

Chief Constable
Chief Constable Robert Carden
Police Headquarters
Carleton Hall Penrith,
Cumbria
CA10 2AU



18th March 2025

Dear

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST – FOI 238/25 Image Enhancement

I refer to your request for information received by Cumbria Constabulary on the 20th of February 2025. I note you seek access to the following information:

1. *Which department deals with image enhancement?*
2. *Which software is used when dealing with image enhancement or photographs?*
3. *If you do not use the software Amped, have you heard of it and why do you not use it?*
4. *How often does your force deal with AI generated images or images that have potentially been enhanced/changed?*
5. *What training is required in order to use the software mentioned in question 2, if any?*
6. *What challenges have you faced, if any, when dealing with image enhancement and how did you overcome these?*
7. *What challenges do you believe could occur due to image enhancement?*

Your request for information has now been considered and I can confirm Cumbria Constabulary does hold the information you request; however, I will be citing exemption Section 31 (1) to questions which relate to software used by the Constabulary.

Section 31 (1) (a)(b), Law Enforcement.

Please Note: Previously, we would disclose this information, however, there has since been a key change in the stance taken, which is outlined in the exemption below. In this case, we consider that disclosure of the information would be likely to make the police service more open to malicious attacks on our computer systems. The risk of cyber-attacks, with the threat more likely since the war in Ukraine, therefore, posing an increased risk more recently.

Section 31(1)(a) exempts information if its disclosure would or would be likely to prejudice the prevention and detection of crime.

As a qualified and prejudice-based exemption, I am required to evidence the harm and apply the public interest test.

Evidence of Harm



EMPLOYER RECOGNITION SCHEME

BRONZE AWARD

Proudly supporting those who serve.



Every effort should be made to release information under Freedom of Information. However, a FOIA response is a release to the world, as once the information is published, the public authority has no control over what use is made of that information.

The Police Service is charged with enforcing the law, preventing, and detecting crime and protecting the communities we serve. To achieve these objectives, all forces utilise Information Technology essential to front line services. Disclosure of the Constabulary's ICT infrastructure, including on-going plans for specific software applications and capabilities, or the lack thereof, would reveal intricacies of those systems, thereby highlighting vulnerabilities and compromising individual force information assurance.

Disclosure would also enable a geographical picture to be drawn up by those individuals who are intent on 'hacking' police systems; some of these individuals may include terrorists or terrorist organisations. In terms of duty of care, this would be detrimental to the public, as disclosure could assist a malicious actor by highlighting vulnerable forces and leaving those forces open to disruption of Information Technology systems; thus, compromising the effective delivery of operational law enforcement which in turn, is met by an increase of criminal offending.

Public Interest Test

Factors favouring disclosure – Disclosing the specific details of certain ICT infrastructure, would allow the public to be better informed on the health state and performance of each forces Information Technology platform. In addition, forces are required to demonstrate efficient services to local taxpayers and satisfy audit requirements. This would provide transparency regarding the use of public funds in so much as highlighting that funds are being used correctly and appropriately, to ensure all Data Centres have adequate software, which results in the smooth running of force Technology systems.

Factors favouring non-disclosure – Whilst there is public interest in providing reassurance that police forces are appropriately and effectively dealing with any threats, posed against police force Technology capabilities, there is a strong public interest in safeguarding the welfare and safety of the public. If ICT systems were successfully attacked, it could lead to the loss of confidentiality, integrity, and availability of police information. Any disclosure has the potential to undermine current and future technological integrity, which in turn compromises Law Enforcement, and could jeopardise the daily running of policing activity. The risk of affecting the function of the police service would be much greater. In addition, by revealing ICT software, this is intelligence to those who would wish to exploit vulnerabilities in the service. This may lead to the compromise of force IT systems which ultimately affects law enforcement capabilities and hinders the prevention and detection of crime or terrorism.

Balance Test

The security of the country is of paramount importance and the Police service will not divulge any information, if to do so would undermine law enforcement and therefore compromise the work of the police service. Whilst there is a public interest in the transparency of policing and force infrastructure, including the Police ICT infrastructure, there is a very strong public interest in safeguarding the integrity of these systems in place.

The points above highlight the merits for and against disclosure of the requested information. Disclosure would undoubtedly provide a greater openness and transparency to the community at large regarding the Information Technology resources available to the police, and whilst there is always a public interest in the transparency of how a police force delivers effective law enforcement, there is a very strong public interest in safeguarding the intricacies and tactical capabilities of the software used when dealing with information.



EMPLOYER RECOGNITION SCHEME

BRONZE AWARD

Proudly supporting those who serve.



I am aware of the immense importance for Public Authorities to demonstrate a level of openness and transparency, I am of the opinion that protecting the tactical capability of Cumbria Constabulary must take precedence in this case. With this in mind, it is my decision that the balance of the public interest lies in the non-disclosure of the exempted information.

I can provide information in relation to the following questions.

Question 1 – Imaging Units
Question 4 – No information held
Question 6 – No information held
Question 7 – No information held

Complaint Rights

If you believe your request has not been properly handled, or you are otherwise dissatisfied with the outcome of your request, you have the right to request an internal review.

In the first instance, please email freedomofinformation@cumbria.police.uk quoting the FOI reference number and explain why you are dissatisfied. Your complaint will be considered and a response will be provided to you after your complaint has been investigated.

If you remain dissatisfied following conclusion of the internal review, you have the right, under section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act, to complain directly to the Information Commissioner.

The address for the Information Commissioner can be found below:

The Information Commissioner
Wycliffe House
Water Lane
Wilmslow
Cheshire
SK9 5AF

Complaints to the Information Commissioner can also be made online:

[Make a complaint | ICO](#)

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your interest in Cumbria Constabulary.



EMPLOYER RECOGNITION SCHEME

BRONZE AWARD
Proudly supporting those who serve.

