

**From:** WOOD, Edward  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Request for internal review of FOI request F08-260  
**Date:** 09 September 2008 17:19:43

---

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 09 September 2008 17:18  
**To:** WOOD, Edward  
**Subject:** RE: Request for internal review of FOI request F08-260

OK what's your room number again?

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** WOOD, Edward

**Sent:** 09 September 2008 17:17

**To:** [REDACTED]

**Subject:** RE: Request for internal review of FOI request F08-260

Yes, I'll be here tomorrow. I will put an appointment in your diary for next week.

Edward

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 09 September 2008 17:16  
**To:** WOOD, Edward  
**Subject:** RE: Request for internal review of FOI request F08-260

Indeed - I will get it to you. Are you in the office tomorrow?

A chat will be useful - I am out from Thursday until next Tuesday.

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** WOOD, Edward

**Sent:** 09 September 2008 17:14

**To:** [REDACTED]

**Subject:** FW: Request for internal review of FOI request F08-260

[REDACTED]

Can you send me any material on this? After I have seen it, it would be helpful to have a quick chat.

Thanks

Edward

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 02 September 2008 16:22  
**To:** WOOD, Edward

**Cc:** [REDACTED]

**Subject:** Request for internal review of FOI request F08-260

Dear Edward,

We have had a request for an internal review of a response to a Freedom of Information request. [REDACTED] is currently on annual leave and [REDACTED] has suggested that you may be well placed to conduct the internal review, as the request concerns application of copyright. For basic details of the request and our response, see here: [http://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/online\\_petitions\\_documents\\_from](http://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/online_petitions_documents_from)

Please can you let me know if you need any further information to determine whether you would be able to take this review on? If you feel unable to take on this review, I would be grateful if you could suggest someone else who can.

Many thanks,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Freedom of Information and Data Protection Coordinator

House of Commons

020 7219 [REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [WOOD, Edward;](#)  
**cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Request for internal review of FOI request F08-260  
**Date:** 02 September 2008 16:21:35

---

Dear Edward,

We have had a request for an internal review of a response to a Freedom of Information request. [REDACTED] is currently on annual leave and [REDACTED] has suggested that you may be well placed to conduct the internal review, as the request concerns application of copyright. For basic details of the request and our response, see here: [http://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/online\\_petitions\\_documents\\_from](http://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/online_petitions_documents_from)

Please can you let me know if you need any further information to determine whether you would be able to take this review on? If you feel unable to take on this review, I would be grateful if you could suggest someone else who can.

Many thanks,

[REDACTED]

---

[REDACTED]  
Freedom of Information and Data Protection Coordinator  
House of Commons  
020 7219 [REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** WOOD, Edward;  
**cc:** [REDACTED];  
**Subject:** RE: Request for internal review of FOI request F08-260  
**Date:** 03 September 2008 08:58:27

---

Thank you Edward - much appreciated. [REDACTED] is back on Monday 8th and can provide you with the relevant details then.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]

---

[REDACTED]  
Freedom of Information and Data Protection Coordinator  
House of Commons  
020 7219 [REDACTED]

---

**From:** WOOD, Edward  
**Sent:** 02 September 2008 18:10  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Request for internal review of FOI request F08-260

Dear [REDACTED]

Happy to take this on. Can you let me know when [REDACTED] is due back so that I can get some background from him about the approach taken?

Best wishes

Edward

---

**From:** SHARPE, Jacqy  
**Sent:** 01 October 2008 13:57  
**To:** WOOD, Edward  
**Subject:** RE: FOI case no. FO8 260

Edward

I was checking my files on an unrelated matter and came across the form which applicants under the FOIA are required by Parliamentary Archives to sign. The form includes the following:

Copyright, Design and Patents Act 1988

I understand that copyright may apply to information which is provided by the House of Lords in response to a request under the FOIA 2000. I will need to check whether copyright restrictions apply before copying or publishing (including on the Internet) information I receive. I confirm that I will be responsible for obtaining the appropriate permissions etc.

Jacqy

---

**From:** WOOD, Edward  
**Sent:** 29 September 2008 15:08  
**To:** SHARPE, Jacqy  
**Subject:** FOI case no. FO8 260

Jacqy

In preparation for our meeting tomorrow, I attach some preliminary thoughts.

Edward

<< File: FOI Review Irving draft v0.2.doc >>

Edward Wood  
Director of Information Management  
Department of Information Services  
House of Commons  
0207 219 [REDACTED]

**From:** WOOD, Edward  
**To:** SHARPE, Jacqy; [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Petitions can make a difference - new report  
**Date:** 13 October 2008 17:40:17

---

The copyright statement on the Australian Parliament's website <http://www.aph.gov.au/legal/copyright.htm> gives a contact for copyright enquiries. However, we could reasonably let the matter rest here given our decision last week that in general we do not wish to undertake to obtain third party copyright permission. The note copied to us by [REDACTED] suggested that government departments might wish to take the same line.

Edward

---

**From:** SHARPE, Jacqy  
**Sent:** 13 October 2008 17:33  
**To:** [REDACTED]; WOOD, Edward; [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Petitions can make a difference - new report

For information. Jacqy

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 13 October 2008 15:31  
**To:** SHARPE, Jacqy  
**Subject:** RE: Petitions can make a difference - new report

Hi Jacqy

I hope you are well .

I receive the email as part of a group mailing and I don't know who it comes from. I suspect the information maybe on the website.

If you haven't already processed the request I am sure your office could check.

Let me know if I can help further

Many thanks

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** SHARPE, Jacqy  
**Sent:** 07 October 2008 16:21  
**To:** [REDACTED]

**Subject:** FW: Petitions can make a difference - new report



We have received an FOI request for material related to e-petitions. As the requesting organisation automatically posts all replies on its website I need to check the position with relation to copyright as we don't want to breach any copyright laws. I should be grateful if you could check whether your Australian contacts would have any objection to their email being supplied to, and thus republished by, the requester?

Thanks.

Jacqy

**From:** WOOD, Edward  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: FOI  
**Date:** 07 October 2008 08:47:46

---

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]. My view is that we should still attempt to get the permission of the third parties. I will ask Jacqy about getting a meeting with OPSI.

Edward

Edward Wood

Director of Information Management

Department of Information Services

House of Commons

0207 219 [REDACTED]

---

---

**From:** [REDACTED]

**Sent:** 06 October 2008 16:29

**To:** [REDACTED]; WOOD, Edward

**Cc:** [REDACTED]

**Subject:** RE: FOI

Thank you, does this mean that even if a suitable licence was held, we would still have to remove third party copyright (far easier than tracking down the owner of third party material) before transmitting to whatdotheyknow?

[REDACTED]

**From:** [WOOD, Edward](#)  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: FOI request  
**Date:** 07 October 2008 17:23:39  
**Attachments:** [portugal.doc](#)

---

[REDACTED]

Do you have any idea where this third party content came from? Did [REDACTED] unearth it? And the other third party stuff? Just trying to speed things up a little.

Thanks

Edward

Edward Wood

Director of Information Management

Department of Information Services

House of Commons

0207 219 [REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 07 October 2008 17:13  
**To:** WOOD, Edward  
**Subject:** FW: FOI request

Sorry, but as you are both copyright and ICT this may make more sense to you than it does to me. Out of the blue it means nothing to me. Any advice?

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** SHARPE, Jacqy  
**Sent:** 07 October 2008 16:08  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FOI request

We have an FOI request for material which includes the attached document. As the requesting organisation posts all replies on its website I need to check the position with relation to copyright. Do you know who I could contact about the paper to check that no copyright issues are involved? Thanks.

Jacqy

**From:** SHARPE, Jacqy  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: What dotheyknow  
**Date:** 25 November 2008 18:06:11

---

[REDACTED]

I think it would be helpful if both Houses took the same approach to this issue so the Clerk may want to discuss it with Michael Pownall. Other than that I don't think we need to add anything else.

Jacqy

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 24 November 2008 16:21  
**To:** [REDACTED]; SHARPE, Jacqy  
**Subject:** FW: What dotheyknow

[REDACTED]

In responding to a request under FOI for data relating to the development of electronic petitions, we have refused to send material subject to parliamentary copyright to 'whatdotheyknow.com' because the site automatically reproduces that material and is therefore in breach of copyright.

Is the Clerk content that the House should issue a bespoke licence to the web site which would enable its owners, within certain terms and conditions, to reproduce this material, and material of a similar nature falling within future requests? A copy of the proposed licence is attached

Jacqy - do we need to add anything?

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** SHARPE, Jacqy  
**Sent:** 13 November 2008 14:33  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: What dotheyknow

[REDACTED]

I sent the following email to the Clerk last week as he had said in response to an earlier email on the subject that he wished to discuss the whole matter and see the draft letter before it goes out.

Please let me know if the Clerk would like to discuss this further with us.

Jacqy

---

**From:** SHARPE, Jacqy  
**Sent:** 06 November 2008 10:22  
**To:** JACK, Malcolm  
**Cc:** [REDACTED] KENNON, Andrew; [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** What dotheyknow

Malcolm

The Office for Public Sector Information has produced a draft licence to allow the re-use of parliamentary material provided in response to an FOI request.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

We now need to decide whether we are content to introduce such a licence. <<  
File: FOILicence20 10.doc >>

[REDACTED]

Jacqy

**From:** SHARPE, Jacqy  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Internal review of Freedom of Information request - Online petitions documents from PICT  
**Date:** 10 December 2008 15:02:18

---

I'm seeing the Clerk at 5.30pm on Tuesday.

Jacqy

-----Original Message-----

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 10 December 2008 14:51  
**To:** SHARPE, Jacqy  
**Subject:** RE: Internal review of Freedom of Information request - Online petitions documents from PICT

Jacqy

Did you have any luck? I know the timing is bad.  
[REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

**From:** SHARPE, Jacqy  
**Sent:** 03 December 2008 18:03  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Internal review of Freedom of Information request - Online petitions documents from PICT

I had a meeting arranged with the Clerk but it had to be postponed. I'll try to get another meeting later this week. Jacqy

-----Original Message-----

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 03 December 2008 11:25  
**To:** SHARPE, Jacqy  
**Subject:** FW: Internal review of Freedom of Information request - Online petitions documents from PICT

Jacqy - have you had a chance to talk to the Clerk? I know that this is not a good time but we owe Mr Irving a response. Please let me know if I can do anything [REDACTED] -----Original Message-----

**From:** SHARPE, Jacqy  
**To:** [REDACTED] JACK, Malcolm;  
**cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Whatdotheyknow and copyright  
**Date:** 22 December 2008 10:04:17

---

[REDACTED]

I met the Clerk last Tuesday. He will be discussing a possible supplementary licence with Michael Pownall after the recess. As the Speaker is the signatory to the original licence I think any supplementary licence would also require his approval.

I am sorry not to have emailed you immediately after the meeting. I put a reminder in my diary and then managed to overlook it.

Jacqy

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 19 December 2008 12:53  
**To:** JACK, Malcolm  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]; SHARPE, Jacqy  
**Subject:** Whatdotheyknow and copyright

Malcolm

I am sorry to trouble you at this busy time but I understand that earlier this week you and Jacqy Sharpe were due to discuss the possible provision of a licence to the whatdotheyknow web site which would enable its owners to reproduce parliamentary copyright material sent in response to FOI requests. This would resolve the outstanding internal review of our refusal to send to the site material about e-petitioning . If we are not yet in a position to respond, do you agree that I should write to the requester stating that we hope to bring the matter to a conclusion early in the New Year?

[REDACTED]

---

**Head of Information Rights and Information Security**  
**0207 219 [REDACTED]**

SHARPE, Jacqy  
From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: 22 December 2008 10:06  
To: SHARPE, Jacqy  
Subject: RE: Whatdotheyknow and copyright

Jacqy  
This is kind of you. I will write to [REDACTED] today promising a response 'early in the New Year'  
[REDACTED]

---

From: SHARPE, Jacqy  
Sent: 22 December 2008 10:04  
To: [REDACTED] JACK, Malcolm  
Cc: [REDACTED]  
Subject: RE: Whatdotheyknow and copyright

I met the Clerk last Tuesday. He will be discussing a possible supplementary licence with [REDACTED] after the recess. As the Speaker is the signatory to the original licence I think any supplementary licence would also require his approval.

I am sorry not to have emailed you immediately after the meeting. I put a reminder in my diary and then managed to overlook it.

Jacqy

---

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: 19 December 2008 12:53  
To: JACK, Malcolm  
Cc: [REDACTED] SHARPE, Jacqy  
Subject: Whatdotheyknow and copyright

Malcolm  
I am sorry to trouble you at this busy time but I understand that earlier this week you and Jacqy Sharpe were due to discuss the possible provision of a licence to the whatdotheyknow web site which would enable its owners to reproduce parliamentary copyright material sent in response to FOI requests. This would resolve the outstanding internal review of our refusal to send to the site material about e-petitioning. If we are not yet in a position to respond, do you agree that I should write to the requester stating that we hope to bring the matter to a conclusion early in the New Year?  
[REDACTED]

---

Head of Information Rights and Information Security  
0207 219 [REDACTED]

**SHARPE, Jacqy**

---

**From:** JACK, Malcolm  
**Sent:** 20 January 2009 10:58  
**To:** SHARPE, Jacqy  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** OPSI

I discussed this with Mike Pownall who would be grateful for some briefing from you – he feels uncertain of making a decision until he has had it.

Malcolm

SHARPE, Jacqy  
From: SHARPE, Jacqy  
Sent: 26 January 2009 13:52  
To: [REDACTED]  
Subject: RE: Copyright, whatdotheyknow and so on

[REDACTED]  
Thanks for that - it seems a very good idea to me too. I'll ask [REDACTED] for his views.

Jacqy

---

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: 23 January 2009 09:21  
To: SHARPE, Jacqy  
Subject: Copyright, whatdotheyknow and so on

Hi Jacqy

An idea occurred to me last night. At the time, and after a glass of wine, it seemed brilliant - but it may well be that it is idiotic, and has already been considered and discarded. So I thought I would run it past you before doing anything else.

The idea was that instead of sending responses to FOI requests received via Whatdotheyknow directly to the site, they could be published on the parliamentary website. The reply to the FOI request could then simply say, "the information requested has been published on the parliamentary website at ..." and provide a hyperlink to the relevant page. In other words, we would be publishing the material ourselves, and could attach the appropriate conditions regarding re-use, copyright etc. And having published the material it would presumably be exempt from disclosure under FOI.

Anyway, that was my thought - I wondered whether it might be simpler than trying to devise new and untried click-use licences.

All the best

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
House of Lords  
London SW1A 0PW

Tel: 020 7219 [REDACTED]

SHARPE, Jacqy  
From: SHARPE, Jacqy  
Sent: 26 January 2009 13:56  
To: [REDACTED]  
Subject: FW: Copyright, whatdotheyknow and so on

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] wondered whether instead of sending responses to FOI requests received via Whatdotheyknow directly to the site, we'd considered publishing them on the parliamentary website. The reply to the FOI request could then simply say, "the information requested has been published on the parliamentary website at ..." and provide a hyperlink to the relevant page. In other words, we would be publishing the material ourselves, and could attach the appropriate conditions regarding re-use, copyright etc. And having published the material it would presumably be exempt from disclosure under FOI.

Provided it didn't mean we had to respond to all requests that way it seems quite a good idea to me.

Jacqy

SHARPE, Jacqy

From: SHARPE, Jacqy  
Sent: 30 January 2009 17:47  
To: [REDACTED]  
Subject: RE: Click-use licence

Thanks, [REDACTED]

I hope we can get this settled next week.

[REDACTED]  
From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: 30 January 2009 11:46  
To: SHARPE, Jacqy  
Subject: RE: Click-use licence

A few minor corrections are highlighted in track changes. I've added some comments/questions as well, but obviously there is no need to take them on board. [REDACTED] shares my general view that this is a rather heavy-handed way to approach the issue, and that publishing responses on our own site, so by-passing copyright concerns, would be simpler. But if you feel committed to this approach, of course we will sign up to the licence.

[REDACTED]  
From: SHARPE, Jacqy  
Sent: 29 January 2009 16:17  
To: [REDACTED]  
Subject: Click-use licence

Jacqy

20/02/2009

**SHARPE, Jacqy**

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 06 February 2009 12:00  
**To:** SHARPE, Jacqy  
**Subject:** FW: Freedom of Information request - Online petitions documents from PICT

Jacqy

Do we know the final position on Mr Irving's internal review? I really would like to get him off my books. He has made an exact request to the HoL who appeared less concerned than us about the matter.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 06 February 2009 11:49  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Freedom of Information request - Online petitions documents from PICT

[REDACTED]

To be aware that HL has received this request. I am forwarding to [REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Francis Irving [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 06 February 2009 11:17  
**To:** House Of Lords Information Office  
**Subject:** Freedom of Information request - Online petitions documents from PICT

Dear Sir or Madam,

I would like to make a freedom of information request for electronic copies of any documents produced by PICT discussing or evaluating the possible deployment of electronic petitioning systems in Parliament.

Yours faithfully,

Francis Irving

-----  
Disclaimer: This message and any reply that you make will be published on the internet. Our privacy and copyright policies:  
<http://www.whatdotheyknow.com/help/about#officers>

Is [hinfo@parliament.uk](mailto:hinfo@parliament.uk) the wrong address for Freedom of Information requests to House of Lords? If so please contact us using this form: <http://www.whatdotheyknow.com/help/contact>

-----