

David Holland

From: <impsrequests@reading.ac.uk>
To: <d.holland@theiet.org>
Sent: 28 October 2008 09:26
Attach: BJH Wg1-ar4-re Review Editor feedback-revisedS41redacted.txt
Subject: Queries - IMPS#00222

IMPS Request IMPS#00222: Personal data

When responding to this message, please use your e-mail system reply and do not alter the subject line, since we need to use the details to process your response. Thank you.

Note : Dear David Holland

Sorry for the delay in getting back to you on these matters, I have been checking our position in response to your queries.

Having spoken to Brian Hoskins I think there has been a misunderstanding. Brian interpreted your question of 11th July 2008 regarding whether he has been selectively deleting emails as applying since the time of your requests, ie since May 2008. In other words while he has not deleted these emails since your requests he cannot recall what he did with them now as it is so long ago. As far as your request goes he certainly doesn't hold the emails. I'm sorry for the confusion this has caused.

Thank you for forwarding the advice from DEFRA. I agree with you that parts of your requests fall under EIR and I have processed these accordingly. I think it may be useful to summarise our current position: I have disclosed the information that you have asked for under three pieces of legislation or statutory instruments including, the Data Protection Act (DPA), via your subject access request, the FOIA and the EIR. We have disclosed the information you have requested in full other than information that:

- is exempt under FOIA S. 40 - Personal Information
- is exempt under FOIA S. 41 - Information Provided in Confidence
- falls within exception EIR S. 13 - Personal data
- is the personal data of third parties (relating to your subject access request under the DPA)

I am prepared to accept that exemption S. 41, which we used in response to your request of 6 May 2008 for redaction purposes, may not apply in this instance and so I have attached this information that we originally redacted.

I'm not convinced that every request and query you have made falls within the scope of EIR, so by default they become matters for FOI and have been processed as such. For instance your queries on records management (point (d)) and email disposal policy (point (e)) of 11th July 2008 are clearly FOI requests, not EIR. In any case given that the only exemptions/exceptions

that have been applied now are that of personal information/data, which apply in the same way for both FOI by virtue of S.40 and EIR by S.13 then, I'm not sure there is much to be gained from debating the finer points of EIR/FOI classification. However I look into this further if you wish me to.

<<<Can you confirm if I am right to conclude that you have not had the liberty to examined all the professor's IPCC correspondence?>>>

Brian Hoskins has confirmed that he has provided me with all the relevant information associated with your requests.

With regard to your point about the progressive disclosure of information we are currently undertaking a root and branch review of our publication scheme, in line with the Information Commissioner's recent guidance for higher education institutions, and this issue will be addressed by this process.

I believe I have addressed all your points which formed the basis of your appeal, however let me know if you wish to progress it.

Yours sincerely

Lee Shailer

EmailAttach1a : BJH Wg1-ar4-re Review Editor feedback-revisedS41redacted.txt (see attachment <BJH Wg1-ar4-re Review Editor feedback-revisedS41redacted.txt>)

This email has been scanned by the MessageLabs Email Security System.
For more information please visit <http://www.messagelabs.com/email>

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG - <http://www.avg.com>

Version: 8.0.175 / Virus Database: 270.8.4/1751 - Release Date: 10/27/2008 10:44 PM