

Home Office
2 Marsham Street
London SW1P 4DF
FoiRequests@homeoffice.gov.uk
www.gov.uk/home-office

Amaar Chowdhury
amaar.chowdhury@proton.me

www.gov.uk/home-office

21 January 2026

Dear Amaar Chowdhury,

Re: Freedom of Information request – FOI2025/10592

Thank you for your email of 6 August. Your request, which can be found in full at **Annex A**, is being handled as a request for information under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA).

Our response to your request is contained in **Annex B**, below.

If you are dissatisfied with this response you may request an independent internal review of our handling of your request by submitting a complaint within two months to foirequests@homeoffice.gov.uk, quoting the reference in this letter's heading. If you ask for an internal review, it would be helpful if you could say why you are dissatisfied with the response.

As part of any internal review the Department's handling of your information request would be reassessed by staff who were not involved in providing you with this response. If you were to remain dissatisfied after an internal review, you would have a right of complaint to the Information Commissioner as established by section 50 of the FOIA.

A link to the Home Office Information Rights Privacy Notice can be found in the following link. This explains how we process your personal information:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/information-rights-privacy-notice>

Yours sincerely,

Border Force FOI enquiries
FoiRequests@homeoffice.gov.uk

From: Amaar Chowdhury <amaar.chowdhury@proton.me>

Sent: 06 August 2025 16:33

To: FOI Requests

Subject: Common Operating Picture and Command Interface contract

Dear Home Office,

My freedom of information request relates directly to the Home Office's Common Operating Picture & Command Interface (COPCI) contract:

1. Please provide meeting minutes, presentation slides relating to the most recent "Performance Review Meeting" in 2025 relating to the [COPCI contract](#), and copies of the most recent "Performance Monitoring Report" produced in 2025.
2. The contract also mentions, on page 176 of the PDF, that "with respect to Ghost, more than 50% loss of availability of Ghost platforms due to system/technical failures ..." results in a Critical Service Level Failure. Does this confirm the Home Office's use of Anduril Ghost drones, which it has previously denied? ([FOI2025/02366](#) states "Anduril is not contracted to deliver this particular technology/service.")
 - a. If the Home Office has indeed been delivered Ghost drones by Anduril, please , please explain its statement in FOI/02366 in as much detail as possible.
 - b. Please also disclose the number of Anduril Ghost drones that the Home Office has had in operation between 2022 and the date that this request is received.
3. Operational Board meetings/reviews take place monthly which discuss "strategical and tactical analysis of operational delivery": Please provide these meeting minutes, reports, and/or presentation slides from December 2022, January 2023, and February 2023.

Best,
Amaar Chowdhury

Our response to your request follows the numbering scheme, 1), 2) and 3), in your request above.

- 1) I confirm that the Home Office holds this information. However, we have concluded that release of this information is exempt from disclosure under Section 31 (1) (a) (b) and (e), as its release would be likely to prejudice the law enforcement interests of the Home Office namely as to the prevention or detection of crime, the apprehension or prosecution of offenders, and/or the operation of the immigration controls.

We have also concluded that release of this information is exempted under Section 43(2) of the FOIA, as its release would be likely to prejudice the commercial interests of the Home Office and/or third parties.

These are qualified exemptions and require consideration of the public interest test. We have concluded the public interest lies in favour of withholding the information. Arguments for and against disclosure in terms of public interest, with the reasons for our conclusion, are set out in **Annex C**.

- 2) No information held. In reference to Anduril's Ghost Technology this was included in the contract at the procurement stage, which was an option that we could have used. This was removed from the contract under variation 1 as the Home Office had no use for it. Unfortunately reference to Ghost was left in the definitions of Schedule 10 - it should have been removed under variation 1. This is an error. We can confirm that the contract does not include Ghost Technology. Accordingly, nor have our operations included the technology.

- 3) I confirm that the Home Office holds this information. However, we have concluded that release of this information is exempt from disclosure under Section 31 (1) (a) (b) and (e), as its release would be likely to prejudice the law enforcement interests of the Home Office namely as to the prevention or detection of crime, the apprehension or prosecution of offenders, and/or the operation of the immigration controls.

We have also concluded that release of this information is exempted under Section 43(2) of the FOIA, as its release would be likely to prejudice the commercial interests of the Home Office and/or third parties.

These are qualified exemptions and require consideration of the public interest test. We have concluded the public interest lies in favour of withholding the information. Arguments for and against disclosure in terms of public interest, with the reasons for our conclusion, are set out in **Annex C**.

Public interest test in relation to s31(1) a) b) e) of FOIA

Some of the exemptions in the FOI Act, referred to as ‘qualified’ exemptions, are subject to a public interest test (PIT). This test is used to balance the public interest in disclosure against the public interest in favour of withholding the information, or the considerations for and against the requirement to say whether the information requested is held or not. We must carry out a PIT where we are considering using any of the qualified exemptions in response to a request for information.

The ‘public interest’ is not necessarily the same as what interests the public. In carrying out a PIT we consider the greater good or benefit to the community as a whole if the information is released or not. Transparency and the ‘right to know’ must be balanced against the need to enable effective government and to serve the best interests of the public.

The FOIA is ‘applicant blind’. This means that we cannot, and do not, ask about the motives of anyone who asks for information. In providing a response to one person, we are expressing a willingness to provide the same response to anyone.

Considerations in favour of disclosing the information

There is a public interest in furthering understanding of Home Office technologies that save lives at sea, supporting the UK’s obligations under the ECHR, UNCLOS, the SOLAS Convention and the SAR Convention. There is also a public interest in furthering understanding of the range of technologies which are used to detect criminal activity, and in ensuring that the use of such technology is justified, proportionate and necessary.

There is also a broad public interest in furthering public understanding of the issues with which public authorities deal. There is a clear public interest in the work of government departments being transparent and open to scrutiny.

Considerations in favour of maintaining the exemption

Release of the information could enable organised criminal groups (OCGs) to gain an insight into the specific detection capabilities that are ranged against them, enabling them to formulate strategies and tactics to defeat or severely curtail these capabilities. The specific information requested would also enable OCGs to identify the relative weaknesses and challenges of operation, such as (and not restricted to) the limitations of operating conditions, as well as to the degree to which the capability figures within the wider Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance (ISR) architecture, thereby extending prejudice (occasioned by the information’s release) to the wider system.

Conclusion

We conclude that the balance of the public interest lies in maintaining the exemption and withholding the information.

Public interest test in relation to s43(2) of FOIA

Some of the exemptions in the FOI Act, referred to as 'qualified' exemptions, are subject to a public interest test (PIT). This test is used to balance the public interest in disclosure against the public interest in favour of withholding the information, or the considerations for and against the requirement to say whether the information requested is held or not. We must carry out a PIT where we are considering using any of the qualified exemptions in response to a request for information.

The 'public interest' is not necessarily the same as what interests the public. In carrying out a PIT we consider the greater good or benefit to the community as a whole if the information is released or not. Transparency and the 'right to know' must be balanced against the need to enable effective government and to serve the best interests of the public.

The FOIA is 'applicant blind'. This means that we cannot, and do not, ask about the motives of anyone who asks for information. In providing a response to one person, we are expressing a willingness to provide the same response to anyone.

Considerations in favour of disclosing the information

There is a public interest in disclosing the information in order to help ensure that there is full transparency in the Home Office's use of public funds, so as to maintain the department's accountability to taxpayers. There is a specific public interest in understanding the extent to which public funds are used to procure the services of this particular technology, and the financial controls and contractual monitoring which are used.

Considerations in favour of maintaining the exemption

There is a public interest in Government departments and agencies being able to secure contracts that represent value for money, and anything that would undermine this is not in the public interest. Value for money can best be obtained where there is a healthy competitive environment, coupled with the protection of the Government's commercial relationship with industry.

Release of the withheld information would provide competitors with information, not available to them by any other means, about current service providers. This would create an unfair advantage resulting in a prejudice to the commercial interests of the company concerned. Disclosure would also prejudice the Home Office's commercial interests by damaging commercial relationships with contractors and service providers. This risks:

- Companies would be discouraged from dealing with the public sector, fearing disclosure of information that may damage them commercially; or
- Companies would withhold information where possible, making the choice of the best contractor more uncertain as it would be based on limited censored data.

Conclusion

We conclude that the balance of the public interest lies in maintaining the exemption and withholding the information.