



## **FOI and Local Government: surveys by the Constitution Unit covering the six years from 2005 to 2010**

November 2011

Jim Amos, Honorary Senior Research Associate  
Ben Worthy, Research Associate  
Gabrielle Bourke, Research Assistant

---

### Introduction

1. Numbers of requests, refusals and internal reviews
2. Sources of requests
3. Spend on handling requests
4. Types of information requested
5. Problems with compliance
6. Positive aspects of FOI

---

## **Introduction**

These six annual surveys<sup>1</sup> cover the experiences with FOI of local authorities in England. Between about 28% and 33% of these authorities provided substantive responses to most questions asked in the surveys (112 authorities in 2005, 118 in 2006, 121 in 2007, 110 in 2008, 117 in 2009 and 104 in 2010).

The purpose of this paper is to summarise the key facts and the evidence that was provided by respondents to these surveys in order to help understand whether any trends are becoming clear. Some of the questions that were asked changed after the first survey and more open questions were asked. There were also some changes to the methods of analysis. Here we have attempted to provide information in a way that provides a fair comparison across the six surveys.

This analysis shows a number of apparent trends and changes over the six years, however we have not attempted to draw firm conclusions from the evidence, since there are a number of possible reasons for the trends and changes.

We are currently engaged in a systematic study of the objectives, benefits and the impact of FOI on Local Government, funded by the ESRC. This study will report in 2011 and we expect that it will clarify many of the questions raised by these surveys.

---

<sup>1</sup> The six surveys are published in full at:

<http://www.ucl.ac.uk/constitution-unit/research/foi/foi-and-local-government/tabs/surveys>

## 1. Numbers of requests, refusals and internal reviews

	Number of requests	Number of refusals	% of refusals	Number of internal reviews	% of refusals subject to intl. reviews
2005	60,361	5,024	8.3%	1,313	26%
2006	72,361	7,594	10.5%	1,701	22%
2007	80,114	8,278	10.3%	1,205	14.6%
2008	118,569	8,259	7.0%	1,632	19.7%
2009	164,508	11,894	7.2%	2,663	22.3%
2010	197,737	12,490	6.3%	2,852	22.8%

## 2. Sources of requests

Respondents were asked to rank the top three sources of requests. We applied a weighting of 100 to the first choice, 50 to the second and 25 to the third. On this basis the percentages are as follows, with a very large proportion of total requests being made by private individuals, business and the media.

	Private individuals	Business	Media
2005	43%	29%	11%
2006	46%	27%	17%
2007	41%	25%	21%
2008	40%	22%	31%
2009	37%	22%	33%
2010	37%	25%	33%

## 3. Spend on handling requests

We asked respondents how many full time equivalent staff (FTE) were employed on FOI compliance activities both in the central teams and in service departments. We then related this to the hours available and to the numbers of requests to produce an average number of hours spent on each request.

On this basis the average time in hours spent handling a request is shown in the table below. However in each year we have noted a very large spread around these averages. We consider that this is an area where more research could be of value to authorities.

Year	Average hours per request
2005	16.4
2006	13.1
2007	15.3
2008	11.6
2009	8.9
2010	6.4

#### 4. Types of information requested

This is an area where comparisons between years are difficult, since the way questions were asked and analysed changed. For the first two years respondents were asked to select from a list of eight categories. These categories were broadly similar but not identical for the second year. For example, environmental information was a new category in 2006. It was also possible for the response to a question to be placed quite reasonably in more than one category. For 2007 we changed the method and the question was an open one. We think this gave a good result, but put the onus upon us to place answers in the most suitable categories. For 2007 onwards we suspect that the very low percentages for active local issues may reflect more a change in method of analysis than a substantial reduction in requests that might be categorised in this way.

Year	Finance, costs & expenses	Local issues	Contracts & business	Planning, policy decisions/ minutes	Environmental Information	Public services	Personal info about staff
2005	24%	21%	20%	16%	Not listed	5%	5%
2006	19%	15%	18%	11%	14%	11%	6%
2007	31%	2%	7%	29%	3%	10%	7%
2008	26%	1%	11%	17%	10%	25%	8%
2009	31%	3%	9%	11%	11%	11%	22%
2010	33%	1%	10%	10%	10%	14%	11%

#### 5. Problems with compliance

Here also comparisons were not easy and for similar reasons. For the survey of 2005, respondents were asked to select from a list of six categories. For the surveys of 2006 onwards the question was an open one and respondents were asked to list their top three problems with compliance. This chart does seem to illustrate interesting changes over the six years.

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
<b>Applying exemptions</b>	27%	8%				
<b>Lack of resources</b>	24%	24%	12%	24%	26%	28%
<b>Applying the Public interest test</b>	18%					
<b>Requests that affect a third party</b>	17%					
<b>Processes, procedures, training, advice</b>		27%	15%	8%	4%	5%
<b>Difficult requests and requesters</b>		25%	17%	27%	21%	29%
<b>Motivation/co-operation from service departments</b>		13%	19%	10%	15%	16%
<b>Records management</b>			14%	6%	9%	7%
<b>Timescales</b>				16%	11%	11%

## 6. Positive aspects of FOI

Respondents were asked to identify the ways in which they thought FOI had positively affected their organisation. Again for the survey of 2005, they were asked to select from a list of six categories, and for 2006 onwards to provide in their own words the top three ways in which they thought that FOI had had a positive effect

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
<b>More openness/transparency &amp; accountability</b>	29%	51%	28%	28%	29%	49%
<b>Improved records management</b>	28%	24%	22%	16%	30%	20%
<b>Improvements within organisation (not Records management)</b>	16%	13%	23%	26%	14%	15%
<b>Improved relationship with public</b>	13%	8%	26%	7%	4%	10%