



Response Date: 25/08/2026

2026/774 - Data-driven policing

In response to your recent request for information regarding;

Please provide a list of any systems, tools or projects currently in use, being trialled, procured but not yet operational, or under development by or on behalf of the force that fall within the following definition of "data-driven policing."

For the purposes of this request, data-driven policing refers to systems, tools or projects that use data analytics, statistical modelling, algorithmic processing, risk assessment, predictive analytics, machine learning or artificial intelligence to inform or support policing decisions, assessments, prioritisation or operational activity.

For each system, tool or project, please provide:

- 1. The name of the system, tool or project and a brief description of its purpose.**
- 2. Whether it is:**
 - o operational;**
 - o being trialled;**
 - o procured but not yet operational; or**
 - o under development.**
- 3. Whether it uses, or is intended to use, data that:**
 - o originates solely from the force or other policing bodies; or**
 - o also includes data originating from non-police organisations, such as local authorities, NHS bodies, other public-sector organisations or private organisations.**
- 4. Copies of any Data Protection Impact Assessments (DPIAs), or equivalent Privacy Impact Assessments, held in relation to each system, tool or project. Where a document is already publicly available, a link to it is sufficient.**

For clarity, this request includes systems that identify or present patterns, trends, associations, links, risks or other data-derived contextual information, or that produce scores, classifications, predictions, alerts, recommendations, prioritised lists or other analytical outputs.

This includes systems used to inform or support human judgement where the final decision remains with a human user, including systems described as providing only information or additional context and systems that the force does not formally describe as "artificial intelligence."

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

Clarification requested

Our information is set up and searchable for our policing purposes. To obtain the information in the format you have requested would involve manually reviewing each record on our force system. 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 retrieving the information exceeds the 'appropriate level' as stated in the Freedom of Information (FOI) Fees and Appropriate Limit regulations 2004.

Therefore, in accordance with the FOI Act 2000 the information you have requested is exempt under Section 12 (1), and this letter acts as a Refusal Notice under section 17 (5) of the legislation.

However, if you're able to specifically advise/narrow down your request to a certain area then we may be able to assist.

To enable us to respond to your request please provide the details requested above or alternatively indicate how we may otherwise assist you.

Clarification received

To clarify, I am not asking for any data that would involve manually reviewing each individual record on the force systems.

My request is simply asking whether the force uses, trials, or is developing any systems, tools, or platforms, that involve predictive analytics, algorithmic processing, artificial intelligence, machine learning, computer-based risk scoring), facial recognition, or data matching/linking for policing purposes.

These types of systems may sometimes be referred to as predictive policing, but I am using the term more broadly to include what the College of Policing refers to as "data-driven technologies": <https://www.college.police.uk/app/data-driven-technologies/introduction> .

To further clarify, I am not seeking any data from these systems, only confirmation as to whether any such systems exist and/or are in use at your police force. Where they do exist, I am requesting their name, purpose, and for any DPIAs to be shared where held.

If this narrowed request is still too broad, I would be grateful if you could advise what part of the request could be answered within the cost limit.

Response

Excess cost is relevant to part of your request which removes the forces obligations under the Freedom of Information Act, as a gesture of goodwill, I have supplied information, relative to your request, retrieved or available before it was realised that the fees limit would be exceeded. 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.

Please provide a list of any systems, tools or projects currently in use, being trialled, procured but not yet operational, or under development by or on behalf of the force that fall within the following definition of "data-driven policing."

For the purposes of this request, data-driven policing refers to systems, tools or projects that use data analytics, statistical modelling, algorithmic processing, risk assessment, predictive analytics, machine learning or artificial intelligence to inform or support policing decisions, assessments, prioritisation or operational activity.

For each system, tool or project, please provide:

1. The name of the system, tool or project and a brief description of its purpose.

2. & 3 Whether it is:

o operational;

Power BI using only internal data

Business Objects - only internal data

Excel

CAT computer assisted triage – Scoring overseen by humans which helps determine whether calls are sent back to LPS or retained CID

o being trialled;

Previously trialled

Object recognition in vehicle

Facial recognition in public space (Holyhead port and Wrexham)

ACTR-AI, AI enabled avatar for interview training tool

CAT computer assisted triage – Scoring overseen by humans

o procured but not yet operational; or

QOFD – optimisation of forward deployment locations

o under development.

Dataiku platform – initially just NWP data others to be used proportionally as required for a specific policing purpose

ACTR-AI Interview training tool

Please note: with the use with any technology/system human oversight is applied to the results.

3. Whether it uses, or is intended to use, data that:

o originates solely from the force or other policing bodies; or

o also includes data originating from non-police organisations, such as local authorities, NHS bodies, other public-sector organisations or private organisations.

4. Copies of any Data Protection Impact Assessments (DPIAs), or equivalent Privacy Impact Assessments, held in relation to each system, tool or project. Where a document is already publicly available, a link to it is sufficient. Please link to

Our information is set up and searchable for our policing purposes. To obtain the information in the format you have requested would involve manually reviewing each record on our force system. 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 retrieving the information exceeds the 'appropriate level' as stated in the Freedom of Information (FOI) Fees and Appropriate Limit regulations 2004.

Therefore, in accordance with the FOI Act 2000 the information you have requested is exempt under Section 12 (1), and this letter acts as a Refusal Notice under section 17 (5) of the legislation.

Furthermore, we can *neither confirm nor deny* whether we hold any further information that the technology is used to support counter-terrorism, serious and organised crime or covert intelligence activity 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 its' use in counter-terrorism, serious and organised crime, or covert intelligence 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 - s24(2) National Security:

Factors in favour of confirming or denying: There is a strong public interest in openness and transparency about the use of advanced technologies 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 its' 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 this technology in CT, SoC, or covert intelligence 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 - S31(3) Law Enforcement:

Factors in favour of confirming or denying: There is a general public interest in understanding how advanced technology 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 advanced technologies' use in CT, SoC, or covert intelligence 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, we can neither confirm nor deny whether we hold information indicating advanced technology is used in CT, SoC, or covert intelligence activity to support 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 25/08/2026