



## Freedom of Information Request Reference N<sup>o</sup>: FOI 003340-18

I write in connection with your request for information received by Suffolk Constabulary and Norfolk Constabularies on 14<sup>th</sup> September, 2018 which you sought access to the following information:

1. *"The annual number of intelligence staff employed by the force for each of the last six years broken down by the number of warranted officers, intelligence researchers, intelligence analysts and intelligence investigators. Please send me the data requested in the form of an Excel spreadsheet or as a csv file using the template provided.*
2. *The annual number of dedicated drug squad officers or officers employed specifically to tackle drug crime and offences by the force for each of the last six years. Please send me the data requested in the form of an Excel spreadsheet or as a csv file using the template provided"*

### Response to your Request

The response provided below is correct as of 25 September 2018

Suffolk and Norfolk Constabularies have considered your request for information and the response is below.

The annual number of intelligence staff employed by the Constabularies is provided in the attached spreadsheet.

With respect to the number of dedicated drug squad officers, this has been provided within the attached for Suffolk Constabulary, however Norfolk Constabulary has not had a separate 'squad'. Drug crime historically has formed part of the work of a variety of units, including the serious and organised crime unit.

In addition to the attached, Norfolk and Suffolk Constabularies can neither confirm nor deny it holds any further information in relation to the request as the duty in s1(1)(a) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 does not apply, by virtue of the following exemptions:

- Section 30(3)** – Investigations and proceedings conducted by public authorities
- Section 31(3)** – Law enforcement

***This should not be taken as conclusive evidence that any additional information does or does not exist.***

Section 30 is a class based qualified exemption and consideration must be given as to whether there is a public interest in neither confirming nor denying any further information exists.

Section 31 is a prejudice based qualified exemption and there is a requirement to articulate the harm that would be caused in confirming whether or not any further information is held, as well as carrying out a public interest test.

**The overall harm for the NCND is as follows:**

By confirming or denying that the Constabularies hold any information regarding covert capabilities of the Constabularies would identify whether or not such tactics are in use and thus prejudicing law enforcement. Confirmation or denial of any other information would limit operational capabilities as criminals/terrorists would gain a greater understanding of the Constabularies methods and techniques, enabling them to take steps to counter them. Any compromise or reduction in technical capability by forces would substantially prejudice the ability of forces to police their areas which would lead to a greater risk to the public.

Information that undermines the operational integrity of policing activities will adversely affect public safety and have a negative impact on law enforcement.

**Section 30**

**Factors favouring confirming or denying whether any other information is held**

The public is entitled to know how public funds are allocated and on what it is spent.

**Factors against confirming or denying whether any other information is held**

By confirming or denying information regarding the Constabularies covert capacity would impede future investigative strategies, hindering the prevention and detection of crime.

Confirming whether any additional is or is not held would also identify the Constabularies capabilities with regards to investigating covert policing operations.

**Section 31**

**Factors favouring confirming or denying whether any other information is held**

Better awareness may reduce crime or lead to more information from the public, allowing steps to be taken to protect themselves.

**Factors against confirming or denying whether any other information is held**

By confirming or denying whether any additional information is held would compromise law enforcement tactics by identifying efficiencies in a particular area of policing. This would have a

detrimental impact on the operation of an effective policing service and its ability to care for members of the public.

Certain aspects of policing must remain protected to ensure that the most effective response to operational demand is maintained.

### **Balance test**

The security of the country is of paramount importance and the police service will not divulge whether information is or is not held if to do so could compromise law enforcement and operational effectiveness. Whilst there is a public interest in the transparency of policing capabilities, there is a very strong public interest in safeguarding the integrity of police investigations and operations of a covert nature.

Forces are already held to account by statute, for example the Police and Criminal Evidence Act and independent bodies such as Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and the Independent Police Complaints Commission. Our accountability is therefore not enhanced by confirming or denying whether any further information is held.

Therefore it is our opinion that for these issues the balancing test for confirming or denying whether any further information is held is not made out.

***None of the above can be viewed as an inference that any further information does or does not exist.***

Should you have any further queries concerning this request, please contact Clair Pack, FOI Decision Maker, quoting the reference number shown above.

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/>

Norfolk and Suffolk Constabularies are 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 the Norfolk and Suffolk Constabulary to review their decision.

Ask Norfolk and Suffolk Constabularies to look at the decision again.

If you are dissatisfied with the decision made by Norfolk and Suffolk Constabularies under the Freedom of Information Act (2000), regarding access to information, you must notify the Norfolk and 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](mailto:information@suffolk.pnn.police.uk)*

In all possible circumstances Norfolk and 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 Norfolk and 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](http://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