm
The release of the information requested would result in harm to the national security of the United Kingdom. Releasing costs associated with the protection of The Prime Minister would provide those intent on committing acts of terrorism with valuable information as to the level of resistance they might expect to encounter with undertaking such an act. Disclosing the information would also give valuable tactical information to those who seek to harm such figures.

The release of information which might assist a potential terrorist in planning an attack on the Prime Minister, including the possibility of identifying the protection levels afforded, would threaten the prime institution of the United Kingdom's constitutional arrangements, and thus the nation's security.

Public Interest favouring disclosure S24
It is accepted that disclosure of expenditure by the police on behalf of the taxpayer can enhance the accountability of the service and its standing within an open and democratic society. Although a sensitive issue, such openness can also enhance understanding of national security issues. The public have both a right and an interest in participating in the debates surrounding national security issues, and knowledge of where money is being spent would enhance their ability to participate meaningfully in such discussions.

Public Interest favouring non-disclosure S24
The fact that there are several groups that would seek to harm the national security of the United Kingdom is generally accepted Persons such as The Prime Minister, who undertake constitutional and representative duties both nationally and internationally, provide a target for such persons.

Groups planning such attacks are known to conduct extensive research into the opposition they might face. Disclosure of this information might enhance their capability. Additionally, it could lead to the need to review tactics, provide extra staff and additional costs. Disclosure therefore would be detrimental from a national security perspective.

Section 31 Harm
The Prime Minister, their visits/arrangements, and their places of residence are at times the target of criminal and fixated elements and terrorist threats. Security and protection arrangements are implemented to prevent and or/reduce the likely success of such criminals and/or the mentally ill. The funding provided is based on the level of protection required. Disclosure of the amounts involved would inevitably compromise the safety of those being protected by enabling an assessment to be made of the security arrangements and the security level of resistance that they might expect to encounter.

It might also reveal policing tactics for other VIPs, something which might undermine protection arrangements generally.

Those planning attacks are known to use a wide range of resources, including press reports and physical reconnaissance. Reducing the information available or making it more difficult to acquire is obviously desirable.

It also follows that any heightened risk to individuals in receipt of protective security arrangements represents a similar risk to a member of any organisation (e.g. the police) providing protection. Any physical attack on any person, regardless of whether they are The Prime Minister or not, is a crime and therefore where release would harm their safety (or that of any other person) section 31(1)(a) is engaged.

Public Interest favouring disclosure S31
The public have a genuine interest in what the police do and how they do it. Their interest is legitimate and to be encouraged within a democratic society where policing is by consent.

Public accountability for the use of resources and taxpayers' money, and a willingness to be transparent and open are desirable characteristics in all public authorities.

The interest in how much money is spent on protection is therefore to be expected, especially when there is some concern as to whether such expenditure is appropriate and justified.

Public Interest favouring non-disclosure S31
Disclosure of any information that would provide terrorists, criminals or the fixated with information as to the levels of protection that may be afforded to The Prime Minister would not be desirable as it would provide anyone intent on committing an act of terrorism with vital intelligence as to the level of resistance that they may encounter. Disclosure of information in respects of total costs would augment that already available, making the task of prevention more difficult and the chance of attack more likely. This would hinder the ability of the law enforcement bodies to perform their public protection role and would clearly not be in the public interest.

One of the primary objectives of GMP is the prevention of crime. The release of any information that might increase the likelihood of a crime is not in the public interest.

Section 38 Harm
Release of the information sought would endanger the physical health of The Prime Minister, the police providing protection and members of the public.

Although the information sought relates to a total cost figure, the ability to extrapolate such information might compromise the safety of individuals.

The possibility of a mosaic effect being established whereby disclosed information could be matched with unofficial information to form assessments as to protective security measures is a real danger. The release of information will also reveal policing tactics regarding The Prime Minister and could be used to form part of a wider assessment of levels of protection afforded to others not subject to this request. The release of this information would therefore also be to the detriment of another who may not be in receipt of similar levels of protection.

Budgets are finite and staffing levels directly related to the money that is provided. Over time it is possible to determine from snippets of information released legitimately or inadvertently, likely police protection tactics.

Public Interest favouring disclosure S38
Disclosure would provide an insight in how the Home Office and police work and would improve public understanding of policing decisions. It would enable the public to determine whether policing arrangements are appropriate and would help with public scrutiny of an important Public Authority. It may help to remove speculation, rumour, and conjecture.

Public Interest favouring non-disclosure S38
Disclosure of the information requested would be likely to increase the vulnerability of The Prime Minister, the public and our officers and/or impact adversely upon our ability to provide a safe and secure environment. Revealing this information would also increase the risk to personal protection staff as collateral damage in the event of an attack.

All people are entitled to live and work without a threat of violence directed against them. It is not in the public interest for unprotected members of the public to be placed in position of vulnerability by disclosing details in respect of principals in receipt of police protection.

Disclosure might lead to protection tactics having to be altered, staffing levels increased and the costs of protection rising, which are adverse effects definitely not in the public interest.

Overall Balance Test.

Whilst there is a public interest in transparency and accountability for public spending, this is outweighed by the stronger public interest in safeguarding national security, public safety, and the effectiveness of protective policing measures.

Disclosure of protection cost information could reveal details about security arrangements and increase risks to those under protection.

Therefore, the balance of the public interest favours maintaining the exemption and withholding the information.

PLEASE NOTE – GMP hold no information regarding the close protection training costs for the **Prime Minister** in relation to question **3.**

In addition to this request, for **questions 1 to 3** in relation to **other cabinet ministers,** the following applies.

Greater Manchester Police neither confirms nor denies that it holds information relevant to the protection of other cabinet ministers request by virtue of the following exemptions**:**

S24(2) National Security
S31(3) Law Enforcement
S38(2) Health and Safety
S40(5) Personal Information.

Section 40(5B)(a)(i) - Personal Information – giving information to a member of the public of the confirmation or denial that would have to be given to comply with section 1(1)(a) would (apart from this Act) contravene any of the principles of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and the Data Protection Act 2018.

To confirm that any information is held or not, could confirm personal data. In some circumstances confirming or denying whether information is held could itself identify a living individual and would therefore 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.

This use of neither confirm nor deny should not be taken as proof that such information does or does not exist.

Harm Overall
To confirm or deny whether GMP holds information relating to the costs of protecting specific Cabinet Ministers, other than the Prime Minister, would itself reveal information about policing and security arrangements relating to identifiable individuals who may be subject to protective measures.

The disclosure of whether such information is held would be likely to provide insight into which individuals law enforcement agencies assess as requiring protection and the extent to which protective measures are, or are not, in place. This could assist individuals intent on disrupting, circumventing or targeting those arrangements and would be likely to undermine the effectiveness of measures designed to protect those individuals.

Protective arrangements for senior government figures are closely linked to the prevention and detection of crime, the apprehension of offenders, and the safeguarding of national security. Any confirmation or denial about the existence of cost information could contribute to a wider intelligence picture regarding security deployments, threat assessments, and the allocation of policing resources. Such information could be exploited by those seeking to cause harm, compromising operational effectiveness and increasing risks to both protected individuals and the public.

Furthermore, confirming or denying whether information is held could disclose personal information relating to identifiable individuals and reveal information concerning their security status or protective arrangements. Disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act is disclosure to the world at large, and any release has the potential to place individuals at an increased risk of harm.

Accordingly, GMP considers that confirming or denying whether information is held would be likely to prejudice national security, law enforcement activities, and the safety of individuals. Therefore, neither confirming nor denying whether the requested information is held is appropriate.

Section 24 - National Security

Factors Favouring Confirmation or Denial
There is a public interest in transparency and accountability regarding the use of public funds. Confirming or denying whether information is held would contribute to public understanding and informed debate concerning protective policing arrangements and the expenditure associated with safeguarding public officials.

Factors Against Confirmation or Denial
There is a strong public interest in protecting national security. Confirming or denying whether information is held relating to the protection of Cabinet Ministers would reveal information about security arrangements and threat assessments. This could enable individuals to identify those considered at greater risk and undermine the effectiveness of protective measures. Any increase in the risk to protected individuals or the wider public would not be in the public interest.

Section 31 - Law Enforcement

Factors Favouring Confirmation or Denial
Confirmation or denial would promote accountability for the expenditure of public funds and provide greater public understanding of how policing resources are allocated to protective functions.

Factors Against Confirmation or Denial
There is a significant public interest in preserving the ability of the police to prevent and detect crime. Confirming or denying whether information is held could reveal information about protective deployments, resource allocation and policing tactics.

Such information could be used by criminals, terrorists or fixated individuals to assess vulnerabilities and circumvent protective measures, placing protected individuals, officers and the public at greater risk.

Section 38 - Health and Safety

Factors Favouring Confirmation or Denial
There is a public interest in understanding how public funds are used and how policing resources are deployed to protect individuals at risk. Confirmation or denial could assist public awareness and accountability.

Factors Against Confirmation or Denial
There is a substantial public interest in safeguarding the health and safety of individuals. Confirming or denying whether information is held in relation to protective arrangements could increase the threat faced by those who receive protection, identify potential vulnerabilities, and expose police officers and members of the public to an increased risk of physical or psychological harm.

Balance Test Overall
Whilst there is a recognised public interest in transparency, accountability and understanding how public funds are spent, this must be balanced against the need to protect national security, support the prevention and detection of crime, and safeguard the health and safety of individuals.

Confirming or denying whether GMP holds information relating to the protection costs of Cabinet Ministers could reveal sensitive information regarding security arrangements, threat assessments and the deployment of policing resources.

Such disclosure would be likely to undermine the effectiveness of protective measures, increase risks to protected individuals, police officers and the wider public, and prejudice law enforcement activities.

Therefore, the public interest in maintaining neither confirm nor deny position significantly outweighs the public interest in confirmation or denial.