



Information Access Team  
Financial and Commercial Group  
Ground Floor (NW), Seacole Building  
2 Marsham Street, London, SW1P 4DF  
Switchboard 020 7035 4848  
E-mail [info.access@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:info.access@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk) [www.homeoffice.gov.uk](http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk)

Andrew Watson  
[Request-23716-17c78cc8@whatdotheyknow.com](#)

Our Ref: 13416  
Your ref:  
Date: 18 January 2010

Dear Mr Watson

I am writing further to my e-mail of 22 December about your request for an internal review of the response from the Identity and Passport Service (IPS) to your Freedom of Information request about the post of Identity Commissioner.

I have now completed the review. I discussed your complaint with the relevant staff at IPS and my findings are set out in the attached report. My conclusion is that it was unfortunate IPS used unclear terminology when replying to the final point in your request for information about the number of people interviewed for the post of Identity Commissioner. I have brought this to their attention and would ask you to accept my apologies.

This completes the internal review process by the Home Office. If you remain dissatisfied with the response to your request for information, you have the right of complaint to the Information Commissioner at the following address:

The Information Commissioner  
Wycliffe House  
Water Lane  
Wilmslow  
Cheshire  
SK9 5AF

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Steve Kirk".

Steve Kirk

## **Internal review report**

Internal review of response to request under the Freedom of Information (Fol) Act 2000 by Andrew Watson, reference 13416

**Responding Unit:** Identity and Passport Service (IPS)

### **Chronology**

Original Fol request:	25 November 2009
IPS response:	17 December 2009
Request for internal review received	21 December 2009

### **Subject of request**

1. Mr Watson asked for information about the recruitment of the Identity Commissioner:
  - The amount spent on recruitment consultants and advertising for the office of the Identity Commissioner
  - The dates advertisements for the post appeared and in which newspapers
  - What other methods of advertising the post were used
  - How many people completed application forms for the post
  - How many applicants for the post were interviewed.

### **The response from IPS**

2. IPS replied to all points raised by Mr Watson, but when replying to the final point, asking how many applicants for the post were interviewed, the reply said that six people had been selected for interview.

### **Mr Watson's request for an internal review**

3. Mr Watson has queried the final response in the letter from IPS as he had asked how many applicants for the post had been interviewed, but IPS had told him the number of applicants who were selected for interview.

### **Consideration of the response**

4. In order to consider Mr Watson's complaint, I contacted IPS to establish how many applicants for the post of identity Commissioner were interviewed as opposed to the number who had been selected for interview. This was necessary as Mr Watson had asked for the number interviewed for the post, but was instead told how many were selected for interview.
5. IPS told me that six people had been interviewed for the position of Identity Commissioner.

### **Conclusion**

6. The terminology used by IPS to the final point of Mr Watson's request for information was unfortunate. It was perfectly reasonable for him to query the point as the number of applicants selected for interview for the post of Identity Commissioner would not necessarily be the same as the number who were interviewed for the post. In this instance the number

was the same, but I would recommend that IPS take steps to avoid such confusion in the future.

Steve Kirk  
Information Access Team  
Home Office

December 2009