

Public Interest Test – 4175/20**Applicable exemptions:**

Section 24 – National security
Section 31 – Law enforcement

Harm in Confirming or Denying that Information is held

Policing is an information-led activity, and recording of all offences (including serious/terrorism offences), forms part of a fundamental day-to-day delivery of effective operational law enforcement.

Although purely statistical data, to confirm or deny whether any information relating to serious/terrorism offences is held would reveal investigative activity enabling serious offenders to identify force areas which may be 'safer' to carry out their offending.

To confirm or deny whether information relating to these types of offences is held would be extremely useful to those involved in serious criminal/terrorism activity which would ultimately undermine ongoing investigations and could lead to police officers having to be removed from their frontline duties in order to increase manpower on an investigation.

Public Interest Considerations**Section 24(2) National Security****Factors favouring complying with Section 1(1)(a) confirming that information is held**

The public are entitled to know how public funds are spent and how resources are distributed within an area of policing. To confirm whether these offences have occurred would enable the general public to hold West Midlands Police to account ensuring all such offences are recorded and investigated appropriately. With the call for transparency of public spending this would enable improved public debate.

Factors against complying with Section 1(1)(a) confirming or denying that information is held

Security measures are put in place to protect the community we serve. As evidenced within the harm, to confirm whether serious/terrorism offences have occurred would highlight vulnerabilities within West Midlands Police to criminals/terrorists and individuals intent on carrying out criminal activity.

Taking into account the current security climate within the United Kingdom, no information (such as the citing of an exemption which confirms serious/terrorism offences have occurred within West Midlands Police jurisdiction; or conversely, stating no information is held) which may aid an offender should be disclosed. To what extent this information may aid an offender is unknown, but it is evident that it will have an impact on a force's ability to monitor serious crime/terrorist activity.

Irrespective of what information is or isn't held, the public entrust the Police Service to make appropriate decisions with regard to their safety and protection and the only way of reducing risk is to be cautious with what is placed into the public domain.

The cumulative effect of criminals gathering information from various sources would have a greater impact when linked to other information gathered from various sources about serious crime/terrorism. The more information disclosed over time will give a more detailed account of the tactical infrastructure of not only a force area but also the country as a whole.

Any incident that results from such a disclosure would, by default, affect National Security.

Section 31(3) Law Enforcement

Factors favouring complying with Section 1(1)(a) confirming that any other information is held

Confirming that any other information exists relating to serious crime/terrorism offences would lead to a better informed public which may encourage individuals to provide intelligence in order to reduce offences.

Factors against complying with Section 1(1)(a) neither confirm nor denying that any other information is held

Confirmation or denial that information relating to serious offences is held in this case would suggest that West Midlands Police's approach to protecting information is that of indifference.

West Midlands Police has a duty of care to the community at large and public safety is of paramount importance. If an FOI disclosure revealed information to the world that would undermine the security of the national infrastructure, offenders (including criminal/terrorist organisations) could use this to their advantage which would compromise public safety and more worryingly, encourage offenders to carry out further crimes.

By its very nature, information relating to whether or not serious/terrorism offences have occurred within a specific force area undoubtedly undermines the effective delivery of operational law enforcement. Under FOI there is a requirement to comply with Section 1(1)(a) and confirm what information is held. However, in some cases it is that confirmation, or not, that could result in disclosing facts harmful to members of the public, police officers, other law enforcement agencies and their employees.

Balancing Test

The Police Service is charged with enforcing the law, preventing and detecting crime and protecting the communities we serve. As part of that policing purpose, information is gathered which can be highly sensitive relating to high profile investigative activity.

Weakening the mechanisms used to monitor any type of criminal activity, and specifically serious/terrorist activity would place the security of the country at an increased level of danger.

In addition, anything that places that confidence at risk, no matter how generic, would undermine any trust or confidence individuals have in the Police Service. Therefore, at this moment in time, it is our opinion that for these issues the balance test favours neither confirming nor denying that any further information is held.