



Date
16 May 2024

Post Office
100 Wood Street
London EC2V 9ER

Your Ref:

Classification:
Public

Dear [REDACTED],

Freedom of Information Request – FOI2024/00678

We are writing in response to your email received by Post Office Limited (“**Post Office**”) on 22 April 2024, which has been dealt with under the terms of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (“**FOIA**”).

In your email you have requested the information shown verbatim in bold below:

“Please pass this on to the person who conducts Freedom of Information reviews.

I am writing to request an internal review of Post Office Limited's handling of my FOI request 'Notification to Second Sight that basement of Fujitsu was a test environment'.

In your response you state that you have identified OVER 834 hits during the period 1 January 2009 to 31 December 2014. You have also stated that a conservative estimate for reviewing each hit is 2 minutes per entry.

- a) please provide the actual number of matches - not a statement OVER x - but the actual number you have identified**
- b) please provide some justification for the "conservative" estimate of 2 minutes per entry to determine whether it might be responsive to the enquiry. How have you arrived at this figure?**
- c) why did you chose the time period that you have chosen? Given that the visit by Michael Rudkin took place on 19 August 2008 why have you chosen the**

arbitrary dates that exclude the period immediately prior to his visit and immediately following his visit?

[You ask me if I could narrow the time period. Could I suggest that 1 March 2008 to 31 December 2011 could be used initially.]”

Although you requested an internal review of Post Office’s decision to cite section 12 of the FOIA in refusing your previous request (ref: FOI2024/00331), to save time, we have treated your email as a new request for information and have also provided the answers to the questions you asked.

Could I suggest that 1 March 2008 to 31 December 2011 could be used initially.

After reasonable and proportionate searches of our email system, using the date range you have specified (i.e.,1 March 2008 to 31 December 2011), we were unable to locate any information within scope of your request. We have detailed the searches carried out below for your information.

We carried out 2 searches using the date parameters you requested Search 1 used the keywords: “Test environment” OR “Bracknell” OR “Fujitsu”, for any emails between Angela van den Bogerd and Fujitsu (both sent and received). Search 2 used the keywords: “Test environment” AND “Bracknell” for any emails between Post Office and Fujitsu (both sent and received). These searches identified a total of 78 emails which, after a manual review, did not locate any information within scope of your request.

“In your response you state that you have identified OVER 834 hits during the period 1 January 2009 to 31 December 2014. You have also stated that a conservative estimate for reviewing each hit is 2 minutes per entry.

a) please provide the actual number of matches - not a statement OVER x - but the actual number you have identified

We have reviewed the search results we obtained while dealing with your previous request and can confirm that the second search (which was designed to reduce the number of hits to a manageable level within the limitations of the FOIA) yielded exactly 834 items, rather than “over 834”, as was stated in error in our response letter.

b) please provide some justification for the "conservative" estimate of 2 minutes per entry to determine whether it might be responsive to the enquiry. How have you arrived at this figure?

The estimate we provided was based on the experience of manually reviewing emails for similar FOIA requests that included emails from that time period, i.e., between 2000 and 2010.

For example, when handling your first request (ref: FOI2024/00024), we identified and reviewed the 250 emails that fell within scope of your request. It took approximately 12 hours to review those 250 emails, due to the variation in length, and with some having multiple attachments. This equates to nearly 3 minutes per email. We therefore concluded that even at a conservative estimate of 2 minutes per an email, it would take over 27 hours (i.e., 1,668 minutes) to review 834 emails.

c) why did you chose the time period that you have chosen? Given that the visit by Michael Rudkin took place on 19 August 2008 why have you chosen the arbitrary dates that exclude the period immediately prior to his visit and immediately following his visit?

While dealing with your previous request, our searches covered the period of 1 January 2009 to 31 December 2014. However, when dealing with your first request, our searches covered the period of 1 May 2008 to 31 December 2008, which included the 19 August 2008, and dates around it. Given that your two requests were seeking the same, or similar, information and that date (i.e., 19 August 2008) had already been covered in the search for your first request, we considered that including it again in subsequent searches would not yield any responsive information. We also understand that the emphasis of your previous request centred around the Second Sight report, and so we wanted to include date parameters relevant to this report.

If you are dissatisfied with the handling of this response, you do have a right to request an internal review. You can do this by writing to the address above within 40 working days of receipt of this response stating your reasons for your internal review request or alternatively, by emailing information.rights@postoffice.co.uk.

If, having requested an internal review by Post Office, you are still not satisfied with our response you also have a right of appeal to the Information Commissioner at:

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

Telephone: 0303 123 1113
www.ico.org.uk/foicomplaints

Yours sincerely,

Information Rights Team
information.rights@postoffice.co.uk
<https://corporate.postoffice.co.uk/en/governance/access-to-information/access-to-information/>

Post Office Limited is committed to protecting your privacy, information about how we do this can be found on our website at www.postoffice.co.uk/privacy