

# WILTSHIRE POLICE



XXXXXX – by Email



**Police Headquarters**  
London Road  
DEVIZES  
Wiltshire  
SN10 2DN

Date: 24<sup>th</sup> Nov 2025

**Our ref: FOI 2025/1107**

Reply contact name: Nick Penny

Dear XXXXXX,

I write in connection with your request for information dated 21<sup>st</sup> November 2025 concerning the use of AI.

I am required by the Freedom of Information Act 2000 to handle all requests in a manner that is blind as to the identity and motives of the requestor. Any information released as a response to a request is regarded as being published and therefore in the public domain without caveat.

Your request for information has now been considered and I am able to respond as follows.

## **You wrote:**

I am investigating how AI-assisted evidence analysis is documented and reported within existing Chain of Custody (CoC) and Audit Trail (AT) structures.

For the sake of clarity, I have included a glossary at the end of this document. CoC is used here as an umbrella term encompassing related concepts such as continuity, chain of evidence, and provenance; while AT refers to any documentation system that captures and records the forensic processing of evidence.

## List of Questions

1. Does your police force deploy Artificial Intelligence (AI) systems in areas including investigation, intelligence, operations, case management, or evidence processing?

If yes, please provide:

Keeping Wiltshire Safe

- I. The names of the tools, underlying technology, software versions, and primary use cases.
- II. Whether each tool is internally developed or procured from third-party providers.
- III. The name of the providers and a copy of any related contract documents.
- IV. The current status of each tool (in trial/pilot stage, under evaluation, or fully deployed).
- V. Whether each AI tool is embedded in any forensic platform(s), or whether it operates as a separate, standalone system for specific tasks.

2. Does your police force use Natural Language Processing (NLP), including Large Language Models (LLMs), Automatic Speech Recognition (ASR), or other AI technologies for processing and analysing forensic audio and textual evidence, (covering tasks including transcription, speaker diarisation, translation, summarisation, redaction, document generation, or form-filling)?

If yes, please provide:

- I. The names of the tools, underlying technology, software versions, and primary use cases.
- II. Whether each tool is internally developed or procured from third-party providers.
- III. The name of the providers and a copy of any related contract documents.
- IV. The current status of each tool (in trial/pilot stage, under evaluation, or fully deployed).
- V. Whether each AI tool is embedded in any forensic platform(s), or whether it operates as a separate, standalone system for specific tasks.

3. Does your force have any specific policies, or protocols governing the use of AI tools in processing and analysing forensic audio and textual evidence, or other forms of evidence?

Please attach or reference any documents related to this.

4. Is the chain of custody (CoC) and/or audit trail (AT) recorded when digital evidence, broadly speaking, are processed and analysed?

If yes, please provide:

- I. Details of the information that is recorded (e.g., evidence identifiers, date/time of transfers, personnel identifiers, storage/access logs, integrity checks)
- II. Details of any technical or procedural methods used to record or track the CoC and/or AT. Kindly specify if the process is automated, manual, or hybrid.
- III. Please indicate whether any verification or validation procedures are in place to confirm that digital evidence, upon acquisition, is a genuine and unmodified record rather than a synthetically generated or manipulated.
- IV. Any guidelines, practice directions, or policies guiding the documentation of CoC and/or AT for digital evidence, including any templates or forms. Kindly attach or reference related documents.

**Keeping Wiltshire Safe**

V. Has your force conducted any internal evaluations or comparisons regarding the efficiency, accuracy or reliability of automated, manual, or hybrid reporting methods? If yes, please provide copies or references.

VI. Is the maintenance of a CoC and/or AT managed in-house or outsourced?

a. If in-house, provide details of the responsible role(s) or department(s), including any training materials or internal guidance relevant to this task.

b. If outsourced, please provide the name of the provider(s), a description of their role, and any related contract document(s).

5. Is the chain of custody (CoC) and/or audit trail (AT) recorded when AI systems are used in processing and analysing forensic audio and textual data, or other forms of evidence?

If yes, please provide:

I. Details of the information that is recorded, which may include but is not limited to: identifier of the evidence, details of the AI model (e.g., version, provider), verified error rates, and identification of human oversight (if applicable).

II. Please indicate whether any paradata is captured during the processing of digital evidence. By paradata, I refer to information generated as a by-product of human interaction with the AI systems during evidence processing (e.g. prompts, edit history, data discards, interaction logs, correction logs, reviewer annotations, parameter adjustments, iterations).

III. Details of any technical or procedural methods used to document CoC and/or AT of AI-assisted evidence analysis, including any templates or forms. Kindly specify if the process is automated, manual, or hybrid.

IV. Has your force conducted any internal evaluations or comparisons regarding the efficiency, accuracy, or reliability of automated, manual, or hybrid reporting methods? If yes, please provide copies or references.

V. Any guidelines or practice directions guiding the documentation of CoC and/or AT specific to AI-assisted evidence analysis. Kindly attach or reference related documents.

VI. Is the maintenance of a CoC and/or AT managed in-house or outsourced?

a. If in-house, provide details of the responsible role(s) or department(s), including any training materials or internal guidance relevant to this task.

b. If outsourced, please provide the name of the provider(s), a description of their role, and any related contract document(s).

6. Are human reviewers involved in reviewing, correcting, or contributing to the outputs generated by the AI systems in processing and analysing forensic audio and textual evidence?

If yes:

- I. What is the formal description of the role(s), and what specific responsibilities do individuals in these roles carry out?
- II. What training materials or internal guidance are provided to support these roles?
- III. How is human contribution tracked and distinguished?
- IV. Are records maintained for the different versions of outputs produced during the human-AI collaborative process?

7. How is evidential disclosure managed in criminal proceedings where AI systems are used in processing and analysing forensic audio, textual data, or other forms of evidence?

- I. Please specify the nature of materials disclosed to defence teams (e.g. final transcript only or detailed version history; original audio; AI model metadata etc?)
- II. Are the documentations of CoC and/or AT disclosed to the defence team? If yes, in what format is this made available?
- III. Is there a standard procedure or checklist governing this? If so, please provide a copy or reference it.

8. Has your force conducted any evaluations or assessments regarding the effectiveness of AI systems for evidence processing, including audio, textual, or other forms of evidence?

If yes, please provide copies of these documents or reports.

## Response:

The answer to your request is exempt under Section 21 of the FOIA (Information available to the applicant by other means).

The information you have requested is available via the following website/link:

[www.wiltshire.police.uk/SysSiteAssets/foi-media/wiltshire/2025/07-july-2025/foi-2025-597-ai-tools-and-technology.pdf](http://www.wiltshire.police.uk/SysSiteAssets/foi-media/wiltshire/2025/07-july-2025/foi-2025-597-ai-tools-and-technology.pdf)

Section 17 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 requires the Wiltshire Police, when refusing to provide such information (because the information is exempt) to provide you the applicant with a notice which: (a) states that fact, (b) specifies the exemption in question and (c) states (if that would not otherwise be apparent) why the exemption applies.

The exemption applicable to the information requested is:

Section 21 Information available to the applicant by other means

Keeping Wiltshire Safe

I am satisfied that all the relevant information has been passed to me and been considered in the light of your request within the time constraints applicable under the legislation.

Wiltshire Police would like to thank you for the interest that you have shown in the Force.

Yours sincerely

Nick Penny

**Force Disclosure Decision Maker**

Wiltshire Police offers a re-examination of your case under its review procedure.



**Force Disclosure Unit**

Wiltshire Police HQ, London Road, Devizes, Wiltshire SN10 2DN



Keeping Wiltshire Safe

## **Freedom of Information Request Appeals Procedure**

### **1. Who Can Ask for a Review**

Any person who has requested information from Wiltshire Police, which has been dealt with under the Freedom of Information Act, is entitled to complain and request an internal review, if they are dissatisfied with the response they received.

### **2. How to Request a Review**

Requests for review of a Freedom of Information request must be made in writing to the:

Force Disclosure Unit  
Wiltshire Police Headquarters,  
London Road, Devizes,  
Wiltshire,  
SN10 2DN

Email at [disclosure@wiltshire.police.uk](mailto:disclosure@wiltshire.police.uk).

The reference number, date of the request and details of why the review is being requested must be included. Requests for review should be brought to the attention of the Force Disclosure Unit within 20 working days of the Force's response to the original Fol request.

### **3. Review Procedure**

Receipt of a request for review will be acknowledged in writing to include confirmation of the reasons for the review. The review will be conducted by another Decision Maker, who is independent from the original Decision Maker. The Force Disclosure Unit will set a target date for a response. The response will be made as soon as is practicable with the intention to complete the review within twenty working days. In more complex cases the review may take up to 40 working days.

The Independent Decision Maker will conduct a review of the handling of the request for information and of decisions taken, including decisions taken about where the public interest lies in respect of exempt information where applicable. The review enables a re-evaluation of the case, taking into account the matters raised by the complaint.

### **4. Conclusion of the Appeal**

On completion of the review the Independent Decision Maker will reply to the complainant with the result of the review. If the complainant is still dissatisfied following the review they should contact the Information Commissioner to make an appeal. The Information Commissioner can be contacted via the following details:

Information Commissioner's Office  
Wycliffe House  
Water Lane  
Wilmslow  
Cheshire

Keeping Wiltshire Safe

SK9 5AF  
Tel: 01625 545 700  
Fax: 01625 524 510  
Email: [mail@ico.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:mail@ico.gsi.gov.uk)

**Please note that the ICO's offices will be closed for the foreseeable future and are therefore unable to receive correspondence via post.**

**If you should wish you contact them, please visit <https://ico.org.uk/global/contact-us/>**