

Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA)

Decision notice

Date: 19 September 2018

Public Authority: British Tourist Authority
Address: Upper Ground Floor
1 Victoria Street
London
SW1H 0ET

Decision (including any steps ordered)

1. The British Tourist Authority trades as either Visit Britain or Visit England and is the national tourism authority legally incorporated under the Development of Tourism Act 1969. It is sponsored by the Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS). Throughout the notice the Commissioner will refer to the public authority as Visit Britain.
2. The complainant has requested a variety of information relating to a number of tender exercises, grant applications and contracts in two separate requests. Visit Britain refused to comply with both requests citing section 12 of the FOIA.
3. The Commissioner's decision is that Visit Britain is entitled to refuse to comply with both requests in accordance with section 12 of the FOIA.
4. The Commissioner does not require any further action to be taken.

Request and response

5. Between 23 and 27 February 2018, the complainant wrote to Visit Britain and requested a variety of information. As the request is quite lengthy it has not been reproduced here but can be found at the end of this notice in the attached Annex.
6. Visit Britain responded on 23 March 2018. It refused to comply with the requests citing section 12 of the FOIA. It suggested to the complainant how she may narrow the scope of the request to enable it to be considered within the cost limit.
7. The complainant submitted a new request on 26 March 2018. Again this is quite lengthy so has not been reproduced here but can be found at the end of this notice in the attached Annex.
8. Visit Britain responded on 5 April 2018. It again refused to comply with the request citing section 12 of the FOIA. It stated that the complainant had failed to narrow the scope of her request sufficiently to enable it to be considered within the cost limit.

Scope of the case

9. The complainant first contacted the Commissioner on 12 March 2018 to complain about the way her requests for information had been handled. The case was initially closed, as there was further action for the complainant and Visit Britain to take before the Commissioner would investigate more fully. The necessary actions were carried out and the complaint was reopened on 13 April 2018.
10. The Commissioner is considering a number of requests made by the complainant to Visit Britain. This notice will address the requests made between 23 and 27 February and 26 March 2018 and Visit Britain's application of section 12 of the FOIA.
11. The Commissioner will first consider the requests made between 23 and 27 February 2018. She will then go on to consider the request of 26 March 2018.

Reasons for decision

Section 12 – cost of compliance

12. Section 12 of the FOIA allows a public authority to refuse to deal with a request where it estimates that it would exceed the appropriate limit to comply with it.
13. The estimate must be reasonable in the circumstances of the case. The appropriate limit is currently £600 for central government departments and £450 for all other public authorities. Public authorities can charge a maximum of £25 per hour to undertake work to comply with a request; 18 hours work in accordance with the appropriate limit of £450 set out above, which is the limit applicable to the Visit Britain. A public authority can take into account the time and cost involved in carrying out the following activities under section 12 of the FOIA:
 - (a) determine whether it holds the information;
 - (b) locate the information, or a document which may contain the information;
 - (c) retrieve the information, or a document which may contain the information; and
 - (d) extract the information from a document containing it.
14. Where a public authority claims that section 12 of the FOIA is engaged it should, *where reasonable*, provide advice and assistance to help the requester refine the request so that it can be dealt with under the appropriate limit, in line with section 16 of the FOIA.

Requests made between 23 and 27 February 2018

15. Visit Britain has provided cost calculations for two elements of the requests made and explained how the requested information is held and what would be involved in locating, retrieving and extracting the requested information.
16. In relation to the following element of the requests, Visit Britain has estimated that it would take a minimum of 13 hours to locate, retrieve and extract the information:

“All the grant contracts for all ESP grant recipients 2016/17 and the evaluation that was undertaken to show that they delivered everything that was agreed as the basis to what they were being funded the grant for in the funding contract.”

17. Visit Britain stated that 2016/17 was the first year of the Events Support Programme (ESP), now known as the Business Events Growth Programme. In this timeframe approximately 12 projects were approved and awarded grant funding up to a maximum of £20,000. Nine of these projects were for activities to be wholly completed within the 12 month financial year period ending on 31 March 2017. The remaining three projects started in 2016/17 but had a longer delivery period that ended in the subsequent financial year 2017/18.
18. It stated that the word "evaluation" used in this element of the requests has been interpreted to mean the assessment of documents within an individual project file to ascertain whether all contractual outputs and outcomes were achieved by the end of the post-completion project monitoring period, the identification of lessons learnt and best practice gained following the delivery of the project. Additionally, it has been interpreted to mean the identification of key unforeseen barriers which may have validly prevented the full delivery of the project.
19. It went on to say that unlike the Heritage Lottery Fund and other statutory grant providers to good causes, Visit Britain is not primarily a grant-giving public body responsible for the programmes. As an example, it stated that the Events Support Programme is relatively new and has only been established by DCMS within the last three years. Consequently, Visit Britain does not have at present a central, electronic asset management system, where all key documentation on each grant-funded project throughout its lifecycle is staged for ease of reference. Instead, the files relating to each of the 12 ESP projects awarded in 2016/17 are a combination of both paper copies of key documents, such as signed hard copies of Grant Offer Letters, and also Word and Excel documents saved on the Business Events Team's folders on the London server.
20. Visit Britain confirmed that none of the current members of the Events Support Team were employed by Visit Britain in 2016/17. Therefore, the Search Team has had to speak with a project manager in the Project Management Office (PMO) who used to work on this team at the time to enable it to understand the composition of the project files and how the information requested is held. This member of staff was responsible for the analysis, scrutiny and processing for payment of all combined Grant Claim and Project Monitoring Report Forms relating to these 12 approved ESP projects.
21. Visit Britain highlighted that the complainant has requested that performance information on *all* approved ESP grants in 2016/17 is provided. Consequently, the Search Team chose three ESP project files at random and used a stopwatch to time how long it took to:

- (a) locate the documents containing it;
- (b) retrieve the information or documents containing it; and
- (c) extract the information from the documents containing it.

It stated that this approach provided an accurate and robust time estimate for each project file which could then be grossed up in terms of the number of hours for all 12 project files.

22. Visit Britain explained that each file contains the following documents at a minimum in terms of the project history and all of them need to be searched in order to locate the relevant information:

- Project Application Form, completed by the applicant.
- Signed Grant Offer Letter, produced by Business Events Team, containing any general and project-specific preliminary conditions set by the ESP Awards Panel, along with details of the contractual project outputs, outcomes, impacts and key stage milestones.
- Copies of all combined Grant Claim and Project Monitoring Report Forms submitted by the applicant to Visit Britain on a periodic basis throughout the project duration. It advised that this stage also involved checking on Visit Britain's financial management information system, CODA to verify the number of grant claims paid with reference to the number of copies saved in the files so that the Search Team could verify the actual number.

23. Once the Search Team was certain it had located all the relevant documents within each of the three projects identified for sampling purposes, the documents were manually reviewed to identify and retrieve the relevant information i.e. find the relevant sections in the combined Grant Claim and Project Monitoring Report Forms that would demonstrate that the applicant had delivered what it had been contracted to do in relation to its original Application Form.

24. Using a stopwatch to time each of the three sample project files, the Search Team estimated that, on average, each file took around 60 minutes to review, retrieve and extract the requested information. The initial liaison with the Project Management Office to determine what is held and in what manner took an hour. It therefore comfortably estimated that it would take a total of 13 hours to comply with this element of the requests.

25. Visit Britain then considered another element of these requests. This is worded as follows:

“Documentation verifying that GBER approval has been granted for the programmes outlined such as Discover England Fund.”

26. It stated that there are some 11 projects delivered by external organisations which have been awarded grant-funding from the Discover England Fund (DEF) which have cited as a General Block Exemption Regulation (GBER), either Industrial Research (Article 25) or Culture and Heritage (Article 53), to demonstrate that the scope of their project activities both fit in with and are compliant with the EU State Aid Regulations.
27. Visit Britain highlighted that the complainant has requested information as to whether GBER approval has been obtained in relation to the relevant projects. The Search Team again randomly selected three DEF projects and using a stopwatch timed how long it took to:
 - (d) locate the documents containing it;
 - (e) retrieve the information or documents containing it; and
 - (f) extract the information from the documents containing it.

It confirmed that it felt this approach provided an accurate and robust time estimate for each project which could then be grossed up in terms of the number of hours for all 11 projects where a GBER exemption exists.

28. Visit Britain explained that data on the 11 projects has been reported using SANI2, an online platform for drafting notifications on the use of GBER to be validated and consequently registered with the European Commissioner via the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS). Secondly, Visit Britain confirmed that it has also reported annually the actual expenditure data incurred on DEF projects where a GBER was approved by BEIS via SARI, a second online reporting platform. Both of these online platforms (SANI2 and SARI) would need to be searched.
29. It argued that each file contains the following documents at a minimum in terms of the project history and all of them need to be searched in order to locate the relevant information:
 - Initial state aid information contained with the Project Application Form, completed by the applicant.
 - Copy of EU State Aid compliance letter produced by the applicant’s external and independent state aid lawyer setting out the rationale for the reliance on one of the GBER Articles in relation to the scope of the proposed project activities.

- Copy of correspondence from Foot Anstey LLP, Visit Britain's external advisory lawyers responsible for giving a legal opinion on a DEF applicant's reliance on a GBER Article.
 - Copies of periodic Project Monitoring Forms where information on GBER received from the applicant may also be saved.
 - Online search of historic data uploaded onto SANI2 and SARI for each of the 11 projects.
30. It confirmed that determining what recorded information is held took 0.5 hours. It then took on average 30 minutes to locate, retrieve and extract the requested information for each of the three projects it sampled. As there are 11 DEF projects falling within the scope of this element of the requests, it estimated that it would take 6 hours to comply. It argued that with the two cost calculations supplied it is evident that the cost to comply with the requests made in February in their entirety would exceed the appropriate limit of 18 hours or £450 considerably.
31. The Commissioner asked Visit Britain to consider one more element of the requests to demonstrate without doubt that the cost to comply would exceed the cost limit. Visit Britain chose the following question:
- "BV&E Trade Show Stand Tender which I believe was advertised in 2016/17 and all contracts associated with the advertising of the tender, scoring sheet etc. and a copy of all the proposals that were submitted in response."
32. During the Commissioner's investigation the complainant clarified that she required the following information:
- "The tender for trade show that had a £300,000 budget that [named redacted] was working on. It was for the BV & E trade stands in Germany and USA trade shows. They probably had 8 stands across the whole company this query only relates to BV & E. [Named redacted] the procurement manager was working on it with [named redacted]. They had meetings about it so ask [name redacted] and [named redacted] for which tender did that 300,000 expenditure relate to."
33. Visit Britain confirmed that this was one tendering exercise and almost everything up to the assessment of the bids and the decision to award the contract is held on the Delta system. This system contains the published tender, invites expressions of interest, has the necessary documentation on it that interested bidders need, contains all the submissions received for the tender and a good proportion of all communications that took place between the interested bidders and Visit Britain. However, it is known that not all communications between

interested bidders and Visit Britain took place via the Delta system. Some are dealt with outside of the system and records of such communications are kept in the relevant department's team folders.

34. Once all submissions are in, Visit Britain reviews these, scores them and ultimately decides which is the winning tender and draws up the necessary paperwork. All this takes place outside of the Delta system and involves the Legal Department, Procurement Department and the Business Events Department. The recorded information held from this point onwards is therefore held across these three main departments in a mixture of hard copy records and electronic records. There is no central location for all the requested information; instead it is held within the Delta system and across three departments in various subfolders held both electronically and in hard copy.
35. Considering where the requested information is held Visit Britain is confident that it would take it several hours of work to locate, retrieve and extract the information from the Delta system and the various electronic and hard copy records spread across three departments.
36. It mentioned that once the tender is closed and completed access to records on the Delta system are restricted. After a tender is closed and complete only certain documents and information can be accessed. It is only the Procurement Department which continues to have access to all information. It stated that this makes the retrieval of information relating to closed and completed tenders more time consuming. It further commented that as a result of the General Data Protection Regulations (the preparation for it and implementation up to May 2018) a lot of information within Visit Britain has been archived onto an external system. It stated that much of the requested information (being information relating to a closed and completed tender) could possibly have been archived. Again this could potentially make the task of locating, retrieving and extracting the requested information more time consuming.
37. The Commissioner is satisfied that Visit Britain has provided estimates for two elements of the requests and these have been based on a sampling exercise it undertook. These two elements of the requests demonstrate that Visit Britain estimates that it would take approximately 19 hours to comply with them alone. It has also explained in detail what would be required for it to potentially comply with a third element of the requests. For this it has not provided an estimate but the Commissioner does not consider this is necessary. It only had to demonstrate sufficiently that it would take it a few hours more to comply with this element of the requests to prove that the cost of overall compliance for all elements of the requests would exceed the appropriate limit significantly.

38. For the above reasons, the Commissioner is satisfied that section 12 of the FOIA applies to the February requests.

Request of 26 March 2018

39. This request was submitted shortly after Visit Britain's refusal notice of 23 March 2018. It constitutes a refined request following the advice and assistance Visit Britain supplied. A refined request should be treated as a new request for the purposes of the FOIA.
40. Visit Britain responded to the request of 26 March on 5 April 2018. It said that the complainant had not narrowed the scope of the request and had only removed her subject access requests from the original requests submitted in February. It therefore applied section 12 of the FOIA again.
41. The Commissioner has reviewed the request of 26 March 2018 and acknowledges that, in the main, this request constitutes a re-submission of the requests she made in February 2018. Little was done by the complainant to narrow the scope of the FOIA element of her request to enable it to be processed within the appropriate limit.
42. The three elements of the February requests discussed above (paragraphs 16, 25 and 31) feature word for word in the refined request submitted in March. Visit Britain has demonstrated that compliance with the three elements alone would exceed the cost limit prescribed by the FOIA. As these three elements do feature word for word in the March request and in addition to these there are also various other requests for information, it follows that compliance with the March request would also exceed the appropriate limit by a considerable degree.
43. For the above reasons, the Commissioner is satisfied that section 12 of the FOIA applies to March request as well.

Section 16 – advice and assistance

44. Section 16 requires a public authority to provide advice and assistance, so far as it would be reasonable to expect the authority to do so, to persons who propose to make, or have made, requests for information to it.
45. The Commissioner notes that in its refusal notice of 23 March 2018 Visit Britain suggested to the complainant that she narrow the scope of her request to enable it to be processed within the cost limit. In particular it referred the complainant to certain sections of the request on which it had previously requested clarification and suggested that these could be refined to enable the request to be brought within the appropriate limit.

46. The Commissioner is therefore satisfied that Visit Britain provided appropriate advice and assistance for the February requests and so met its obligations under section 16.
47. With regards to the March request, it is noted that Visit Britain says that the complainant simply removed all subject access requests from her correspondence and resubmitted the request. The refusal notice of 5 April 2018 stated that the complainant had failed to narrow down her request and so section 12 of the FOIA applied. The Commissioner does not consider that Visit Britain could have provided the complainant with any additional advice or assistance at this point. It had already advised the complainant to narrow down the scope of the request and in particular suggested narrowing down the sections of the February requests on which it had requested clarification and the complainant failed to follow such advice.

Right of appeal

48. Either party has the right to appeal against this decision notice to the First-tier Tribunal (Information Rights). Information about the appeals process may be obtained from:

First-tier Tribunal (Information Rights)
GRC & GRP Tribunals,
PO Box 9300,
LEICESTER,
LE1 8DJ

Tel: 0300 1234504

Fax: 0870 739 5836

Email: GRC@hmcts.gsi.gov.uk

Website: www.justice.gov.uk/tribunals/general-regulatory-chamber

49. 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.
50. Any Notice of Appeal should be served on the Tribunal within 28 (calendar) days of the date on which this decision notice is sent.

Signed

Samantha Coward
Senior Case Officer
Information Commissioner's Office
Wycliffe House
Water Lane
Wilmslow
Cheshire
SK9 5AF

Annex

Requests made between 23 February and 27 February 2018

"This is a resubmitted and partially new freedom of information request stemming from numerous other submitted requests not being fully fulfilled from [name redacted], formally project executive on The Event Support Programme, Business Visits and Events Unit.

You have 20 working days to comply with this request. Request to be returned by 23rd March 2018.

Please supply missing information that has been not released to date (*now nearly a year since the first request was submitted*) and new information requests under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 relating to:

New FOI requests

1. Knights solicitors all documentation relating to procurement and total value of monies expended to date for their services for defence for the BTA in employment tribunal versus [name redacted]
2. Please provided conflict of interest declarations that have been completed by all staff relating to points 4 (Non- Tender Actions) and point 8 relating to ALL expenditure valued between £10,000 and £25,000 for the non-tender action expenditure undertaken by VisitBritain across all its departments since 2015.
3. Please release all submitted tenders from the suppliers who applied/that were submitted for Gold List research, BV&E promo film 1st tender and 2nd tenders such as; SFA proposal submitted, Wilder Films proposal submitted in response to the tenders advertised also be released immediately.

Added: 24th Feb 2018

4. Emails from [name redacted] and [name redacted] that I was in a formal disciplinary process leading to the meeting that took place on 1st Mar 2018.
5. PCMA contract

Added; 25th Feb 2018

6. All the grant contracts for ALL ESP grant recipients 2016/2017 and the evaluation that was undertaken to show that they delivered everything that was agreed as the basis to what they were being funded the grant for in the funding contract.
7. BV&E Trade Show Stand Tender which I believe was advertised in 2016/2017 and all contracts associated with advertising of tender, scoring sheet etc. and a copy of all the proposals that were submitted in response.

Added; 26th Feb 2018

8. List of all General Block Exemption Regulations Schemes operating across the BTA since 2013 and the programmes they are being applied to e.g; Discover England fund
9. Documentation verifying that GBER approval has been granted for the programmes outlined such as Discover England etc.

Added; 26th Feb 2018

10. Copy of the contract with the supplier who provides data back up for VisitBritain. Could possibly be 'Capture' and under the terms 'Managed Collection Agreement'

Added; 27th Feb 2018

11. weblinks to Contract finder advert for SFA Associates Gold List tender and the published notice
12. weblinks to Contract finder advert for BV&E Promo film tender which Wilder won and published notice
13. weblinks to Contract finder advert for Northstar Media buy and published notice
14. weblinks to Contract finder advert for BV&E Out-takes and published notice
15. weblinks to Contract finder advert for BV&E VisitEngland promo film

You will find EC DIRECTIVE 2014/24/EU OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 26 February 2014 on public procurement and repealing Directive 2004/18/EC states clearly;

126) 94/73 (51) *It should be clarified that the provisions concerning protection of confidential information do not in any way prevent public disclosure of non-confidential parts of concluded contracts, including any subsequent changes.*

Non- Tender Actions

16. You state that non-tender actions were undertaken for the following;
 - LinkedIn Media Buy
 - BV&E promo film 2nd outtakes which Wilder secured contract
 - BV&E promo film VisitEngland outtakes which Motiv Productions secured contract
 - Northstar media buy
17. Please supply the business case / rationale / options / evaluation paper and recommendation reports that were developed for these procurements; LinkedIn, Motiv Productions, Wilder (2nd contract) & Northstar media and;
18. The value of expenditure on each of these procurements e.g. Northstar Media buy £20,000
19. Please provide the total value of non-tender actions that have been undertaken by VisitBritain across the whole organisation since 2015.
 - Please provide the number of tenders and total value of these tenders e.g. 25 tenders for £15,000, 16 tenders for £10,000
20. Please supply details of ALL expenditure valued between £10,000 and £25,000 and all the options papers and evaluations assessments undertaken for these non-tender action expenditure undertaken by VisitBritain across all its departments since 2015.

FOI requests which have still not been supplied from subject access requests made in Apr & May 2017 and FOI/subject access requests made in Sept 2017 and Jan 2018

21. You state you are not releasing the scoring sheets as they were 'provided in confidence' – as I was a primary scorer on the procurement assessment relating to the Gold List (SFA Associates) and the BV&E film contract which Wilder Films won I am therefore applying subject access request to access my own personal data and I hereby

advise I remove the 'confidence' you state you are applying to protect me;

Therefore, please supply;

22. Procurement scoring sheets and soft copy of the excel scoring spreadsheet done for the Gold List Research tender that [name redacted] Associates won. There are a number of original and revised scoring sheets in [name redacted]'s files for this tender. Please ensure you send all copies of scoring sheets.
23. Advertised tender, procurement scoring sheets and soft copy of the excel scoring spreadsheet done for the BV&E promo film which Wilder Films was awarded as a first contract

Emails

24. I do not believe that you have deleted my IT profile as there is also an ongoing court matter, please reinstate my IT profile and locate the emails I have requested off hard drives and server. I have also ARCHIVED most of the emails I have requested and they should still be on the server due to this.
25. Furthermore, you state that you have deleted my profile as I have left the organisation. I dispute this, however, staff are still in situ that requests have been made for emails released namely; [names redacted] etc. Therefore, you have no grounds for with-holding this data.
26. LinkedIn media buy - Emails from [name redacted] to/from [name redacted] and [name redacted] questioning the options for this media buy in [name redacted]'s Microsoft outlook inbox BV&E Promo film which Wilder Films secured -- All emails sent to/from [name redacted] to [name redacted] and [name redacted] of WilderFilms and to/from [name redacted] and [name redacted] of Wilder Films.
27. BV&E Promo – 2nd outtakes - All emails sent to/from all suppliers who bid for the 2nd BV&E film out-takes business from [name redacted]'s email account and;
 - All comms sent out around this tender via the procurement portal
28. BV&E – VisitEngland outtakes - All emails that went out from [name redacted] to Motiv productions and the other suppliers who applied for the VisitEngland outtakes BV&E promo film tender
29. All emails sent to/from [name redacted]'s (should be on the server) to PCMS contacts prior to his attending the US event in Jan

2017. He would have been cc'ing or corresponding with [name redacted] and possibly [name redacted] & [name redacted] so check their inboxes or sent items for responses they supplied as they are staff still in situ in VisitBritain.

30. All emails sent to/from [name redacted] and [name redacted] by [name redacted] about conflict of interest declarations not being completed – check emails from [name redacted] to [name redacted] and [name redacted] (they should be on the server otherwise work backwards and check emails from [name redacted] to [name redacted]).
31. Emails sent from [name redacted] to/from , [names redacted] and [name redacted] and [name redacted] about a supplying a list of the procurement they were planning
32. Northstar Media buy - Emails to/from [name redacted]'s, [name redacted]'s, [name redacted]'s and [name redacted]'s outlook account to Northstar media buy

ESP Committee

33. Ideas document that I designed and drafted and that was sent to [name redacted] and [name redacted]. Response: This is attached to an email sent to these men in Feb 2017 if my IT profile is deleted please check [name redacted]'s and [name redacted]'s email to find this document – [name redacted] was probably cc'ed on this email as well and might have a copy.

ESP Grant Programme – the following requests have not been fulfilled

34. Please supply a print-out/excel spreadsheet from CODA showing all the funding that all grant applicants for the event support programme to date have received from VisitBritain between 2013 to 2017. You have only supplied the details of grants awarded to Marketing Manchester since 2015. Please undertake the same exercise for all the grant recipients per requested in the original FOI.
35. The grant applicants were; Liverpool Vision, Newcastle Gateshead, London & Partners, Destination Bristol, Rough Agenda, Glasgow Marketing Bureau, Heriot Watt University, Plymouth City Council, Midlands Aerospace Alliance, University of Aberdeen, Glasgow Convention Bureau, Sheffield City Council.
36. Please supply the state aid declarations/letters outlining and listing all public funding these bodies have received and declared for the preceding 3 years to the date of grant award from other sources prior to funding from the event support programme being granted

37. Emails sent to/from [name redacted] to/from [name redacted] in DCMS – please check [name redacted]'s email if mine is deleted.
38. [Name redacted] inbox archive 'Marketing Manchester' folder emails to/from [name redacted], [name redacted] and [name redacted] from Marketing Manchester. These emails are archived and therefore should be on the SERVER.
39. Documents which were being prepared for BEIS state aid review process that should be in these folders. Check with [named redacted] in DCMS to see if she has a copy of this document.
40. Excel spreadsheet correcting the addresses and contact data from the Gold List this should be on the desktop of the [named redacted] was working on until Mar 1st

Subject Access Requests made in Apr and May 2017 – Personal Information that still has not been fully released

41. Minutes of meeting between [name redacted] and [named redacted] regarding the Gold List Fight. I am subject matter in those minutes. Please clarify/communicate if these do or do not exist.

If you need any more information from me please let me know as soon as possible.”

Request of 26 March 2018

“Please supply missing information that has been not released to date (*now nearly a year since the first request was submitted*) under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 relating to:

New FOI requests

1. Knights solicitors all documentation relating to procurement and total value of monies expended to date for their services for defence for the BTA in employment tribunal versus [name redacted]
2. Please provided conflict of interest declarations that have been completed by all staff relating to points 4 (Non-Tender Actions) and point 8 relating to ALL expenditure valued between £10,000 and £25,000 for the non-tender action expenditure undertaken by VisitBritain across all its departments since 2015.
3. Please release all submitted tenders from the suppliers who applied/that were submitted for Gold List research, BV&E promo film 1st tender and 2nd tenders such as; SFA proposal submitted, Wilder

Films proposal submitted in response to the tenders advertised also be released immediately.

4. PCMA contract relating to \$20,000 sponsorship that [name redacted] undertook last Jan 2017
5. All the grant contracts for ALL ESP grant recipients 2016/2017 and the evaluation that was undertaken to show that they delivered everything that was agreed as the basis to what they were being funded the grant for in the funding contract.
6. BV&E Trade Show Stand Tender which I believe was advertised in 2016/2017 and all contracts associated with advertising of tender, scoring sheet etc. and a copy of all the proposals that were submitted in response.
7. List of all General Block Exemption Regulations Schemes operating across the BTA since 2013 and the programmes they are being applied to e.g; Discover England fund
8. Documentation verifying that GBER approval has been granted for the programmes outlined such as Discover England etc.
9. Copy of the contract with the supplier who provides data back up for VisitBritain. Could possibly be 'Capture' and under the terms 'Managed Collection Agreement'
10. Weblinks to Contract finder advert for SFA Associates Gold List tender and the published notice
11. Weblinks to Contract finder advert for BV&E Promo film tender which Wilder won and published notice
12. Weblinks to Contract finder advert for Northstar Media buy and published notice
13. Weblinks to Contract finder advert for BV&E Out-takes and published notice
14. Weblinks to Contract finder advert for BV&E VisitEngland promo film

You will find EC DIRECTIVE 2014/24/EU OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 26 February 2014 on public procurement and repealing Directive 2004/18/EC states clearly;

126) 94/73 (51) *It should be clarified that the provisions concerning protection of confidential information do not in any way prevent public*

disclosure of non-confidential parts of concluded contracts, including any subsequent changes.

Non- Tender Actions

15. You state that non-tender actions were undertaken for the following;
 - LinkedIn Media Buy
 - BV&E promo film 2nd outtakes which Wilder secured contract
 - BV&E promo film VisitEngland outtakes which Motiv Productions secured contract
 - Northstar media buy
16. Please supply the business case / rationale / options / evaluation paper and recommendation reports that were developed for these procurements; LinkedIn, Motiv Productions, Wilder (2nd contract) & Northstar media and;
17. The value of expenditure on each of these procurements e.g. Northstar Media buy £20,000
18. Please provide the total value of non-tender actions that have been undertaken by VisitBritain across the whole organisation since 2015.
 - Please provide the number of tenders and total value of these tenders e.g. 25 tenders for £15,000, 16 tenders for £10,000
19. Please supply details of ALL expenditure valued between £10,000 and £25,000 and all the options papers and evaluations assessments undertaken for these non-tender action expenditure undertaken by VisitBritain across all its departments since 2015.

FOI requests which have still not been supplied from subject access requests made in Apr & May 2017 and FOI/subject access requests made in Sept 2017 and Jan 2018

20. You state you are not releasing the scoring sheets as they were 'provided in confidence' – as I was a primary scorer on the procurement assessment relating to the Gold List (SFA Associates) and the BV&E film contract which Wilder Films won

I am therefore applying subject access request to access my own personal data and I hereby advise I remove the 'confidence' you state you are applying to protect me;

Therefore, please supply;

21. Procurement scoring sheets and soft copy of the excel scoring spreadsheet done for the Gold List Research tender that [name redacted] Associates won. There are a number of original and revised scoring sheets in [name redacted]'s files for this tender. Please ensure you send all copies of scoring sheets.
22. Advertised tender, procurement scoring sheets and soft copy of the excel scoring spreadsheet done for the BV&E promo film which Wilder Films was awarded as a first contract

ESP Grant Programme – the following requests have not been fulfilled

23. Please supply a print-out/excel spreadsheet from CODA showing all the funding that all grant applicants for the event support programme to date have received from VisitBritain between 2013 to 2017. You have only supplied the details of grants awarded to Marketing Manchester since 2015. Please undertake the same exercise for all the grant recipients per requested in the original FOI.
24. The grant applicants were; Liverpool Vision, Newcastle Gateshead, London & Partners, Destination Bristol, Rough Agenda, Glasgow Marketing Bureau, Heriot Watt University, Plymouth City Council, Midlands Aerospace Alliance, University of Aberdeen, Glasgow Convention Bureau, Sheffield City Council.
25. Please supply the state aid declarations/letters outlining and listing all public funding these bodies have received and declared for the preceding 3 years to the date of grant award from other sources prior to funding from the event support programme being granted
26. [Name redacted] inbox archive 'Marketing Manchester' folder emails to/from [name redacted], [name redacted] and [name redacted] from Marketing Manchester. These emails are archived and therefore should be on the SERVER.
27. Excel spreadsheet correcting the addresses and contact data from the Gold List this should be on the desktop of the PC [name redacted] was working on until Mar 1st

Subject Access Requests – Personal Information that still has not been fully released

28. Minutes of meeting between [name redacted] and [name redacted] regarding the Gold List Fight. I am subject matter in those minutes. Please clarify/communicate if these do or do not exist.
29. Emails from [name redacted] and [name redacted] that I was in a formal disciplinary process leading to the meeting that took place on 1st Mar 2018.”