

Tuesday, 08 September 2026

Our ref: 01/FOI/26/017545/X

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST REFERENCE NO: 01/FOI/26/017545/X

I write in connection with your request for information dated 30/08/2026, received by Greater Manchester Police (GMP) for the following information:

Thank you for previously confirming that your force uses Mitie Care & Custody Limited for the provision of healthcare professionals in police custody and that SUMS (Service User Management System) is used to request the services of a healthcare professional to attend to a detainee.

For clarity, I am not seeking commercially sensitive information. This request is made for my own personal purposes and seeks only the following limited recorded information concerning the contractual and reporting arrangements:

- 1. Does the contract include Service Level Agreements (SLA) and/or Key Performance Indicators (KPI) targets relating to the response to requests for healthcare professionals? If yes, is the relevant response time measured from the police request time to the start of the clinical consultation/assessment, or to some other identifiable event? If another event is used, please identify that event.*
- 2. Are the resulting SLA/KPI performance outcomes reported by Mitie Care & Custody Limited to the force on a monthly, quarterly or other regular basis? If yes, please state the reporting frequency.*
- 3. Does the contract require SUMS to be specifically configured for the force's contractual requirements, or is the standard SUMS system provided by Mitie Care & Custody Limited used without force-specific contractual configuration?*
- 4. Does the contract with Mitie Care & Custody Limited require any parent-company guarantee, guarantee, indemnity, undertaking or other contractual assurance from Mitie Group plc? If yes, please identify the nature of that assurance. A copy is not requested at this stage.*

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

1. Yes, further details exempt under S43
2. Yes, further details exempt under S43
3. Exempt under S43
4. Exempt under S43

The exemption which applies is:

- **Section 43(2) – Commercial Interest**

Section 43(2) is a prejudice based and qualified exemption, as such is subject to a harm and public interest test. Please see below.

Harm

To disclose the information asked for within this request may prejudice the Force's future commercial interests and tender process. Disclosure will likely leave GMP in a position where it is not able to negotiate the best value for money in the future and may also prejudice the commercial interests of those providing services to GMP, as external agencies may set certain conditions depending on a variety of factors. If the terms provided to GMP is different to terms set to other agencies, this could jeopardise the interests of these providers. This could decrease competition for our business, and costs could increase as a result.

Factors favouring disclosure

Disclosure would provide better understanding, accountability and justification as to how GMP spends public funds.

Factors Favouring Non-Disclosure

Disclosure of commercial sensitive information could damage any future tender processes, as contractors would be aware what is on our contracts GMP and suppliers agreed on. Therefore, this could give an unfair advantage to other companies applying for such contracts with GMP and for them to other clients. Moreover, to disclose such information would leave GMP in a vulnerable position in respect of a civil action being brought against GMP by the contractor.

Balancing test

When balancing the public interest Greater Manchester Police has to consider whether the information should be released into the public domain. The most persuasive reason for disclosing the information would be that there would be a better public understanding of how GMP spends public funds. This needs to be weighed against the strongest reason for non-disclosure, which, in this case is damage that may be caused to GMP & service providers in relation to future contracts. In this instance, the case for disclosure is not made out.