

Reference: 2327808

Contact: Information Governance Team
foi.officer@greatermanchester-ca.gov.uk

Date: 3 June 2021

Mr Matt O'Donoghue

William Monaghan
Information Governance Officer
Greater Manchester Combined Authority
Churchgate House
56 Oxford St
Manchester
M1 6EU
foi.officer@greatermanchester-ca.gov.uk
www.greatermanchester-ca.gov.uk

Dear Mr O'Donoghue

Freedom of Information Act 2000

Your request for information was received by us on 27 April 2021, regarding

In January 2021 PWC was commissioned by GMCA to carry out a review of Greater Manchester Police.

- (1) Please disclose the final report*
- (2) Please disclose all previous drafts*
- (3) Please disclose all emails and communications, between Greater Manchester Police and the GMCA in relation to the content and publication of this report?*
- (4) Please disclose the data, including minutes and notes, of all meetings between GMP and GMCA in relation to the contents of this report*

GMCA Response

I can confirm that Greater Manchester Combined Authority holds this information. However, we are withholding that information since we consider that the following exemptions apply to it.

The information is exempt from disclosure under Section 36(2)(b)(i) and Section 36(2)(c) of the Freedom of Information Act (FoIA). Disclosure of the information would be likely to prejudice the ability to give free and frank advice and, would be likely prejudice the ability of the authority in the conduct of public affairs.

To apply this exemption we are required to seek the reasonable opinion of the Qualified Person; at the GMCA this is the Monitoring Officer. The opinion of the Qualified Person is set out below:

<u>BOLTON</u>	<u>MANCHESTER</u>	<u>ROCHDALE</u>	<u>STOCKPORT</u>	<u>TRAFFORD</u>
<u>BURY</u>	<u>OLDHAM</u>	<u>SALFORD</u>	<u>TAMESIDE</u>	<u>WIGAN</u>

Regarding the use of Section 36(2)(b)(i): *The PCC has recently appointed a new Chief Constable who has taken up his post this week. It is reasonable for him to be able to have full and frank advice and exchange of views with the PCC, Deputy PCC and officers on the content of the report. Publication would inhibit that process.*

Regarding the use of Section 36(2)(c): *Publication is also likely to prejudice the effective conduct of public affairs in that the Chief Constable and PCC would be required to deal with the publicity and media attention caused by publication rather than the substantive issues that are the subject of the report.*

I have considered whether it would nevertheless be in the public interest to publish the report. I have considered factors both for and against the disclosure of the information and have decided that it would not be in the public interest to publish the report at this time and I have set this test out down below. Whilst I think that it would promote accountability and transparency, in my opinion this is outweighed at present by the need for the Chief Constable to be able to have candid discussions on the content of the report and for the PCC to hold the Chief Constable to account; the Chief Constable has also made a commitment to place in the public domain the details from the deliverables as his comprehensive package of reform is implemented.

Factors in favour of disclosure

- It will promote openness and honesty
- It will promote accountability and transparency in public spending
- It will promote accountability and transparency in decision-making by the Authority
- It will assist the public to understand why a decision was made
- It will bring to light information affecting public safety
- It will further the understanding of and participation in the debate of current issues
- The information will be published in the future, but not for a relatively long period of time or at no set date

Factors in favour of withholding

- Release will inhibit the effective delivery of services and/or undermine the Authority's ability to fulfil its role
- Release will result in unfairness to others
- Release may jeopardise the Authority's bargaining position and/or result in the less effective use of public money
- Information was volunteered by third parties and release may jeopardise future participation
- The information will be published in the future, but not for a relatively long period of time or at no set date

<u>BOLTON</u>	<u>MANCHESTER</u>	<u>ROCHDALE</u>	<u>STOCKPORT</u>	<u>TRAFFORD</u>
<u>BURY</u>	<u>OLDHAM</u>	<u>SALFORD</u>	<u>TAMESIDE</u>	<u>WIGAN</u>

- Release may hinder the full and frank sharing of information and/or the receipt of detailed advice.

This response therefore acts as a refusal notice under section 17 of the FoIA.

If you have any queries or concerns then please do not hesitate to contact us, quoting your reference number: 2327808

If you are not satisfied with this response you may ask for an internal review. Internal review requests should be submitted within two months of the date of receipt of the response to your original letter and should be addressed to:

foi.officer@greatermanchester-ca.gov.uk

If you are not content with the outcome of the internal review, you have the right to apply directly to the Information Commissioner for a decision. The Information Commissioner can be contacted at:

*Information Commissioner's Office
Wycliffe House
Water Lane
Wilmslow
Cheshire
SK9 5AF*

If you need further clarification with regards to Freedom of Information you can go to the Information Commissioners website www.ICO.org.uk

Yours sincerely,

William Monaghan

Information Governance Officer

<u>BOLTON</u>	<u>MANCHESTER</u>	<u>ROCHDALE</u>	<u>STOCKPORT</u>	<u>TRAFFORD</u>
<u>BURY</u>	<u>OLDHAM</u>	<u>SALFORD</u>	<u>TAMESIDE</u>	<u>WIGAN</u>