

Diane Scott  
[request-25099-c8c58e@x]

9 February 2010

Our Ref: FOI Review 2010/04 – F0085877  
[FOI Request 2009/214 – F0082080]

Dear Ms Scott,

**Re: Freedom of Information (Scotland) Act 2002 – Request for Information**

Thank you for your email which was received by the University on 6 February 2010 timed 00:57 hours requesting a Review of our actions, as detailed below.

**“Please pass this on to the person who conducts Freedom of Information reviews.**

**I am writing to request an internal review of University of Glasgow's handling of my FOI request 'Internal Audit Update 2009'.**

**Can you please review why it took the university longer than the maximum time allowed by law to answer this request and see if there are lessons that can be learned to prevent further transgressions in future?**

**Can you also review the reasons for withholding information. The university says that release of this information would cause severe damage to its commercial interests but the public interest in disclosure its slight. I think this is logically incorrect. If there is information that if it was made public would cause this enormous damage then surely the public interest in disclosure must be substantial due to the fact that the University including the vet school receives millions of pounds each year from taxpayers.**

**Also you state**

**"The disclosure of the requested information, at this time, would be likely to be detrimental to the public interest by inhibiting organisations from entering into relationships and working with the Faculty and the University. This in turn would threaten a major source of clinical income and could lead to the gaining of competitive advantage by rivals. This possible failure to achieve maximum income potential would substantially prejudice the commercial interests of the Faculty of Veterinary Medicine and the University of Glasgow."**

**Aren't you actually letting the cat out of the bag already by admitting that on a website that is open to the public? Surely any organisation that was thinking about entering such an arrangement would already be put off by the seriousness of the disclosure that you have just made. If the weaknesses that your auditors have identified are so dreadful then it must be the case that any organisation that might be inhibited by the disclosure of the detail of these weaknesses will already have been inhibited by the fact that you are acknowledging both the fact of these weaknesses and their extreme seriousness on a publicly available website.**

I think that it must be in your interests and also the public interest to disclose the detail now because there is a big danger that people will believe that they are actually worse than they really are.

I notice that your decisions have been subject to a lot of appeals in the past. I hope you don't mind me saying but very often your response to the appeal does not answer the points that the person making the appeal has made and just says that the person reviewing the decision believes that the right decision was made.

I am fairly sure that you will reject this appeal like you have rejected all of the others but if you do can you please analyse the argument that I have made above and tell me where you disagree with the logic that I am putting forward.

Can you also tell me the name of the person conducting the appeal and give me details of the experience (including any formal training) that they have in the operation of the Freedom of Information Act.

A full history of my FOI request and all correspondence is available on the Internet at this address:  
[http://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/internal\\_audit\\_update\\_2009](http://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/internal_audit_update_2009)

The University acknowledges receipt of your Request for a Review and confirms that a response to your request for Review will be sent to you promptly; and in any event not later than 5 March 2010, as required under the terms of FOISA. The University will contact you if the University requires any further information.

Yours sincerely,

Data Protection and Freedom of Information Office