

FEAR OF RACISM AND DEATH

FORMAL CLARIFICATION AND CONSOLIDATED REQUEST FOR RECORDED INFORMATION

Freedom of Information Reference: 01/FOI/26/055460/F

Concerning the City of London Police deployment to 23 Jersey House, Enfield, on 31 October 2025

To:

Data Rights
Metropolitan Police Service
PO Box 313
Sidcup
DA15 0HH

Email: DataRights@met.police.uk

From:

Derrick Lynch
also known as John Canoe
Reparation Nation Limited / IC3CSI
23 Jersey House
2 Eastfield Road
Enfield
EN3 5UY

Email: thereparationnation@gmail.com

Date: 1 October 2026

SUBJECT

FORMAL CLARIFICATION OF CITY OF LONDON POLICE DEPLOYMENT — RESPONSE TO MPS REQUEST FOR FURTHER PARTICULARS — FOI REFERENCE 01/FOI/26/055460/F

Principal operational reference:
Metropolitan Police CAD 2248 — 31/10/2025

Earlier relevant FOI reference:

01/FOI/25/048820/V

Relevant internal review reference:

01/FOI/26/051190/I

PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT

This document is submitted in direct response to the Metropolitan Police Service letter dated 1 October 2026 concerning FOI Reference 01/FOI/26/055460/F.

In that correspondence, the MPS asked me to:

“Please confirm precisely what City of London Police deployment you are interested in?”

The purpose of this document is to answer that question comprehensively and to remove any remaining ambiguity about the deployment to which my substantive questions relate.

The deployment is:

The attendance of four City of London Police officers at 23 Jersey House, 2 Eastfield Road, Enfield EN3 5UY, on 31 October 2025, between approximately 11:15 and 11:50, with the central period approximately 11:20–11:40, in circumstances in which a voluntary interview was referenced, and recorded or cross-referenced by the Metropolitan Police Service under CAD 2248 (31/10/2025).

The Metropolitan Police Service itself subsequently confirmed in writing:

“City of London Police did attend your property, CAD 2248 31/10/25 refers.” Gmail Download - URGENT_ Suspec...

That confirmation provides the principal MPS identifier for the event.

STATUS OF THIS DOCUMENT

This document is a clarification document.

It is not intended to create a new and separate FOI request.

It is intended to supplement and clarify the existing request under:

01/FOI/26/055460/F

and should be read together with:

- the original request;
- Questions 1–82;
- the earlier FOI material under 01/FOI/25/048820/V;
- the internal-review material;
- the Benbow disclosure;
- the Voluntary Attendance Guidance;
- the preservation correspondence;
- and the associated Subject Access and complaint records.

Nothing in this document should be interpreted as withdrawing, narrowing, replacing or abandoning any substantive question already submitted.

CORE IDENTIFIERS

For ease of reference, the deployment is identified by the following particulars:

Identifier	Detail
Date	31 October 2025
Time window	approximately 11:15–11:50
Core attendance	approximately 11:20–11:40
Location	23 Jersey House, 2 Eastfield Road, Enfield EN3 5UY
Attending force	City of London Police
Number of officers observed	Four
MPS operational reference	CAD 2248 (31/10/2025)
Operational context referenced	Voluntary interview
Earlier FOI	01/FOI/25/048820/V
Internal review	01/FOI/26/051190/I
Current FOI	01/FOI/26/055460/F

My Subject Access Request to the MPS separately identified the same attendance by date, address, time window and CAD reference, and requested the full CAD log, radio material, linked incident records, BWV, officer notes, risk assessments, cross-force communications and records concerning the referenced voluntary interview. Gmail - UK GDPR Subject Access ...

My corresponding request to City of London Police likewise identified the same attendance and cross-referenced Met CAD 2248. Gmail Download - UK GDPR Subjec...

DOCUMENT OBJECTIVES

This document has five principal objectives:

- 1. To identify the deployment beyond reasonable ambiguity.**
- 2. To connect that deployment to the earlier FOI and subsequent documentary history.**
- 3. To distinguish requests for recorded information from requests for opinion, complaint handling or other non-FOI functions.**
- 4. To identify the principal record categories, systems and references that should enable the MPS to locate the relevant information.**
- 5. To request that the MPS now proceed from clarification to substantive consideration of Questions 1–82.**

IMPORTANT INTERPRETIVE NOTE

Throughout this document, where a question is expressed in terms such as:

- “why”;**
- “who authorised”;**
- “what safeguards applied”;**
- “was the MPS informed”;**
- “was the deployment a Benbow operation”;**
- “what risk assessment was undertaken”;**

the request should be understood as seeking the recorded information evidencing those matters.

For example:

“Why were four officers deployed?”

means:

“What recorded information exists showing the operational rationale for deploying four officers?”

Likewise:

“Was the deployment a Benbow operation?”

means:

“What recorded information establishes whether the deployment was or was not designated or conducted as a Benbow operation?”

This document does not require the MPS to manufacture explanations where no record exists.

Where no recorded information is held, I ask the MPS to state that clearly.

DOCUMENT STRUCTURE

This clarification is organised into the following sections:

Section 1 — Precise Identification of the City of London Police Deployment

Section 2 — Connection Between the 31 October 2025 Deployment and the Earlier FOI Request

Section 3 — Why the Benbow Disclosure Requires Deployment-Specific Clarification

Section 4 — Recorded Operational Purpose, Tasking, Briefing, Risk Assessment and Supervisory Authorisation

Section 5 — Voluntary Interview Status, Private Residential Attendance and Applicable Safeguards

Section 6 — Cross-Force Jurisdiction, MPS Notification, Coordination and Command Responsibility

Section 7 — Equality, Anti-Black Racism Safeguards, Disproportionality and Auditable Decision-Making

Section 8 — Preservation of Records, Evidential Continuity and Identification of the Complete Operational Paper Trail

Section 9 — Distinction Between Recorded Information, Opinion, Complaint Handling and Other MPS Functions

Section 10 — Responsibility, Referral, Ownership of Outstanding Matters and Avoidance of Administrative Dead Ends

Section 11 — Distinguishing the 31 October 2025 Residential Deployment from Later Events and Other References

Section 12 — Specific Search Terms, Record Locations and Linked References to Be Used by the MPS

Section 13 — Required Form of the MPS Response to Questions 1–82

Section 14 — Formal Effect of This Clarification and Preservation of the Original Scope

Section 15 — Request for Confirmation That the Clarification Requirement Has Now Been Satisfied

Section 16 — Consolidated Position and Final Request for Action

Section 17 — Proposed Index of Supporting References and Documentary Chain

Section 18 — Requested Next Steps, Response Handling and Document Control

Section 19 — Request for a Definitive MPS Position on the 31 October 2025 Deployment

Section 20 — Conclusion, Formal Request to Proceed and Closing Position

FORMAL REQUEST AT THE OUTSET

Having now identified the deployment by:

- **exact date;**
- **narrow time window;**
- **full residential address;**
- **attending police force;**
- **number of officers;**
- **operational context;**
- **and the Metropolitan Police Service's own CAD reference,**

I ask the MPS to treat the clarification requirement as satisfied and to proceed with substantive consideration of FOI Reference:

01/FOI/26/055460/F

on the basis set out in the sections that follow.

SECTION 1 — PRECISE IDENTIFICATION OF THE CITY OF LONDON POLICE DEPLOYMENT

This section is provided in direct response to the Metropolitan Police Service request dated **1 October 2026** under Freedom of Information Reference **01/FOI/26/055460/F**, which asks:

“Please confirm precisely what City of London Police deployment you are interested in?”

The deployment I am referring to is the attendance of **City of London Police officers at my private residential address, 23 Jersey House, 2 Eastfield Road, Enfield, EN3 5UY, on 31 October 2025.**

The attendance occurred approximately between **11:15 and 11:50**, with the central period being approximately **11:20 to 11:40**.

The Metropolitan Police Service recorded or cross-referenced this attendance under:

Metropolitan Police CAD 2248 — 31/10/2025.

This is not a speculative identification. In correspondence dated **5 November 2025**, the Metropolitan Police Service expressly confirmed:

“City of London Police did attend your property, CAD 2248 31/10/25 refers.” Gmail Download - URGENT_ Suspec...

I subsequently relied upon that MPS reference in a Subject Access Request concerning the same attendance, identifying:

- **Date:** 31 October 2025;
- **Time:** approximately 11:15–11:50;
- **Core period:** approximately 11:20–11:40;
- **Location:** 23 Jersey House, 2 Eastfield Road, Enfield, EN3 5UY;
- **Metropolitan Police reference:** CAD 2248 (31/10/2025);
- **Attending police force:** City of London Police. Gmail - UK GDPR Subject Access ...

I also submitted a separate Subject Access Request directly concerning **City of London Police attendance at 23 Jersey House on 31 October 2025**, again identifying the same time window and expressly linking the attendance to **Met CAD 2248**. Gmail Download - UK GDPR Subjec...

The attendance involved **four officers**. In my formal complaint dated **6 March 2026**, I recorded that I observed **four White police officers through the peephole at my door** and requested an explanation for why four officers had been deployed to my residential address in circumstances presented as voluntary. Formal response and complaint c... Formal response and complaint c...

The operational context was connected with what was described or referenced as a **“voluntary interview.”**

My correspondence to the MPS North Area BCU on 5 November 2025 specifically asked the MPS to state:

“the purpose of the 31/10/2025 attendance (a ‘voluntary interview’ was referenced)”. Gmail Download - Please allocat...

My corresponding request to the City of London Police Professional Standards Directorate also asked it to confirm:

- the purpose of the attendance;
- the reference to a voluntary interview;
- the legal and operational basis for CoLP officers operating in the Metropolitan Police area;
- the names, ranks and collar numbers of the attending officers;
- any written authorisation or tasking;
- and any associated operational, risk-assessment or briefing records. Gmail Download - Verification, ...

For absolute clarity, the deployment to which my questions refer is therefore:

The deployment of four City of London Police officers to 23 Jersey House, 2 Eastfield Road, Enfield, EN3 5UY, on 31 October 2025, between approximately 11:15 and 11:50, with the core attendance approximately 11:20–11:40, within Metropolitan Police Service territory, in connection with what was referenced as a voluntary interview, and recorded or cross-referenced by the Metropolitan Police Service under CAD 2248 (31/10/2025).

This is the specific deployment to which my questions concerning:

- legal authority;

- cross-force jurisdiction;
- Benbow;
- mutual aid;
- operational tasking;
- MPS notification;
- command responsibility;
- supervisory authorisation;
- risk assessment;
- safeguarding;
- equality safeguards;
- number of officers deployed;
- residential attendance;
- Body-Worn Video;
- command-and-control records;
- and preservation of operational material

are directed.

The deployment is therefore capable of identification by the Metropolitan Police Service through the combination of:

CAD 2248 (31/10/2025)

23 Jersey House, 2 Eastfield Road, Enfield EN3 5UY

31 October 2025

approximately 11:15–11:50

City of London Police attendance

four officers

reference to a voluntary interview

This section is intended solely to remove any possible ambiguity as to the deployment being referred to. It does not withdraw, replace, reduce or narrow any substantive question previously submitted under FOI Reference **01/FOI/26/055460/F**.

SECTION 2 — CONNECTION BETWEEN THE 31 OCTOBER 2025 DEPLOYMENT AND THE EARLIER FOI REQUEST

The City of London Police attendance identified in Section 1 is directly connected to the earlier Freedom of Information request that became **FOI Reference 01/FOI/25/048820/V**.

That earlier FOI request was submitted on **5 November 2025**, only a few days after the 31 October 2025 attendance.

It specifically asked for recorded information concerning:

- policies, procedures and operational guidance governing **City of London Police officers operating within the Metropolitan Police Service area**;
- any requirement for **written tasking or authorisation**;
- briefing arrangements;
- notification to the Metropolitan Police Service;
- mutual-aid or cross-force agreements;
- voluntary interviews conducted at **private residential premises**;
- identification, risk assessment and safeguarding requirements;
- Body-Worn Video policies;
- CAD, radio and command-and-control retention;
- and uniform or identification guidance. Gmail - Freedom of Information ...

The request expressly sought the versions of the relevant material **in force on 31/10/2025**.

That date is the date of the City of London Police attendance identified in Section 1.

The earlier FOI request was therefore not a general or abstract enquiry about cross-force policing.

It arose from, and was directed toward understanding, the operational framework surrounding the **31 October 2025 City of London Police attendance at 23 Jersey House**.

This connection is reinforced by the fact that the earlier FOI sought information about precisely the issues now raised again in the present request:

1. how City of London Police officers may operate in Metropolitan Police territory;
2. what authorisation or tasking is required;

3. whether the Metropolitan Police Service must be notified;
4. whether a cross-force agreement or protocol governs the deployment;
5. what rules apply to voluntary interviews at private residential addresses;
6. what risk assessment and safeguarding requirements apply;
7. what records should exist;
8. and how those records are retained.

The Metropolitan Police Service subsequently responded to that earlier FOI.

In relation to policies or operational guidance governing City of London Police deployments into the Metropolitan Police area, the MPS response stated:

“No Information Located.” 01FOI25048820V_2026-52-26 01522...

However, in response to the question concerning mutual-aid or cross-force arrangements, the MPS confirmed the existence of the **Benbow Agreement**.
01FOI25048820V_2026-52-26 01522...

The MPS also supplied its **Voluntary Attendance Guidance** in response to the question concerning voluntary interviews conducted at private residential premises.
01FOI25048820V_2026-52-26 01522...

The MPS further stated that the relevant retention period for command/control material was **seven years**. 01FOI25048820V_2026-52-26 01522...

Those disclosures are central to the present clarification.

The earlier FOI therefore established three important points:

First, the MPS accepted that the subject matter concerning voluntary attendance at private residential addresses was relevant enough to disclose its Voluntary Attendance Guidance.

Second, the MPS confirmed that a cross-force arrangement known as **Benbow** existed.

Third, the MPS stated that it had located no information in response to the request for general policies or operational guidance governing City of London Police officers operating within the MPS area.

The present request seeks to move from that general policy level to the **actual deployment-level records**.

The issue is no longer merely:

“What policies might govern City of London Police officers operating in Metropolitan Police territory?”

The issue is now:

“What recorded legal, operational and command framework actually governed the City of London Police deployment to 23 Jersey House on 31 October 2025, recorded or cross-referenced as Met CAD 2248?”

This distinction is fundamental.

The earlier FOI concerned the general framework.

The present request concerns the **actual application of that framework to the identified deployment.**

That is why the questions now seek recorded information concerning:

- whether the deployment was undertaken under Benbow;
- whether some other cross-force arrangement applied;
- who authorised the deployment;
- what tasking existed;
- whether the MPS was informed;
- whether MPS agreement or coordination was required;
- what operational purpose was recorded;
- what risk assessment was undertaken;
- what supervisory authorisation existed;
- and which force retained operational responsibility.

Accordingly, FOI Reference **01/FOI/25/048820/V** should be treated as part of the documentary history that identifies and explains the present request.

The present clarification does not create a new subject.

It identifies the specific operational event that the earlier FOI was seeking to understand.

For avoidance of doubt:

The earlier FOI request of 5 November 2025 and the present FOI request both concern the same underlying subject matter: the City of London Police attendance at 23 Jersey House, Enfield, on 31 October 2025, and the legal, operational, cross-force and safeguarding framework governing that attendance.

SECTION 3 — WHY THE BENBOW DISCLOSURE REQUIRES DEPLOYMENT-SPECIFIC CLARIFICATION

The Metropolitan Police Service has now disclosed a redacted version of the **2022 Benbow Protocol — A Joint Policing Protocol for Major Events and Disorder in London**.

That disclosure is directly relevant to the City of London Police deployment identified in Sections 1 and 2 because the disclosed material confirms that Benbow is a formal arrangement involving:

- the Metropolitan Police Service;
- City of London Police;
- British Transport Police; and
- Ministry of Defence Police.

The disclosed material further indicates that participating forces ordinarily retain strategic and tactical command of their own personnel in their own force areas, but that qualifying operations may be designated as **Benbow operations**, under which officers may operate within a unified command structure. 01-FOI-26-055460-F_2026-10-01_D...

That disclosure creates an important distinction between two separate questions:

1. **What is the Benbow Protocol generally?**
2. **Was the specific City of London Police deployment to 23 Jersey House on 31 October 2025 conducted under Benbow?**

The first question concerns general policy or protocol.

The second concerns the actual operational status of the identified deployment.

The present request is concerned with the second question.

I therefore require the Metropolitan Police Service to identify, from recorded information, whether the City of London Police attendance at:

23 Jersey House, 2 Eastfield Road, Enfield EN3 5UY
on 31 October 2025

between approximately **11:15 and 11:50**

recorded or cross-referenced under **Met CAD 2248 (31/10/2025)**

was formally designated, authorised or conducted as a **Benbow operation**.

This is capable of a clear recorded-information answer.

If the answer is **YES**, I require the MPS to identify the recorded information showing:

- the date and time the operation was designated as a Benbow operation;
- the office, role or authority that made that designation;
- the relevant operational reference;
- the recorded command structure;
- the strategic command arrangement;
- the tactical command arrangement;
- the operational command arrangement;
- and the records showing how City of London Police officers came to be deployed into Metropolitan Police territory.

These questions are already reflected in the current request, which asks specifically whether the deployment was a Benbow operation, when it was designated, who authorised it, what records evidence the designation, and what Gold, Silver and Bronze arrangements applied. 01-FOI-26-055460-F_2026-10-01_D...

If the answer is **NO**, that does not end the enquiry.

It instead creates the equally important question:

What other recorded legal or operational framework governed the deployment?

The current request expressly asks that, if Benbow did not apply, the MPS identify any other:

- statutory power;
- protocol;
- mutual-aid arrangement;
- agreement;
- policy;
- operational procedure;
- cross-force tasking arrangement;
- or policing arrangement

under which City of London Police officers operated in Metropolitan Police territory. 01-FOI-26-055460-F_2026-10-01_D...

This distinction is necessary because the previous FOI response produced an apparent gap.

On the one hand, in response to the earlier request for policies and procedures governing City of London Police officers operating in the MPS area, the MPS stated:

“No Information Located.” 01FOI25048820V_2026-52-26 01522...

On the other hand, the MPS acknowledged the existence of a cross-force arrangement, namely the **Benbow Agreement**. 01FOI25048820V_2026-52-26 01522...

The present clarification therefore seeks to determine which of the following is correct in relation to the actual 31 October 2025 deployment:

- Benbow applied;
- another cross-force arrangement applied;
- City of London Police acted under some separate statutory or operational authority;
- Metropolitan Police approval or coordination was obtained;
- Metropolitan Police notification alone was sufficient;
- or some other recorded framework governed the attendance.

The purpose of these questions is not to ask the MPS to provide an opinion on what should have happened.

The purpose is to identify **what the records show actually did happen**.

That distinction is important in light of the MPS reminder that the Freedom of Information Act concerns recorded information rather than opinion. 01-FOI-26-055460-F_2026-10-01_D...

The questions concerning Benbow are therefore framed deliberately as requests for records, including:

- designation records;
- authorisation records;
- operational logs;
- command records;
- tasking documents;
- briefing records;
- inter-force communications;
- and any linked operational references.

For avoidance of doubt, I am not asking the MPS to speculate about whether Benbow might theoretically have applied.

I am asking:

Was this specific deployment recorded as a Benbow operation?

If yes, identify the records.

If no, identify the recorded framework that actually governed it.

That question is central to establishing the legal, operational and command basis upon which City of London Police officers were deployed to a private residential address in Enfield on 31 October 2025.

SECTION 4 — RECORDED OPERATIONAL PURPOSE, TASKING, BRIEFING, RISK ASSESSMENT AND SUPERVISORY AUTHORISATION

Having identified the precise deployment, the next issue is the **recorded operational decision-making that led to four City of London Police officers attending my private residential address on 31 October 2025.**

The Metropolitan Police Service has asked me to clarify which deployment I mean. That clarification has now been provided. The remaining questions concern what the relevant police records show about the planning, purpose, authorisation and control of that deployment.

The present request therefore seeks the recorded information establishing:

- the operational purpose of the attendance;
- who initiated or requested the attendance;
- what tasking was issued;
- what briefing was given to the officers;
- what risk assessment was undertaken;
- what supervisory authorisation existed;
- why four officers were deployed;
- and why a private residential address was chosen as the point of contact.

These are not requests for speculation or opinion.

They are requests for the underlying records.

The current FOI request already asks:

- **What was the recorded operational purpose of the deployment?**
- **What written tasking existed?**
- **What briefing was provided?**
- **What risk assessment was undertaken?**
- **What supervisory authorisation existed?** 01-FOI-26-055460-F_2026-10-01_D...

Those questions are central because the circumstances of the attendance were not neutral.

The attendance involved:

- a private residential address;

- four officers;
- an unexpected or immediate police presence;
- and a context in which a “voluntary interview” was referenced.

My later formal complaint recorded that I observed four officers at my door and asked why four officers had been deployed if the purpose of the contact was genuinely voluntary. Formal response and complaint c...

The same correspondence expressly asked for the operational rationale for the number of officers deployed, including any:

- tasking;
- briefing;
- risk grading;
- threat assessment;
- CAD entry;
- or supervisor comments.

Formal response and complaint c...

That is important because the MPS's own Voluntary Attendance Guidance identifies a **private residence** as a heightened-risk context and states that combinations of relevant risk factors increase the possibility of legal challenge.

It further states that where more than one such factor is present, the matter must be authorised by a supervisor. VOLUNTARY ATTENDANCE GUIDANCE_(...

The guidance also requires a pre-interview risk assessment addressing matters including:

- fitness for interview;
- need for an Appropriate Adult;
- communication issues;
- vulnerability;
- and related safeguarding considerations. VOLUNTARY ATTENDANCE GUIDANCE_(...

Accordingly, I ask the MPS to identify the records showing whether, before the 31 October 2025 attendance:

1. a formal or informal operational tasking was created;

2. the officers were briefed;
3. a risk assessment was completed;
4. the number of officers was considered;
5. the use of a private residential address was considered;
6. any vulnerability or safeguarding issue was considered;
7. supervisory approval was obtained;
8. any alternative location was considered;
9. any delay or appointment-based approach was considered;
10. and any record was created documenting those decisions.

The question of **why four officers attended** is particularly important.

I do not ask the MPS to create a rationale now.

I ask the MPS to identify the rationale that was recorded at the time.

If the number of officers was based upon:

- officer safety;
- intelligence;
- risk grading;
- anticipated resistance;
- safeguarding;
- operational availability;
- arrest contingency;
- or any other recorded reason,

then I request the relevant recorded information identifying that reason.

If no recorded rationale exists, I ask the MPS to state that expressly.

The same applies to the choice of residential address.

If officers attended my home because:

- that was the address recorded for me;
- the purpose was to invite voluntary engagement;
- an immediate interview was intended;

- another force requested attendance;
- or some other operational reason applied,

then I request the contemporaneous record showing that.

If no such record exists, that should also be stated expressly.

The distinction between **recorded operational fact** and **later explanation** is important.

The present request concerns the record created at or before the time of deployment.

It does not seek a retrospective justification drafted after the event.

For clarity, the categories of records sought include:

- CAD or command-and-control entries;
- deployment logs;
- dispatch records;
- tasking sheets;
- operation or briefing orders;
- supervisor notes;
- risk assessments;
- threat gradings;
- officer briefing records;
- emails;
- internal messaging;
- cross-force communications;
- officer notebook or PNB entries;
- intelligence submissions;
- and any system record explaining the decision to deploy four officers to the address.

My earlier Subject Access Request to the MPS already sought the full CAD log, associated radio audio, linked incident references, officer notes, incident reports, briefings and risk assessments concerning the 31 October 2025 attendance. Gmail - UK GDPR Subject Access ...

My corresponding request to City of London Police sought:

- briefings;
- tasking sheets;
- operation orders;
- mutual-aid or jurisdiction paperwork;
- and risk or PSED assessments.

Gmail Download - UK GDPR Subjec...

The issue is therefore well defined.

For avoidance of doubt, I request the MPS to identify, from recorded information:

what the officers were sent to do, why four officers were sent, what they were told before attending, what risk was identified, who approved the deployment, and what record exists of those decisions.

Where no such record is held, please state that expressly against the relevant question.

SECTION 5 — VOLUNTARY INTERVIEW STATUS, PRIVATE RESIDENTIAL ATTENDANCE AND APPLICABLE SAFEGUARDS

The deployment identified above was connected with what was referenced as a **“voluntary interview.”**

That fact is important because the Metropolitan Police Service itself disclosed its **Voluntary Attendance Guidance** in response to my earlier FOI request concerning voluntary interviews conducted at private residential premises.

The earlier FOI specifically requested guidance covering voluntary interviews at private residential addresses, including requirements for:

- identification;
- risk assessment;
- safeguarding;
- and particular consideration for vulnerable or disabled residents.

The MPS responded by providing its redacted **Voluntary Attendance Guidance**.
01FOI25048820V_2026-52-26 01522...

The disclosed guidance states that its application is triggered where a suspect is to be interviewed under caution while not in police detention, and that it applies both in police buildings and away from police premises. VOLUNTARY ATTENDANCE GUIDANCE_(...

It specifically recognises the **informality of a venue**, including a **private residence**, as a heightened risk factor. VOLUNTARY ATTENDANCE GUIDANCE_(...

The same guidance also requires officers to conduct a pre-interview risk assessment addressing matters including:

- suspect fitness for interview;
- need for an Appropriate Adult;
- communication issues;
- learning difficulties;
- mental health;
- intoxication;
- substance misuse;
- and levels of understanding. VOLUNTARY ATTENDANCE GUIDANCE_(...

The guidance further states that where combinations of heightened-risk factors exist, the possibility of legal challenge increases and officers should consider delay or an alternative location. It also states that where more than one such factor exists, supervisor authorisation is required. VOLUNTARY ATTENDANCE GUIDANCE_...

Those provisions are directly relevant to the 31 October 2025 attendance because the circumstances included, at minimum:

- attendance at a private residential address;
- immediate police presence;
- four officers at the door;
- and a context in which a voluntary interview was referenced.

My formal complaint of 6 March 2026 expressly recorded that I observed four officers at my door and raised concern about the practical voluntariness of an encounter structured in that way. Formal response and complaint c...

That correspondence also identified the private residential setting and immediacy of police attendance as relevant risk factors and requested disclosure of whether supervisor authorisation had been obtained and on what recorded risk assessment. Formal response and complaint c...

The present request therefore asks the MPS to identify the **recorded safeguards actually applied to this specific attendance**.

In particular, I require clarification of whether the records show that officers were instructed to ensure that I understood:

- that I was not under arrest;
- that the interview or engagement was voluntary;
- that I was not obliged to admit officers into my home;
- that I was not obliged to answer questions merely because officers attended;
- that I could decline immediate engagement;
- and that I could seek legal advice before deciding whether to participate.

I also ask whether the records show any consideration of:

- conducting the interview at a police station instead;
- arranging the interview by appointment;
- delaying the engagement;

- reducing the number of officers;
- or using a less intrusive method of contact.

These are not requests for a newly created opinion.

They are requests for the recorded decision-making and safeguards that existed at the time.

The MPS guidance itself explains that suspects dealt with outside custody should still receive the relevant rights, entitlements and safeguards, and specifically recognises the importance of those safeguards where a voluntary interview takes place in the suspect's own home rather than at a police station. VOLUNTARY ATTENDANCE GUIDANCE_...

Accordingly, I request the MPS to identify whether the relevant records show:

1. that the attendance was formally categorised as a voluntary interview or voluntary attendance process;
2. which version of the Voluntary Attendance Guidance was considered applicable;
3. whether any rights notice or equivalent information was intended to be given;
4. whether the officers were briefed on voluntariness;
5. whether legal advice was discussed or planned;
6. whether the private residential setting was treated as a heightened-risk factor;
7. whether immediacy was considered;
8. whether the number of officers was treated as relevant to risk or proportionality;
9. whether supervisor authorisation was required;
10. whether such authorisation was obtained;
11. whether a pre-interview risk assessment was completed;
12. whether vulnerability or communication issues were assessed;
13. whether an alternative venue was considered;
14. and what contemporaneous record exists of each of those matters.

My earlier correspondence to the Metropolitan Police Service already asked for records concerning the 31 October 2025 attendance, including any "voluntary interview" records, briefings, risk assessments, officer notes and cross-force communications.
Gmail - UK GDPR Subject Access ...

My corresponding request to City of London Police similarly asked for any “voluntary interview” notes or records, risk assessments, tasking sheets and briefing material.
Gmail Download - UK GDPR Subjec...

For avoidance of doubt, I am not asking the MPS to decide now whether the encounter was in fact voluntary in a legal or philosophical sense.

I am asking what the records show about:

how the attendance was categorised, what safeguards were supposed to apply, what safeguards were actually considered, and what documentary evidence exists showing that those safeguards were used in relation to this specific deployment.

SECTION 6 — CROSS-FORCE JURISDICTION, MPS NOTIFICATION, COORDINATION AND COMMAND RESPONSIBILITY

The deployment identified in the preceding sections involved **City of London Police officers operating at a private residential address within the Metropolitan Police Service area.**

That circumstance gives rise to a separate and important set of recorded-information questions concerning:

- how the deployment was authorised across force boundaries;
- whether the Metropolitan Police Service was notified in advance;
- whether MPS agreement, approval or coordination was required;
- whether any such agreement, approval or coordination actually occurred;
- which force exercised operational command;
- and which force retained responsibility for the officers while they were operating in Enfield.

These questions are not hypothetical.

The attendance has already been identified by the Metropolitan Police Service under **CAD 2248 (31/10/2025)**, and the MPS subsequently confirmed in writing that **City of London Police attended my property**. Gmail Download - URGENT_ Suspec...

My correspondence dated 5 November 2025 specifically asked the Metropolitan Police Service to preserve and disclose any:

- cross-force requests;
 - mutual-aid arrangements;
 - tasking;
 - authorisations;
 - and communications with City of London Police relating to the attendance.
- Gmail - UK GDPR Subject Access ...

My corresponding request to City of London Police asked for the legal and operational basis upon which CoLP officers operated in the Metropolitan Police area, including any:

- mutual aid;
- tasking;
- joint operation;

- warrant;
- request from the MPS;
- written authorisation;
- tasking logs;
- or operation/briefing orders. Gmail Download - Verification, ...

The earlier FOI request of 5 November 2025 also expressly sought policies and procedures governing City of London Police officers operating in the Metropolitan Police area, including requirements for written tasking, authorisation, briefing and notification to the MPS. Gmail - Freedom of Information ...

The MPS response to that question stated:

“No Information Located.” 01FOI25048820V_2026-52-26 01522...

However, the MPS separately acknowledged the existence of a cross-force arrangement known as **Benbow**. 01FOI25048820V_2026-52-26 01522...

That makes it necessary to establish the actual recorded basis upon which the 31 October 2025 deployment occurred.

I therefore ask the MPS to identify whether its records show that City of London Police:

1. notified the MPS before attending my address;
2. requested permission or operational assistance from the MPS;
3. received approval from the MPS;
4. received any tasking from the MPS;
5. operated pursuant to a joint arrangement;
6. operated pursuant to mutual aid;
7. operated pursuant to Benbow;
8. operated under some other statutory or common operational framework;
9. or attended independently without prior MPS involvement.

If the MPS was notified, I ask for the recorded information showing:

- when notification occurred;
- by whom it was made;
- which MPS unit or officer received it;

- what information was supplied;
- whether the purpose of the attendance was explained;
- whether the number of officers was communicated;
- whether the private residential location was identified;
- and whether any objection, approval, instruction or safeguarding consideration was recorded.

If the MPS approved or coordinated the deployment, I ask for the record showing:

- the decision-maker;
- the date and time of approval;
- the operational basis for approval;
- any conditions attached;
- any supervisory involvement;
- and any linked operational reference.

If the MPS did **not** approve the deployment because approval was not required, I ask the MPS to identify the recorded policy, protocol or legal basis supporting that position.

The question of **command responsibility** must also be clarified.

The present request asks:

- under whose strategic command the officers were acting;
- under whose tactical command they were acting;
- under whose operational command they were acting;
- what Gold, Silver and Bronze arrangements applied;
- and which force retained operational responsibility for the officers. 01-FOI-26-055460-F_2026-10-01_D...

These questions matter because the officers were physically operating inside another force's territorial area.

Accordingly, I ask the MPS to identify whether the relevant records show that command remained entirely with City of London Police, transferred in any respect to the MPS, was shared, or was governed by a joint or unified command structure.

If command remained with City of London Police, I ask the MPS to state whether its records show:

- that this was known to the MPS;
- that the MPS had no command role;
- and what arrangement permitted CoLP officers to operate in Enfield while retaining CoLP command.

If command was shared or unified, I ask for the records identifying:

- the responsible command structure;
- the force or unit exercising each level of command;
- and the operational reference under which that arrangement was recorded.

This question also affects responsibility for any complaint arising from the attendance.

The present request therefore asks which force was responsible for complaints concerning decisions made during the deployment. 01-FOI-26-055460-F_2026-10-01_D...

I ask the MPS to identify whether the records show that responsibility rested with:

- City of London Police;
- Metropolitan Police Service;
- both forces;
- or another designated body.

The existence of **Met CAD 2248** is particularly relevant here.

It shows that the Metropolitan Police Service held or created a command-and-control reference associated with the CoLP attendance.

I therefore ask the MPS to identify:

- who created CAD 2248;
- why it was created;
- what information was entered into it;
- what force or officer supplied that information;
- whether it recorded the intended purpose of the attendance;
- whether it recorded the number or identities of CoLP officers;
- whether it recorded any MPS authorisation or coordination;

- and whether it cross-referenced any CoLP incident, crime, tasking or deployment number.

My Subject Access Request expressly requested the full CAD log, radio audio, linked incident numbers and cross-force communications concerning this attendance. Gmail - UK GDPR Subject Access ...

For avoidance of doubt, I am not asking the MPS to state what normally happens when one police force operates in another force's area.

I am asking what the records show happened in this case.

The question is therefore:

What recorded cross-force authority, notification, coordination and command arrangements governed the deployment of four City of London Police officers to 23 Jersey House, Enfield, on 31 October 2025, and what role did the Metropolitan Police Service actually play before, during or after that deployment?

SECTION 7 — EQUALITY, ANTI-BLACK RACISM SAFEGUARDS, DISPROPORTIONALITY AND AUDITABLE DECISION-MAKING

PERSONAL CONTEXT — FEAR OF ANTI-BLACK RACISM, SERIOUS HARM AND DEATH

There is an important reason why my questions concerning anti-Black racism, Institutional Racism, safeguarding, proportionality and supervisory oversight are not abstract questions.

I am a Black person.

At the time of the attendance, and subsequently, I had not been provided with evidence demonstrating what specific safeguards against anti-Black racism or Institutional Racism had been applied to the decisions concerning me.

I had not been shown a record demonstrating:

- what anti-Black-racism safeguards governed the decision to deploy officers to my home;
- whether racial disproportionality had been considered;
- whether any equality or Public Sector Equality Duty assessment had been undertaken;
- whether the number of officers deployed had been reviewed for proportionality;
- whether racial bias, including unconscious, structural or institutional bias, had been guarded against;
- or whether a supervisor had independently reviewed those matters.

That absence of information materially affected how I experienced the police attendance.

When I observed **four White police officers at the door of my private home**, in circumstances connected with what was described or referenced as a voluntary interview, I did not possess evidence demonstrating that safeguards against anti-Black racism or Institutional Racism had been applied to the decision-making that placed those officers at my door. My existing complaint records that I observed four White officers through the peephole. FORMAL CLARIFICATION AND CONSOL...

The circumstances also involved a private residential address, four officers, an immediate police presence and a context in which a voluntary interview was referenced. FORMAL CLARIFICATION AND CONSOL...

In those circumstances, my concern was not merely procedural.

I experienced fear for my physical safety and fear of death.

That statement describes my fear and the reason for it. It is not an allegation that any particular officer intended to kill me, nor is it a conclusion that racism caused the deployment.

The distinction is important.

My concern was that, as a Black person confronted unexpectedly at my private home by four police officers, I had not been provided with evidence showing that the decision-making process had contained effective safeguards capable of identifying and preventing anti-Black racism, racial stereotyping, disproportionate treatment or Institutional Racism.

Without evidence of those safeguards, I could not know whether the operational assumptions concerning me had been subjected to effective equality, proportionality or anti-bias scrutiny.

That uncertainty contributed directly to my fear.

The purpose of asking these questions is therefore not to invite the Metropolitan Police Service to speculate about my emotional state, nor to require it to accept that racism occurred.

The purpose is to establish the recorded facts necessary to determine:

what safeguards against anti-Black racism and Institutional Racism existed, whether they applied to this deployment, whether they were actually used, who was responsible for applying them, and what record demonstrates that they were used.

This is particularly important because my present request already asks whether the operational process contained documented safeguards capable of reducing the risk of discriminatory or disproportionate decision-making.

The present request also seeks clarity about the **safeguards that existed within the operational decision-making process** for the 31 October 2025 deployment.

For avoidance of doubt, these questions are not allegations that racism caused the deployment.

They are questions about:

- what safeguards existed;
- whether those safeguards applied;
- whether they were used;
- whether compliance was recorded;
- and whether the resulting decision-making is auditable.

This distinction is important.

My current request expressly states that I make **no allegation, no accusation, no assertion, no assumption and no conclusion** that anti-Black racism or Institutional Racism determined the decisions concerning me. The questions instead concern the safeguards that existed and whether they were applied to the actual deployment. 01-FOI-26-055460-F_2026-10-01_D...

The deployment involved a number of operational decisions capable of being examined through recorded information, including:

- the decision to deploy officers;
- the decision to deploy four officers;
- the decision to attend a private residential address;
- the decision to do so in circumstances connected with a voluntary interview;
- the risk assessment;
- the supervisory authorisation;
- and the cross-force decision-making surrounding CoLP officers operating in Metropolitan Police territory.

The present request therefore asks what safeguards against anti-Black racism and Institutional Racism existed within those decision-making processes.

In particular, I ask the MPS to identify the recorded safeguards applicable to:

1. the decision to deploy officers;
2. the number of officers deployed;
3. the choice of a private residential address;
4. operational risk assessment;
5. supervisory authorisation;

6. cross-force deployment decisions;
7. any Benbow-related decision-making, if Benbow applied;
8. any proportionality assessment;
9. any equality or disproportionality consideration;
10. and any subsequent review of those decisions.

These questions already appear within my substantive request. 01-FOI-26-055460-F_2026-10-01_D...

I further ask the MPS to identify the **documentary source** for each safeguard.

That includes, where held:

- policy documents;
- operational guidance;
- equality guidance;
- risk-assessment templates;
- supervisory decision templates;
- PSED-related material;
- disproportionality frameworks;
- professional standards guidance;
- anti-racism guidance;
- and any other recorded control relevant to operational decision-making.

For each relevant safeguard, I ask the MPS to identify:

- the title of the document;
- the version in force on 31 October 2025;
- the responsible office or department;
- and whether compliance was required to be recorded.

The question of auditability is particularly important.

I therefore ask whether the records show:

- that an equality consideration was undertaken;
- that a disproportionality assessment was undertaken;

- that any race-related consideration was recorded;
- that any safeguarding concern was recorded;
- that supervisory challenge occurred;
- or that any second-level review existed.

If such records exist, I request identification and disclosure of the non-exempt information.

If no such record exists, I ask that this be stated expressly.

The present request also asks whether race was recorded or considered within any operational risk assessment concerning me.

Again, this is not a request for speculation.

If race was recorded or considered, I ask the MPS to identify:

- where;
- by whom;
- for what recorded operational purpose;
- and under what policy or lawful basis.

If race was not recorded or considered, the question becomes:

What safeguard existed to identify the possibility of unconscious, structural or institutional racial bias entering the decision-making process?

That question is already expressly contained within the current request. 01-FOI-26-055460-F_2026-10-01_D...

I also ask whether any specific anti-Black-racism safeguard existed at the material time.

That question should not be answered merely by pointing to generic equality statements if the MPS holds more specific recorded material.

If the MPS held:

- specific anti-Black-racism guidance;
- race-disproportionality controls;
- supervisory review requirements;
- operational equality prompts;
- or related training or governance material,

I ask for the relevant recorded information.

My earlier correspondence also asked for risk/PSED assessments connected to the 31 October 2025 attendance. Gmail - UK GDPR Subject Access ...

My corresponding request to City of London Police asked for any risk or Public Sector Equality Duty assessments associated with the deployment. Gmail Download - Verification, ...

The purpose of these questions is therefore to establish whether the operational process had identifiable, documented checks capable of reducing the risk of discriminatory or disproportionate decision-making.

For clarity, I am not asking the MPS to make a retrospective judgment that the deployment was or was not racist.

I am asking for the records showing:

- what equality safeguards existed;
- what anti-racism safeguards existed;
- what disproportionality safeguards existed;
- whether they applied to this deployment;
- whether they were actually used;
- who was responsible for compliance;
- and whether compliance can now be verified from the record.

If the MPS considers that no specific anti-Black-racism safeguard existed, I ask it to state that expressly rather than substitute a general statement about equality.

If safeguards existed but there is no record showing whether they were applied in this deployment, I ask the MPS to distinguish clearly between:

- **safeguard existed generally;**
- **safeguard applied to this type of decision;**
- **record exists showing application in this case;**
- and **no case-specific record is held.**

That distinction is essential to clarity.

For avoidance of doubt, the central question in this section is:

What recorded equality, anti-Black-racism, disproportionality and supervisory safeguards existed and applied to the decision to deploy four City of London Police

officers to my private residential address in Enfield on 31 October 2025, and what record demonstrates whether those safeguards were actually used?

SECTION 8 — PRESERVATION OF RECORDS, EVIDENTIAL CONTINUITY AND IDENTIFICATION OF THE COMPLETE OPERATIONAL PAPER TRAIL

A further central issue is the preservation and identification of the complete body of records relating to the City of London Police deployment to **23 Jersey House on 31 October 2025**.

This issue is separate from the question of whether particular records must ultimately be disclosed under the Freedom of Information Act.

The immediate point is that the relevant operational records must first be identified accurately and preserved so that they remain capable of examination through the appropriate legal, complaints, data-protection or disclosure route.

My correspondence has repeatedly placed both the Metropolitan Police Service and City of London Police on notice that records concerning this attendance are relevant and should be preserved.

Following the 31 October 2025 attendance, I expressly requested preservation of records associated with **Met CAD 2248 (31/10/2025)**, including:

- the full CAD log;
- radio audio;
- Body-Worn Video;
- officer notes and PNB entries;
- incident reports;
- briefings;
- risk assessments;
- cross-force tasking;
- mutual-aid documentation;
- and communications between the Metropolitan Police Service and City of London Police. Gmail - UK GDPR Subject Access ...

My corresponding request to City of London Police similarly sought preservation of:

- BWV footage and identifiers;
- CAD and radio audio;
- officer notebooks;
- attendance logs;

- briefing documents;
- tasking sheets;
- operation orders;
- jurisdiction or mutual-aid documentation;
- risk and PSED assessments;
- crime or incident records;
- and records concerning the referenced voluntary interview. Gmail Download - UK GDPR Subjec...

My verification request to City of London Police Professional Standards again asked for immediate preservation of the same categories of records and specifically requested any associated incident or crime references and cross-references to Met CAD 2248. Gmail Download - Verification, ...

The issue was subsequently restated in my formal complaint of **6 March 2026**.

That correspondence expressly required preservation of all records relevant to the police attendance at my residential address, including:

- CAD and command-and-control logs;
- radio transmissions and audio;
- officer notebook entries;
- BWV and metadata;
- tasking logs;
- briefing records;
- deployment rationale;
- supervisor-authorisation records;
- risk assessments;
- intelligence submissions;
- incident reports;
- and local or cross-force tasking documents. Formal response and complaint c...

The covering email sent with that complaint also placed the MPS on formal notice to preserve command-and-control logs, radio transmissions, BWV, tasking records, officer notebooks and supervisory authorisations. Gmail - Cover Letter – Submissi...

Accordingly, the existence of a preservation issue is not new.

It has been raised repeatedly since shortly after the 31 October 2025 attendance.

A. Identification of all record categories

For clarity, I ask the MPS to identify whether records relating to this deployment exist within any of the following categories:

- CAD / command-and-control records;
- linked incident or crime reports;
- radio transmissions;
- dispatcher records;
- call-handler notes;
- deployment instructions;
- tasking records;
- officer attendance logs;
- briefing documents;
- operation orders;
- supervisor notes;
- decision logs;
- risk assessments;
- threat or vulnerability gradings;
- Public Sector Equality Duty records;
- safeguarding records;
- intelligence records;
- internal emails;
- cross-force emails;
- secure messaging records;
- telephone logs;
- officer PNB entries;
- officer statements;

- BWV footage;
- BWV metadata;
- BWV categorisation records;
- BWV retention or hold records;
- CCTV obtained by police;
- records supplied to or received from City of London Police;
- records concerning the proposed voluntary interview;
- records concerning any legal-advice or Appropriate Adult considerations;
- records concerning MPS notification or coordination;
- records concerning Benbow or any alternative cross-force arrangement;
- records concerning Gold, Silver or Bronze command;
- and records concerning complaint ownership or operational responsibility.

This list is intended to ensure that searches are not artificially restricted to the CAD entry alone.

B. Met CAD 2248 should be treated as the starting reference

The principal MPS identifier presently known is:

CAD 2248 — 31/10/2025.

The MPS itself confirmed that City of London Police attended my property and that **CAD 2248 31/10/25 refers**. Gmail Download - URGENT_ Suspec...

Accordingly, I ask the MPS to use CAD 2248 as the starting point for identifying:

- all linked CAD events;
- associated incident or crime references;
- officer or unit identifiers;
- linked City of London Police references;
- tasking records;
- radio channels;
- associated BWV identifiers;
- and any cross-force communication generated before, during or after the attendance.

If CAD 2248 points to another operational reference, I ask that reference to be identified.

If that further reference points to additional records, those records should also be identified.

The search should therefore follow the record chain rather than stop at the first system entry.

C. Retention

The earlier MPS FOI response stated that the relevant retention period for CAD/radio/log material was **seven years**. 01FOI25048820V_2026-52-26 01522...

That previous statement is important because the attendance occurred on 31 October 2025.

The records should therefore, subject to any applicable policy distinctions, still fall within the retention period previously identified by the MPS.

I ask the MPS to confirm:

- what retention schedule applies to CAD 2248;
- what retention schedule applies to linked radio audio;
- what retention schedule applies to BWV;
- what retention schedule applies to tasking and briefing records;
- what retention schedule applies to officer notebook material;
- and whether any complaint, SAR, legal or preservation marker has altered the ordinary deletion date.

Where different record categories have different retention periods, I ask that each be stated separately.

D. Preservation holds

I have repeatedly requested preservation.

I therefore ask the MPS to identify whether any preservation, hold, retention or “do not delete” marker was placed against any relevant material following:

- my November 2025 requests;
- my complaints;
- my Subject Access Requests;
- my March 2026 formal complaint;

- any involvement of Professional Standards;
- or any contemplated or actual legal proceedings.

If a hold was applied, I ask for:

- the date it was applied;
- the record categories covered;
- the department that applied it;
- and its present status.

If no hold was applied despite the repeated preservation requests, I ask that this also be stated expressly.

E. Whether any records have been deleted, overwritten or become unavailable

I further ask the MPS to state whether any relevant record has:

- been deleted;
- overwritten;
- automatically purged;
- corrupted;
- lost;
- become inaccessible;
- or otherwise ceased to be available

since 31 October 2025.

If any record has ceased to be available, I ask the MPS to identify:

- the category of record;
- the date it ceased to be available;
- the applicable retention rule;
- whether a preservation request had already been received;
- and whether an audit trail exists showing the deletion or disposal.

This request is particularly important because preservation was sought within days of the attendance.

F. BWV preservation and metadata

Body-Worn Video is of particular importance because it may establish objectively:

- which officers attended;
- their numbers and positioning;
- what was said at the door;
- whether a voluntary interview was discussed;
- whether rights or safeguards were explained;
- whether any MPS officer attended;
- and what occurred immediately before and after contact at the residence.

My requests specifically sought both **BWV footage and BWV identifiers/metadata**.

Gmail Download - UK GDPR Subjec...

Accordingly, if no BWV footage is presently held, I ask the MPS to distinguish between:

- BWV was never activated;
- BWV was activated but no longer retained;
- BWV existed but was deleted;
- BWV exists but is held by City of London Police rather than the MPS;
- or the MPS holds no information establishing whether BWV existed.

The same distinction should be made for metadata and BWV identifiers.

G. Cross-force records

Because the deployment involved City of London Police operating inside Metropolitan Police territory, the evidential record may be divided between two police forces.

I therefore ask the MPS to identify all records it holds that originated from City of London Police and all records it sent to City of London Police concerning the attendance.

This includes:

- emails;
- CAD-to-CAD communications;
- telephone communications;
- radio liaison;
- operational requests;
- tasking;
- intelligence;

- risk information;
- safeguarding information;
- and post-event communications.

If the MPS knows that a particular category of record is held by City of London Police rather than the MPS, I ask that this be stated clearly.

H. Preservation is distinct from FOI disclosure

For clarity, I recognise that not every request for preservation is itself a request for disclosure under FOIA.

The MPS's 1 October 2026 correspondence indicated that preservation questions may fall within other functions or departments.

I therefore ask that the MPS distinguish between:

- whether the information is held;
- whether the record has been preserved;
- whether it is disclosable under FOIA;
- whether access should instead be pursued through data-protection rights;
- whether the matter belongs to Professional Standards;
- and whether Legal Services or another department is responsible for preservation.

This distinction will avoid unnecessary procedural confusion.

Where Data Rights is not the competent department to action preservation, I ask that the appropriate department be identified clearly.

I. Complete audit trail

The ultimate purpose is to ensure that the complete operational history can be reconstructed.

I therefore ask the MPS to preserve and identify, as far as recorded information allows, the chronological record of:

1. the first request or decision that led to the deployment;
2. any communication from City of London Police to the MPS;
3. creation of CAD 2248;
4. any risk assessment;

5. any supervisory authorisation;
6. tasking of the four officers;
7. briefing of those officers;
8. their journey or deployment to Enfield;
9. arrival at 23 Jersey House;
10. the residential encounter;
11. departure;
12. any post-attendance debrief or report;
13. any subsequent cross-force communication;
14. later complaint or safeguarding handling;
15. and any preservation or retention decisions made afterward.

For avoidance of doubt, the central question in this section is:

What complete body of operational records exists concerning the deployment of four City of London Police officers to 23 Jersey House on 31 October 2025, what has been preserved, what remains available today, and what audit trail exists showing the creation, retention, movement or deletion of those records?

SECTION 9 — DISTINCTION BETWEEN RECORDED INFORMATION, OPINION, COMPLAINT HANDLING AND OTHER MPS FUNCTIONS

The Metropolitan Police Service has indicated that the Freedom of Information Act applies to **recorded information** and does not require the MPS to provide opinions, create explanations that are not already recorded, or answer questions that fall outside the scope of FOIA.

I recognise that distinction.

The purpose of this section is therefore to remove any ambiguity about what I am asking the MPS to do under FOI Reference **01/FOI/26/055460/F**.

I am not asking the MPS to speculate.

I am not asking the MPS to reconstruct events from memory.

I am not asking the MPS to create a new operational justification after the event.

I am asking the MPS to identify and disclose, subject to any lawful exemption, the **recorded information that already exists** concerning the deployment identified in Sections 1–8.

That distinction applies across the whole request.

For example, where I ask:

- why four officers were deployed;
- what legal basis governed the deployment;
- whether Benbow applied;
- whether the MPS was notified;
- what risk assessment existed;
- what supervisory authorisation existed;
- what safeguards were applied;
- who retained command responsibility;

I am asking for the **recorded information evidencing those matters**.

If the MPS holds no recorded information answering a question, the appropriate response is to state that no such information is held.

If recorded information is held but exempt from disclosure, the appropriate response is to identify the relevant exemption and explain its application where required.

If the matter falls outside FOIA entirely, I ask the MPS to identify that clearly and distinguish it from a situation in which information is simply not held.

This distinction is particularly important because several different functions are now engaged by the same underlying deployment.

Those functions include:

- Freedom of Information;
- Subject Access / data protection;
- Professional Standards / complaints;
- record preservation;
- operational governance;
- legal services;
- safeguarding;
- equality review;
- and cross-force liaison.

The fact that a matter may also fall within one of those functions does not, by itself, answer whether recorded information is held for FOIA purposes.

For example, a question about preservation may belong operationally to another department, but there may still be recorded information showing:

- whether a preservation request was received;
- whether a hold was applied;
- which department dealt with it;
- and what records were affected.

Likewise, a question about complaint responsibility may fall within Professional Standards, but there may still be recorded information identifying:

- which force retained responsibility;
- which department handled the complaint;
- and how the matter was allocated.

Similarly, equality and safeguarding questions may engage operational or Professional Standards functions, but there may still be recorded policies, templates, assessments, supervisory notes or audit records capable of disclosure under FOIA.

The MPS's own 1 October 2026 correspondence distinguishes between matters for Data Rights and matters that may fall to other departments.

I therefore ask that the final response avoids combining different categories of answer into a single general statement.

Instead, for each question, please distinguish clearly between the following possibilities:

1. **Recorded information is held and can be disclosed.**
2. **Recorded information is held but is exempt from disclosure.**
3. **No recorded information is held.**
4. **The question seeks an opinion rather than recorded information.**
5. **The matter falls outside FOIA and belongs to another MPS function.**
6. **The information is believed to be held by City of London Police or another body rather than the MPS.**
7. **The information is partly held by the MPS and partly by another body.**
8. **Further clarification is genuinely required.**

This classification would significantly reduce confusion.

A. Questions framed as “why”

Where a question uses the word “**why**”, I ask the MPS to interpret it, where possible, as a request for:

- the recorded rationale;
- decision note;
- tasking rationale;
- risk assessment;
- supervisor comment;
- CAD entry;
- briefing;
- email;
- or other contemporaneous record explaining the decision.

For example:

“Why were four officers deployed?”

should be read as:

“What recorded information exists showing the operational rationale for deploying four officers?”

Likewise:

“Why was my home used?”

should be read as:

“What recorded information exists showing the rationale for using my residential address as the point of attendance?”

This is intended to ensure that the wording of the question does not obscure the fact that the request is directed at existing records.

B. Questions framed as “who authorised”

Where I ask who authorised a decision, I seek:

- the recorded identity or role of the decision-maker;
- the date or time of authorisation;
- and the record evidencing that authorisation.

If a personal name is exempt, I ask that the MPS consider whether rank, role, office or department can be disclosed instead.

C. Questions framed as “what safeguards applied”

Where I ask what safeguards applied, I seek:

- the relevant policy;
- procedure;
- operational guidance;
- assessment framework;
- supervisory control;
- or case-specific record.

I do not ask the MPS to formulate a new safeguard retrospectively.

D. Questions framed as “was X done”

Where I ask whether something occurred, for example:

- whether MPS was notified;
- whether supervisor approval existed;
- whether a risk assessment was undertaken;
- whether Benbow applied;

I ask for a response based on the records held.

If the records show “yes”, please identify them.

If the records show “no”, please state that.

If the MPS holds no information from which the answer can be established, please state:

“No recorded information held from which this can be determined.”

That is materially different from answering “no”.

E. Questions involving legal basis

Where I ask what legal basis governed the attendance, I do not ask the MPS to provide legal advice.

I ask for the recorded:

- statutory power;
- protocol;
- agreement;
- mutual-aid basis;
- operational procedure;
- tasking authority;
- or other legal/operational basis cited in the relevant records.

If no legal basis is recorded, please state that expressly.

F. Questions involving complaints

Where the question concerns which force or department was responsible for complaint handling, I ask for the recorded allocation of responsibility.

If the MPS considers that complaint handling itself is outside FOIA, I nevertheless ask it to identify any recorded information showing:

- which body was responsible;

- which referral was made;
- what reference was created;
- and what department received the matter.

G. Questions involving equality and safeguarding

Where questions concern anti-Black racism safeguards, equality, disproportionality or safeguarding, I ask for recorded policies and case-specific records.

I do not ask the MPS to form a new conclusion about whether discrimination occurred.

The request is for the documentary safeguards, assessments and audit trail.

H. Questions involving preservation

Where preservation falls outside the ordinary remit of Data Rights, I ask that this be stated clearly.

However, I also ask the MPS to identify:

- which department is responsible;
- whether any preservation request was forwarded;
- and what recorded information exists concerning that forwarding or action.

I. Avoiding procedural looping

The purpose of this section is to prevent the request from becoming caught in a procedural loop in which:

- Data Rights says the matter belongs to another department;
- another department says it is an FOI issue;
- or one police force directs the matter to the other without identifying what it actually holds.

I therefore ask the MPS to identify, question by question, **what it holds, what it does not hold, what it cannot disclose, and what genuinely belongs elsewhere.**

For avoidance of doubt, the central principle of this section is:

Wherever an existing record can answer the question, I am asking for that record or the recorded information contained within it. Where no such record is held, I ask the MPS to state that clearly rather than substituting a general explanation or directing me elsewhere without identifying the status of the information sought.

SECTION 10 — RESPONSIBILITY, REFERRAL, OWNERSHIP OF OUTSTANDING MATTERS AND AVOIDANCE OF ADMINISTRATIVE DEAD ENDS

A further issue requiring clarity is **which organisation, force, department or office is responsible for each outstanding matter arising from the 31 October 2025 deployment.**

This is important because the subject matter now spans several functions:

- Freedom of Information;
- Subject Access and data protection;
- operational policing;
- cross-force tasking;
- Professional Standards;
- safeguarding;
- equality considerations;
- preservation of records;
- legal services;
- and complaints oversight.

The fact that different questions may fall within different functions should not result in those questions being left unanswered simply because one department considers another department more appropriate.

The purpose of this section is therefore to ensure that each outstanding matter is assigned to a clearly identified responsible body.

The deployment itself is already sufficiently identified:

31 October 2025

23 Jersey House, 2 Eastfield Road, Enfield EN3 5UY

approximately 11:15–11:50

Met CAD 2248 (31/10/2025)

City of London Police attendance

four officers

reference to a voluntary interview

The remaining issue is responsibility for answering the questions arising from that deployment.

A. Matters potentially held by the Metropolitan Police Service

The Metropolitan Police Service should identify what recorded information it holds concerning:

- CAD 2248;
- MPS notification;
- MPS coordination;
- MPS approval;
- MPS tasking;
- cross-force communications;
- command arrangements;
- Benbow;
- mutual aid;
- relevant policies;
- voluntary-attendance safeguards;
- retention and preservation;
- and any MPS complaint or Professional Standards involvement.

The MPS has already confirmed that City of London Police attended the property and that **CAD 2248 31/10/25 refers**. Gmail Download - URGENT_ Suspec...

That confirmation means the MPS plainly holds at least some recorded information connected with the attendance.

Accordingly, where the MPS holds information, I ask it to answer from its own records rather than direct the entire matter elsewhere.

B. Matters potentially held by City of London Police

City of London Police may hold records concerning:

- who authorised its officers to attend;
- officer identities;
- briefing;
- tasking;
- risk assessment;
- BWV;

- officer notebooks;
- internal command;
- the purpose of the voluntary interview;
- and the operational rationale for deploying four officers.

My 5 November 2025 request to City of London Police specifically asked for those categories of material, including written authorisation, tasking logs, operation or briefing orders, officer identities and relevant risk records. Gmail Download - Verification, ...

If the MPS knows that a particular record is held solely by City of London Police, I ask the MPS to identify that fact clearly.

The response should distinguish:

“MPS does not hold this information and believes City of London Police is the relevant holder”

from:

“MPS holds no information and does not know whether any other body holds it.”

Those are materially different answers.

C. Cross-force material

Some records may exist in both forces.

For example:

- emails between MPS and CoLP;
- tasking communications;
- notification records;
- CAD cross-references;
- command discussions;
- safeguarding information;
- risk information;
- and post-event correspondence.

Where such information is held jointly or duplicated, the existence of another holder should not be treated as a reason for the MPS not to address the records it itself holds.

D. Professional Standards responsibility

There are also Professional Standards issues arising from the attendance.

My records show complaint-related references including:

- **CO/204/25;**
- later correspondence under **CO/348/25;**
- and associated oversight correspondence.

The present request does not ask the MPS Data Rights Unit to determine those complaints.

However, where a question concerns complaint ownership, referral, allocation or responsibility, I ask the MPS to identify the recorded information showing:

- which force was responsible;
- whether a referral was made;
- when it was made;
- to whom;
- and under what reference.

E. Preservation responsibility

The MPS's 1 October 2026 response indicated that preservation matters may fall outside the ordinary remit of Data Rights.

I accept that different departments may have different operational responsibilities.

However, where preservation is not a Data Rights function, I ask the MPS to identify the appropriate responsible body, which may include:

- Directorate of Professional Standards;
- Directorate of Legal Services;
- the relevant operational command;
- the Officer in the Case;
- Information Rights;
- or another designated unit.

The response should identify the actual responsible function rather than merely state that Data Rights cannot assist.

F. Equality and safeguarding responsibility

Questions concerning equality, safeguarding and anti-Black-racism controls may also fall across more than one department.

Potentially relevant functions may include:

- operational command;
- Professional Standards;
- equality, diversity or inclusion functions;
- safeguarding;
- policy units;
- and legal or governance departments.

Where the MPS holds recorded information about the applicable safeguards, that information should still be addressed.

Where another department must conduct a substantive review, that department should be identified.

G. Legal-services responsibility

If any question concerns preservation for contemplated litigation, legal hold, pre-action matters or evidential retention connected with legal proceedings, the MPS has indicated that such matters may fall to legal services.

Where that is the case, I ask the MPS to identify:

- the correct department;
- the appropriate contact route;
- whether the matter has already been referred;
- and any reference created.

H. Subject Access and personal data

Some of the material concerning the deployment may constitute my personal data and therefore fall more appropriately within data-protection access rights.

I have already made Subject Access Requests concerning:

- Met CAD 2248;
- the City of London Police attendance;
- CCTV;
- access records;

- BWV;
- communications;
- risk assessments;
- and related personal data. Gmail - UK GDPR Subject Access ... Gmail Download - UK GDPR Subjec...

Where the MPS considers that a particular item cannot be dealt with under FOIA because it constitutes my personal data, I ask it to say so clearly and identify the appropriate data-protection route.

That should not be confused with saying that no information is held.

I. No silent closure of questions

Where any question falls outside the Data Rights Unit's function, I ask that it not simply be treated as closed.

Instead, the response should identify:

1. the nature of the outstanding matter;
2. the department or body responsible;
3. whether referral has been made;
4. the date of referral;
5. the reference number, if any;
6. and what remains outstanding.

This is particularly important because the original request expressly asked the MPS to identify and answer substantive matters that remained unresolved following the earlier internal review.

J. Avoiding circular referral

I ask that the MPS avoid a situation in which:

- MPS refers matters to CoLP;
- CoLP refers matters back to MPS;
- Data Rights refers matters to Professional Standards;
- Professional Standards refers matters to FOI;
- and no department takes ownership of the substantive question.

For each matter, there should be a clear answer to:

Who owns this issue?

Who holds the relevant records?

Who is responsible for action?

What reference governs that action?

K. Requested responsibility matrix

To improve clarity, I ask the MPS to provide, where possible, a simple responsibility matrix identifying:

Issue	MPS holds records?	Responsible MPS department	Other relevant body	Referral made?	Reference
CAD 2248					
Cross-force tasking					
Benbow status					
Officer deployment					
Voluntary interview safeguards					
Risk assessment					
Supervisory authorisation					
BWV					
Preservation					
Complaint responsibility					
Equality safeguards					

This would substantially reduce further confusion.

For avoidance of doubt, the central question in this section is:

For every substantive matter arising from the 31 October 2025 deployment, which force, department or office is responsible, what recorded information does the MPS itself hold, what has been referred elsewhere, and what remains outstanding?

SECTION 11 — DISTINGUISHING THE 31 OCTOBER 2025 RESIDENTIAL DEPLOYMENT FROM LATER EVENTS AND OTHER REFERENCES

For clarity, the City of London Police deployment identified throughout this document is the **31 October 2025 residential attendance at 23 Jersey House, 2 Eastfield Road, Enfield EN3 5UY**, recorded or cross-referenced by the Metropolitan Police Service under **CAD 2248 (31/10/2025)**.

It is important that this event is not conflated with later police contact, later arrest and custody events, or other complaint and investigation references.

A. The event covered by this clarification

The event covered here is:

- **Date:** 31 October 2025;
- **Time:** approximately 11:15–11:50;
- **Core period:** approximately 11:20–11:40;
- **Location:** 23 Jersey House, 2 Eastfield Road, Enfield EN3 5UY;
- **Attending force:** City of London Police;
- **Number observed:** four officers;
- **MPS reference:** CAD 2248 (31/10/2025);
- **Operational context referenced:** voluntary interview.

The MPS itself later confirmed in writing that **City of London Police attended my property** and that **CAD 2248 31/10/25 refers**. Gmail Download - URGENT_ Suspec...

My 5 November 2025 Subject Access Request likewise identifies the same date, time, location and CAD reference, and asks for records concerning the attendance and the referenced voluntary interview. Gmail - UK GDPR Subject Access ...

B. The 16 April 2026 arrest is a separate event

This clarification does **not** concern the later arrest on **16 April 2026**.

The Subject Access Request relating to that incident records:

- arrest on Seven Sisters Road;
- arrest time approximately 12:40;
- transport to Bishopsgate Police Station;
- custody arrival at 13:58;

- release at 14:51;
- and custody reference **C26049222**. FORMAL SUBJECT ACCESS REQUEST –...

That was a separate and later event.

The preservation notice concerning 16 April 2026 also makes clear that, before that arrest, my engagement with police had been limited to **voluntary attendance requests**, which I had declined pending safeguards. URGENT PRESERVATION NOTICE AND ...

The 31 October 2025 residential attendance therefore forms part of an earlier stage in the chronology.

C. The 7 July 2025 incident is also distinct

The records also refer to an earlier **7 July 2025** incident involving seizure of posters.

The later correspondence identifies:

- City of London Police reference **25000396433**;
- exhibit reference **EMA/01**;
- Professional Standards complaint reference **CO/204/25**;
- date of seizure **7 July 2025**;
- and PC Ernesto Milanes-Abadal as the officer identified in the evidence as having seized the property. Gmail - COLP - 25000396433 - BR...

That incident may form part of the wider investigative background that eventually led to voluntary attendance requests.

However, the materials currently available do **not** establish that the 7 July 2025 incident and the 31 October 2025 residential attendance were the same operational event.

They should therefore remain distinct unless the police records themselves show a direct operational linkage.

D. Complaint references must not be treated as interchangeable

Several complaint or case references appear across the documentary history, including:

- **CO/204/25**;
- **CO/348/25**;
- **IOPC 2025/010184**;
- **25000396433**;

- and **Met CAD 2248 (31/10/2025)**.

These references should not be treated as interchangeable unless the relevant police records establish the relationship between them.

For example, correspondence dated 5 November 2025 identifies:

IOPC 2025/010184; Force Ref: CO/204/25

and asks for preservation of material relating specifically to **31/10/2025 (Met CAD 2248)** at 23 Jersey House. Gmail Download - Suspended comp...

That demonstrates that multiple references can exist around the same wider sequence of events without necessarily serving the same function.

One may be:

- a complaint reference;
- another an operational CAD reference;
- another an investigation reference;
- another an IOPC reference;
- and another a Professional Standards reference.

I therefore ask the MPS to identify the function of each relevant reference rather than assume that one number represents the entire matter.

E. The purpose of separating the events

This distinction matters because the present request concerns the **operational basis for the 31 October 2025 residential deployment**.

The request should therefore not be answered by relying only on records concerning:

- the 7 July 2025 seizure;
- the later 16 April 2026 arrest;
- later custody processing;
- or later complaint correspondence.

Those records may provide context, but they are not substitutes for the actual records of the 31 October attendance.

The relevant search must therefore remain centred upon:

31 October 2025 + 23 Jersey House + CAD 2248 + City of London Police + four officers + voluntary interview.

F. Relationship between wider investigation and specific deployment

Where the 31 October 2025 deployment arose from a wider CoLP investigation, I ask the MPS to identify that relationship from recorded information.

If CAD 2248 links to:

- 25000396433;
- CO/204/25;
- another CoLP incident number;
- another MPS incident number;
- a voluntary-attendance request;
- or another operational record,

please identify that cross-reference.

If no such link is recorded, please state that clearly.

G. No substitution of later records for the deployment record

The later existence of an arrest, court proceedings, complaint handling or custody records does not answer the earlier questions concerning:

- why four officers attended the home;
- who authorised that attendance;
- what risk assessment existed;
- whether Benbow applied;
- whether the MPS was notified;
- what tasking existed;
- and what safeguards applied.

Those are event-specific questions.

They require event-specific records.

For avoidance of doubt, the central purpose of this section is:

to ensure that the 31 October 2025 City of London Police residential attendance is treated as a distinct operational event and is not confused with the earlier 7 July 2025 incident, the later 16 April 2026 arrest, or complaint and investigation references that may relate to the wider chronology but serve different administrative or operational functions.

SECTION 12 — SPECIFIC SEARCH TERMS, RECORD LOCATIONS AND LINKED REFERENCES TO BE USED BY THE MPS

To remove any remaining ambiguity and to assist the Metropolitan Police Service in locating the relevant recorded information, I set out below the specific identifiers, search terms and record categories that should reasonably lead to the deployment records.

The principal event identifier is:

Met CAD 2248 — 31/10/2025

The principal location is:

23 Jersey House

2 Eastfield Road

Enfield

EN3 5UY

The relevant date and time are:

31 October 2025

approximately 11:15–11:50

core period approximately 11:20–11:40

The attending force was:

City of London Police

The attendance involved:

four officers

The operational context referenced was:

“voluntary interview”

The MPS has already confirmed in writing that City of London Police attended my property and that **CAD 2248 31/10/25 refers**. Gmail Download - URGENT_ Suspec...

My 5 November 2025 Subject Access Request expressly asked for the full CAD log, radio audio, linked CRIS or incident numbers, BWV, officer notes, briefings, risk assessments, cross-force communications, and records concerning a referenced voluntary interview. Gmail - UK GDPR Subject Access ...

Accordingly, I ask that searches not be confined to one database or one exact wording.

The following identifiers and terms should be used, where technically possible, to locate linked records:

- CAD 2248;
- 31/10/2025;
- 23 Jersey House;
- 2 Eastfield Road;
- Enfield EN3 5UY;
- Derrick Lynch;
- John Canoe;
- City of London Police;
- CoLP;
- voluntary interview;
- voluntary attendance;
- residential attendance;
- home attendance;
- cross-force deployment;
- mutual aid;
- Benbow;
- City of London Police attendance in Enfield;
- four officers;
- written-only contact;
- safeguarding;
- risk assessment;
- tasking;
- deployment;
- briefing;
- and any linked incident or crime reference contained within CAD 2248.

Where the MPS system uses abbreviated or coded descriptors, I ask that equivalent system terms also be searched.

A. CAD and command-and-control systems

Please search all records linked to **CAD 2248 (31/10/2025)**, including:

- the initial CAD entry;
- amendments;
- dispatch entries;
- call-handler notes;
- controller notes;
- incident updates;
- closure entries;
- linked CADs;
- linked crime or incident numbers;
- officer/unit identifiers;
- radio channel references;
- and any audit history.

The MPS should also identify whether CAD 2248 contains any direct or indirect reference to:

- City of London Police;
- a voluntary interview;
- a request for assistance;
- an intelligence or safeguarding concern;
- a cross-force deployment;
- or any other operational reference.

B. Cross-force communications

Please search for communications between the MPS and City of London Police relating to the 31 October 2025 attendance, including:

- emails;
- internal messaging;
- telephone logs;
- command-and-control messages;
- operational requests;

- tasking messages;
- coordination messages;
- intelligence sharing;
- safeguarding information;
- and post-event communications.

My earlier SAR expressly requested any emails or communications with City of London Police regarding the attendance, including cross-force requests, mutual-aid/tasking and authorisations. Gmail - UK GDPR Subject Access ...

C. Operational tasking systems

Please search for any:

- tasking sheet;
- operational order;
- deployment instruction;
- briefing;
- attendance request;
- command instruction;
- supervisory direction;
- officer allocation;
- or deployment rationale

connected to the event.

If the MPS did not itself task the CoLP officers, I ask it to identify any record showing that the tasking originated with City of London Police.

D. Risk, safeguarding and equality records

Please search for any record concerning:

- risk assessment;
- threat grading;
- vulnerability;
- safeguarding;
- Public Sector Equality Duty considerations;

- equality assessment;
- disproportionality;
- disability or communication needs;
- written-only contact;
- doorbell/intercom protocol;
- or any supervisory safeguard.

My 5 November 2025 SAR specifically requested risk/PSED assessments and safeguarding markers relating to the attendance. Gmail - UK GDPR Subject Access ...

E. Voluntary interview records

Please search for any record using terms such as:

- voluntary interview;
- voluntary attendance;
- interview under caution;
- appointment;
- interview request;
- suspect interview;
- home interview;
- residential interview;
- or request for cooperation.

The MPS should also identify whether any appointment letter, invitation, officer note or internal instruction existed concerning a proposed interview.

F. BWV and media systems

Please search for:

- BWV identifiers;
- footage;
- metadata;
- activation records;
- categorisation;
- retention records;

- preservation markers;
- and any cross-force transfer of BWV.

If the MPS does not hold the footage itself but holds a record referring to City of London Police BWV, that record is also relevant.

G. Officer and unit records

Please identify any record showing:

- officer names;
- collar numbers;
- ranks;
- unit;
- supervisor;
- operational team;
- or command structure

associated with the attendance.

If names are exempt, please consider disclosure of rank, role, unit or other non-exempt identifying information.

H. Benbow and mutual-aid records

Please search any system or file capable of showing whether the event was:

- designated under Benbow;
- associated with mutual aid;
- treated as a joint operation;
- covered by another cross-force agreement;
- or authorised under another procedure.

The purpose is not to obtain generic Benbow material again, but to determine whether the identified deployment was linked to any such arrangement.

I. Complaint and Professional Standards cross-references

Please identify whether CAD 2248 or the 31 October 2025 attendance was later linked in MPS records to:

- a Professional Standards matter;

- a complaint;
- an IOPC reference;
- a City of London Police complaint reference;
- or any preservation notice.

This includes any internal reference linking the attendance to **CO/204/25**, **CO/348/25**, **IOPC 2025/010184**, or another number.

The current materials show that **IOPC 2025/010184** and **Force Ref CO/204/25** were being discussed in connection with preservation of material relating to **31/10/2025 (Met CAD 2248)**. Gmail Download - Suspended comp...

J. Linked records should be followed through

If a search result identifies another reference number, please follow that reference.

For example:

CAD 2248 → linked incident number → linked tasking record → linked officer/unit → linked communication → linked BWV

The search should not stop merely because the first record points elsewhere.

The object is to identify the full connected operational record.

K. No assumption that a record does not exist because one system is negative

If one system returns no result, I ask that the MPS not treat that as conclusive where another system may hold the information.

For example, tasking may sit outside CAD; BWV metadata may sit in a separate system; Professional Standards records may be held independently; and cross-force emails may not appear in the primary incident record.

The search therefore needs to reflect the multi-system nature of the event.

For avoidance of doubt, the purpose of this section is:

to provide the MPS with a sufficiently precise set of identifiers, dates, times, locations, search terms and likely record categories so that there can be no reasonable uncertainty as to how the relevant deployment records should be located.

SECTION 12 — SPECIFIC SEARCH TERMS, RECORD LOCATIONS AND LINKED REFERENCES TO BE USED BY THE MPS

To remove any remaining ambiguity and to assist the Metropolitan Police Service in locating the relevant recorded information, I set out below the specific identifiers, search terms and record categories that should reasonably lead to the deployment records.

The principal event identifier is:

Met CAD 2248 — 31/10/2025

The principal location is:

23 Jersey House

2 Eastfield Road

Enfield

EN3 5UY

The relevant date and time are:

31 October 2025

approximately 11:15–11:50

core period approximately 11:20–11:40

The attending force was:

City of London Police

The attendance involved:

four officers

The operational context referenced was:

“voluntary interview”

The MPS has already confirmed in writing that City of London Police attended my property and that **CAD 2248 31/10/25 refers**. Gmail Download - URGENT_ Suspec...

My 5 November 2025 Subject Access Request expressly asked for the full CAD log, radio audio, linked CRIS or incident numbers, BWV, officer notes, briefings, risk assessments, cross-force communications, and records concerning a referenced voluntary interview. Gmail - UK GDPR Subject Access ...

Accordingly, I ask that searches not be confined to one database or one exact wording.

The following identifiers and terms should be used, where technically possible, to locate linked records:

- CAD 2248;
- 31/10/2025;
- 23 Jersey House;
- 2 Eastfield Road;
- Enfield EN3 5UY;
- Derrick Lynch;
- John Canoe;
- City of London Police;
- CoLP;
- voluntary interview;
- voluntary attendance;
- residential attendance;
- home attendance;
- cross-force deployment;
- mutual aid;
- Benbow;
- City of London Police attendance in Enfield;
- four officers;
- written-only contact;
- safeguarding;
- risk assessment;
- tasking;
- deployment;
- briefing;
- and any linked incident or crime reference contained within CAD 2248.

Where the MPS system uses abbreviated or coded descriptors, I ask that equivalent system terms also be searched.

A. CAD and command-and-control systems

Please search all records linked to **CAD 2248 (31/10/2025)**, including:

- the initial CAD entry;
- amendments;
- dispatch entries;
- call-handler notes;
- controller notes;
- incident updates;
- closure entries;
- linked CADs;
- linked crime or incident numbers;
- officer/unit identifiers;
- radio channel references;
- and any audit history.

The MPS should also identify whether CAD 2248 contains any direct or indirect reference to:

- City of London Police;
- a voluntary interview;
- a request for assistance;
- an intelligence or safeguarding concern;
- a cross-force deployment;
- or any other operational reference.

B. Cross-force communications

Please search for communications between the MPS and City of London Police relating to the 31 October 2025 attendance, including:

- emails;
- internal messaging;
- telephone logs;
- command-and-control messages;
- operational requests;

- tasking messages;
- coordination messages;
- intelligence sharing;
- safeguarding information;
- and post-event communications.

My earlier SAR expressly requested any emails or communications with City of London Police regarding the attendance, including cross-force requests, mutual-aid/tasking and authorisations. Gmail - UK GDPR Subject Access ...

C. Operational tasking systems

Please search for any:

- tasking sheet;
- operational order;
- deployment instruction;
- briefing;
- attendance request;
- command instruction;
- supervisory direction;
- officer allocation;
- or deployment rationale

connected to the event.

If the MPS did not itself task the CoLP officers, I ask it to identify any record showing that the tasking originated with City of London Police.

D. Risk, safeguarding and equality records

Please search for any record concerning:

- risk assessment;
- threat grading;
- vulnerability;
- safeguarding;
- Public Sector Equality Duty considerations;

- equality assessment;
- disproportionality;
- disability or communication needs;
- written-only contact;
- doorbell/intercom protocol;
- or any supervisory safeguard.

My 5 November 2025 SAR specifically requested risk/PSED assessments and safeguarding markers relating to the attendance. Gmail - UK GDPR Subject Access ...

E. Voluntary interview records

Please search for any record using terms such as:

- voluntary interview;
- voluntary attendance;
- interview under caution;
- appointment;
- interview request;
- suspect interview;
- home interview;
- residential interview;
- or request for cooperation.

The MPS should also identify whether any appointment letter, invitation, officer note or internal instruction existed concerning a proposed interview.

F. BWV and media systems

Please search for:

- BWV identifiers;
- footage;
- metadata;
- activation records;
- categorisation;
- retention records;

- preservation markers;
- and any cross-force transfer of BWV.

If the MPS does not hold the footage itself but holds a record referring to City of London Police BWV, that record is also relevant.

G. Officer and unit records

Please identify any record showing:

- officer names;
- collar numbers;
- ranks;
- unit;
- supervisor;
- operational team;
- or command structure

associated with the attendance.

If names are exempt, please consider disclosure of rank, role, unit or other non-exempt identifying information.

H. Benbow and mutual-aid records

Please search any system or file capable of showing whether the event was:

- designated under Benbow;
- associated with mutual aid;
- treated as a joint operation;
- covered by another cross-force agreement;
- or authorised under another procedure.

The purpose is not to obtain generic Benbow material again, but to determine whether the identified deployment was linked to any such arrangement.

I. Complaint and Professional Standards cross-references

Please identify whether CAD 2248 or the 31 October 2025 attendance was later linked in MPS records to:

- a Professional Standards matter;

- a complaint;
- an IOPC reference;
- a City of London Police complaint reference;
- or any preservation notice.

This includes any internal reference linking the attendance to **CO/204/25**, **CO/348/25**, **IOPC 2025/010184**, or another number.

The current materials show that **IOPC 2025/010184** and **Force Ref CO/204/25** were being discussed in connection with preservation of material relating to **31/10/2025 (Met CAD 2248)**. Gmail Download - Suspended comp...

J. Linked records should be followed through

If a search result identifies another reference number, please follow that reference.

For example:

CAD 2248 → linked incident number → linked tasking record → linked officer/unit → linked communication → linked BWV

The search should not stop merely because the first record points elsewhere.

The object is to identify the full connected operational record.

K. No assumption that a record does not exist because one system is negative

If one system returns no result, I ask that the MPS not treat that as conclusive where another system may hold the information.

For example, tasking may sit outside CAD; BWV metadata may sit in a separate system; Professional Standards records may be held independently; and cross-force emails may not appear in the primary incident record.

The search therefore needs to reflect the multi-system nature of the event.

For avoidance of doubt, the purpose of this section is:

to provide the MPS with a sufficiently precise set of identifiers, dates, times, locations, search terms and likely record categories so that there can be no reasonable uncertainty as to how the relevant deployment records should be located.

SECTION 14 — FORMAL EFFECT OF THIS CLARIFICATION AND PRESERVATION OF THE ORIGINAL SCOPE

This clarification is provided solely to answer the Metropolitan Police Service request for further particulars identifying the City of London Police deployment referred to in **FOI Reference 01/FOI/26/055460/F**.

Its purpose is to remove ambiguity.

It is **not** intended to replace, rewrite, abandon, reduce or otherwise narrow the substantive scope of the existing request.

The deployment has now been identified with precision as:

31 October 2025

23 Jersey House, 2 Eastfield Road, Enfield EN3 5UY

approximately 11:15–11:50

core period approximately 11:20–11:40

City of London Police attendance

four officers observed

Met CAD 2248 (31/10/2025)

voluntary interview referenced

The MPS has itself confirmed that **City of London Police attended my property** and that **CAD 2248 31/10/25 refers**. Gmail Download - URGENT_ Suspec...

This clarification should therefore be read as supplying the missing factual identifier for the already-submitted request.

A. No withdrawal of Questions 1–82

For avoidance of doubt, none of Questions 1–82 is withdrawn.

Each question remains live to the extent that it seeks:

- recorded information;
- identification of records;
- identification of the responsible body;
- or clarification of whether the MPS holds the information sought.

This clarification merely identifies the specific deployment to which those questions relate.

B. No substitution of this document for the original request

This document should not be treated as a new FOI request replacing the existing one.

It should be treated as clarification supplied in response to the MPS request for further information.

The original request, together with the clarification now provided, should be read as one continuous request.

C. No narrowing to CAD 2248 alone

Although **CAD 2248 (31/10/2025)** is the principal MPS identifier presently known to me, the request should not be artificially restricted to records physically stored inside that CAD entry.

The clarification identifies the event.

The request extends to the relevant recorded information held elsewhere within the MPS where that information concerns the same deployment.

That may include:

- command systems;
- operational tasking;
- email;
- BWV systems;
- Professional Standards records;
- safeguarding records;
- policy records;
- risk assessments;
- legal records;
- and cross-force communications.

The presence of CAD 2248 is therefore a search anchor, not a limitation on record location.

D. No narrowing to the physical attendance only

The request concerns not only the minutes during which the four officers were physically present at the property.

It also concerns the recorded decision-making before and after attendance, including:

- initiation of the deployment;
- authorisation;

- cross-force notification;
- tasking;
- briefing;
- risk assessment;
- safeguarding;
- command;
- post-attendance reporting;
- and later record handling.

The operational event should therefore be understood as including its relevant planning, execution and immediate administrative aftermath.

E. No concession that Benbow was applicable

The repeated reference to Benbow in this clarification does not assert that Benbow governed the 31 October 2025 attendance.

That remains an unanswered factual question.

The MPS is being asked to establish from its records whether:

- Benbow applied;
- another cross-force arrangement applied;
- or some other legal or operational framework governed the attendance.

The disclosure of Benbow is relevant because it demonstrates the existence of a formal cross-force protocol, not because I assume that the deployment was necessarily conducted under it.

F. No concession that Benbow was inapplicable

Likewise, nothing in this clarification should be interpreted as conceding that Benbow did not apply.

That question must be answered from the records.

G. No concession as to the legal status of the attendance

My use of phrases such as:

“voluntary interview,”

“voluntary attendance,”

or

“circumstances presented as voluntary”

does not concede that the encounter satisfied every legal or procedural requirement associated with voluntariness.

Those expressions reflect the terminology appearing in the documentary history.

The purpose of the request is, in part, to identify the records showing:

- how the attendance was categorised;
- what safeguards applied;
- and what officers were instructed to do.

H. No concession as to the lawfulness, propriety or proportionality of the deployment

Supplying precise identification of the deployment does not amount to accepting that:

- the deployment was lawful;
- the number of officers was proportionate;
- the residential attendance was appropriate;
- the correct safeguards were applied;
- the correct cross-force authority existed;
- or the decision-making was procedurally proper.

Those are separate matters.

The present clarification is evidential and administrative: it identifies the event.

I. No concession regarding complaint responsibility

The existence of City of London Police complaint references does not resolve which force or department held responsibility for every decision connected with the deployment.

That remains one of the matters requiring clarification.

J. No concession that matters outside Data Rights have been resolved

The MPS's indication that certain matters may fall outside the Data Rights Unit does not mean those matters have been answered or resolved.

Where the relevant issue belongs to another MPS function, I continue to ask that the responsible function be identified and that any existing referral or recorded action be stated.

K. No abandonment of preservation requests

Nothing in this clarification withdraws or supersedes earlier requests to preserve records concerning the 31 October 2025 attendance.

Those preservation requests remain part of the documentary history.

My March 2026 correspondence expressly requested preservation of CAD/command-and-control records, radio transmissions, BWV, tasking records, briefings, deployment rationale, supervisory authorisations, risk assessments, intelligence submissions and incident reports concerning the residential attendance. Formal response and complaint C...

L. No abandonment of Subject Access rights or other routes

The present FOI request does not replace:

- Subject Access Requests;
- complaints;
- preservation notices;
- Professional Standards processes;
- or any other lawful information-access or accountability route.

Different processes may apply to different categories of records.

The existence of one route should not be treated as cancellation of another.

M. Continuity of the documentary history

The relevant sequence includes:

- the 31 October 2025 CoLP attendance;
- the MPS confirmation under CAD 2248;
- the 5 November 2025 FOI and SAR correspondence;
- the earlier FOI response under 01/FOI/25/048820/V;
- subsequent internal review activity;
- the March 2026 complaint and preservation requests;
- and the present request under 01/FOI/26/055460/F.

These documents form a connected evidential history.

This clarification should therefore be read in that context rather than as an isolated new enquiry.

For avoidance of doubt, the central effect of this section is:

This document supplies precise identifying particulars for the City of London Police deployment already under consideration. It does not withdraw, replace, narrow or concede any substantive issue within Questions 1–82 or any associated preservation, Subject Access, complaint or accountability request.

SECTION 15 — REQUEST FOR CONFIRMATION THAT THE CLARIFICATION REQUIREMENT HAS NOW BEEN SATISFIED

The Metropolitan Police Service asked me to confirm precisely which City of London Police deployment I was referring to.

That clarification has now been provided in detail.

The deployment has been identified by:

- **date:** 31 October 2025;
- **time:** approximately 11:15–11:50;
- **core period:** approximately 11:20–11:40;
- **location:** 23 Jersey House, 2 Eastfield Road, Enfield EN3 5UY;
- **attending force:** City of London Police;
- **number of officers observed:** four;
- **MPS reference:** CAD 2248 (31/10/2025);
- **operational context referenced:** voluntary interview;
- **earlier FOI linkage:** 01/FOI/25/048820/V;
- **current FOI reference:** 01/FOI/26/055460/F.

The MPS itself previously confirmed in writing that **City of London Police attended my property** and that **CAD 2248 31/10/25 refers**. Gmail Download - URGENT_ Suspec...

My own contemporaneous and subsequent correspondence also repeatedly identified the same event by date, address, time window, CAD reference and voluntary-interview context. Gmail - UK GDPR Subject Access ... Gmail Download - UK GDPR Subjec...

Accordingly, I ask the MPS to confirm expressly that the clarification requirement has now been satisfied.

A. Confirmation requested

Please confirm:

1. that the MPS accepts that the deployment has now been identified with sufficient precision;
2. that no further clarification is required before substantive processing can continue;
3. that FOI Reference **01/FOI/26/055460/F** remains active;

4. that the request has not been treated as withdrawn;
5. that the MPS will now proceed to search for and consider the recorded information requested;
6. and the date from which the MPS will calculate the applicable response period following receipt of this clarification.

B. If the MPS still considers the deployment insufficiently identified

If, despite the information now supplied, the MPS considers that further clarification is still required, I ask that it state precisely:

- what fact is still missing;
- why that fact is necessary to locate the records;
- what systems or record sets cannot presently be searched without it;
- and what additional information the MPS believes I am reasonably capable of supplying.

A general statement that further clarification is required would no longer be sufficient.

The event has now been identified by multiple independent markers, including a Metropolitan Police CAD reference.

C. No further ambiguity as to subject matter

The MPS should now be able to distinguish this deployment from:

- the earlier 7 July 2025 incident;
- the later 16 April 2026 arrest;
- unrelated CoLP deployments;
- generic mutual-aid operations;
- or other voluntary-interview matters.

The event under consideration is specifically:

the four-officer City of London Police attendance at 23 Jersey House on 31 October 2025, recorded or cross-referenced under Met CAD 2248, in circumstances in which a voluntary interview was referenced.

D. CAD 2248 provides an internal search route

The existence of **CAD 2248** is especially significant because it provides the MPS with its own internal event identifier.

I therefore ask the MPS to confirm that this reference will be used as part of the search process.

Where CAD 2248 contains or points to:

- another CAD;
- an incident number;
- a crime reference;
- a City of London Police reference;
- an officer/unit identifier;
- a tasking record;
- or another linked system reference,

I ask that those links be followed.

E. Clarification should now lead to substantive processing

The purpose of clarification under FOIA is to enable the authority to identify and locate the information sought.

That purpose has now been met.

I have provided substantially more detail than merely a general description of the incident.

The MPS now has:

- its own CAD reference;
- an exact date;
- a narrow time period;
- a full address;
- the force involved;
- the number of officers observed;
- and the operational context.

I therefore ask that the matter now move from **clarification** to **substantive search and response**.

F. Avoidance of repeated clarification cycles

I also ask that the MPS avoid returning the request to clarification status unless a genuinely new and specific ambiguity arises.

Repeated requests for clarification after the event has been identified by an internal CAD reference would risk unnecessary delay and procedural repetition.

If a particular individual question remains ambiguous, that issue should be identified against that particular question rather than suspending the entire request.

G. Questions capable of being answered immediately from identified records

Some questions may be capable of being addressed directly from CAD 2248 or associated records, including:

- whether MPS knew of the attendance;
- when the MPS became aware of it;
- what purpose was recorded;
- whether City of London Police was identified;
- whether any cross-force communication was recorded;
- and what linked references exist.

I ask that those matters not be delayed solely because other questions may require broader searches.

H. Processing should distinguish broad and narrow searches

The request contains both:

- deployment-specific questions; and
- broader policy or governance questions.

The deployment-specific questions can now be searched using the precise identifiers supplied.

The broader policy questions can be searched by reference to the relevant policy owners and document repositories.

The existence of two search types should not prevent progress on either.

I. Confirmation of status

For clarity, I ask the MPS to provide a short written confirmation in the following terms or equivalent:

“The MPS accepts the clarification supplied in relation to FOI Reference 01/FOI/26/055460/F. The City of London Police deployment has been identified as

the attendance at 23 Jersey House, Enfield, on 31 October 2025, associated with CAD 2248. The request will now proceed to substantive consideration.”

If the MPS cannot provide that confirmation, I ask that it explain precisely why.

For avoidance of doubt, the central request in this section is:

Please confirm that the deployment has now been identified with sufficient precision and that FOI Reference 01/FOI/26/055460/F will now proceed to substantive search and response.

SECTION 16 — CONSOLIDATED POSITION AND FINAL REQUEST FOR ACTION

The purpose of this clarification document is to place the Metropolitan Police Service in a position where there can be no remaining uncertainty about the deployment to which FOI Reference **01/FOI/26/055460/F** relates.

The deployment has now been identified by multiple independent factual markers and by the Metropolitan Police Service's own records.

The event is:

Date: 31 October 2025

Time: approximately 11:15–11:50

Core period: approximately 11:20–11:40

Location: 23 Jersey House, 2 Eastfield Road, Enfield EN3 5UY

Attending force: City of London Police

Number of officers observed: four

MPS reference: CAD 2248 (31/10/2025)

Operational context referenced: voluntary interview

The MPS itself confirmed in writing that:

“City of London Police did attend your property, CAD 2248 31/10/25 refers.” Gmail Download - URGENT_ Suspec...

My Subject Access Request to the MPS identified the same attendance by date, time, address and CAD number, and requested the full CAD log, radio audio, linked incident references, BWV, officer notes, risk assessments, cross-force communications and records concerning the referenced voluntary interview. Gmail - UK GDPR Subject Access ...

My corresponding request to City of London Police also identified the same attendance and asked for the legal and operational basis, officer identities, tasking, briefing, risk assessment, incident references and voluntary-interview records. Gmail Download - Verification, ...

My later formal complaint expressly recorded that I observed **four officers at my door** and asked why four officers were deployed in circumstances presented as voluntary. Formal response and complaint c...

The earlier FOI request of 5 November 2025 sought precisely the policy and procedural material relevant to that event, including:

- CoLP officers operating in MPS territory;
- written tasking and authorisation;
- MPS notification;

- mutual aid and cross-force arrangements;
- voluntary interviews at private residential addresses;
- BWV;
- command-and-control retention;
- and safeguarding. Gmail - Freedom of Information ...

The MPS subsequently disclosed the existence of the Benbow arrangement and supplied its Voluntary Attendance Guidance. 01FOI25048820V_2026-52-26 01522...

Accordingly, the present request is not an abstract enquiry.

It concerns the actual legal, operational, command, safeguarding and evidential framework that governed a specific deployment which has now been identified with precision.

A. The remaining substantive questions

The principal matters requiring answer are now clear.

They include:

- whether the deployment was a Benbow operation;
- if not, what other legal or operational arrangement governed it;
- who authorised the deployment;
- whether the MPS was informed in advance;
- whether MPS approval, coordination or notification was required;
- what written tasking existed;
- what briefing was provided;
- what operational purpose was recorded;
- why four officers were deployed;
- what risk assessment existed;
- what supervisory authorisation existed;
- what voluntary-attendance safeguards applied;
- what equality and safeguarding controls existed;
- which force retained operational command and responsibility;
- what records remain preserved;

- and which department or body owns each outstanding matter.

These are the matters that Questions 1–82 seek to resolve.

B. The request is now capable of targeted search

The MPS now possesses sufficient identifying information to search its own systems.

At minimum, the search can begin with:

CAD 2248 (31/10/2025)

and then follow all linked references, systems, departments and cross-force records.

The request should therefore no longer be treated as lacking sufficient specificity.

C. Recorded information should be distinguished from later explanation

The core purpose of the request is to identify the **contemporaneous recorded information**.

Where the MPS holds a later explanation but no contemporaneous operational record, I ask that the distinction be made clear.

For example:

Contemporaneous record:

tasking, CAD entry, risk assessment, briefing, supervisor approval.

Later explanation:

a subsequent narrative written in response to a complaint or FOI request.

Both may be relevant, but they are not the same.

D. Absence of information should be stated clearly

Where no record exists, I ask that the MPS say so expressly.

For example:

“No recorded information held showing supervisor authorisation.”

is materially clearer than a general statement about policy.

Likewise:

“No recorded information held showing that the deployment was designated under Benbow.”

is materially different from saying that Benbow did not apply.

The response should preserve those distinctions.

E. Partial answers should not be treated as complete answers

Where a general policy answers only part of a question, I ask that the MPS identify the remaining deployment-specific issue.

For example:

- disclosure of Benbow does not answer whether this deployment was Benbow;
- disclosure of Voluntary Attendance Guidance does not answer whether its safeguards were applied;
- disclosure of a retention policy does not answer whether a specific record was preserved;
- disclosure of equality policy does not answer whether any case-specific equality consideration was recorded.

The final response should distinguish general policy from actual case application.

F. Responsibility should be allocated rather than displaced

Where a matter falls outside the immediate remit of Data Rights, I ask that the responsible department or body be identified.

The matter should not simply disappear from consideration because it belongs elsewhere.

If the responsible body is:

- City of London Police;
- MPS Professional Standards;
- Legal Services;
- an operational command;
- a data-protection team;
- or another office,

please identify that clearly.

G. Preservation remains relevant

The repeated preservation requests made since November 2025 remain relevant to the evidential history.

My March 2026 complaint expressly sought preservation of:

- CAD and command-and-control logs;

- radio transmissions;
- BWV;
- officer notebooks;
- tasking;
- briefing;
- deployment rationale;
- supervisor authorisation;
- risk assessments;
- intelligence;
- incident reports;
- and cross-force tasking material. Formal response and complaint c...

The present clarification does not withdraw those requests.

H. No narrowing of the original 82 questions

Nothing in this clarification should be interpreted as narrowing the substantive request.

The clarification has one purpose:

to identify the specific deployment.

That purpose has now been fully achieved.

I. Final action requested

I therefore ask the Metropolitan Police Service to:

1. acknowledge this clarification;
2. confirm that the deployment has now been sufficiently identified;
3. confirm that FOI Reference **01/FOI/26/055460/F** remains active;
4. proceed to substantive searches;
5. use CAD 2248 and the identifying information supplied throughout this document;
6. follow all linked operational references;
7. answer Questions 1–82 individually;
8. distinguish information held, not held, exempt, outside FOIA or held elsewhere;

9. identify the responsible department for matters outside Data Rights;
10. and confirm what remains outstanding after the response.

J. Final statement of identification

For absolute clarity, the deployment referred to throughout my request is:

The deployment of four City of London Police officers to 23 Jersey House, 2 Eastfield Road, Enfield EN3 5UY, on 31 October 2025, between approximately 11:15 and 11:50, with the central period approximately 11:20–11:40, in circumstances in which a voluntary interview was referenced, and recorded or cross-referenced by the Metropolitan Police Service under CAD 2248 (31/10/2025).

That is the deployment.

I respectfully request that the MPS now proceed to answer the substantive request on that basis.

SECTION 17 — PROPOSED INDEX OF SUPPORTING REFERENCES AND DOCUMENTARY CHAIN

For clarity and ease of checking, I consider it useful for the Metropolitan Police Service to read the present clarification together with the principal documents that establish the identity and history of the 31 October 2025 deployment.

This section therefore identifies the key documentary chain without attempting to replace the substance of those documents.

A. Metropolitan Police confirmation of the attendance

The most important identifying record presently available is the Metropolitan Police email of **5 November 2025**, in which the MPS stated:

“City of London Police did attend your property, CAD 2248 31/10/25 refers.” Gmail Download - URGENT_ Suspec...

That document is important because it independently confirms:

- City of London Police attendance;
- the date, 31 October 2025;
- and the relevant MPS CAD reference, 2248.

B. MPS Subject Access Request concerning CAD 2248

My Subject Access Request dated **5 November 2025** identifies:

- the attendance at 23 Jersey House;
- the date 31 October 2025;
- the time window 11:15–11:50;
- the core period approximately 11:20–11:40;
- Met CAD 2248;
- the referenced voluntary interview;
- and the categories of operational records sought. Gmail - UK GDPR Subject Access ...

This document is useful because it fixes the event with a narrow date/time/location combination and links it directly to the MPS CAD.

C. City of London Police Subject Access Request

My corresponding request to City of London Police identifies the same attendance as:

City of London Police attendance at 23 Jersey House on 31/10/2025, between 11:15 and 11:50, linked to Met CAD 2248. Gmail Download - UK GDPR Subjec...

That request also identifies the categories of CoLP records relevant to the event, including:

- BWV;
- CAD/radio records;
- officer notebooks;
- tasking;
- operation orders;
- mutual-aid or jurisdiction paperwork;
- risk/PSED assessments;
- and voluntary-interview records.

D. Verification and jurisdiction request to City of London Police

The verification request sent to City of London Police Professional Standards on 5 November 2025 is particularly relevant because it asks CoLP to confirm:

- that officers were deployed to the address;
- the legal and operational basis for operating in MPS territory;
- the officers' identities;
- the purpose of the attendance;
- the reference to a voluntary interview;
- and the associated tasking, briefing and preservation records. Gmail Download - Verification, ...

This document demonstrates that the cross-force jurisdiction question was raised immediately after the attendance.

E. CCTV and access-record request

My SAR concerning CCTV, concierge and access records identifies the same event by:

- address;
- date;
- time window;

- and police attendance.

It also asks who authorised entry and whether there was coordination with either the Metropolitan Police Service or City of London Police. Gmail - UK GDPR Subject Access ...

This document is relevant to the physical attendance and entry/approach aspect of the event.

F. Original FOI request of 5 November 2025

The FOI request submitted shortly after the event sought recorded information about:

- CoLP deployments into MPS territory;
- cross-force tasking;
- mutual aid;
- voluntary interviews at residential addresses;
- risk and safeguarding;
- BWV;
- CAD/radio retention;
- and identification/uniform issues.

It expressly sought the versions in force on **31/10/2025**. Gmail - Freedom of Information ...

This document is important because it shows the direct connection between the attendance and the policy questions subsequently pursued under FOI.

G. MPS FOI response under 01/FOI/25/048820/V

The later MPS response is relevant because it stated:

- **“No Information Located”** in relation to the general question about CoLP operating in the MPS area;
- acknowledged the Benbow arrangement;
- supplied Voluntary Attendance Guidance;
- and stated a seven-year retention period for relevant command/control data.
01FOI25048820V_2026-52-26 01522...

That response created the need for the present deployment-specific questions.

H. Formal complaint dated 6 March 2026

The formal complaint concerning 01/FOI/25/048820/V records that I observed **four White police officers through the peephole at my door** and expressly challenges the proportionality and safeguards of a four-officer residential attendance in circumstances presented as voluntary. Formal response and complaint c...

It further asks why four officers were deployed and seeks the recorded rationale and safeguard material. Formal response and complaint c...

This document is important because it fixes the number of officers observed.

I. Preservation request arising from the March 2026 complaint

The same complaint requires preservation of:

- CAD/command-and-control records;
- radio transmissions;
- BWV;
- officer notebook entries;
- tasking;
- briefings;
- deployment rationale;
- supervisory authorisations;
- risk assessments;
- intelligence submissions;
- incident reports;
- and cross-force tasking material. Formal response and complaint c...

This demonstrates that the relevant evidential categories were specifically identified and preservation requested well before the present clarification.

J. Current FOI reference 01/FOI/26/055460/F

The present FOI asks deployment-specific questions concerning:

- Benbow status;
- command;
- notification;
- authorisation;

- tasking;
- briefing;
- risk assessment;
- supervisory authorisation;
- and operational responsibility.

The present clarification document is intended to connect those questions unambiguously to the event already identified as:

31 October 2025 — 23 Jersey House — City of London Police — four officers — Met CAD 2248 — voluntary interview referenced.

K. Purpose of this documentary index

The purpose of this section is not to require the MPS to treat every document as proving every disputed matter.

Rather, it demonstrates that the same identifiable event has been referred to consistently across multiple pieces of correspondence using overlapping identifiers.

Taken together, the documentary chain provides the MPS with:

- an exact date;
- an exact residential address;
- a narrow time window;
- its own CAD reference;
- confirmation of City of London Police attendance;
- the number of officers observed;
- the voluntary-interview context;
- and the categories of records repeatedly requested.

For avoidance of doubt, I ask the MPS to read the present clarification alongside this documentary chain when processing **01/FOI/26/055460/F**, so that the history and identity of the deployment are not considered in isolation from the records that already define it.

SECTION 18 — REQUESTED NEXT STEPS, RESPONSE HANDLING AND DOCUMENT CONTROL

Having now identified the deployment with precision and explained the documentary chain, I ask the Metropolitan Police Service to take the following practical steps so that FOI Reference **01/FOI/26/055460/F** can proceed without further uncertainty or administrative fragmentation.

This section is intended to convert the clarification into a clear processing route.

A. Confirm receipt of this clarification

Please confirm that this clarification document has been received and linked to:

FOI Reference 01/FOI/26/055460/F

Please also confirm that it has been retained as part of the official case record for that request.

B. Confirm that the deployment is now sufficiently identified

Please confirm that the MPS now understands the relevant deployment to be:

31 October 2025

23 Jersey House, 2 Eastfield Road, Enfield EN3 5UY

approximately 11:15–11:50

core period approximately 11:20–11:40

City of London Police attendance

four officers observed

Met CAD 2248 (31/10/2025)

voluntary interview referenced

The MPS previously confirmed that City of London Police attended my property and that **CAD 2248 31/10/25 refers**. Gmail Download - URGENT_ Suspec...

C. Confirm that the request remains active

Please confirm that:

- 01/FOI/26/055460/F remains open;
- it has not been treated as withdrawn;
- it has not been closed because clarification was requested;
- and substantive processing will now continue.

D. Confirm the operative date for further processing

Please confirm the date on which the MPS considers the clarification requirement satisfied and the date from which it will calculate the applicable response period.

This is requested simply so that the procedural position is clear and auditable.

E. Identify the case owner

Please identify the officer, team or role responsible for coordinating the response to 01/FOI/26/055460/F.

Where multiple departments are involved, please identify:

- the lead Data Rights contact;
- any operational policy owner;
- any Professional Standards contact;
- any legal or preservation contact;
- and any other relevant department.

F. Use a single consolidated response where possible

Because the request concerns multiple connected issues, I ask that the MPS provide a consolidated response wherever reasonably possible.

Fragmented replies from different departments risk creating inconsistent terminology, duplicate referrals and uncertainty about which matters remain outstanding.

Where different departments must respond separately, please provide a central index showing:

- which department is dealing with which issue;
- the relevant reference number;
- and whether a response is outstanding.

G. Preserve the documentary chain

Please ensure that the following are linked within the case record where available:

- the original 5 November 2025 FOI request;
- the response under 01/FOI/25/048820/V;
- the Voluntary Attendance Guidance;
- the Benbow disclosure;
- the internal review material;

- the 6 March 2026 formal complaint;
- the preservation requests;
- the present 82-question request;
- and this clarification document.

The purpose is to avoid each stage being considered in isolation from the history that explains it.

H. Follow linked references

Where the search identifies an additional operational or administrative reference, please follow it.

In particular, if CAD 2248 links to:

- another CAD;
- a crime or incident number;
- a CoLP reference;
- a tasking record;
- an officer/unit record;
- a complaint reference;
- or a BWV identifier,

please record and follow that link rather than treating CAD 2248 as the end of the search.

I. Record the search methodology

Where no information is located, I ask that the response identify, so far as reasonably possible:

- the systems searched;
- the departments consulted;
- the principal search terms or references used;
- and whether CAD 2248 was used as a search identifier.

This is especially important because the deployment is now identified much more precisely than at the time of the original FOI.

J. Distinguish document existence from disclosure

Please distinguish clearly between:

- a record not existing;
- a record existing but not being held by the MPS;
- a record being held but exempt from disclosure;
- a record being held by City of London Police;
- and a record existing but being accessible through a different statutory route.

Those outcomes should not be merged.

K. Preserve current records while processing continues

Where relevant records are still held, I ask that appropriate steps be taken to ensure that they are not lost through routine deletion while the matter remains active.

If Data Rights is not responsible for that action, please identify the appropriate department and confirm whether the preservation issue has been passed to it.

L. Identify unresolved matters at the end of the response

At the conclusion of the substantive response, please provide a short schedule identifying:

- questions fully answered;
- questions partly answered;
- questions where no information is held;
- questions where information is exempt;
- questions referred elsewhere;
- and questions that remain outstanding.

This will make it possible to see clearly what, if anything, still requires action.

M. Maintain the distinction between the 31 October deployment and other events

Please ensure that searches and responses remain centred on the specific 31 October 2025 residential attendance and are not inadvertently substituted with records concerning:

- the 7 July 2025 seizure incident;
- the 16 April 2026 arrest;
- or other unrelated City of London Police activity.

Those events may be relevant background, but they are not substitutes for the records of the deployment identified in this clarification.

N. Final processing request

For avoidance of doubt, I now ask the Metropolitan Police Service to move from clarification to substantive processing.

The relevant event is sufficiently identified by:

Met CAD 2248 (31/10/2025)

23 Jersey House, 2 Eastfield Road, Enfield EN3 5UY

approximately 11:15–11:50

City of London Police attendance

four officers observed

voluntary interview referenced

Please therefore proceed to search, classify and respond to Questions 1–82 on that basis.

The central request in this section is:

Please confirm receipt, confirm that the clarification requirement has been satisfied, identify the responsible case owner, preserve the linked documentary chain, and proceed to a structured substantive response to FOI Reference 01/FOI/26/055460/F.

SECTION 19 — REQUEST FOR A DEFINITIVE MPS POSITION ON THE 31 OCTOBER 2025 DEPLOYMENT

The purpose of this final substantive section is to ensure that, once the Metropolitan Police Service has completed its searches, the response provides a **definitive institutional position based on the records held**.

The central issue is no longer identification of the incident.

The incident has now been identified by:

- the precise date;
- a narrow time window;
- the full address;
- the attending police force;
- the number of officers observed;
- the voluntary-interview context;
- and the Metropolitan Police Service's own CAD reference.

The MPS itself confirmed in writing on 5 November 2025 that:

“City of London Police did attend your property, CAD 2248 31/10/25 refers.” Gmail Download - URGENT_ Suspec...

Accordingly, after the searches described throughout this clarification document have been undertaken, I ask the MPS to provide a definitive recorded-information position on the following core matters.

A. Was the deployment known to the Metropolitan Police Service?

Please state what the records show.

If the MPS knew of the deployment before the officers attended, identify the record showing that knowledge.

If the MPS first became aware during or after the attendance, identify the record showing when and how that occurred.

If CAD 2248 itself records the relevant notification, please identify the relevant entry.

The purpose is to establish the recorded chronology of MPS knowledge.

B. Was the deployment authorised, coordinated or merely recorded by the MPS?

The existence of an MPS CAD does not by itself establish the precise nature of MPS involvement.

I therefore ask the MPS to distinguish between the following possibilities, based upon the records:

- MPS authorised the deployment;
- MPS agreed to the deployment;
- MPS coordinated the deployment;
- MPS provided operational assistance;
- MPS was merely notified;
- MPS became aware only after the officers arrived;
- or MPS simply created a record concerning an independently initiated CoLP attendance.

If another arrangement applied, please identify it.

C. What was the recorded legal and operational framework?

Please provide the MPS's definitive recorded-information position on whether the deployment was governed by:

- Benbow;
- mutual aid;
- another cross-force protocol;
- a specific request from City of London Police;
- a request from the Metropolitan Police Service;
- another statutory or operational arrangement;
- or no recorded cross-force framework identifiable from MPS records.

If the MPS cannot determine the framework because it holds insufficient recorded information, please say so expressly.

That is different from determining that no framework existed.

D. Was the deployment a Benbow operation?

This question requires a clear answer based upon the records.

Please state one of the following, or an equivalent formulation:

- 1. Records confirm that the deployment was a Benbow operation;**
- 2. Records confirm that the deployment was not a Benbow operation;**

or

3. The MPS holds no recorded information from which Benbow status can be determined.

If Benbow applied, please identify the records evidencing the designation.

If it did not apply, please identify the alternative recorded framework where one exists.

The MPS's earlier disclosure established the existence of the Benbow arrangement, but did not establish whether this deployment fell within it. 01FOI25048820V_2026-52-26 01522...

E. What was the recorded purpose of the deployment?

Please state the operational purpose appearing in the records.

My contemporaneous correspondence identified that a **“voluntary interview” was referenced** in relation to the 31 October attendance. Gmail Download - Please allocat...

I therefore ask the MPS to determine whether its records describe the purpose as:

- arranging a voluntary interview;
- conducting a voluntary interview;
- inviting voluntary attendance;
- serving information or documentation;
- obtaining cooperation;
- conducting enquiries;
- or another recorded purpose.

Please use the terminology actually appearing in the records rather than reconstructing a purpose retrospectively.

F. Why were four officers deployed?

My formal complaint recorded that I observed four officers at my door and requested an explanation for the size of the deployment. Formal response and complaint c...

The definitive response should therefore state whether any contemporaneous record explains:

- why four officers were considered necessary;
- whether officer safety was a factor;
- whether intelligence or risk grading was a factor;

- whether vulnerability was considered;
- whether anticipated resistance or non-cooperation was recorded;
- or whether some other operational reason existed.

If no contemporaneous rationale is held, please say so expressly.

G. Was a risk assessment undertaken?

Please identify whether any risk assessment existed before the attendance.

If one existed, please identify:

- its type;
- when it was completed;
- the responsible role or unit;
- what record holds it;
- and whether it influenced the number of officers, venue or method of approach.

My earlier requests expressly sought the relevant briefings and risk assessments relating to the attendance. Gmail - UK GDPR Subject Access ...

H. Was supervisory authorisation obtained?

Please state whether a record exists showing supervisory authorisation of:

- the deployment itself;
- the residential attendance;
- the proposed voluntary interview;
- the number of officers;
- or the risk assessment.

Where an authorising officer's name cannot be disclosed, please identify the rank, role or department if possible.

If no record of supervisory authorisation is held, please state that.

I. What safeguards were recorded?

Please identify the safeguards recorded in relation to:

- voluntariness;
- legal advice;
- residential interviewing;

- vulnerability;
- safeguarding;
- communication needs;
- equality considerations;
- and proportionality.

The MPS supplied its Voluntary Attendance Guidance in response to my earlier request concerning residential voluntary interviews. 01FOI25048820V_2026-52-26 01522...

The issue now is whether the relevant safeguards were reflected in the actual records of this deployment.

J. Who exercised command over the officers?

Please state what the records show concerning:

- strategic command;
- tactical command;
- operational command;
- officer supervision;
- and responsibility for decisions made at the address.

If City of London Police retained full command, please state that.

If the MPS exercised any command role, please identify it.

If command was shared or unified, please identify the relevant arrangement.

If the MPS cannot determine command responsibility from the records it holds, please say so.

K. Which force was responsible for the consequences of the deployment?

Please identify the recorded position concerning responsibility for:

- operational decisions;
- safeguarding;
- complaints;
- preservation of evidence;
- and subsequent review.

Where different responsibilities rested with different forces, please distinguish them.

L. What records currently survive?

The definitive response should state, as far as the MPS can establish, which categories of records remain available.

This should include consideration of:

- CAD;
- radio audio;
- BWV or BWV metadata;
- tasking;
- briefings;
- risk assessments;
- supervisory records;
- emails;
- cross-force communications;
- officer notes;
- safeguarding records;
- and any linked incident references.

The earlier MPS response stated a seven-year retention period in relation to command/control material. 01FOI25048820V_2026-52-26 01522...

I therefore ask the MPS to identify what remains available now and whether any category has already ceased to be available.

M. What records are held only by City of London Police?

Where the MPS does not hold a particular deployment record but knows or reasonably understands that City of London Police would be the record holder, please identify that distinction.

For example:

MPS does not hold the CoLP officer briefing, but holds a record showing that CoLP officers were tasked.

would be more informative than simply:

“Information not held.”

N. What matters remain genuinely unresolved after the MPS response?

Once the substantive searches have been completed, I ask the MPS to provide a short concluding schedule identifying any matters that still cannot be resolved.

That schedule should distinguish between:

- no record exists;
- MPS does not hold the record;
- City of London Police appears to hold the record;
- information is held but exempt;
- another MPS department must act;
- or the historical record is insufficient to determine the answer.

This would create a clear final position rather than leaving uncertainty about what has and has not been answered.

O. The required institutional position

Ultimately, I ask the Metropolitan Police Service to provide a clear documentary account of its own role in this event.

The question can be summarised as follows:

What do Metropolitan Police Service records establish about the authority, purpose, planning, notification, command, risk assessment, safeguards and inter-force arrangements governing the deployment of four City of London Police officers to 23 Jersey House, Enfield, on 31 October 2025 under or associated with Met CAD 2248?

Where the records establish an answer, please give it.

Where they do not, please identify the absence of recorded information precisely.

For avoidance of doubt, I am not asking the Metropolitan Police Service to manufacture certainty where its records do not provide it.

I am asking the MPS to give the clearest possible **record-based institutional position**, including clearly identifying the limits of the records where those limits exist.

SECTION 20 — CONCLUSION, FORMAL REQUEST TO PROCEED AND CLOSING POSITION

The Metropolitan Police Service asked me to identify precisely which City of London Police deployment is the subject of FOI Reference **01/FOI/26/055460/F**.

That deployment has now been identified in detail and supported by the documentary record.

The event is:

Date: 31 October 2025

Time: approximately 11:15–11:50

Core period: approximately 11:20–11:40

Location: 23 Jersey House, 2 Eastfield Road, Enfield EN3 5UY

Attending force: City of London Police

Number of officers observed: four

MPS reference: CAD 2248 (31/10/2025)

Operational context referenced: voluntary interview

The Metropolitan Police Service itself confirmed in writing that **City of London Police attended my property** and that **CAD 2248 31/10/25 refers**. Gmail Download - URGENT_ Suspec...

The deployment is therefore no longer ambiguous.

A. Clarification has been fully supplied

The purpose of this document has been to remove any possible uncertainty about:

- the date;
- the time;
- the location;
- the force involved;
- the number of officers;
- the relevant MPS reference;
- and the operational context.

Those identifying particulars have now been supplied.

Accordingly, I ask the MPS to confirm that the clarification requirement has been satisfied and that no further general clarification is required before the substantive request can proceed.

B. The substantive request remains unchanged

For avoidance of doubt, this clarification does not:

- withdraw Questions 1–82;
- replace the original request;
- narrow the scope of the substantive questions;
- concede the lawfulness of the deployment;
- concede that Benbow did or did not apply;
- concede that the attendance was properly voluntary;
- concede that adequate safeguarding existed;
- or concede that any outstanding operational, preservation or equality issue has already been resolved.

The clarification identifies the event.

The substantive questions remain to be answered from the records.

C. The central evidential issue

The central issue is now straightforward:

What recorded information does the Metropolitan Police Service hold concerning the legal, operational, command, safeguarding and cross-force framework governing the deployment of four City of London Police officers to 23 Jersey House on 31 October 2025?

That includes, in particular:

- whether Benbow applied;
- whether another cross-force arrangement applied;
- who authorised the deployment;
- whether MPS was notified;
- what tasking existed;
- what briefing existed;
- what purpose was recorded;
- what risk assessment existed;
- what supervisory approval existed;

- what safeguards applied;
- which force retained command;
- what records survive;
- and which body is responsible for any remaining issue.

D. Recorded information, not retrospective explanation

I reiterate that I seek the recorded information that existed at the relevant time.

Where contemporaneous records exist, please identify or disclose them subject to lawful exemptions.

Where only later explanatory records exist, please distinguish them from contemporaneous operational records.

Where no record exists, please state that clearly.

E. No information held must be distinguished from a negative factual answer

This distinction is especially important.

For example:

“No recorded information is held showing that Benbow applied”

is not the same as:

“Benbow did not apply.”

Likewise:

“No recorded information is held showing supervisory authorisation”

is not the same as:

“No supervisory authorisation occurred.”

I ask that the final response preserve these distinctions carefully.

F. Information held elsewhere

Where the MPS does not hold a particular record but knows that City of London Police or another body is the likely holder, please identify that clearly.

The existence of another record holder should not obscure what the MPS itself holds.

G. Matters outside FOIA

Where a matter falls outside FOIA, please identify:

- why;

- the responsible department or body;
- whether referral has already occurred;
- and the applicable reference number where one exists.

This is particularly important for:

- preservation;
- Professional Standards;
- legal services;
- equality review;
- and complaint ownership.

H. Preservation and evidential integrity

The records concerning this attendance have been the subject of repeated preservation requests.

Those requests covered, among other things:

- CAD and command-and-control logs;
- radio transmissions;
- BWV;
- officer notes;
- tasking records;
- briefing records;
- deployment rationale;
- supervisory authorisation;
- risk assessments;
- intelligence records;
- incident records;
- and cross-force communications. Formal response and complaint c...

I therefore ask that any records still held remain protected from routine deletion while the matter is being processed through the relevant routes.

I. Required final response

I ask the Metropolitan Police Service to provide:

1. confirmation that the clarification has been accepted;
2. confirmation that 01/FOI/26/055460/F remains active;
3. a substantive question-by-question response to Questions 1–82;
4. identification of information held and disclosed;
5. identification of information held but exempt;
6. identification of information not held;
7. identification of matters outside FOIA;
8. identification of matters held by another body;
9. identification of referrals already made;
10. and a final schedule of matters, if any, that remain unresolved.

J. Final identification statement

For absolute clarity, the deployment is:

The deployment of four City of London Police officers to 23 Jersey House, 2 Eastfield Road, Enfield EN3 5UY, on 31 October 2025, between approximately 11:15 and 11:50, with the central period approximately 11:20–11:40, in circumstances in which a voluntary interview was referenced, and recorded or cross-referenced by the Metropolitan Police Service under CAD 2248 (31/10/2025).

That is the deployment to which my request relates.

K. Closing request


I respectfully ask the Metropolitan Police Service to now proceed from clarification to substantive determination.

Please confirm receipt of this clarification document, confirm that the deployment has been sufficiently identified, and proceed to answer FOI Reference **01/FOI/26/055460/F** on the basis set out above.

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Derrick Lynch', with a large circular loop at the start and a long diagonal stroke extending upwards and to the right.

Derrick Lynch

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading 'John Canoe', written in a cursive, slanted style.

also known as **John Canoe**

Reparation Nation Limited / IC3CSI






23 Jersey House

2 Eastfield Road

Enfield

EN3 5UY

Email: thereparationnation@gmail.com

REPARATIONS POLICE CODES FOR REPARATIONS POLICE CODES FOR REPARATIONS									
									
IC1		IC2		IC3		IC4		IC5	
W1 UK White W2 White European W9 Other White		W9 Other White Dark European		B1 Caribbean B2 African B9 Other Black		A1 Indian A2 Pakistani A3 Bangladeshi A9 Other Asian		O1 Chinese O9 Any Other Oriental	
QUESTION: White skin, Caucasoid, highest life value, pure blood, Aryan, Japhetic, Celtic, Nordic, Viking, Norse, Germanic, Slavic, Baltic, straight red/ginger or blond/blonde hair, blue, grey, green or pale eyes, not visibly contaminated with non-white blood but freckles are acceptable? UK RACE TAX 0-6%?		QUESTION: Darkened skin, Sallow, Swarthy, Tawny, Olive skin, Melanochroid, Iberian Peninsula, Mediterranean, Balkan, straight dark hair (no curls), slightly lower life value, Dark eyes, visibly contaminated with non-white blood? UK RACE TAX 6-13%?		QUESTION: Black Skin Negroid, Hamitic, Moor, Bantu, Cushite, Kaffir, Kinky/Curly Dark hair, Dark eyes? UK RACE TAX 33-66%?		QUESTION: Brown/Dark Skin Asianoid, South Asian, Hindutva, Indo-Aryan, Dravidian, Straight hair, Dark eyes? UK RACE TAX 22-33%?		QUESTION: Yellow Skin Mongoloid, Epicanthic fold, Slit eyes, Neotenic, Sinodonty, Straight hair that never curls, Dark eyes? UK RACE TAX 22-33%?	
FAMILY: Absolute Nuclear, Egalitarian Nuclear –Low intergenerational cohabitation, early home-leaving, privacy-valued.		FAMILY: Endogamous Communitarian, Asymmetric –Patriarchal extended families, high respect for elders, strong honour culture.		FAMILY: Endogamous Communitarian, Asymmetric –Arranged marriages, multigenerational homes, patriarchal authority, family honour central.		FAMILY: Endogamous Communitarian, Asymmetric –Arranged marriages, multigenerational homes, patriarchal authority, family honour central.		FAMILY: Absolute Nuclear, Filial-Flexible –Confucian values, filial piety, elder care in private home, education-centred.	
M1 White & Black Caribbean M2 White & Black African M3 White & Asian M9 Any Other Mixed		QUESTION: Semitic, Jewish, Christian, Muslim, Arab, Israeli, North American, South American, Mixed Lineage, Mixed Race, Mongrel, North African, Stateless, visibly contaminated with Black blood? UK RACE TAX 0-66%?		FAMILY: Flexible System, Chosen Support –Mixed identity negotiation, hybrid parenting, often fluid structures, blended cultures.		QUESTION: Unseen, Unrecognised, Unhuman, Unknown, Alien, Computer, Robot, Artificial Intelligence, Humanoid? TAX FREE?		FAMILY: Anomic, Unknown or Chosen –Fragmented or concealed systems; may reflect institutional upbringing or systemic exclusion.	
UK Government Race and Ethnicity Codes. Are you a Racist?									
									
IC1		IC2		IC3		IC4		IC5	
W1 UK White W2 White European W9 Other White		W9 Other White (Dark European)		B1 Caribbean B2 African B9 Other Black		A1 Indian A2 Pakistani A3 Bangladeshi A9 Other Asian		O1 Chinese O9 Any Other Oriental	
1 White Race WBRI White British		2 White Race WALB Albanian		3 Black Race BAFR Black - African		6 Mixed Race MABL Asian and Black		M1 White & Black Caribbean	
1 White Race WCOR White British - Cornish		2 White Race WOTH Any Other White Background		3 Black Race BANN Black - Angolan		6 Mixed Race MACH Asian and Chinese		M2 White & Black African	
1 White Race WENG White British - English		2 White Race WBOS Bosnian- Herzegovinian		3 Black Race BAOF Other Black African		6 Mixed Race MAOE Asian and Any Other Ethnic Group		M3 White & Asian	
1 White Race WSCO White British - Scottish		2 White Race WCRO Croatian		3 Black Race BCON Black - Congolese		6 Mixed Race MBCH Black and Chinese		M9 Any Other Mixed	
1 White Race WWEL White British - Welsh		2 White Race WGRK Greek		3 Black Race BCRB Black Caribbean		6 Mixed Race MBOE Black and Any Other Ethnic Group			
1 White Race WOWB White British Other		2 White Race WGRC Greek Cypriot		3 Black Race BEUR Black European		6 Mixed Race MCOE Chinese and Any Other Ethnic Group			
1 White Race WIRI White - Irish		2 White Race WGRE Greek/ Greek Cypriot		3 Black Race BGHA Black - Ghanalan		6 Mixed Race MOTH Any Other Mixed Background			
1 White Race WIRT White - Traveller of Irish Heritage		2 White Race WROM Gypsy / Roma		3 Black Race BNAM Black North American		6 Mixed Race MOTM Other Mixed Background			
1 White Race WEEU White Eastern European		2 White Race WITA Italian		3 Black Race BNGN Black - Nigerian		6 Mixed Race MWAI White and Indian			
1 White Race WEUR White European		2 White Race WKOS Kosovan		3 Black Race BOTB Other Black		6 Mixed Race MWAO White and Any Other Asian Background			
1 White Race WOTW White Other		2 White Race WPOR Portuguese		3 Black Race BOTH Any Other Black Background		6 Mixed Race MWAP White and Pakistani			
1 White Race WWEU White Western European		2 White Race WSER Serbian		3 Black Race BSLN Black - Sierra Leonean		6 Mixed Race MWAS White and Asian			
		2 White Race WTUK Turkish		3 Black Race BSOM Black - Somali		6 Mixed Race MWBA White and Black African			
		2 White Race WTUR Turkish Cypriot		3 Black Race BSUD Black - Sudanese		6 Mixed Race MWBC White and Black Caribbean			
				4 Asian Race AAFR African Asian		6 Mixed Race MWCH White and Chinese			
				4 Asian Race ABAN Bangladeshi		6 Mixed Race MWOE White and Any Other Ethnic Group			
				4 Asian Race AIND Indian		6 Other Race OAFG Afghan			
				4 Asian Race AKAO Kashmiri Other		6 Other Race OARA Arab Other			
				4 Asian Race AKPA Kashmiri Pakistani		6 Other Race OEGY Egyptian			
				4 Asian Race AMPK Mirpuri Pakistani		6 Other Race OFIL Filipino			
				4 Asian Race ANEP Nepali		6 Other Race OIRN Iranian			
				4 Asian Race AOPK Other Pakistani		6 Other Race OIRQ Iraqi			
				4 Asian Race AOTA Other Asian		6 Other Race OJPN Japanese			
				4 Asian Race AOTH Any Other Asian Background		6 Other Race OKOR Korean			
				4 Asian Race APKN Pakistani		6 Other Race OKRD Kurdish			
				4 Asian Race ASLT Sri Lankan Tamil		6 Other Race OLAM Latin/ South/ Central American			
				4 Asian Race ASNL Sri Lankan Sinhalese		6 Other Race OLEB Lebanese			
				4 Asian Race ASRO Sri Lankan Other		6 Other Race OLIB Libyan			
						6 Other Race OMAL Malay			
						6 Other Race OMRC Moroccan			
						6 Other Race OOGF Other Ethnic Group			
						6 Other Race OOTH Any Other Ethnic Group			
						6 Other Race OPOL Polynesian			
						6 Other Race OTHA Thai			
						6 Other Race OVIE Vietnamese			
						6 Other Race OYEM Yemeni			