HEDDLU GOGLEDD CYMRU
NORTH WALES POLICE

Response Date:20/10/2026

2026/1056 - Immigration Status Fields and Automated Arrest Reporting

In response to your recent request for information regarding;

I request the following information concerning structured immigration-status information held within your custody, arrest or records-management systems.
For clarity, I am not requesting a manual review of individual records, free-text fields, case files, intelligence records, documents or attachments.
I am seeking only information that can be obtained from existing structured fields and existing automated reporting/database functionality.

1. Systems
Please identify the principal system currently used to record arrests/custody records, for example Niche RMS, Athena/Connect or another system.
Please also identify, where readily available, the reporting or Business Intelligence tool used to produce statistical reports from that system, for example Power BI, BOXI or equivalent.

Niche RMS – Crime/occurrence recording System

2. Immigration-status fields
Please confirm whether arrest or custody records contain any structured field recording immigration status or an equivalent category.
This might, for example, be called:
"Immigration Status"
"Custody Person Immigration Status"
"Cust Per Immigration Status"
or another equivalent field.

Please provide the name of the field used by your force.

3. Available values
Please provide the selectable values, codes or categories available within that structured field and their definitions.
For example, another UK police force has disclosed categories including:
ASY – Asylum seeker
EXP – Expired status
ILE – Illegal entry
ILL – Illegal immigrant
ILR – Indefinite leave to remain
ILT – Indefinite leave to enter
IMG – Legal immigrant
RCL – Refugee claimant
REF – Refugee
SVA – Student visa
VIS – Legal visitor
WVA – Working visa
I am not assuming your force uses these categories. Please provide the values actually used by your system.

4. Annual arrest-record totals
For each calendar year from 1 January 2018 to the latest date available, please provide the number of arrest/custody records falling within each value of the structured immigration-status field.
Please also provide:
- **number recorded as blank / not recorded / unknown;**
- **total number of arrest records for each year.**

I am requesting arrest records rather than unique individuals, unless your existing reporting system only produces figures by individual, in which case please state this.
Please supply the information in spreadsheet or CSV format where possible.

5. Automated reporting
Please confirm whether the figures requested in Question 4 can be obtained through an existing automated query, reporting tool, Business Intelligence system or database report without manually examining individual records.
If yes, please identify the reporting system where readily available.
6. Where information is unavailable
If your force does not have a structured immigration-status field capable of producing these figures, please simply confirm:
"No structured field/report capable of producing the requested figures is held."
There is no requirement to search free-text records to answer this request.

If the field or reporting capability was introduced during the requested period, please provide figures from the earliest date for which they are electronically retrievable and state that date.

Harm has been identified in providing you with the Mandatory and Optional Data Fields, we will conduct a public interest test to decide on disclosure;

The exemptions and data being considered in the public interest test are listed below:

Section 43 (2) Commercial Interests
Section 31 (1) Law Enforcement

Sections 43 and 31 are both qualified, with 43 being a class-based exemption and 31 prejudice based which means that the public authority must demonstrate that it is satisfied that to release the information would damage someone's commercial interests or our own law enforcement. The public authority must consider the balance of the public interest in releasing the information against the public interest in withholding it.

To provide details of the data fields within Niche RMS would be prejudicial to the commercial interests for the company. In turn, if the architecture of NicheRMS is revealed this has significant potential for the law enforcement position to be undermined.

Harm Test

Section 43
Whether a field is Mandatory or Optional is a factual response. However, the question requests disclosure of the data fields, mandatory or discretionary and specifically seeks an understanding of the data fields in the system. Provision of such information would provide a clear indication of the NicheRMS schema which is a fundamental element of Niche Technology proprietary information.

Section 31
With information about the architecture, it becomes easier for any hacker to gain access to the system. Which would be detrimental to our day-to-day operations.

Public Interest Test

Factors Favouring Disclosure section 43 and section 31

There is a strong public interest in public authorities being open and transparent and disclosing data relating to the systems we use and the fields within assists with this.

Factors Favouring Non - Disclosure section 43

Any response to this question would provide visibility (partial or whole) of NicheRMS schema into the public domain. Clearly, whether a field is Mandatory or Optional is a factual response. However, the question requests disclosure of the data fields, mandatory or discretionary and specifically seeks an understanding of the data fields in the system. Provision of such information would provide a clear indication of the NicheRMS schema which is a fundamental element of Niche Technology proprietary information. The NicheRMS schema is never shared with Third Parties. Disclosure of a list of mandatory or optional fields would be seriously prejudicial to their commercial interests
Niche Technology UK works in a limited market of suppliers. Details of the product, even at a high level provides information into the marketplace which could be used by competitors. Such information is not publicly disseminated or available to competitors, and Niche goes to great effort to prevent such disclosure whether in demonstrations or in public documentation. Direct and impactful competitive harm flows to Niche when its proprietary and confidential information is compromised through public disclosure to competitors. Niche seeks to retain the competitive advantages that this proprietary and confidential information affords it.

Factors Favouring Non - Disclosure section 31

There is a significant potential for the law enforcement position to be undermined if the architecture of NicheRMS is revealed. With information about the architecture, it becomes easier for any hacker to gain access to the system, which would have a significant impact on our day-to-day activities and operations.

Balancing Test

There are factors which in general terms favour release of this information, however, the factors favouring non-disclosure are more specifically relevant.

Releasing information which can be used by competitors and have a detrimental effect on a company would not be in the spirit of the Act. We cannot disclose information which would put companies at risk or create security issues or them or us.

My decision, therefore, is not to release this information.

Therefore, in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act 2000, this letter acts as a Refusal Notice under section 17 (1) of the legislation.

THIS INFORMATION HAS BEEN PROVIDED IN RESPONSE TO A REQUEST
UNDER THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 2000, AND IS CORRECT AS AT 19/10/2026