

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

18 March 2010

Your Ref:

Our Ref: 0114/2010

Mr Angelo Marino Bruno

Email: [request-29029-0178xxx@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx.xxm](mailto:request-29029-0178xxx@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx.xxm)

Force Disclosure Unit  
Police Headquarters  
173 Pitt Street  
GLASGOW  
G2 4JS

Tel: 0141 435 1217

Fax: 0141 435 1218

Dear Mr Bruno

**FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST REFERENCE NUMBER 0114/2010**

I refer to your request for information dated 17 February 2010, which was received by Strathclyde Police on that date.

Your request for information has now been considered and on 18 March 2010, a decision was made to provide some of the information requested by you. Some of the information requested by you is, however, considered to be exempt in terms of the Freedom of Information (Scotland) Act 2002 (the Act). Section 16 of the Act requires Strathclyde Police to provide you with a notice which: (a) states that it holds the information, (b) states that it is claiming an exemption, (c) specifies the exemption in question and (d) states, if that would not be otherwise apparent, why the exemption applies. Where information is considered to be exempt, this letter serves as a Refusal Notice and an explanation of the appropriate exemption is provided.

For ease of reference, I have provided a response to each of the questions posed by you, as detailed below.

***1. Total number of and names and job titles of all your employees, officers (all ranks) who are Common Purpose Graduates.***

The following table provides some of the information you have requested. In relation to numbers 11 to 15 where the officers names have not been included the exemptions listed below apply:

|   |                          |                    |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | Detective Superintendent | Colin Field        |
| 2 | Detective Inspector      | Douglas Weir       |
| 3 | Programmes Manager       | Zoe White          |
| 4 | Chief Inspector          | Malcolm MacCormick |
| 5 | Superintendent           | Fiona McPherson    |
| 6 | Inspector                | Craig Ritchie      |
| 7 | Chief Superintendent     | David Thomson      |
| 8 | Chief Superintendent     | Graham Cairns      |
| 9 | Constable                | Elaine Kennedy     |

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

|    |                          |                |
|----|--------------------------|----------------|
| 10 | Sergeant                 | Farooq Hussain |
| 11 | Inspector                |                |
| 12 | Chief Inspector          |                |
| 13 | Detective Inspector      |                |
| 14 | Superintendent           |                |
| 15 | Detective Superintendent |                |

**Section 35(1) (a) & (b)**

In relation to numbers 11 to 15, the officers concerned are currently, or have recently been involved in sensitive covert roles within the Force. Release of their names may compromise the investigations in which they are involved, their safety, the safety of their colleagues and of the public. Release of their names and the consequences of this may also prevent officers from wishing to carry out these roles in the future, and would, or would be likely to prejudice substantially the prevention or detection of crime and the apprehension or prosecution of offenders.

This is a non-absolute exemption and requires the application of the public interest test.

**Section 39 (1) – Health, safety and the environment**

Release of the names of officers who are in these roles would, or would be likely to, endanger the physical or mental health or the safety of an individual. Identification of the officers concerned could not only compromise any investigation that they are involved in, but also their own safety and would discourage others from wishing to carry out such duties in the future, for fear that their safety would be put at risk. If the officers are put at risk, the safety of their colleagues would also be compromised and the effectiveness of the investigations hindered. If this were to occur, then the safety of the public would also be put at risk.

This is a non-absolute exemption and requires the application of the public interest test.

**Public Interest Test**

As you can see, the above exemptions are non-absolute and require the application of the public interest test. It could be argued that accountability for public funds would favour disclosure. That said, the applicability of the above exemptions, the nature of the criminal investigations that the officers are involved in, their personal interests, their safety and the safety of others and the need for the efficient and effective conduct of the Force favour retention of this information.

***2. Total amount spent by your organisation on Common Purpose programmes for your staff in each year from 1997-2009 inclusive.***

In relation to years 1997-2003 inclusive, Strathclyde Police does not hold the information you request and in term of Section 17 of the Act, this letter represents a formal notice that information is not held. By way of explanation, the invoices pertaining to charges made up to 2003, inclusive, were destroyed in line with the Strathclyde Police Record Retention Policy (4 years plus current year to be held). A copy of the Record Retention Schedule can be found via the following link <http://www.strathclyde.police.uk/index.asp?locID=1461&docID=-1>

The total expenditure by Strathclyde Police on Common Purpose programmes from 2004 to 2009 is detailed in the table below. As all VAT is reclaimed the amounts refer to the analysed amount which is the actual cost to the Force.

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

| <b>YEAR</b> | <b>TOTAL COST</b> |
|-------------|-------------------|
| 2004        | 3,950             |
| 2005        | 4,430             |
| 2006        | 4,700             |
| 2007        | 7,225             |
| 2008        | 19,725            |
| 2009        | 7,000             |

I hope this information is helpful, however, if you are not satisfied with the way in which your request has been dealt with, you are entitled in the first instance to request a review of the decision made by the Force. Should you wish to request such a review, please write to Mrs Sheena Brennan, Disclosure Manager at the above address within 40 working days of receiving this letter. Once informed of the Review Panel's decision, if you are still not satisfied, then you are entitled to apply to the Scottish Information Commissioner within six months for a decision. Contact details are; Office of the Scottish Information Commissioner, Kinburn Castle, Doubledykes Road, St Andrews, Fife, KY16 9DS, telephone 01334 464610. I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your interest in Strathclyde Police.

Should you require any further assistance concerning this matter please contact me directly on 0141 435 1217 quoting the reference number given.

Yours sincerely

Susan McGinlay  
Sergeant

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**