

[Redacted]

From: [Redacted]
Sent: 20 August 2018 10:34
To: [Redacted]
Subject: FW: Freedom of Information Request 18/01008

From: [Redacted] **On Behalf Of** Freedom of Information
Sent: 04 April 2018 16:19
To: [Redacted]
Subject: RE: Freedom of Information Request 18/01008

[Redacted]

I have been looking at this case, I think we might need to go back to SpAds on behalf of the business area. SpAds have indicated that they are not content with a section 12 response. [Redacted] has applied the cost limit to a request which asks for “any contact” and any “contract or submission” with/from the company Cambridge Analytical. Whilst I appreciate the sensitivities with this company, to respond to this request, like any other request we receive for communications across the SG would exceed the cost limit as we cannot limit the searches by subject or topic.

I would be concerned about the precedent responding to this request would set, given we regularly refuse this under section 12 and think that perhaps a compromise may be the best option. I am thinking along the line of providing the response under section 12 but including something along the lines of:

‘You may find it helpful to note that whilst we are unable to search the records held across the Scottish Government, the Scottish Procurement and Commercial Directorate (responsible for.....)

have searched records which are held centrally and can confirm that the Scottish Procurement and Commercial Directorate do not hold a record of any contracts with, or any invoices or submissions from, Cambridge Analytica.’

I know this is not something we would normally recommend (as where costs apply that is all we should consider), but in this case it might be helpful to provide as additional information.

What do you think?

[Redacted]

[Redacted] Freedom of Information Unit | Scottish Government | 2W | St Andrews House | Regent Road | Edinburgh | EH1 3DG | [Redacted] | Ext [Redacted].

You can find the most recent information on FOI on the [FOI SharePoint site](#). It contains detailed guidance on all aspects of FOI, as well as step-by-step guides to answering a request and doing an internal review, response templates and sample reasons.

From: [Redacted] **On Behalf Of** FoI SpAds PO
Sent: 04 April 2018 12:47
To: [Redacted]; FoI SpAds PO <Fol.SpAdsPO@gov.scot>
Subject: RE: Freedom of Information Request 18/01008

[Redacted],

SpAds are not content with your proposed approach. They would like this request answered definitively.

Grateful for a revised response in due course.

Many thanks,

[Redacted]
[Redacted]
4N.05
St. Andrew's House

[Redacted]
[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: 04 April 2018 09:54
To: FoI SpAds PO
Subject: Freedom of Information Request 18/01008

Special Advisers Office

Reference number: [FoI/18/01008](#) (click to open case on Tracker)

FOR INFORMATION

You may wish to know that we have received an FOI seeking information about both "any contact" and any "contract or submission" with/from the company Cambridge Analytica.

The FOI Team have advised that the response should take the standard form that the cost of providing the information would cost more than £600. With this in mind, I attach my proposed response (which I hope to issue this week).

Regards

[Redacted]

Scottish Government Procurement Team | **Scottish Procurement and Commercial Directorate**

The Scottish Government, Victoria Quay, Edinburgh, EH6 6QQ

Tel: [Redacted]

www.scotland.gov.uk/procurement

[Redacted]

From: [Redacted]
Sent: 20 August 2018 08:35
To: [Redacted]
Subject: FW: FOI - E - correspondence on branding - [Redacted]

From: [Redacted]
Sent: 17 April 2018 19:36
To: Freedom of Information <foi@gov.scot>
Subject: Re: FOI - E - correspondence on branding - [Redacted]

I know this may go against the orthodox view, but this is clearly not a single FOI request and there is next to nothing the requester can do to narrow it.

I believe we should be providing advice and guidance along the lines of it having to be treated as several requests (and even then, at least one or two will breach the cost limit).

[Redacted]
Sent from my BlackBerry - [Redacted]

[Redacted- Not in scope]

[Redacted - Not in scope]

From: [Redacted]
Sent: 17 April 2018 11:53
To: Central Enquiry Unit <CEU@gov.scot>
Subject: FOI - correspondence on branding

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please could I request the following under freedom of information legislation:

1. Any Scottish Government correspondence in the last 3 years, either internal or external, concerning the use of British branding on Scottish products (including but not limited to union jacks and the words 'British' and 'UK'). External correspondence may include that with food or drink producers or supermarkets. *As you will appreciate, Scottish exports cover a wide range of areas, including services, professional, scientific and technical activities, as well as manufacturing and food and drink. Searching for correspondence relating to all of these areas would require consideration across a wide range of policy areas, which I think would be likely to take the cost of compliance above £600. I believe the cost of complying with this request is more likely to fall under the cost limit if you were to focus on one or two sectors (I note you refer to food and drink).*

2. Any Scottish Government correspondence in the last three years, either internal or external, concerning lack of Scottish branding on Scottish products (including but not limited to saltires, lion rampants, and the words 'Scottish' and 'Scots' and 'Scotch'). External correspondence may include that with food or drink producers or supermarkets. **As above.**
3. [Redacted - Not in scope]
4. Any Scottish Government/Transport Scotland correspondence, either internal or external, concerning the installation of plaques at the location of projects funded by the Scottish Government, including but not limited to the V&A Dundee and Queensferry Crossing. **This request is potentially very wide ranging, given the Scottish Government provides funding across a whole range of areas, including Health and Education, and these are not limited to the types of infrastructure projects you mention. Additionally, by not specifying a timeframe, we would need to consider all relevant correspondence going back for the past 11 years and this may be considerable.**
5. [Redacted - Not in scope]
6. Any internal Scottish Government correspondence in the last 3 years mentioning the specific words "union jack", "union flag", "British", "Monarchy", "queen", "royal" or "palace" and the context of that correspondence. **As you will be aware, correspondence relating to the words you specify could cover a widerange of areas, including flag flying policy, Honours. In addition, 'queen' and 'royal' may be used in contexts such as hospital and business names, street/place names, or in a sporting context (Royal and Ancient). This would therefore require a trawl across all of government. I have conducted a very simple search on our electronic records system for documents, created since 1 January 2015, whose name includes 'royal' or 'queen' and stopped each when they reached 5,000. As before, I would recommend you consider limiting your request to a specific context or contexts, and limiting your timeframe further.**

[Redacted]

From: [Redacted]
Sent: 20 August 2018 08:36
To: [Redacted]
Subject: FW: FOI - ODO - Correspondence between the Scottish Government and Saltire Graphics or [Redacted]

From: [Redacted]
Sent: 26 April 2018 16:37
To: [Redacted]; Freedom of Information <foi@gov.scot>
Subject: RE: FOI - ODO - Correspondence between the Scottish Government and Saltire Graphics or [Redacted]

[Redacted]

I would ask [Redacted] to clarify both your point about 'latter/former' and who he means by [Redacted]

As the scope of his request is wider than the previous request, you cannot simply refer him to the previous answer as that was for a defined period. If you consider that replying on the basis of anything that was "ever contracted" would breach the cost limit, you could refer him to the previous case (under section 25) but also suggest how he might narrow his request so that it may fall under the cost limit. However, I understand you may be able to pull information easily from the Procurement database, so not sure whether that would apply.

[Redacted - Not in scope]

Regards

[Redacted]
[Redacted]