

23 February 2026

FOI Ref 22469

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

Disclosure of non-personal information (metadata, logs, policies)

Please provide the following non-personal information:

1. A list of systems that hold incident-related records (e.g., BWV systems, CAD, RMS/NICHE, incident logs).
2. The types of metadata retained for BWV and incident records (timestamps, access logs, edit logs, deletion logs).
3. Retention schedules for:
 - BWV footage
 - metadata and audit logs
 - incident logs and system records
4. Policies governing:
 - BWV recording, retention, editing, deletion
 - retention holds and suspension of deletion
 - audit logging and access monitoring
5. Confirmation of whether audit logs for access, edits, and deletions are retained

This FOIA request does not seek personal data disclosure.

Clarification received on 09/02/2026:

Thank you for your email requesting clarification.

For the avoidance of doubt, I confirm that all three elements of Question 4 remain in scope.

- Point 1 (policies governing Body Worn Video recording, retention, editing, and deletion) remains fully requested as originally submitted.

In response to your clarification question regarding Points 2 and 3, I confirm that I require the relevant policies in general, insofar as they govern or apply to Body Worn Video and incident-related records.

Accordingly, for Points 2 and 3, this includes force-wide or system-wide policies governing:

- retention holds and the suspension of deletion; and
- audit logging and access monitoring

where those policies apply to, affect, or are relied upon for the management, access, editing, retention, or deletion of Body Worn Video or associated incident data.

This clarification is provided to assist processing of the request and does not narrow, remove, or exclude any part of Question 4, including Point 1.

Please proceed on this basis.

SP received your request on 30/01/2026 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.

Please provide the following non-personal information:

- 1. A list of systems that hold incident-related records (e.g., BWV systems, CAD, RMS/NICHE, incident logs). – **No information held.**
- 2. The types of metadata retained for BWV and incident records (timestamps, access logs, edit logs, deletion logs). – **Withheld, Section 21, please see below.**
- 3. Retention schedules for:
BWV footage
metadata and audit logs
incident logs and system records – **Withheld, Section 21, please see below. Further information is not held.**
- 4. Policies governing:
BWV recording, retention, editing, deletion
retention holds and suspension of deletion
audit logging and access monitoring – **Withheld, Section 31.**
- 5. Confirmation of whether audit logs for access, edits, and deletions are retained – **Disclosed, audit logs are kept permanently.**

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 21(1) - Information reasonably accessible by other means.

Section 21 is an absolute, class-based exemption and as such there is no requirement to quantify the harm that may arise from the disclosure, nor is there a requirement to perform a Public Interest Test.

- 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.

Harm:

The current body worn video policy contains detailed information on the various uses and tactics employed in its deployment. Disclosure of the requested information would therefore place information into the public domain that would undermine operational policing by exposing police tactics and jeopardising existing or future investigations. It would allow those with ill intent to speak with a level of authority on this subject to cause disruption to operational policing and prejudice the prevention and detection of crime. The information contained within the policy is vital for police officers to conduct duties and pursue investigations

and detect crime and also enables the criminal justice process to ensure that offenders are apprehended and prosecuted in order 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. 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.

Advice and assistance

In order to comply with our obligations under Section 16 of the Act, the obligation to provide advice and assistance, please find below links to the information requested.

- <https://www.axon.com/help/axon-evidence-legacy/software/axon-evidence-legacy/audit-trail/audit-trail.htm>
- <https://www.staffordshire.police.uk/hyg/fpnstaffordshire/privacy-notice/>
- <https://www.staffordshire.police.uk/SysSiteAssets/media/downloads/staffordshire/privacy/retention-schedule.pdf>

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.



STAFFORDSHIRE
POLICE

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
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