

11 August 2026

FOI Ref 23221

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

This is a request under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

Please provide the following data broken down by year, capturing the snapshot date of 1st January for each year from 2016 to 2026 inclusive (or the closest available operational date to that window):

1. Staffing & Caseload Tiers

A) The total Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) headcount of dedicated police officers and staff (e.g., MOSVO, SOMU, or VISOR teams) whose primary, dedicated role is the active community management and supervision of Registered Sex Offenders (RSOs).

B) The total number of Registered Sex Offenders (RSOs) actively managed by your force on that snapshot date.

2. Enforcement and Outcomes

For each full calendar year prior to the snapshot dates (i.e. 1st January to 31st December for each year from 2016 through 2025 inclusive), please provide:

A) The total number of recorded offences under HO Code 066/17 (Breach of Notification Requirements / failure to comply with notification requirements under Section 91 Sexual Offences Act 2003), and the number of those offences that resulted in a Charge / Summons outcome.

B) The total number of recorded offences under HO Code 068/08 (Breach of a Sexual Harm Prevention Order / SOPO), and the number of those offences that resulted in a Charge / Summons outcome.

Precedent Note on Section 31:

Please note that multiple territorial police forces have already fulfilled this exact request in full—including providing the aggregate FTE headcount for Question 1A—without citing statutory exemptions under Section 31 (Law Enforcement). As this request seeks a single, force-wide aggregate figure rather than local unit rotas or operational deployments, there is clear precedent that disclosing this high-level metric does not prejudice law enforcement or public safety.

Advice and Assistance (Section 16):

If providing the full 10-year historical dataset for any specific question exceeds the statutory cost limit under Section 12, please prioritize the data starting from the most recent year (2026) and work backwards as far as the cost limit allows, rather than issuing a blanket refusal.

Please provide the data in a machine-readable format, such as a CSV file or Excel spreadsheet.

SP received your request on 04/08/2026 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.

1. Staffing & Caseload Tiers

A) The total Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) headcount of dedicated police officers and staff (e.g., MOSVO, SOMU, or VISOR teams) whose primary, dedicated role is the active community management and supervision of Registered Sex Offenders (RSOs). – **Withheld, Section 31.**

B) The total number of Registered Sex Offenders (RSOs) actively managed by your force on that snapshot date. – **Disclosed, 1654.**

2. Enforcement and Outcomes

For each full calendar year prior to the snapshot dates (i.e. 1st January to 31st December for each year from 2016 through 2025 inclusive), please provide:

- A) The total number of recorded offences under HO Code 066/17 (Breach of Notification Requirements / failure to comply with notification requirements under Section 91 Sexual Offences Act 2003), and the number of those offences that resulted in a Charge / Summons outcome. – **Disclosed, please see the accompanying file entitled 'FOI 23221 Staffing Roles Data'.**
- B) The total number of recorded offences under HO Code 068/08 (Breach of a Sexual Harm Prevention Order / SOPO), and the number of those offences that resulted in a Charge / Summons outcome. – **Disclosed, please see the accompanying file entitled 'FOI 23221 Staffing Roles Data'.**

The following exemption has 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, it is required to evidence the harm in disclosure and apply the public interest test.

Harm:

To provide a headcount of dedicated police officers and staff for specific departments could undermine existing or future investigations, operations and police tactics. It would allow those with ill intent to cause disruption to operational policing and prejudice the prevention and detection of crime. Knowing the headcount of dedicated police officers and staff and associated information for specific areas would allow individuals to assess policing capability, capacity and resourcing levels in relation to the management and supervision of Registered Sex Offenders. This information could be used to identify perceived vulnerabilities and hinder police activity. It would also aid offenders in adapting their behaviour to avoid detection and reduce the effectiveness of police tactics deployed to protect the public.

Public Interest Test

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

To disclose this information would adhere to the basic principle of being open and transparent, it would also lead to a better public awareness of the workings of the police force and the communications used with operations and during routine policing.

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

Releasing such data would give those individuals with the intent to do so, the intelligence required to disrupt police activity. Disclosure would reveal information about the level of resources would enable offenders and others seeking to avoid police scrutiny to make informed assessments about policing capability. This knowledge would allow those with ill intent to target their offending more effectively, which would inevitably lead to an increased likelihood of criminal activity and an increased danger to the public. Any disclosure of information which is likely to undermine the ability to serve the public in preventing and detecting crime can only be considered as being harmful to the public.

Balance test

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.

Please be advised that all Freedom of Information request responses are published on the SP website although personal details are not included.

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:

IAT@staffordshire.police.uk

Or by Post to:

Information Access Team
Staffordshire Police HQ
PO Box 3167



STAFFORDSHIRE
POLICE

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 Force's 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 20 working days. In more complex cases the review may take up to 40 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, taking into account 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