From: [redacted]
To: Tynte-Irvine C (Claire); [redacted]
Cc: [redacted] Strang F (Frank); [redacted]
Subject: RE: FoI 18/00490 - [redacted] - correspondence in relation to Oxfam projects - For Issue
Date: 26 April 2018 10:13:43
Attachments: FOI response.docx

Good morning colleagues,

I have received clearance back from SpAds who have also informed us that ministerial clearance is **not required**. I have put together the response from the FoI/EIR guidance templates and have attached it to the email.

[redacted]

Let me know if there is anything else I can assist with.

Best regards,

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 25 April 2018 18:37
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted] Strang F (Frank)
Subject: Re: FoI 18/00490 - [redacted] - correspondence in relation to Oxfam projects - FOR CLEARANCE

Thank goodness for that!

[redacted]

[redacted]

Sent with BlackBerry Work (www.blackberry.com)

From: [redacted]
Sent: 25 Apr 2018 18:18
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: FoI 18/00490 - [redacted] - correspondence in relation to Oxfam projects - FOR CLEARANCE

[redacted],

Many thanks. SpAds are content with your response on this basis. It does not require Ministerial clearance.

[redacted]

Kind regards,

[redacted]

[redacted] to the Special Advisers' Office
4N.05
St. Andrew's House

[redacted]

All e-mails and attachments sent by the Special Advisers' Private Office to another official on behalf of Special Advisers relating to a decision, request or comment made by a Special Adviser, or a note of a meeting with Special Advisers must be filed appropriately by the primary recipient. The Private Office does not keep official reports of such e-mails or attachments.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 24 April 2018 09:21
To: FoI SpAds PO; [redacted]
Cc: [redacted] Tynte-Irvine C (Claire); [redacted]
Subject: RE: FoI 18/00490 - [redacted] - correspondence in relation to Oxfam projects - FOR CLEARANCE

Good morning [redacted],

I have gone through the list of emails on eRDM and have found only 3 email chains that should be released, I have attached them below. All other email chains in the schedule of documents can be withheld under section 30(b)(i) and 30(b)(ii).

Let me know if you need anything else to get this cleared with SpAds.
<< File: FoI_18_00490 - Call with Minister Re Oxfam 12 Feb 06_43 Redacted.pdf >> << File: FoI_18_00490 - HEF funding - Oxfam 11 Feb 20_06 - Redacted#2.pdf >> << File: FoI_18_00490 - RE - Oxfam - action point asap Monday pls 12 Feb 13_40 Redacted OK_Redacted.pdf >>

Best regards,

[redacted]

From: [redacted] **On Behalf Of** FoI SpAds PO
Sent: 23 April 2018 16:09
To: [redacted] FoI SpAds PO
Cc: [redacted] Tynte-Irvine C (Claire); [redacted]
Subject: RE: FoI 18/00490 - [redacted] - correspondence in relation to Oxfam projects - FOR CLEARANCE

Hi [redacted],

These were from emails that were in the batch marked as the ones to be released.

Thanks,

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 23 April 2018 15:43
To: FoI SpAds PO; [redacted]
Cc: [redacted] Tynte-Irvine C (Claire); [redacted]
Subject: RE: FoI 18/00490 - [redacted] - correspondence in relation to Oxfam projects - FOR CLEARANCE

Hi [redacted],

My understanding is that was one of the task we did before coming back to yourself.

The physical documents I came to deliver a couple of weeks ago that were separated into two plies,

they were the collection of internal email chains showing which ones we believed should have been withheld as per section 30(b)(i) and 30(b)(ii).

Best regards,

[redacted]

From: [redacted] **On Behalf Of** FoI SpAds PO
Sent: 23 April 2018 15:20
To: FoI SpAds PO; [redacted]
Cc: [redacted] Tynte-Irvine C (Claire)
Subject: RE: FoI 18/00490 - [redacted] - correspondence in relation to Oxfam projects - FOR CLEARANCE

[redacted],

SpAds suggest that the internal correspondence should be re-examined to ensure it is all within scope and in line with our guidance on internal communications. A specific example is a thread dated 14th February developing a response to a media enquiry from PA. This would usually be withheld per the FOI guidance http://sgsharepoint/sites/freedomofinformation/FOIEIR%20Wiki/Press%20releases%20and%20handling%20strategies.aspx .

Likewise, there are other emails with to-ing and fro-ing as various facts are trying to be established (12th Feb). Does this form information pertaining to SG's response (as per the request clarification)?

Many thanks,

[redacted]

[redacted] to the Special Advisers' Office
4N.05
St. Andrew's House

[redacted]

All e-mails and attachments sent by the Special Advisers' Private Office to another official on behalf of Special Advisers relating to a decision, request or comment made by a Special Adviser, or a note of a meeting with Special Advisers must be filed appropriately by the primary recipient. The Private Office does not keep official reports of such e-mails or attachments.

From: [redacted] **On Behalf Of** FoI SpAds PO
Sent: 11 April 2018 14:56
To: [redacted] FoI SpAds PO; [redacted]
Cc: [redacted] Tynte-Irvine C (Claire)
Subject: RE: FoI 18/00490 - [redacted] - correspondence in relation to Oxfam projects - FOR CLEARANCE

Thanks [redacted] that's really helpful. Whilst the documents previously released may not have been published, it's good to know that they'll have been looked at before.

The redaction issue is due to documents being released with the redactions being able to be viewed. I appreciate that some will be PDFs that will not allow us to replace the text with **[redacted]**, but an example would be document 158 which is a letter to Oxfam. This looks like there would be a Word version of this which could be redacted in this way.

Conversely, document 155 has been presented in this way.

Likewise, one of the email chains 'Fw: CALL WITH MINISTER? Re: Oxfam' sent 12 February 2018 06:43 (apologies, I can't tie it to the schedule) has been properly redacted, but one called 'Re: HEF funding – Oxfam' has the redactions done using the black boxes.

Further to my call with Calum, the issue with the email trails is that there are instances where the top email is different, but the whole trail is duplicated elsewhere. The trails should just appear once and not constantly repeated.

The other email point related to the various emails (dated 14th February) developing lines in response to media enquiries. Development of lines should be withheld per the FOI guidance http://sgsharepoint/sites/freedomofinformation/FOIEIR%20Wiki/Press%20releases%20and%20handling%20strategies.aspx .

I hope that this all makes sense,

[redacted]

[redacted] to the Special Advisers' Office
4N.05
St. Andrew's House

[redacted]

All e-mails and attachments sent by the Special Advisers' Private Office to another official on behalf of Special Advisers relating to a decision, request or comment made by a Special Adviser, or a note of a meeting with Special Advisers must be filed appropriately by the primary recipient. The Private Office does not keep official reports of such e-mails or attachments.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 10 April 2018 18:05
To: FoI SpAds PO; [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: FoI 18/00490 - [redacted] - correspondence in relation to Oxfam projects - FOR CLEARANCE

[redacted],

Sorry for not getting back sooner.

Here is the schedule annotated with what documents have previously been released. We never published this information.

The funding details are all in the public domain, though I don't think this assists us with the FoI as we haven't yet started to publish applications and other documentation.

<< File: FoI-18-00490 - Schedule of Documents.doc >>

I'm not sure what this means. Redaction using a 'black box' falls within the guidance for PDF documents. Indeed I have used this method in the past. So I'm not sure why it's not acceptable now.

Similarly in these emails, there are a number of parts redacted with just a black box. SpAds will not accept this style of redaction as it is not an effective means of redacting information. It should instead be redacted with **[redacted]** per the FOI guidance http://sgsharepoint/sites/freedomofinformation/FOIEIR%20Wiki/Redacting%20information.aspx

On the views of Oxfam and SMP, we haven't sought their views as yet. As per our usual practice we would inform them that we have received a FoI, and if we release any information that it has been released.

[redacted],

Could you look again at the e-mails that [redacted] mention require further redacting and look at the duplicate e-mails.

Thanks,

[redacted]

From: [redacted] **On Behalf Of** FoI SpAds PO
Sent: 03 April 2018 18:30
To: [redacted] FoI SpAds PO
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: FoI 18/00490 - [redacted] - correspondence in relation to Oxfam projects - FOR CLEARANCE

[redacted],

Thanks for sending this through. I wonder if you could clarify a few things:

Can you please provide the schedule of documents. Can you ensure it specifies which documents have been released previously under FOI
Is any of the information requested already in the public domain (e.g. funding details)?
There are various emails (dated 14th February) developing lines in response to media enquiries. Development of lines should be withheld per the FOI guidance
http://sgsharepoint/sites/freedomofinformation/FOIEIR%20Wiki/Press%20releases%20and%20handling%20strategies.aspx
Similarly in these emails, there are a number of parts redacted with just a black box. SpAds will not accept this style of redaction as it is not an effective means of redacting information. It should instead be redacted with **[redacted]** per the FOI guidance http://sgsharepoint/sites/freedomofinformation/FOIEIR%20Wiki/Redacting%20information.aspx
There are a number of duplicate emails within this batch from the 14th – can any emails trails being released please be rationalised so that they appear just the once
The above should also apply to other email trails proposed for release
What are the views of Oxfam and Scotland/Malawi partnership to the release of their correspondence?

Grateful if you could address these points, resubmitting documents where appropriate.

Many thanks,

[redacted] to the Special Advisers' Office
4N.05
St. Andrew's House

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 29 March 2018 16:59
To: FoI SpAds PO
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: FoI 18/00490 - [redacted] - correspondence in relation to Oxfam projects - FOR CLEARANCE

Good afternoon,

FOR CLEARANCE

Brief synopsis / background of initial FoI request

The requester, [redacted], asked for:
Details of funding given to Oxfam for international development work going back to programmes in and around 2006. As correspondence etc. may be difficult to retrieve key documents (such as grant confirmations, or letters with details of grants) would suffice. With regards to the last point specifically information relating to the Scottish Government's response to the current Oxfam sexual abuse situation.

Timing
Please provide a response by COP Friday 6th April 2018.

Key points of interest/Sensitivities on case for consideration
Please note that Applications Forms and Reports have been previously released under FoI, though we haven't published them and we will do that this time. Hard copies of the documents have been posted through internal mail.

Draft Response
<< File: FOI 18-00490 - SG response.docx >>
Best regards,

[redacted] | European Relations Division | External Affairs | Scottish Government
Area 2H North | Victoria Quay | Edinburgh | EH6 6QQ
[redacted].

<< OLE Object: Picture (Device Independent Bitmap) >>

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Subject: RE: FoI/18/00490 - Oxfam Information Feb 2017
Date: 14 February 2018 15:33:00

Thanks [redacted]. Much appreciated.

Ian

From: [redacted]
Sent: 14 February 2018 15:01
To: [redacted]
Subject: Re: FoI/18/00490 - Oxfam Information Feb 2017

We don't fund Oxfam so it's a nil return.

Sent from my BlackBerry 10 smartphone.

From: [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 14 February 2018 14:54
To: [redacted]
Subject: RE: FoI/18/00490 - Oxfam Information Feb 2017

Thanks for getting back so quickly [redacted].

However, [redacted] seeks information beyond our international work and seeks information on 'all funding' and that seems to be funding for services either in UK or abroad (see bullet points 1, 2 and 3 below).

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 14 February 2018 14:46
To: [redacted]
Subject: Re: FoI/18/00490 - Oxfam Information Feb 2017

Hi [redacted] - we have worked with Oxfam Scotland but not about international work and we haven't funded them. It's a nil return from us on your foi.
Cheers
Paul

Sent from my BlackBerry 10 smartphone.

From: [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 14 February 2018 14:42
To: [redacted]
Subject: FW: FoI/18/00490 - Oxfam Information Feb 2017

Hi [redacted],

We have reviewed an FoI request connected to the current Oxfam story. However, you see from the details below that the requester has asked for information and correspondence in relation to Oxfam's SG funded work both in the UK and abroad. The International Development team are working on the 'abroad'

part of the request, but I don't know who would know anything about the 'UK or Scottish' work. [redacted] suggested that your team might have been involved with Oxfam working in Scotland. Could I ask if you have?