

Freedom of Information Act 2000 (Section 50)

Decision Notice

Date: 21 December 2009

Public Authority: British Broadcasting Corporation
Address: 2252 White City
201 Wood Lane
London
W12 7TS

Summary

The complainant made an information request to the British Broadcasting Corporation (the "BBC") for all documents relating to the Live Aid concert of 13 July 1985. The BBC voluntarily provided part of this information but refused to provide access to the remainder stating that it was outside the scope of the Freedom of Information Act ("the Act") because it was held for the purposes of journalism, art or literature. The Commissioner is satisfied that the information in question was held for the purpose of journalism, art and literature. Therefore the BBC was not obliged to comply with Parts I to V of the Act.

The Commissioner's Role

1. The Commissioner's duty is to decide whether the BBC has complied with its duties under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (the "Act"). This Notice sets out his decision.

The Request

2. On 30 June 2009 the complainant made the following request for information to the BBC:

"I would like to request all documentation that relates to the Live Aid concert of Saturday July 13 1985 and the broadcast of that event to the world. Some of this material will predate the event and much of it will have been generated after the concert had finished."

3. The complainant followed up his request for information on 19 August 2009 and 2 September 2009. The BBC apologised for the length of time it had taken to respond.
4. The BBC provided the complainant with some of the requested information on 9 September 2009:

“Searches conducted at the BBC’s Written Archives Centre have located three production files containing information relevant to your request. The relevant production areas have confirmed that they do not hold any additional files and the individuals who worked on the broadcast are no longer at the BBC.”

5. Extracts from Board of Management minutes and the TV and Radio Weekly Programme Review Boards which had commented on the broadcast were provided. The complainant was also invited to view the programme files at the Written Archives Centre.
6. It was pointed out that the requested information was not covered by the Act, though without any specific details being provided in support of this argument. The BBC went on to state that the information that had been withheld (home addresses and payment details) would have been exempt in any case by virtue of section 40(2) – third party personal information.
7. On 15 September 2009 the complainant requested an internal review regarding the decision not to release all the requested information.
8. The BBC declined the request on 18 December 2009 because it did not believe that the request for information fell within the scope of the Act. In this email it was stressed again that the BBC did not need to provide the requested information and that, “we have only located 3 files, plus the electronic information included in our response”. The Vision and Audio & Music divisions conducted a search and could find no additional material.

The Investigation

Scope of the case

9. On 31 October 2009 the complainant contacted the Commissioner to complain about the way his request for information had been handled. The complainant specifically asked the Commissioner to consider the following points:
 - The amount of information he received.
 - The time it took to provide it.
 - That he did not consider the requested information fell outside the scope of the Act.

- That the decision to withhold some of the information was at odds with BBC policy which, the complainant maintained, had been to disclose 'historic' information over 7 years old.

Chronology

10. Having reviewed the request and the correspondence supplied by the complainant the Commissioner decided that it was necessary to contact the BBC for further argument as the derogation had not been clearly explained.

11. On 14 December 2009 the BBC provided further argument in support of its view that the requested information was derogated:

“The BBC is not required to supply information held for the purposes of creating the BBC’s output or information that supports and is closely associated with these creative activities. Programme files are held for the purposes of our programming and specifically to inform the editorial decision-making process when considering requests to re-screen these, or similar, programmes.”

12. The BBC, although it had accommodated the complainant’s requests for information in the past, was no longer prepared to do so as the requested information fell outside the scope of the Act.

13. On 2 October 2009 the High Court handed down its judgments in relation to two appeals it had heard involving the application of the derogation by the BBC. Both judgments found in favour of the BBC. The Commissioner has applied the findings of the two judgments to the facts of this case.

Analysis

Substantive Procedural Matters

Jurisdiction

14. Section 3 of the Act states:

“3. – (1) In this Act “public authority” means –
(b).... any body...which –
(i) is listed in Schedule 1.....”

The entry in relation to the BBC at Schedule 1, Part VI reads:

“The British Broadcasting Corporation, in respect of information held for purposes other than those of journalism, art or literature”

15. Section 7 of the Act states:

“7. – (1) Where a public authority is listed in Schedule 1 only in relation to information of a specified description, nothing in Parts I to V of this Act applies to any other information held by the authority”.

The BBC has argued that the construction of sections 3, 7 and Schedule 1 means that the BBC is not a public authority where it holds the requested information for the purposes of journalism, art or literature. Consequently, the Commissioner would not have jurisdiction to issue a decision notice given the wording of section 50.

16. This issue has been considered by the House of Lords in the case of *Sugar v BBC*¹. By a majority of 3:2, the Lords found in favour of the Appellant, Mr Sugar, in concluding that the Commissioner does have jurisdiction to issue decision notices regardless of whether the information that has been requested is derogated. The Commissioner adopts the reasoning set out by Lord Hope at paragraphs 54 and 55 where he said:

“54. Section 7(1) says that where a public authority is listed in Schedule 1 only in relation to information of a specified description, nothing in Parts I to V of the Act applies to any other information held by the authority. What it does not say is that, in that case, the authority is a hybrid – a “public authority” within the meaning of the Act for some of the information that it holds and not a “public authority” for the rest. The technique which it uses is a different one. Taking the words of the subsection exactly as one finds them, what it says is that nothing in Parts I to V of the Act applies to any other “information” held by “the authority”. This approach indicates that, despite the qualification that appears against its name in Schedule 1, the body is a public authority within the meaning of the Act for all its purposes. That, in effect, is what section 3(1) of the Act provides when it says what “public authority” means “in this Act”. The exception in section 7(1) does not qualify the meaning of “public authority” in section 3(1). It is directed to the information that the authority holds on the assumption that, but for its provisions, Parts I to V would apply because the holder of the information is a public authority.”

55. The question whether or not Parts I to V apply to the information to which the person making the request under section 1(1) seeks access depends on the way the public authority is listed. If its listing is unqualified, Parts I to V apply to all the information that it holds. If it is listed only in relation to information of a specified description, only information that falls within the specified description is subject to the right of access that Part I provides. But it is nevertheless, for all the purposes of the Act, a public authority”.

17. Therefore, the Commissioner has jurisdiction to issue a decision notice on the grounds that the BBC remains a public authority. Where the information is derogated, the Commissioner considers that the BBC has no obligations to comply with Parts I to V in respect of that information.

¹ *Sugar v BBC* [2009] UKHL 9

18. The Commissioner will first determine whether the request is for information held for the purposes of journalism, art or literature and if therefore the BBC is required to comply with Parts I to V in respect of the request.

Derogation

19. The scope of the derogation has been considered by the High Court in the cases of the BBC v Steven Sugar and the Information Commissioner [EW2349]² and the BBC v the Information Commissioner [EW2348].³ In both decisions Mr Justice Irwin stated:

“My conclusion is that the words in the Schedule mean the BBC has no obligation to disclose information which they hold to any significant extent for the purposes of journalism, art or literature, whether or not the information is also held for other purposes. The words do not mean that the information is disclosable if it is held for purposes distinct from journalism, art or literature, whilst it is also held to any significant extent for those purposes. If the information is held for mixed purposes, including to any significant extent the purposes listed in the Schedule or one of them, then the information is not disclosable.” (para 65 EA2349 and para 73 EW2348).

20. The Commissioner interprets the phrase “to any significant extent”, when taken in the context of the judgment as a whole, to mean that where the requested information is held to a more than trivial or insignificant extent for journalistic, artistic or literary purposes the BBC will not be obliged to comply with Parts I to V of the Act. This is the case even if the information is also held for other purposes.
21. For completeness, the Commissioner considers that where information is held for non-journalistic/artistic/literary purposes and is only held to a trivial or insignificant extent for the purposes listed in Schedule 1, then the BBC will be obliged to comply with its obligations under Parts I to V of the Act.
22. Thus, provided there is a relationship between the information and one of the purposes listed in Schedule 1, then the information is derogated. This approach is supported by Mr Justice Irwin’s comments on the relationship between operational information, such as programme costs and budgets, and creative output:

“It seems to me difficult to say that information held for ‘operational’ purposes is not held for the ‘purposes of journalism, art or literature.’” (para 87 EW2348)

23. The information relevant to the request need not be journalistic, artistic or literary material itself. As explained above all that needs to be established is whether the

² BBC v Steven Sugar & The Information Commissioner [2009] EWHC 2349 (Admin)

³ BBC v The Information Commissioner [2009] EWHC 2348 (Admin)

requested information is held to any significant extent for one or more of the derogated purposes of art, literature or journalism.

24. The two High Court decisions referred to above related to information falling within the following categories:

- Salaries of presenters / talent
- Total staff costs of programmes
- Programme budgets
- Programme costs
- Payments to other production companies for programmes
- Payments to secure coverage of sporting events and other events
- Content of programmes / coverage of issues within programmes

25. In relation to all of the above Mr Justice Irwin found that the information was held for operational purposes related to programme content and therefore to a significant extent for the purposes of journalism, art or literature.

26. The Commissioner recognises that the High Court cases did not specifically consider information related to live broadcasts. Nevertheless the Commissioner considers the comments made by Mr Justice Irwin regarding the need for a relationship between the requested information and the derogated purposes are relevant and therefore he has considered them here. Any extant information within the scope of the request is likely to constitute creative content held for the purposes of BBC programming or material held for operational purposes to support the creation of broadcast content. The Commissioner also accepts the BBC's assertion that programme files are used to inform editorial decisions about requests to re-screen these or similar programmes. The fact that the BBC has chosen in the past to disclose 'historic information on a discretionary basis does not alter the fact that, in the Commissioner's view, the information covered by the complainant's request is held to a significant extent for the purposes listed in Schedule 1 of the Act. In light of this decision it has not been necessary to go on to consider the other issues raised by the complainant.

27. In view of the above, the Commissioner has found that the request is for information held to a significant extent for the purposes of journalism, art or literature and that the BBC was not obliged to comply with Parts I to V of the Act.

The Decision

28. The Commissioner's decision is that as the request is for information held to a significant extent for the purposes of journalism, art or literature the BBC was not obliged to comply with Part I to V of the Act in this case.

Steps Required

29. The Commissioner requires no steps to be taken.

Right of Appeal

30. Either party has the right to appeal against this Decision Notice to the Information Tribunal. Information about the appeals process may be obtained from:

Information Tribunal
Arnhem House Support Centre
PO Box 6987
Leicester
LE1 6ZX

Tel: 0845 600 0877
Fax: 0116 249 4253
Email: informationtribunal@tribunals.gsi.gov.uk.
Website: www.informationtribunal.gov.uk

If you wish to appeal against a decision notice, you can obtain information on how to appeal along with the relevant forms from the Information Tribunal website.

Any Notice of Appeal should be served on the Tribunal within 28 calendar days of the date on which this Decision Notice is served.

Dated the 21st day of December 2009

Signed

**Jo Pedder
Senior Policy Manager**

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

Legal Annex

General Right of Access

Section 1(1) provides that -

“Any person making a request for information to a public authority is entitled –

(a) to be informed in writing by the public authority whether it holds information of the description specified in the request, and

(b) if that is the case, to have that information communicated to him.”

Section 1(2) provides that -

“Subsection (1) has the effect subject to the following provisions of this section and to the provisions of sections 2, 9, 12 and 14.”

Section 1(3) provides that –

“Where a public authority –

reasonably requires further information in order to identify and locate the information requested, and

has informed the applicant of that requirement,

the authority is not obliged to comply with subsection (1) unless it is supplied with that further information.”

Section 1(4) provides that –

“The information –

in respect of which the applicant is to be informed under subsection (1)(a),
or

which is to be communicated under subsection (1)(b),

is the information in question held at the time when the request is received, except that account may be taken of any amendment or deletion made between that time and the time when the information is to be communicated under subsection (1)(b), being an amendment or deletion that would have been made regardless of the receipt of the request.”

Section 1(5) provides that –

“A public authority is to be taken to have complied with subsection (1)(a) in relation to any information if it has communicated the information to the applicant in accordance with subsection (1)(b).”

Section 1(6) provides that –

“In this Act, the duty of a public authority to comply with subsection (1)(a) is referred to as “the duty to confirm or deny”.”