

Freedom of Information Request Reference N°: FOI 001957-18

I write in connection with your request for information received by Suffolk Constabulary on the 3 June 2018 in which you sought access to the following information:

1. *“The cost of policing each Ipswich Town home game (broken down club-by-club) during the 2017-18 season*
2. *The number of officers deployed to each Ipswich Town home game (broken down club-by-club) during the 2017-18 season, broken down by policing rank*
3. *The number of arrests made at each Ipswich Town home game (broken down club-by-club) during the 2017-18 season, broken down by type of offence.”*

Response to your Request

The response provided below is correct as of 6 June 2018

Suffolk Constabulary has considered your request for information and the response is below.

1. The total cost to the Constabulary and the total charge to ITFC during the 2017/18 financial year is provided in the table below. This cost to the Constabulary figure has been extracted from financial ledgers and calculating SPS (Special Police Service) rates for the resources deployed for 6 hours. The SPS calculation accounts for additional overheads such as Contact and Control Room and Resource Management.

Total Cost	£381,934.12
Monies received from ITFC	£101,418.32

In respect the cost to police individual matches, this information has not been provided as a result of exemptions within the Act. Section 1 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA) places two duties on public authorities. Unless exemptions apply, the first duty at s1(1)(a) is to confirm or deny whether the information specified in a request is held. The second duty at s1 (1)(b) is to disclose information that has been confirmed as being held.

Suffolk Constabulary can confirm that they do hold the information requested however it has not been disclosed due to exemptions within the Act.



Section 17 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 requires that the Constabulary, when refusing to provide such information (because the information is exempt) is to provide you the applicant with a notice ban which:

- a) States that fact
- b) Specifies the exemption(s) in question and
- c) States (if that would not otherwise be apparent) why the exemption(s) applies.

The information is exempt from disclosure by virtue of the following exemption;

Section 31(a)(b)(c) – Law Enforcement

Section 31 is a qualified and prejudice based exemption and I am therefore obliged to articulate the harm in this information being disclosed and assess the public interest in disclosure.

2. The number of officers deployed at each match has not been provided as a result of exemptions within the Act. Section 1 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA) places two duties on public authorities. Unless exemptions apply, the first duty at s1(1)(a) is to confirm or deny whether the information specified in a request is held. The second duty at s1(1)(b) is to disclose information that has been confirmed as being held.

Suffolk Constabulary can confirm that they do hold the information requested however it has not been disclosed due to exemptions within the Act.

Section 17 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 requires that the Constabulary, when refusing to provide such information (because the information is exempt) is to provide you the applicant with a notice ban which:

- a) States that fact
- b) Specifies the exemption(s) in question and
- c) States (if that would not otherwise be apparent) why the exemption(s) applies.

The information is exempt from disclosure by virtue of the following exemption;

Section 31(a)(b)(c) – Law Enforcement

Section 31 is a qualified and prejudice based exemption and I am therefore obliged to articulate the harm in this information being disclosed and assess the public interest in disclosure.

3. The total number of arrests made at ITFC matches, is as follows:

Match	Total Arrests	Offence
ITFC v Birmingham City	2	Affray
ITFC v Norwich City	3	Section 5 Public Order Act
	1	Section 4 Public Order Act
	1	Section 3 Public Order Act
	1	Drunk and Disorderly
	1	Possession of Firework / Flare at sporting event
ITFC v Leeds	1	Entering whilst drunk

Harm and Public Interest Test – Section 31

Harm in disclosure

Information concerning the strengths and capabilities of Constabularies would not be disclosed if to do so would prejudice policing across the county and impact negatively on resources. The provision of individual match costs will identify the level of policing at any one game. This will allow people to draw conclusions as to the perceived level of police officers required to police specific matches, which in turn could identify to the criminal fraternity occasions where the Constabulary will be at its most vulnerable. This has the potential to increase the probability of crime being committed for those occasions where individual perceive the police presence to be limited.

Officers are deployed to matches dependent on the category of match and intelligence received. Provision of this information will allow individuals to ascertain those matches where the police numbers are at their lowest. This would undermine the law enforcement capabilities of the Constabulary and therefore it is confirmed that Section 31 is engaged.

Factors favouring disclosure

Police officer numbers differ depending on operational demand at the time and consequently the costs attributed to this deployment will also change.

Information that relates directly to the operational effectiveness and efficiencies of the Constabulary is a positive factor favouring disclosure. The public have a right to know that they are being protected in an appropriate and diligent manner.



Public knowledge of Constabulary will ensure informed public debate, retaining the openness and transparency.

Factors favouring non-disclosure

Disclosure of information that can affect the current and future law enforcement capabilities of Constabularies will always favour non-disclosure. On this occasion, providing information that will identify police resources at individual football matches will allow for comparisons to be made. This in turn will allow for the determination as to the strength of front line police officers at future like matches, invariably providing criminals with advanced knowledge of the Constabulary's capabilities.

Although it can be argued that financial figures are historical and the likelihood is that future requirements will be subject to change depending on operational requirements at the time, provision of data at such a low level will allow individuals to determine the perceived officer presence at future like matches. This will be subject to change depending on the operational requirement; however it would provide a good basis for an approximate value to be determined.

Although public knowledge of the Constabulary's capabilities is a positive factor, this is not unlimited and there are aspects of policing that must remain confidential.

Balancing test

Public knowledge of how funds are being spent and assurance that the Police service are doing all they can to ensure public safety is maintained, is always a positive factor in disclosure.

On balance however, disclosure of this nature is more likely to have the opposite affect causing the criminal fraternity to have prior knowledge of Police operational capabilities at football matches, compromising the prevention and detection of crime and administration of justice.

The Police service has a duty to ensure public safety is never compromised and disclosures under FOI should always ensure this is maintained.

It is the Constabulary's decision that disclosure lies in non-disclosure and the application of the exemption is maintained.

A full copy of the Freedom of Information Act (2000) can be viewed on the 'Office of Public Sector Information' web-site;
<http://www.opsi.gov.uk/>



Suffolk Constabulary is not responsible for the content, or the reliability, of the website referenced. The Constabulary cannot guarantee that this link will work all of the time, and we have no control over the availability of the linked pages.



Your Right to Request a Review of Decisions Made Under the Terms of the
Freedom of Information Act (2000).

If you are unhappy with how your request has been handled, or if you think the decision is incorrect, you have the right to ask Suffolk Constabulary to review their decision.

Ask Suffolk Constabulary to look at the decision again.

If you are dissatisfied with the decision made by Suffolk Constabulary under the Freedom of Information Act (2000), regarding access to information, you must notify Suffolk Constabulary that you are requesting a review within 20 days of the date of its response to your Freedom of Information request. Requests for a review should be made in writing and addressed to:

*Freedom of Information Decision Maker
Information Management Department
Suffolk Constabulary
Police Headquarters
Martlesham Heath
Ipswich
Suffolk
IP5 3QS
OR
Email: information@suffolk.pnn.police.uk*

In all possible circumstances Suffolk Constabulary will aim to respond to your request for us to look at our decision again within 20 working days of receipt of your request for an internal review.

The Information Commissioner.

After lodging a request for a review with Suffolk Constabulary, if you are still dissatisfied with the decision, you can apply to the Information Commissioner for a decision on whether the request for information has been dealt with in accordance with the requirements of the Act.

For information on how to make application to the Information Commissioner please visit their website at www.ico.org.uk or contact them at the address shown below:

The Information Commissioner's Office
Wycliffe House
Water Lane
Wilmslow
Cheshire
SK9 5AF
Telephone: 01625 545 700