

21 August 2026

FOI Ref 23204

Request - You asked Staffordshire Police (SP) the following:

I would be grateful if you could provide the following details regarding your police force's IT expenditure for the past three fiscal years (from 2023/24 to 2025/26):

1) Total IT Expenditure:

Please provide the overall IT expenditure for each of the last three fiscal years.

2) Software Expenditure:

Please provide the total spend on software for each of the last three fiscal years. This should include initial software licence fees, software maintenance fees, and subscription fees but should exclude associated services such as installation.

3) Cell-Site, Communications Data and Digital Forensics Software – Supplier and Spend Detail:

For each of the last three fiscal years, please provide the following for any software used for cell-site analysis, communications data analysis (e.g. call data records / CDRs), digital device extraction analysis, or associated intelligence / link analysis. This includes, for example, products supplied by Forensic Analytics Ltd, Chorus Intelligence Ltd, or equivalent providers:

- the name of the supplier and the product(s) held;
- the total spend or annual contract value (including licence, maintenance and subscription fees, but excluding associated services such as installation, training or consultancy);
- the number of software licences or named users held;

If supplier- or contract-level information is not held in this form, I would instead be grateful for the total software spend (as defined at point 2 above) on software of this type — i.e. software primarily used by cell-site / communications data units, digital forensics units, or intelligence / analysis teams, as opposed to software used across the wider police force — for each of the last three fiscal years.

SP received your request on 31/07/2026 and have processed this under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA).

SP's response to your enquiry is as follows:

SP holds the requested information.

- I would be grateful if you could provide the following details regarding your police force's IT expenditure for the past three fiscal years (from 2023/24 to 2025/26):
- 1) Total IT Expenditure:



Please provide the overall IT expenditure for each of the last three fiscal years. – **Disclosed**,

2023/24 – £13,145,869

2024/25 – £14,854,191

2025/26 – £15,159,796

- 2) Software Expenditure:

Please provide the total spend on software for each of the last three fiscal years. This should include initial software licence fees, software maintenance fees, and subscription fees but should exclude associated services such as installation. – **Disclosed**,

2023/24 – £6,013,913

2024/25 – £7,172,389

2025/26 – £7,975,586

- 3) Cell-Site, Communications Data and Digital Forensics Software – Supplier and Spend Detail:

For each of the last three fiscal years, please provide the following for any software used for cell-site analysis, communications data analysis (e.g. call data records / CDRs), digital device extraction analysis, or associated intelligence / link analysis. This includes, for example, products supplied by Forensic Analytics Ltd, Chorus Intelligence Ltd, or equivalent providers:

- the name of the supplier and the product(s) held; - **Withheld, please see sections 31 and 43 exemptions below.**

- the total spend or annual contract value (including licence, maintenance and subscription fees, but excluding associated services such as installation, training or consultancy); - **Disclosed**,

2023/24 – £336,065

2024/25 – £434,662

2025/26 – £431,371

- the number of software licences or named users held; - **Withheld, please see sections 31 and 43 exemptions below.**

If supplier- or contract-level information is not held in this form, I would instead be grateful for the total software spend (as defined at point 2 above) on software of this type — i.e. software primarily used by cell-site / communications data units, digital forensics units, or intelligence / analysis teams, as opposed to software used across the wider police force — for each of the last three fiscal years.

Please note that these figures have been provided to the best of the ability of SP, subject to the limitation of current recording protocols and systems and software.

Every effort is made to ensure that the figures presented are accurate and complete. However, it is important to note that data is extracted from multiple sources, therefore, the data presented is subject to the inaccuracies and idiosyncrasies inherent in any large-scale recording system. Consequently, care should be taken in the interpretation and presentation of this data, to not misrepresent the whole or any part of the data disclosed.

All Freedom of Information request responses are published on the SP website although personal details are not included.

The following exemptions have been applied:

In accordance with Section 17(1) of the Freedom of Information Act, this letter represents a refusal notice for parts of this particular request.

- **Section 31 (1)(a)(b) Law Enforcement**

Information is exempt from disclosure under S31(1)(a)(b) where the release of Information would, or would be likely to, prejudice the prevention and detection of crime and/ or the apprehension or prosecution of offenders. This exemption is qualified and prejudice-based and, as such, we are required to evidence the harm in disclosure and apply the public interest test.

- **Section 43(2) Commercial Interests**

This is a prejudice based qualified exemption which means there is a requirement to provide evidence of harm and a public interest test needs to be considered.

Harm:

Specific details of any digital forensic software or providers used by SP would be extremely useful to those involved in criminality as it would enable them to create a map of those most used by police forces. Providing information that disclosed digital forensics software and/or providers used would mean that force by force, a malign individual could identify the software and/or providers most critical to law enforcement and specifically target those providing the most assistance. This would have a huge impact on the effective delivery of operational law enforcement as it would leave companies open to cyberattacks which could have devastating consequences.

The information relating to Cell-Site, Communications Data and Digital Forensics Software and their contracts, if released into the public domain, would harm SP's negotiating position with regards to future contracts for equipment or services. There are commercially confidential clauses within these contracts which are not permitted to be shared to the wider public.

Public Interest Test

Factors favouring disclosure under Section 31(1)(a)(b)

Confirming details and descriptions of the software used would be of interest to the public, namely give insight into the forensic processes used to solve crimes.

Factors favouring non-disclosure under Section 31(1)(a)(b)

Measures are put in place to protect the community served by SP and as evidenced within the harm, to provide information that revealed digital forensic software or providers would allow individuals intent on disrupting law enforcement to target specific companies using the information obtained to maximise the impact. Taking into account the current security climate and the increasing risk of cyber-attack within the United Kingdom, no information which may aid criminality should be disclosed. It is clear that it would have an impact on a Force's ability to carry out the core duty of enforcing the law and serving the community. The public trust the Police Service to make appropriate decisions with regard to their safety and protection and the only way of reducing risk is to be cautious with what is placed into the public domain.

Factors favouring disclosure under Section 43(2)

Disclosure of the requested information would allow the public to be aware of how public funds are spent or allocated and thereby would provide transparency and accountability, showing that funds from the public purse are used appropriately and proportionally.

Factors favouring non-disclosure under Section 43(2)

Through disclosure of the requested information, SP would find that its negotiating position would be greatly impaired through the release of details that would not only likely be prejudicial to SP but also to the agencies/companies involved. Releasing this information would be expected to have a detrimental effect on their ability to be competitive in the future and would be exceedingly likely to deter further enterprises submitting offers for tender in the future. This then would impede SP obtaining the most competitive or appropriate services in the future and negatively impact upon the public purse.

Balance test

It is the responsibility of SP, when dealing with commercial businesses, to not only protect their commercial interest but also that of SP. Commercial interests must be protected so that the best possible value for money is obtained through open competition, both for businesses and SP. This would not be achieved if full details were to be made available to the market.

Although the use of public funds must be open and transparent, SP is accountable for the money that it spends and utilises and if to release the information means the force is unable to negotiate future tendering and have the ability to secure value for money due to business relationships having been impaired, then this would not be in the public interest.

Having considered the public interest test factors, we are required to determine whether, on balance, the factors favouring disclosure outweigh those which are against disclosure. It is our view that the factors favouring disclosure do not outweigh those which favour withholding the details. Therefore, SP declines to provide the information for the reasons stated above.

When considering whether disclosure is appropriate, we must weigh the strongest reason for disclosure against the strongest reasons for non-disclosure. In this case, whilst the factors favouring disclosure are important in that it would adhere to the basic principle of being open and transparent, we believe when weighed against the risk of disclosure undermining our ability to prevent and detect crime and hindering our ability to protect the public, then non-disclosure takes precedence.

Freedom of Information Request Appeals Procedure

1. Who Can Ask for a Review

Any person who has requested information from SP, 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 within two months of the date of receipt of this email, and should be addressed to:



STAFFORDSHIRE
POLICE

IAT@staffordshire.police.uk

Or by Post to:

Information Access Team
Staffordshire Police HQ
PO Box 3167
Stafford
ST16 9JZ

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 Information Access Team within two months of the SP response to the original FOI request.

3. Review Procedure

Receipt of a request for review will be acknowledged in writing. The review will be conducted by a supervisor who is independent from the original Decision Maker. The Information Access Team 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 forty working days.

The independent supervisor 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, considering the matters raised by the complaint.

4. Conclusion of the Appeal

On completion of the review the independent supervisor will reply to the appellant with the result of the review. If the appellant 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 link: <https://ico.org.uk/make-a-complaint/foi-and-eir-complaints/foi-and-eir-complaints/>

Freedom of Information
Information Access Team