

WILTSHIRE POLICE



XXXXXXX
By email

**Force Disclosure Unit
Police Headquarters**
London Road
DEVIZES
Wiltshire
SN10 2DN

Date 29th April 2026

Our Ref FOI 2026-082

Dear XXXXX,

I write in connection with your request for information dated 19th January 2026, concerning use of AI in preparation of intelligence reports to inform operational decisions. Please accept my apologies for the delay in responding to your request.

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.

Following receipt of your request, research was conducted by the Robotics Team at Wiltshire Police.

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

You wrote:

Under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, 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)?

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?

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

Our response:

In relation to any uses linked to counter terrorism, serious and organised crime (SoC), covert intelligence activity or specialist digital forensics supporting these functions, Wiltshire Police can neither confirm nor deny whether any information is held by virtue of sections 24(2) - National Security and 31(3) - Law Enforcement of the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

Keeping Wiltshire Safe

Sections 24 and 31 are both prejudice-based, qualified exemptions and therefore require Wiltshire Police to establish the harm in disclosure, and the public interest for and against disclosure.

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

There is Force wide access to Copilot chat and 50 out of 100 staff have access to M365 Copilot Premium licenses.

2. 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?

Only as an assistant (e.g. emails etc) - no agents or other form of AI are being used for investigative purposes and there have been no incidents in relation to hallucination.

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

Yes, the AI user acceptance policy that all staff have read and agreed to. The Robotic Delivery Team will manage and monitor all processes that are built with AI and will regression test to test the accuracy of the information processed. We have a robust governance structure and benefits program. In its current form, the policy has been available for around 2-3 weeks. It will continue to be updated.

Evidence of Harm

Having disclosed high-level information about routine, non-sensitive uses of Artificial Intelligence (AI), Wiltshire 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 Wiltshire 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 favouring confirming or denying that any other information is held

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.

Keeping Wiltshire Safe

Factors against confirming or denying that any other information is held

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.

Section 31(3) (Law Enforcement)

Factors favouring confirming or denying that any other information is held

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 that any other information is held

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, Wiltshire 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.

A separate response has already provided high-level information about routine, non-sensitive AI use. To go further would risk disclosing sensitive capability by inference.

Section 17 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 requires the Constabulary, when refusing to provide 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.

In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act 2000 this letter acts as a Refusal Notice for those aspects of your request.

Exemptions applied:

Section 24(2) - National Security

Section 31(3) - Law Enforcement

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,

FDU Decision Maker