

C Jones

request-412327-094933f2@whatdotheyknow.com

Network Rail
Freedom of Information
The Quadrant
Elder Gate
Milton Keynes
MK9 1EN

**T** 01908 782405 **E** <u>FOI@networkrail.c</u>o.uk

15<sup>th</sup> August 2017

Dear C Jones,

Information request

Reference number: FOI2017/00744

Thank you for your email of 19<sup>th</sup> June 2017. You requested the following information:

1. Do you have a similar document for the automatic gates of platforms 13-19 at London Victoria please?

To clarify what I meant by 'information' in the rest of my request, please could you provide the following:

- 2. The nature and number of any complaints made by passengers about these gates from Feb 2016 Feb 2017.
- 3. Details of any improvement works or expansion of the number of gates that are planned (what work is proposed) and when it is due to be completed.
- 4. If any improvement or expansion works to the automatic gates are are currently not currently on schedule:
- a. the reasons for the delay
- b. what the expected completion date is

I have processed your request under the terms of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA).

I can confirm that we hold the information you requested for questions one and two (see below).

Please be aware that the automatic gates for platforms 13-19 at Victoria station are neither owned nor operated by Network Rail. They are in fact owned by Southernrailway

## **Question one**

Whilst the documents we hold are not the same as the one you have identified in your request we do, however, believe they contain similar information and therefore satisfy this part of your request.

Please find attached the recorded information we hold for this question.

We are withholding a small number of lines from the disclosure document. These lines contain the specific details of lone working procedures. It is our belief that the disclosure of these details would be likely to endanger the physical health of Southern employees as well as having an adverse effect on the public health as a whole.

Under section 38(1)(a) and section 38(1)(b) of the FOIA. Information is exempt from release if its disclosure would, or would be likely to —

- a) endanger the physical or mental health of any individual, or
- b) endanger the safety of any individual.

Section 38 is a qualified exemption. This means that we need to consider whether the greater public interest lies in disclosure of the information, or in maintaining the exemption to withhold the information.

#### **Public Interest Test**

# Arguments in favour of disclosure

• Disclosure of the requested information would be in line with a public authority being open and transparent.

#### Arguments against disclosure

- Disclosure via FOI is a disclosure to the world. As such, revealing potential vulnerabilities and details of lone worker protection could increase the likelihood of abuse or violence towards gateline operators.
- We consider that disclosing this information not only increases the risk of abuse/ violence for gateline operators, it is also important to mention the travelling public whose safety could also be endangered if we were to disclose in this instance. To explain a little further, any violence or abuse towards the operator could easily be redirected towards a member of the public which would endanger their safety.

# Conclusion

In this instance, there is a public interest in openness and transparency; this must be weighed against the public interest in maintaining and ensuring the safety of the public and avoiding endangering the safety and physical and mental health of the gateline operators. We consider that the strongest public interest lies in protecting

the detail around the lone working procedures for platforms 13-19 at Victoria Station.

.

Accordingly, on balance, the factors favouring non-disclosure outweigh the factors favouring disclosure. As such, the public interest favours withholding part of this part of the requested information.

Please also note that a small number of names contained within this document have been withheld in accordance with S40 (2) FOIA, as they fall within the definition of personal information; this is explained in full in Annex A at the end of this letter.

As noted above, the withheld information is only a very small part of the overall disclosure.

## **Question two**

During the period 1 February 2016 to 28 February 2017, I can confirm that we have had one complaint regarding the automatic gates at platforms 13-19 at Victoria station. This complaint was about a valid ticket not being accepted by the automatic gates.

## **Questions three and four**

I can inform you that we have searched our records and we do not hold the information you requested for these questions.

This is because there are currently no ongoing improvement schemes that have been planned with any dates or funding. We have had some initial concept schemes taken to GRIP 3<sup>1</sup> but these have no start date. Therefore we have no schemes behind or on schedule, as there are no ongoing schemes.

As mentioned above, whilst we are ultimately responsible for the running of Victoria station, we do not own or operate the automated ticket gates. This is the responsibility of Southernrailway who are better placed to answer any questions about upgrades or technological enhancements to these gates. While they are not subject to the FOIA they may be willing to answer your questions on this matter.

If you have any enquiries about this response, please contact me in the first instance at FOI@networkrail.co.uk or on 01908 782405. Details of your appeal rights are below.

Please remember to quote the reference number at the top of this letter in all future communications.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> GRIP 3 is the option selection stage of the GRIP process. To find out more about this stage and the GRIP process in general please see this website (<a href="https://www.kintecglobal.com/news/what-is-the-grip-process-41806/">https://www.kintecglobal.com/news/what-is-the-grip-process-41806/</a>)

Yours sincerely

Robert Malcolm Information Officer

## **Appeal Rights**

If you are unhappy with the way your request has been handled and wish to make a complaint or request a review of our decision, please write to the FOI Compliance and Appeals Manager at Network Rail, Freedom of Information, The Quadrant, Elder Gate, Milton Keynes, MK9 1EN, or by email at <a href="mailto:foi@networkrail.co.uk">foi@networkrail.co.uk</a>. Your request must be submitted within 40 working days of receipt of this letter.

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

## Annex A- S40(2) FOIA Personal data of third parties

We are withholding a small number of names contained within the disclosure documents. In our view these names are exempt from disclosure under section 40(2) (personal information) of the FOIA.

Section 40(2) of the FOIA allows us to withhold information if it constitutes the personal information of identifiable individuals, and its disclosure would contravene one or more of the data protection principles of the Data Protection Act 1998. In this instance, the information you have requested constitutes the personal information of the individuals involved in the creation of the 'Victoria Station Standard Operating Procedure'.

The first data protection principle states that personal information must be handled fairly and lawfully. In our view the disclosure of the names would be unfair to the individuals concerned. This is because it constitutes the personal information of staff members of the train operating company who do not hold senior roles and are not public-facing. In these circumstances, we consider that the individuals concerned would have no reasonable expectation that such information would be disclosed.

Whilst we recognise that there is a legitimate interest in disclosing the names to provide full transparency and openness about our decision making process, however, based on the factors noted above we do not consider that this outweighs the rights of the individuals in this case. Accordingly, we consider that the disclosure of the names would be unfair and would therefore breach the first data protection principle.