

Wednesday, 16 September
Our ref: 01/FOI/26/017520/O

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST REFERENCE NO: 01/FOI/26/017520/O

I write in connection with your request for information dated 25/08/2026, I note you seek access to the following information:

I am making this request under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 concerning Greater Manchester Police's use of Live Facial Recognition (LFR).

Please provide the following information for the period 21 October 2025 to the date of this request.

Where possible, please provide numerical information in Excel or CSV format, broken down by individual deployment and/or month.

1. Use of facial recognition

Please provide:

- * The total number of LFR deployments.*
- * The date, location and duration of each deployment.*
- * The total number of faces scanned.*
- * The total number of alerts generated.*
- * The number of people approached or spoken to by officers following an alert.*
- * The number of people searched following an alert.*
- * The number of arrests resulting from an alert.*
- * The number of arrests resulting in a charge.*
- * The number resulting in no further action.*

Where possible, please provide the above information for each individual deployment.

2. Alerts and false identifications

GMP has publicly stated that approximately 850,000 faces have been scanned and there has been only one false alert.

Please provide the figures and information behind this claim, including:

- * The total number of faces scanned.*
- * The total number of alerts generated.*
- * The number of alerts that GMP considers to have been genuine matches.*
- * The number considered to have been false alerts or false matches.*
- * GMP's definition of a "false alert" or "false match".*
- * The number of alerts where an officer determined that the person was ****not**** the person on the watchlist.*
- * The number of alerts where an officer approached or spoke to someone but no arrest was made.*
- * The number of alerts that resulted in a search but no arrest.*
- * The number of alerts that resulted in an arrest.*
- * The number of cases in which GMP subsequently established that a person had been wrongly identified.*

For any false alerts recorded, please provide the date of the alert, how the error was identified, and whether the person was stopped, searched or arrested.

I am not requesting names, photographs or other personal information.

3. GMP has stated that an LFR alert does not itself result in an arrest and that an officer makes the decision whether to approach or arrest someone.

Please provide:

- * Any policy, guidance or instructions given to officers about what they should do following an alert.*
- * The criteria officers are expected to consider before approaching, searching or arresting someone following an alert.*
- * Whether officers are required to record why they accepted or rejected an alert.*
- * If this information is recorded, the number of alerts rejected by officers because they believed the person was not the person on the watchlist.*
- * If recorded, the number of alerts where officers could not establish whether the person was a genuine match.*

4. For each LFR deployment, please provide the number of people included on the watchlist. Please also provide, where recorded, how many people were included because they were:

- * wanted for arrest;*
- * wanted by a court;*
- * subject to a court order;*
- * registered sex offenders or subject to notification requirements;*
- * missing persons;*

- * considered at risk of harm to themselves or others;
- * included for another reason.

*Please provide the policy or guidance explaining who can be placed on an LFR watchlist.
I am not requesting names, photographs or other personal information.*

*5. Please provide the total number of LFR-related arrests during the requested period.
For these arrests, please provide, where recorded:*

- * the offence or offence category;
- * the number resulting in no further action;
- * the number resulting in a charge;
- * the number referred to the CPS;
- * the number that went to court;
- * the number resulting in a conviction;
- * the number resulting in an acquittal.

Please specifically provide the number of LFR-related arrests involving:

- * suspected sexual offences;
- * registered sex offenders;
- * breaches of orders or notification requirements relating to sexual offences.

*GMP has publicly reported that cases arising from its use of LFR have included sex offences.
Please provide the number of such cases and their outcomes, where this information is held.*

Please also provide the number of cases in which an LFR alert was the initial reason for identifying or locating the person.

I am not requesting names or information that would identify individual suspects or defendants.

*6. GMP has stated that images associated with alerts are deleted immediately after use or within 24 hours, while images of people who do not generate an alert are deleted immediately.
Please provide:*

- * The policy or guidance governing the deletion of images.
- * The maximum amount of time an alert image can be retained.
- * The maximum amount of time an image of someone who does not generate an alert can be retained.
- * How GMP ensures that images are deleted.
- * Whether officers have to take any action to delete images or whether deletion is automatic.
- * Whether an alert image can be kept for longer than 24 hours if it becomes relevant to an investigation.

** If so, how long such images can be retained and under what circumstances.*

** The number of occasions during the requested period on which alert images were retained for longer than 24 hours, if recorded.*

7. Please provide any reports, tests, reviews or assessments held by GMP concerning the accuracy of its LFR system since October 2025.

Please include any information held about whether the system produces different results according to:

** age;*

** sex;*

** ethnicity;*

** any other demographic group assessed by GMP.*

Please also provide any figures held by GMP for false-positive or false-negative results.

8. Please provide the number of complaints GMP received concerning its use of LFR during the requested period.

Where recorded, please provide the number of complaints concerning:

** wrongful identification;*

** wrongful stop or engagement;*

** wrongful arrest;*

** discrimination;*

** privacy or data protection;*

** inappropriate use of the watchlist.*

Please provide the outcome of these complaints, where recorded, such as upheld, partially upheld, rejected or unresolved.

I am not requesting information that would identify complainants.

9. Please provide copies of any relevant:

** Data Protection Impact Assessments;*

** equality assessments;*

** human rights assessments;*

** internal reviews or audits;*

** reports to senior officers or governance boards;*

** reports provided to elected representatives or scrutiny bodies;*

concerning GMP's use of LFR since October 2025.

GMP's website states that it uses NEC's NeoFace facial recognition technology. Please also provide any GMP-held reports or assessments concerning the accuracy or performance of the system.

Result of Searches

Following receipt of your request searches were conducted within Greater Manchester Police to locate information relevant to your request. I can confirm that the information you have requested is held by Greater Manchester Police.

However, GMP does not hold the information that you have requested in an easily retrievable format. Our system does not feature automated tools to extract Part 5 data. Consequently, retrieving the requested information will require a manual review of all arrest records.

The total figure of arrests to date being 123 arrests from LFR alerts. To break down the requested data would mean that we have to go through all 123 alerts using multiple systems which would take longer than 18 hours to complete.

Therefore, as per section 12(1) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000, the cost of providing you with the information is above the amount to which we are legally required to respond i.e. the cost of locating and retrieving the information exceeds the 'appropriate level' as stated in the Freedom of Information (Fees and Appropriate Limit) Regulations 2004.

In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act 2000, this letter acts as a Refusal Notice.

Although excess costs remove GMP's obligations under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, as a gesture of goodwill (see below information), I have supplied information, relative to your request, that was retrieved / available before it was realised that the fees limit would be exceed. I trust this is helpful, but it does not affect our legal right to rely on the fees regulations for the remainder of your request.

Parts 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6 – Most information is already available online via [Live Facial Recognition | Greater Manchester Police](#)

Part 8 - There is no specific allegation code that can be used to log this type of complaint. Therefore, we have done a keyword search on 'facial recognition' on allegation narratives received in the timeframe state. No cases fit the criteria given.

For the remainder of the data, in accordance with Section 16(1), the duty to provide advice and assistance, of the Freedom of Information Act 2000. Greater Manchester Police will be unable to provide advice for you to reduce the request in order for the force to keep this within the fees

limit as the only method to collate the remainder of the information is reviewing the record individually.