



Response Date: 20/03/2026

2026/091 - Use of AI

In response to your recent request for information regarding;

I would like to request information on the use of AI in the force and in particular in the preparation of intelligence reports to inform operational decisions.

Does anyone working for your force use AI tools and, if so, which AI tool (Microsoft copilot, Google Gemini, Chat GPT or other)?

The questions references generative AI tools. Microsoft Copilot is available internally to the Force through our Microsoft tenant with no content being shared back with Microsoft for training models or otherwise. The direction to staff is to not use personal or police data in Copilot.

If AI tools are used, what purposes have they been used for? Does this include intelligence gathering or compiling intelligence reports? Has an AI tool ever been found to produce unreliable or untrue information - sometimes known as an 'AI hallucination' - and if so, please provide details of these incidents and how it was handled?

N/A. No AI is used in intelligence gathering or processing.

Whilst Copilot is available the Force is not currently promoting specific uses. No examples of AI hallucinations have been raised within the Force.

Do you have any policies, monitoring systems or safeguards regarding the use of AI and when were these introduced?

We have an artificial intelligence governance board, and also an AI usage policy which ensure compliance with NPCC guidelines and are currently under review given the fast moving nature of generative AI.

Any AI products whether explicitly AI tools, or with embedded use of AI, either generative AI or otherwise, must be scrutinised by the AI governance board before procurement or use.

North Wales Police can neither confirm nor deny that it holds any information in relation to cyber related incidents as the duty in Section 1(1)(a) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 does not apply by virtue of the following exemptions:

Section 24(2) National Security

Section 31(3) Law Enforcement

Pencadlys yr Heddlu,
Glan-y-Don, Bae Colwyn LL29 8AW
www.heddlugogleddcymru.police.uk

Police Headquarters,
Glan-y-Don, Colwyn Bay LL29 8AW
www.northwales.police.uk

With Sections 24 and 31 being prejudice based qualified exemptions, there exists the requirement to articulate the harm that would be caused in confirming or not whether information is held as well as carrying out a public interest test.

Evidence of Harm

Having disclosed high-level information about routine, non-sensitive uses of Artificial Intelligence (AI), North Wales Police will neither confirm nor deny whether it holds any further information that would indicate whether AI is, or is not, used in connection with counter-terrorism, serious and organised crime, covert intelligence activity, or specialist digital forensics supporting those functions. The duty to confirm or deny is disapplied by virtue of sections 24(2) (national security) and 31(3) (law enforcement) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000. This response should not be taken as an indication of whether any additional information is held.

Confirming or denying whether AI is used by North Wales Police in counter-terrorism, serious and organised crime, covert intelligence or specialist digital forensics would enable hostile actors to infer the presence, absence or maturity of particular policing capabilities. This type of capability insight is of practical value to adversaries who routinely adapt their behaviour to exploit perceived weaknesses, overwhelm less technologically equipped forces, or adjust methods to avoid detection. Even a single confirmation or denial could be combined with publicly available information from other forces to build a detailed national picture of capability. This mosaic effect represents a realistic and actionable risk, providing information that could materially undermine national security and the effectiveness of law-enforcement operations.

Public Interest Test – Section 24(2) (National Security)

Factors in favour of confirming or denying - There is a strong public interest in openness and transparency about the use of AI in policing. Confirming or denying the existence of information could contribute to informed public debate about how emerging technologies are deployed, the safeguards in place, and whether they align with legal and ethical standards. Disclosure can enhance accountability, promote trust, and reassure the public that AI use is subject to appropriate oversight.

Factors against confirming or denying - There is an overriding public interest in protecting national security. Confirming or denying the existence of information about AI deployment in CT, SoC, covert intelligence, or linked specialist forensics would provide adversaries with useful insights into operational capabilities and priorities. Even a simple confirmation or denial could enable hostile actors to adjust methods, exploit potential gaps, or test thresholds. The resulting risk to national security would be real and more than trivial, and is not mitigated by partial or local confirmations, because the cumulative mosaic effect across multiple forces would still disclose sensitive capability at a national level.

Public Interest Test – Section 31(3) (Law Enforcement)

Factors in favour of confirming or denying - There is a general public interest in understanding how AI is used to support policing functions, including the efficiency and effectiveness of core processes, and in ensuring that novel technologies are used lawfully and proportionately. Confirmation or denial could support external scrutiny and promote confidence in policing practice.

Factors against confirming or denying - Confirming or denying the existence of information relating to AI use in CT, SoC, covert intelligence, or specialist digital forensics would be likely to prejudice the prevention and detection of crime, the apprehension or prosecution of offenders, and the operation of law enforcement tactics and methodologies. Knowledge of whether specific capabilities exist, or do not exist, enables offenders to adapt behaviour, exploit capability gaps, frustrate investigations, and increase the cost and complexity of counter-measures. The public interest strongly favours maintaining an NCND to preserve the effectiveness of law enforcement and the safety of the public.

Balance Test

For the reasons set out above, North Wales Police will neither confirm nor deny whether it holds information indicating AI is used in CT, SoC, covert intelligence activity, or specialist digital forensics supporting those functions.

The public interest in maintaining the NCND position under sections 24(2) and 31(3) outweighs the public interest in confirmation or denial. This response should not be taken as an indication of whether any relevant information is held.

Therefore, in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act 2000, this letter acts as a Refusal Notice under section 17 (1) of the legislation.

THIS INFORMATION HAS BEEN PROVIDED IN RESPONSE TO A REQUEST
UNDER THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 2000, AND IS CORRECT AS AT 03/02/2026