



Home Office

Information Access Team

Ground Floor, Seacole Building, 2 Marsham Street, London, SW1P 4DF

info.access@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk

www.homeoffice.gov.uk

Mr Watts
request-5262-5de682b0@whatdotheyknow.com

Date: 12 January 2010

Dear Mr Watts,

Freedom of Information request (our ref. 10868)

In the course of Home Office review processes, it has come to my attention that your letter of 22 March 2009 to the UK Border Agency remains unanswered. In it, pursuant to your Freedom of Information (Fol) request of 26 December 2008, you requested further information regarding the cost burden to the U.K. of foreign criminals who have returned to their country of origin.

Although I have not previously been involved in the handling of your request, please allow me to apologise on behalf of the Department for this oversight and for the length of time which it is taking to provide you with a response to your request. We accept that to take such a time to respond is poor service and falls far short of the standards which the Department sets itself.

Your initial request was interpreted as limited to the cash amounts paid directly to foreign criminals. However, as you made clear in your letter of 22 March 2009, your interest is in a wider field.

In order to satisfy your request as effectively as possible, I would like to seek clarification of the scope and focus of your interests. If it is satisfactory to you, I would like to treat this clarification as a new Fol request. To this end, it would be of great assistance if you were able to confirm the parameters of your request. Does your request refer to the total cost burden to government of foreign criminals who return to their country of origin in the year after their release from jail? Does the time period of your interest remain the first year of the Facilitated Returns Scheme (from October 2006)?

Thank you in advance for this additional information. Dependent on the nature of your request and the manner in which the relevant files are stored, it may not be possible to provide all of the information in precisely the format that you desire. However, we will be better placed to answer your request as closely as possible if we understand precisely



WhatDoTheyKnow

the nature of that request.

Finally I note that, on 5 February 2009 and prior to the receipt of your original response, you used the automated function on www.whatdotheyknow.com to request an internal review of your case thus far. I appreciate that at the time you were awaiting an initial response which was, in the event, considerably overdue. Furthermore, you had an interest in additional information which this response did not supply.

As I have explained, I propose addressing this further information as an additional FoI request. Bearing this in mind, do you still require an internal review of the initial treatment of your original FoI request of 26 December 2008?

In any case we shall, of course, make every effort to ensure no repeat of the unsatisfactory service which you have thus far received, and to respond to your new FoI request within the 20 working day time limit, as legislated by the FoI Act.

Yours sincerely

C Proctor
Information Access Team