



FOI Reference: 446/2013

Request:

I am writing to submit a request for information in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act. I would like to know the following:

1. Has your force used (in a trial or otherwise) or considered using unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs)?
2. If your force has not considered using UAVs, could you state why not?
3. If your force has used or plans to use UAVs in a trial or other capacity, could you please provide:
 - a. The dates, times and locations of the trials.
 - b. The purposes for which they were/are to be carried out.
 - c. The manufacturer and model of the UAV used/to be used.
4. Has any sort of plan or timetable been produced by the force in order to make preparations for the introduction of UAVs?
 - a. If so, please provide a copy of the plan/timetable.
5. Have any force representatives held discussions with representatives of UAV manufacturers or manufacturers' industry bodies on the issue of the introduction of UAVs? If so, please can you provide:
 - a. Dates, times and agendas of the meetings; b. Minutes of the meetings.
6. Have any force representatives held discussions with representatives of other police forces in relation to the use of UAVs?
If so, please can you provide:
 - a. Dates, times and agendas of the meetings; b. Minutes of the meetings.
7. Has your force received from central or local government or the Association of Chief Police Officers any instructions, advice, recommendations, guidance or information relating to police use of UAVs?
 - a. If so, please provide a copy of the documents provided.
8. Has your force designated a single point of contact (SPOC) for unmanned aerial systems?

Clarification:

I am writing to issue a clarification to my recent FOI request - I would like it to cover the period 1 July 2009 to 30 June 2013.

Response 1:

I can confirm that Dyfed Powys Police does hold the information requested and is as follows:

During 2009 – 2010 Dyfed Powys Police carried out a scoping exercise to establish the benefits of acquiring a UAV to support operational policing. No trial took place.

Response 2:

N/A

Response 3a-c:

I can confirm that Dyfed Powys Police does hold some of the information requested and is as follows:

A UAV was borrowed/loaned from a company and deployed in the early stages of Operation Tempest (search for April Jones) in October 2012.

- a) 3rd – 5th October 2012
- b) To conduct aerial photography of a search area
- c) The make and manufacturer of the UAV is not known

Response 4-a:

I can confirm that there is no information held by Dyfed Powys Police as there is no plan or timetable produced by the force in order to make preparations for the introduction of UAV's.

Response 5a-b:

I can confirm that Dyfed Powys Police does hold some of the information requested and is as follows:

An informal visit to 'Air Robot' based at the National Defence College in Salisbury on 26th October 2009. No agenda/minutes were recorded.

Response 6a-b:

I can confirm that there is no information held by Dyfed Powys Police as no force representatives have held discussions with representatives of other police forces in relation to the use of UAV's.

Response 7-a:

I can confirm that there is no information held by Dyfed Powys Police, no instructions, advice, recommendations, guidance or information relating to police use of UAV's has been received from central or local government or the Association of Chief Police Officers.

Response 8:

I can confirm that there is no information held by Dyfed Powys Police as there is no single point of contact (SPOC) for unmanned aerial systems.

Additionally, Dyfed Powys Police can neither confirm nor deny that they hold any other information relevant to the whole of your request by virtue of the following exemption:

Section 23(5) Information supplied by, or concerning, certain security bodies

The duty to confirm or deny does not arise if, or to the extent that, compliance with Section 1(1)(a) would involve the disclosure of any information (whether or not already recorded) which was directly or indirectly supplied to the public authority by, or relates to, any of the bodies specified in the subsection (3).

Section 23 is an absolute class-based exemption and therefore there is no requirement to conduct a harm or public interest test.