

Freedom of Information Requests and Public Procurement

Eleanor Grey QC
39 Essex Chambers
17 May 2018

The challenge

“We fully expect to see all government bodies that contract out public services... having transparency, not commercial sensitivity, as their default position.”

*Public Accounts Committee,
Margaret Hodge chairing, 2014*

Transparency Principles -

“Government has in place a presumption in favour of disclosure of contract and related information, that may previously have been withheld on grounds of commercial confidentiality.”

(Procurement Policy Note – Update to Transparency Principles Action Note PPN 01/17)

Guidance on what should be released includes -

- Government Tenders and Contracts Central Government Transparency Guidance Note (November 2017)
- The Local Government (Transparency Requirements) (England) Regulations 2015, Local Government Transparency Code 2015
- Model Services Contract – Transparency and Freedom of Information Clause

Overview of legal framework securing public access

- Freedom of Information Act 2000
- Environmental Information Regulations 2004
- Exemptions and exceptions
- Stages of the procurement process
- General approaches

Two Disclosure Regimes:

- Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA)
- Environmental Information Regulations 2004 (EIRs)
- Identify the applicable regime
- EIRs are more onerous?
- All exceptions are ‘qualified’ under EIRs;
- Test of ‘disclosure would adversely affect’ (rather than ‘would be likely to’)

Key Exemptions

- The “confidentiality of commercial or industrial information’ - EIRs Reg 12(5), FOIA s43(2), also s41 (confidence);
- Effect on ‘intellectual property rights’ (EIRs) or “trade secrets” (s43(1) FOIA);
- Material ‘which is still in the course of completion, or unfinished documents or to incomplete data’ - EIRs Reg 12(4) - or intended for future publication (s22 FOIA)

Commercial Interests (1)

- Define confidential material in the contract
- Evidence the prejudice relied upon
- If relying on third party interests – consult them!
- “speculation is not enough”
- “disclosure supports competition”?
- But *Topp v ICO* EA/2012/0253: disclosure of pricing structure would not assist

Commercial Interests (2)

- North East Lincolnshire Council, ICO Ref FS50554846 (2014)
- “Winning tender documentation” requested (without figures), s43(2) relied upon
- ‘the possibility of prejudice should be real and significant’
- Detailed justification of USP, business model of leisure services operator set out
- Weighed against improvements to be gained by information to potential competitors

Common thread?

Evidence of prejudice / harm to the commercial interests relied upon.

Stages of the Process (1)

- Early discussion of expectations and potential disclosure on contract award and thereafter;
- All pre-contract award information will *generally* be confidential until award;
- After contract award, there is a distinction between the successful and the unsuccessful;
- Successful bids may expect to see information about contract price and type of goods supplied released – but not underlying ‘strategic’ information

Stages of the Process (2)

- There is a weaker public interest in releasing information about unsuccessful bids, or their evaluation;
- There is a stronger case for releasing information, including evaluations, of the successful bidder, as public money received;
- Each case must be considered on its facts.

Evaluation and Scoring

- Evaluation notes withheld in FS50554709 (2014)
- *Mears v Leeds City Council* [2011] EWHC 1031 – no general duty to disclose Model Answers (but ensure do not create additional undisclosed scoring criteria)
- FS50601053 (2016): scores and evaluation reports for CCG elective care services withheld under s43(2).

Who holds what ?

- There can be confusion about what is held by public authority, plus ...
- Whether, and if so what, information is held by a contractor *on behalf of* a public authority
- i.e., Contractor's information about contract delivery?
- Scope depends on contract
- Early definitions of responsibilities and responses, and identification of sensitivities

Note Keeping

- Brief or detailed?
- Old debate!
- Short notes may be easier to disclose –
- But
- Poor record-keeping, poor aids for decisions
- Limited justification for treating as sensitive

39 Essex Chambers LLP is a governance and holding entity and a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales (registered number OC360005) with its registered office at 81 Chancery Lane, London WC2A 1DD. 39 Essex Chambers' members provide legal and advocacy services as independent, self-employed barristers and no entity connected with 39 Essex Chambers provides any legal services. 39 Essex Chambers (Services) Limited manages the administrative, operational and support functions of Chambers and is a company incorporated in England and Wales (company number 7385894) with its registered office at 81 Chancery Lane, London WC2A 1DD.

39essex.com

BARRISTERS . ARBITRATORS . MEDIATORS

LONDON . MANCHESTER . SINGAPORE . KUALA LUMPUR

