Luke Steele
By email

21 October 2013

Dear Mr Steele,

I am dealing with your three recent requests under the terms of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 ('the Act'). The University is sending a copy of this letter to the three separate 'WhatDoTheyKnow' email addresses that you used to make each of the requests.

In your first request, our reference FOI-2013-299, received on 23 September 2013, you asked:

“I write in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (“The Act”) to request the disclosure of visual data held which concerns the use of Non-Human Primates (NHPs) in research and related breeding. For the purposes of clarification, ‘research’ is defined as any activity which falls within the Animal (Scientific Procedures) Act 1986 (“ASPA”) and ‘breeding’ is any activity in relation to acting as a Designated Breeding & Supply Establishment (“DBSE”) under ASPA. The information I wish to request is as follows:
1. Photographs, footage or any visual data taken or captured of primates within the animal house(s) of the University of Cambridge from 2009 hitherto.”

In your second request, our reference FOI-2013-307, received on 30 September 2013, you asked:

“I write in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (“The Act”) to request the disclosure of data held concerning the use of primates in research. For the purposes of clarification, ‘research’ is defined as any activity which falls within the Animal (Scientific Procedures) Act 1986 (“ASPA”). The information I wish to request is as follows:
1. The cost/benefit analysis for the following primate research projects:
a. Opposing Effects of 5,7-DHT Infusions into the Orbitofrontal Cortex and Amygdala on Flexible Responding - Cerebral Cortex, July 2010;20:1668—1675

c. Differential Contributions of the Primate Ventrolateral Prefrontal and Orbitofrontal Cortex to Serial Reversal Learning - The Journal of Neuroscience, October 27, 2010; 30(43):14552–14559

d. Contribution of the amygdala, but not orbitofrontal or medial prefrontal cortices, to the expression of flavour preferences in marmoset monkeys - European Journal of Neuroscience, Vol. 34, pp. 1006–1017, 2011


f. Lesions of Ventrolateral Prefrontal or Anterior Orbitofrontal Cortex in Primates Heighten Negative Emotion – Biological Psychiatry, Volume 72, Issue 4, Pages 266 – 272 (August 2012)


i. Coding of Reward Risk by Orbitofrontal Neurons Is Mostly Distinct from Coding of Reward Value – Neuron, Volume 68, Issue 4, 789-800, 18 November 2010


k. Sensitivity to Temporal Reward Structure in Amygdala Neurons - Current Biology, Volume 22, Issue 19, 1839-1844, 06 September 2012

l. Prediction of economic choice by primate amygdala neurons - Cerebral Cortex; 11/2009; 20(7):1668-75”.

In your third request, our reference FOI-2013-308, also received on 30 September 2013, you asked:

“I write in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act 2000 ("The Act") to request the disclosure of data held concerning the use of primates in research. For the purposes of clarification, ‘research’ is defined as any activity which falls within the Animal (Scientific Procedures) Act 1986 ("ASPA"). The information I wish to request is as follows:

1. Copies of the minutes for the university’s Animal Welfare & Ethical Review Board ("AWERB") (formerly known as Ethical Review Committee) for 2010 hitherto where those minutes concern, or partially concern, primate research.”

The information you have requested, while likely to be held by the University, is refused under section 12(1) of the Act. You have requested a very wide range of records that are neither held within one administrative Division nor one academic Department and in many cases may be held by individual academic researchers. The University has estimated that the time required to determine whether the information is held and thereafter to locate, retrieve and extract it would considerably surpass 18 hours of staff time charged at £25 per hour, and therefore that your request exceeds the appropriate limit of £450 as set out in the Freedom of Information and Data Protection (Appropriate Limit and Fees) Regulations 2004 (‘the Fees Regulations’). Please note that to determine whether or not all of the information is held would itself exceed the appropriate limit. For the purpose of this application of
section 12, the University has aggregated your above three requests as permitted under Regulation 5 of the Fees Regulations so that the estimated cost of complying with each of them request is taken to be the total costs of complying with all of them. Your requests were received within a period of sixty consecutive working days and are requests for information on the same topic.

The University is mindful of its duty under section 16(1) of the Act to advise and assist you in narrowing your request to bring it within the appropriate limit. It is likely that information to answer your third request above (our reference FOI-2013-308) could be provided within the appropriate limit of £450. You will need to submit a new request under the Act if you wish the University to consider this. However, please note that the above advice and assistance does not indicate that the information requested in any new request submitted under the Act will be provided as some or all of it may constitute exempt information under Part II of the Act. In particular, sections 36(2)(c), 38(1)(b) and 40(2) may be relevant in this regard because providing the information would be likely to prejudice the University’s ability to carry out its mission to conduct research for the benefit of society in a safe manner, within the law, and with due regard to the duties of care and confidence that it owes to its staff.

If you are unhappy with the service you have received in relation to your request and wish to make a complaint or request an internal review of this decision, you should write to Dr Kirsty Allen, Head of the Registry’s Office, quoting the reference above, at The Old Schools, Trinity Lane, Cambridge, CB2 1TN or send an email marked for her attention to foi@admin.cam.ac.uk. The University would normally expect to receive your request for an internal review within 40 working days of the date of this letter and reserves the right not to review a decision where there has been undue delay in raising a complaint. If you are not content with the outcome of your review, you may apply directly to the Information Commissioner for a decision. Generally, the Information Commissioner cannot make a decision unless you have exhausted the complaints procedure provided by the University. The Information Commissioner may be contacted at: The Information Commissioner’s Office, Wycliffe House, Water Lane, Wilmslow, Cheshire, SK9 5AF (http://www.ico.org.uk/).

Yours sincerely,

James Knapton