

Reference: 1-177234732

19 July 2011

By email

Eleanor Berg
Information Requests

Mr Mark Salter
request-77165-4f082137@whatdotheyknow.com

information.requests@ofcom.org.uk

Dear Mr Salter

Freedom of Information: Right to know request

Thank you for your follow-up requests for information relating to Power Line Technology ('PLT') which have been considered under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 ('FOIA') and the Environmental Information Regulations ('EIR').

Your original request

You asked on 21 June 2011 for

- 1. The case reference and date raised.*
- 2. Precise details of the radio spectrum reportedly affected.*
- 3. Where multiple sources were reported or identified, please state the total number of sources determined from your investigation.*
- 4. Whether all identified sources of interference were removed/resolved.*
- 5. Precise details of the make(s) and model(s) of PLT or other equipment determined to be causing interference.*
- 6. Precise details of the radio spectrum range used by the equipment as determined during your investigation. Where this is not known, please state the reason this detail was not determined.*
- 7. For those cases in point 4 above where devices were left interfering, please provide a synopsis of the reason the interference was not removed, please include the case status.*

Response

We responded to this on 6 July 2011. Our response can be seen here on [whatdotheyknow.com](http://www.whatdotheyknow.com):

http://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/disclosure_of_information_gather#outgoing-139738.

Your follow-up request

Your follow-up request on 6 July 2011 asked:

*I would like to ask for a quick revisit of this response please. In my request I asked for the "most recent thirty cases involving Power Line Technology (PLT)". Although the majority of cases given do involve PLT, some only reference PLT/A as the "alleged source" and some disclosed were ascertained *not* to be PLT at all and therefore fall outside the scope of this request.*

So, please may I have the information requested for the thirty most recent cases involving PLT, not cases that include the word, but where your investigations determined that PLT was present, interfering and thus involved.

Please can you also provide the information requested in points 3 through 7 of my request; which appear to currently be missing.

Response

You asked for the 30 most recent cases involving PLT of which we provided. You said in your follow-up response that some of the disclosed cases were ascertained to not relate to PLT and you suggested that this falls outside the scope of your request.

The thirty cases that we provided to you were the most recent cases that were logged as a suspected PLT interference case. Ofcom therefore provided you with these 30 cases regardless of what was determined to be the cause after a full investigation.

We therefore believe that we have provided you with the full information that you requested at that time.

I have answered your individual questions below.

3. Where multiple sources were reported or identified, please state the total number of sources determined from your investigation.

The information that Ofcom holds has been provided to you in our original response. Therefore to provide you with any further information to determine where multiple sources of interference have been reported, Ofcom would need to find and extract the relevant information from our case logging systems. This would require a detailed research and analysis process.

Therefore, information on whether multiple sources have been reported is being withheld under the exception in section 12(4)(b) of the EIR. This exception states that Ofcom is not required to provide the information where the request for information is manifestly unreasonable.

4. Whether all identified sources of interference were removed/resolved.

As above the information that Ofcom holds has been provided to you in our original response. Therefore to provide you with any further relating to determine whether all identified sources of interference were removed/resolved Ofcom would need to find and extract the relevant information from our case logging systems. This would require a detailed research and analysis process.

Therefore, information on whether multiple sources have been reported is being withheld under the exception in section 12(4)(b) of the EIR. This exception states that Ofcom is not required to provide the information where the request for information is manifestly unreasonable.

5. Precise details of the make(s) and model(s) of PLT or other equipment determined to be causing interference.

While we hold the details of the make(s) and model(s) of PLT or other equipment determined to be causing interference, the information in the format you have requested is being withheld as it would fall under the exception in section 12(4)(b) of the EIR, as explained above. There is a section on our case logging system which can be used to note the make and model, however, this is not utilised in all cases. Therefore to search each case for this information and extract the relevant information will be time consuming and unreasonable.

6. Precise details of the radio spectrum range used by the equipment as determined during your investigation. Where this is not known, please state the reason this detail was not determined.

We have already provided you with the spectrum range in our original response. This was in the column titled 'Frequency'.

7. For those cases in point 4 above where devices were left interfering, please provide a synopsis of the reason the interference was not removed, please include the case status.

We have already provided you with a synopsis for each case in our original response. The column titled 'Notes' provides you with the reason the interference was not removed, if applicable.

If you have any queries about this letter, please contact me at information.requests@ofcom.org.uk. Please remember to quote the reference number above in any future communications.

Please ensure that when using the provided information in any way, you comply with all relevant legislation. For example, the information provided may be protected by copyright under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (as amended). If in doubt, please seek independent legal advice. For Ofcom's policy on copyright and related issues, please refer to <http://www.ofcom.org.uk/disclaimer>.

Yours sincerely



Eleanor Berg

If you are unhappy with the response or level of service you have received in relation to your request from Ofcom, you may ask for an internal review. If you ask us for an internal review of our decision, it will be treated as a formal complaint and will be subject to an independent review within Ofcom. We will acknowledge the complaint and inform you of the date by which you might expect to be told the outcome.

The following outcomes are possible:

- the original decision is upheld; or
- the original decision is reversed or modified.

Timing

If you wish to exercise your right to an internal review **you should contact us within two months of the date of this letter**. There is no statutory deadline for undertaking internal reviews and it will depend upon the complexity of the case. However, we aim to conclude all such reviews within 20 working days, and up to 40 working days in exceptional cases. We will keep you informed of the progress of any such review. If you wish to request an internal review, you should contact:

Graham Howell
The Secretary to the Corporation
Ofcom
Riverside House
2a Southwark Bridge Road
London SE1 9HA

If you are not content with the outcome of the internal review, you have the right to apply directly to the Information Commissioner for a decision. The Information Commissioner can be contacted at:

Information Commissioner's Office
Wycliffe House
Water Lane
Wilmslow
Cheshire
SK9 5AF