

what exemptions you are relying on for the redactions, with enough detail so that your reasoning can be challenged. This would not necessarily be for each redaction individually, but the redactions as a whole would have to be covered by the exemptions and explanations." We note that you are not suggesting that we should deal with each redaction individually.

However, to provide more detailed information to you concerning these redactions would require a comparison of the redacted and unredacted information and a fresh consideration of the exemptions in each case. We have in fact done this for over a thousand pages of information which you have received - redactions have been marked on those pages to show which exemption was applied. In addition, we have provided you with a copy of the desk instructions which were used to make those redactions - those instructions provide detailed examples of the sort of information which has been removed and would, I suggest, meet your requirement to provide sufficient detail for the reasoning to be challenged.

We believe that it would be a disproportionate burden on public resources for us to carry out this process again, for the remaining information, especially bearing in mind that the outstanding IEP information is so similar in nature to that which you have already received. We hope that you are able to agree with us that this would not be an appropriate use of public resources, which are after all met with taxpayers' money. Instead, we would invite you to explain any specific concerns which you may have relating to the information and we shall do our best to explain why those details have been redacted. This seems to be a reasonable and proportionate method of resolving any concerns which you may have and we look forward to hearing from you to resolve this matter.

Yours sincerely



A J Walker
Director General of Resources