

Mr. Matthew Pearce

29 July 2011

Dear Mr. Pearce

**FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 2000 – INFORMATION REQUEST
(Our file: FOI_11-124)**

In response to your email of 24 June 2011, I have undertaken an internal review of your appeal of our response of 22 June 2011 pursuant to the UEA internal appeal procedure as outlined on page 25 of the document:

<http://www.uea.ac.uk/is/strategies/infregs/Freedom+of+Information+Act+Policy>

Please accept my apologies for the delay in forwarding the results of our internal review to you.

I confirm that as Pro-Vice-Chancellor at UEA, I am a senior member of staff who has had no material role in the original decision. I have sufficient training and knowledge in the Act to undertake the Review. My role in the review has been to consider afresh the reasonableness of the decision and handling of the request, which I have now done. I have consulted with the Information Policy and Compliance Officer where necessary to gain an understanding of the issues under consideration, and have consulted guidance from the Information Commissioners Office on the conduct of internal reviews in general and in regards the issues at hand in this matter.

I have reviewed those aspects of the original decision about which you have complained or sought further clarification, namely:

1. *The guidance notes for UEA5 that you provided make it very clear that an invoice should have been attached to each claim. Has this been omitted from your response?*

I can confirm that there was no separate invoice attached to the expense claim from Sir Muir Russell.

In relation to the payment to Professor Boulton, I can confirm that there was also no separate invoice attached to his expense claim form. There was additional documentation, constituting details breaking down the hours undertaken in respect of Review work which was submitted to Sir Muir Russell with the claim form, and forwarded to UEA with the expense claim form. However as these are not invoices or financial source documents they have not been released in response to the original request.

2. *In the absence of any invoice and absence of any other written information relevant to any contract that might support self-employment it appears that you may not have provided the relevant financial regulation covering the manner in*

which these two claims have been approved for payment. Are there any other relevant financial regulations which apply here.

No.

3. *Sir Muir Russell's claim clearly indicates that he believed he had been providing a service for an agreed fee. Have you included all records relating to this agreement?*

In so far as there is correspondence which is relevant to your original request, this is now provided as an attachment to this letter in the document 'Appendix A_Further information.zip'.

4. *Sir Muir Russell believed he had the capacity to approve Professor Boulton's claim for payment. Is there any record that this approval was either relevant or necessary?*

The payment on behalf of the University was approved by the Registrar & Secretary, not by Sir Muir Russell.

5. *In a previous FOI request...you indicated that the University either sought or received advice regarding the nature of the relationship between Sir Muir Russell and the University. Any such advice...or any record of the exact nature of any relationship between Sir Muir Russell and the University including any record of the existence of a Public Appointment might have had a bearing on the manner in which these claims for payment should have been processed. Have you included all records relating to the existence of any relationship or any request or receipt of advice relating to the relationship between Sir Muir Russell and the University?*

I am unaware of any further information that relates to the processing of this payment but if you could provide further information as to the prior request and/or legal advice that you feel effects the processing of the invoice, we will examine that information and seek to assist your enquiries.

6. *If (1) neither of these payments was adequately covered by any existing financial regulation and (2) there is no record of any obligation on the University to have made either of these payments and (3) no tax was withheld on either payment, is your financial controller comfortable that there is apparently no record of anyone every having queried or justified the manner in which either of these payments should have been processed?*

We have no recorded information as to the opinion of our financial controller of this processing.

We would now consider this to be our final position on the internal review of this matter, and would advise that if you are dissatisfied with this response, you should now exercise your right of appeal to the Information Commissioner at:

Information Commissioner's Office
Wycliffe House
Water Lane
Wilmslow
Cheshire SK9 5AF
Telephone: 0303 123 1113
[Website: www.ico.gov.uk](http://www.ico.gov.uk)

Please quote our reference given at the head of this letter in all correspondence.

Yours sincerely,



Thomas Ward
Pro-Vice-Chancellor - Academic