



Ein cyf/Our ref ATISN 11736

18 January 2018

Dear ,

Request for Information – ATISN 11736

I wrote to you on 1 December regarding your request for information on the grant awarded to Gordon Dadds Solicitors. You asked for:

1. The specific terms of the grant awarded to Gordon Dadds in 2014 and the detailed offer terms.
2. Copies of any interim and final reviews carried out to determine whether the offer terms were met.
3. Confirmation on whether this was the only Welsh Government grant awarded to Gordon Dadds.

I confirm we hold information caught by your request. The Welsh Government provided two grants to Gordon Dadds in 2014: one to Gordon Dadds Wales LLP and one to Brook Street Support Services LLP also owned by Gordon Dadds. The information we hold in response to your first question is the individual offer letters and the standard terms and conditions which accompanied the offers of the two grants. A copy of the information is appended at Annex A, however, I have concluded that some of the information within the grant offer letters is withheld under Section 40, personal data, and Section 43, commercial interests, of the Freedom of Information Act 2000. Full reasoning for applying this exemption is given at Annex B.



BUDDSODDWYR | **INVESTORS**
MEWN POBL | **IN PEOPLE**

E&T FoI
Welsh Government
Treforest - QED Centre
Main Avenue
Treforest Industrial Estate
Pontypridd
CF37 5YR

RhyddidGwyb.EconomiaThrafnidiaeth@llyw.cymru
FOI.EconomyandTransport@gov.wales
www.gov.wales

Rydym yn croesawu derbyn gohebiaeth yn Gymraeg. Byddwn yn ateb gohebiaeth a dderbynnir yn Gymraeg yn Gymraeg ac ni fydd gohebu yn Gymraeg yn arwain at oedi.

We welcome receiving correspondence in Welsh. Any correspondence received in Welsh will be answered in Welsh and corresponding in Welsh will not lead to a delay in responding.

I can also confirm that the sums have been fully paid as all the conditions were met and that the jobs remain under conditions in line with the terms of the offer.

The information we hold in relation to your second request contains commercial data as provided to the Welsh Government by Gordon Dadds, for the purpose of assessing the grant applications. I have therefore concluded that it is exempt under Section 43 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000, commercial interests. Full reasoning for applying this exemption is given at Annex B.

If you are dissatisfied with the Welsh Government's handling of your request, you can ask for an internal review within 40 working days of the date of this response. Requests for an internal review should be addressed to the Welsh Government's Freedom of Information Officer at:

Information Rights Unit, Welsh Government, Cathays Park, Cardiff, CF10 3NQ
or FreedomOfInformationOfficer@wales.gsi.gov.uk.

Please remember to quote the ATISN reference number above.

You also 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.

However, please note that the Commissioner will not normally investigate a complaint until it has been through our own internal review process.

Yours sincerely

ATISN 11736 – Application for Exemption

Section 40 – Personal Data

Section 40 of the Freedom of Information Act sets out an exemption from the right to know if the information requested is personal information protected by the Data Protection Act 1998 (DPA). Personal data is defined in Section 1(1) of the DPA as:

“personal data” means data which relates to a living individual who can be identified from those data; or from those data and other information which is in the possession of, or is likely to come into the possession of, the data controller”.

I have concluded that, in this instance, the withheld information within the Departure Request amounts to third party personal data.

Under Section 40(2) of the FOI Act, personal data is exempt from release if disclosure would breach one of the data protection principles. I consider the principle being most relevant in this instance as being the first.

The first data protection principle states:

Personal data shall be processed fairly and lawfully and, in particular, shall not be processed unless -

(a) at least one of the conditions in Schedule 2 is met, and (b) in the case of sensitive personal data, at least one of the conditions in Schedule 3 is also met.

I consider that the withheld information in relation to names and contact details falls within the description of personal data as defined by the DPA and that its disclosure would breach the first data protection principle. The first data protection principle has two components:

1. Personal data shall be processed fairly and lawfully and
2. Personal data shall not be processed unless at least one of the conditions in DPA schedule 2 is met

Guidance from the Information Commissioner’s Office (Personal information (section 40 and regulation 13) v 1.4) states:

If disclosure would not be fair, then the information is exempt from disclosure.

This approach was endorsed by the Court of Appeal in the case of Deborah Clark v the Information Commissioner and East Hertfordshire District Council where it was held:

“The first data protection principle entails a consideration of whether it would be fair to disclose the personal data in all the circumstances. The Commissioner determined that it would not be fair to disclose the requested information and thus the first data protection principle would be breached. There was no need in the present case therefore to consider whether any other Schedule 2 condition or conditions could be met because even if such

conditions could be established, it would still not be possible to disclose the personal data without breaching the DPA” (paragraph 63).

Our analysis of the ICO’s key considerations in assessing ‘fairness’, as set out in the Guidance, are presented below.

The withheld information amounts to the personal data of third party officers who do not have public facing roles and would not expect their names and contact details to be released in this context. There are set procedures in place for members of the public to contact both the Welsh Government using generic contact mechanisms. Having such systems in place means members of the public do not make direct contact with officials and avoids those officials dealing with potentially unnecessary and disruptive correspondence. In this context, the civil servants were liaising with each other as part of their normal course of business. In doing so, there would be no expectation that their personal details would at any time be placed in the public domain.

The Welsh Government does not believe there is any legitimate interest in the public or the requestor having access to this information, and we do not see any legitimate reason why the named officials need to be contacted directly. Because of that, it is believed release of this information would be unfair and so breach the first data protection principle. Despite withholding information of individual officer details, it remains clear which body issued or received the correspondence, which is the primary factor.

For that reason, I believe the information should be withheld under section 40(2) of the Freedom of Information Act. This is an absolute exemption and not subject to the public interest tests.

Section 43 (2) – Commercial Interests

Decisions relating to non-disclosure have been taken with due consideration of the exemptions identified under Section 43(2) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA). This states that information is exempt information if its disclosure under this Act would, or would be likely to prejudice the commercial interests of any person (including the public authority holding it).

The information contained in the interim reviews, and some of the information contained in the grant offer letters, are commercially sensitive to Gordon Dadds Ltd. It amounts to financial information relating to capital expenditure, financing and salary expenditure. This information is not otherwise available and its disclosure would be likely to cause commercial prejudice to the company because it relates to the people employed and to the sources of finance utilised to purchase assets.

As with most businesses, Gordon Dadds Ltd works within a highly competitive industry. To disclose the information would mean disclosing financial data. Its release would be likely to cause the company commercial disadvantage in an ever competitive field as it would provide the company's competitors with a level of information they otherwise wouldn't have.

Section 43 is a qualified (public interest tested) exemption. This means that in order to engage it, I must show that the public interest in withholding the information is greater than the public interest in releasing it. I have therefore given consideration to the effects of disclosure of the information to the world at large as the information is made available to anybody and everybody, not just the requestor. As such, when considering your request I have considered the wider effects of disclosure rather than any personal interest you may have in being provided with the information.

Public Interest Test

I recognise the general public interest in openness and transparency and that releasing the information would help the public gain a better understanding of the decisions made by Government. It is also recognised that there is a public interest in how public money is to be, or has been, used to ensure that Government gets the best value from the public purse.

I am aware that as a general rule, the sensitivity of information is likely to reduce over time, so that the age of information, or timing of the request may be relevant in determining whether to apply the exemption, or where the public interest may lie. In this case, however, the information captured is very much current information.

In conclusion,

I believe the public interest is satisfied by the amount of information being disclosed in response to this request for information.