



Llywodraeth Cymru
Welsh Government

8 September 2016

Dear ,

Complaint in respect of ATISN 10560

Thank you for your e-mail of 13 August 2016.

I wrote to you on 18 August to explain that your complaint communicated to us by e-mail on 15 August had been referred to me for an internal review. I am now writing to confirm the outcome of that review.

Your complaint concerned a response to an FOI request sent to you by Paul Webb on 25 July 2016. In that response Mr Webb concluded that the time it would take to respond to your request would be in excess of the time limit set for FOI requests of this nature. He went on to explain that should you wish to refine your request by narrowing its scope by being more specific about the information required, this would be treated as a new request.

The main burden of your complaint seems to be Paul Webb's interpretation to 'enlarge' your request to include: 'e-mails sent by Huw Lewis / Minister / Private Secretary Minister to third parties where Ceri Breeze is also copied in. These would include new e-mails generated by the Minister or his Private Office but also e-mails where the Minister / Private Office responds to an e-mail sent to him by a third party – as the Minister would be the originator of the responding e-mail.'

I understand from Paul Webb that he acknowledged your request as follows:

'please treat this as an acknowledgement of your request. We will now get on and process the request searching for e-mails, between those dates, where Huw Lewis or Ceri Breeze are the originator and the other party is the recipient or a copy recipient. Let me know if this has not captured what you mean.'

This seems to me to have been a sensible attempt to clarify how Paul Webb was going to deal with your request. It sought to make clear the category of documents which would be considered. He went on to provide you with an opportunity to respond further if he had not captured your meaning correctly.

The categories of document set out in Paul Webb's letter to you of 25 July seemed to me to describe in more detail how Mr Webb was proposing to interpret the category of document originally defined in his clarifying e-mail. From what I can see the definition of document as set out in the 25 July letter is fully in line with the definition Mr Webb had shared with you in his original response. It seems to me, therefore, that having initially clarified that he had understood your request correctly Mr Webb provided more detailed information which was entirely in line with that request. You were clearly not happy with the information you were provided but that information is both in line with that which you requested and that which Mr Webb said he would provide.

Having reviewed the information in this case my conclusion is that I cannot uphold your complaint.

I have considered your complaint in accordance with the procedure outlined in the Welsh Government's Practical Guide for Making Requests for Information which is available by post on request or via the internet.

If you remain dissatisfied with this response you have the right to complain to the Information Commissioner. The Information Commissioner can be contacted at:

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

Yours sincerely

John Howells
Director of Housing and Regeneration