

Gloucestershire Constabulary
Police Headquarters
No.1 Waterwells, Waterwells Drive
Quedgeley, Gloucester. GL2 2AN
www.gloucestershire.police.uk



Our reference: FOI_26_0558

E-mail: FOI

@gloucestershire.police.uk

Direct dial: 01452 754304

Postal Address: As above

Date: 21/07/2026

Dear

Gloucestershire Constabulary Freedom of Information request FOI_26_0558

On 10/06/2026 you sent an email constituting a request under the Freedom of Information Act asking the following:

Thank you for your response.

Please see the attached email chain.

Within that correspondence on page 1, the Force Vetting Manager states that each police force has its own "risk appetite". This statement appears to indicate that "risk appetite" is a recognised concept within the vetting environment.

However, your internal review concluded that a response could not be provided to my original question because a "concept" is not recorded information.

In light of the Force Vetting Manager's statement, I would be grateful if you could clarify the following:

1. Is "risk appetite" a recognised concept within Gloucestershire Constabulary's vetting function?
2. If "risk appetite" is a recognised concept, please provide any recorded information held by Gloucestershire Constabulary which defines, describes, references or discusses the concept of risk appetite in relation to vetting.
3. If "risk appetite" is not a recognised concept within Gloucestershire Constabulary's vetting function, please explain on what basis the Force Vetting Manager stated that each police force has its own risk appetite.
4. Was the Force Vetting Manager's statement regarding each force having its own risk appetite based upon:
 - a) a documented source;
 - b) training material;

c) College of Policing guidance; or

d) personal opinion?

5. Does Gloucestershire Constabulary hold any recorded information which refers to:
in connection with vetting?

o "risk appetite";

o "force risk appetite"; or

o "organisational risk appetite"

6. Has Gloucestershire Constabulary ever held any recorded information which referred to the concept of risk appetite in connection with vetting, even if such information is no longer in use?

7. If the Constabulary's position is that "risk appetite" is merely a concept and not recorded information, please confirm whether the Force Vetting Manager's statement that each force has its own risk appetite was itself derived from recorded information held by Gloucestershire Constabulary.

8. Please confirm whether Gloucestershire Constabulary's vetting officers receive any training, instruction, briefing or guidance which refers to the concept of risk appetite.

9. Please confirm whether the term "risk appetite" forms part of the vocabulary, terminology or professional language used by Gloucestershire Constabulary's vetting unit.

10. If the answer to Question 9 is yes, please provide any recorded information explaining what is meant by the term within the context of vetting.

I believe these questions arise directly from the apparent inconsistency between the Force Vetting Manager's statement that each force has its own risk appetite and the conclusion of the internal review that the Constabulary could not answer whether the concept is used.

Under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 s1, I can confirm that Gloucestershire Constabulary holds some relevant information.

1. Yes, insofar as it is common terminology when referring to the holistic assessment of vetting risk.
2. The vetting process is an assessment of the risk an applicant and their associates pose. Whilst there is nothing that officially mentions it, it is a term that is used generally and is based upon adherence to the Police Vetting Regulations, Codes of Practice, Authorised Professional Practice (APP), College of Policing Risk Principles and the Code of Ethics.
3. N/A
4. a) No
- 4 b) No
- 4 c) No

- 4 d) No but the Force Vetting Manager will have individual delegated authority from his or her Chief Constable allowing for individual forces to have differing approaches, depending on the Chief Constable's direction.

5. No to all parts.

6. No, but the College of Policing Risk Principles are relevant and available to the public.

7. All vetting decisions are fully recorded and is an assessment of the recorded information. Please see the answer to 4d.

8. Vetting officers are trained in line with Police Vetting Regulations, Codes of Practice and APP.

9. Yes.

10. The term 'risk appetite' is used in general terms. The vetting process is an assessment of risk that an applicant poses, either themselves or through an association(s). These risks are assessed in line with the Police (Vetting) Regulations, Code of Practice and APP. As part of the decision-making process, consideration of what risk mitigation or risk management there is available. Different Forces may be able to manage this risk in different ways. This then falls under the term risk appetite as to whether force A is able to accept and manage the risk where force B may not be able to.

If you are not satisfied with this response or any actions taken in dealing with your request, you have the right to ask that we review your case under our internal procedure. Please note that a request for an internal review must be made within 20 working days of the response to your original request.

If you decide to request that such a review is undertaken and following this process you are still unsatisfied, you then have the right to direct your complaint to the Information Commissioner for consideration.

The Information Commissioner can be contacted via the following means:

Website - <https://ico.org.uk/>

Call their helpline - 0303 123 1113

Email - casework@ico.org.uk

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

Yours sincerely,

Disclosure Officer
Gloucestershire Constabulary