K	7
12	\supset

FOIA: Disclosure - Full
Case number: 2010020002642
Sent: 29/03/2010 15:56:51

Sent by: Gill Brown Replies go to:

Document owner: Gill Brown

General		
To:		
cc:		
bcc:		
Subject:	FOIA: Disclosure - Full	
Text:		

Dear Mr Davies

Freedom of Information Request Reference No: 2010020002642

I write in connection with your request for an internal review, which was received by the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) on 1 February 2010. In addition to the review you asked some questions which were classified as a new request and are as follows:

- 1. The total number of full names, partial names and initials including possible misspellings and duplications, which are listed on the database. For the avoidance of doubt, this is not a request for you to analyse those different names in order to try to establish how many individuals are represented by those names. Nor is it a request for you to distinguish between those named who are friends or family or acquaintances or contacts of Mulcaire or Goodman or targets of their work or victims of their illegal activity. It is simply a request for the total number of names or partial names which occur on the spreadsheet database.
- 2. The total number of mobile phone numbers (or partial mobile phone numbers) which are recorded on the database, regardless of any other question about their provenance or ownership or the use or abuse of those numbers.
- 3. To provide the most convenient possible measure of the extent to which the material seized from Mulcaire and Goodman included recordings of voicemail messages. You can answer with a precise figure or an approximation in relation to the number of minutes, the number of messages, the number of tapes or any other indicator, which will allow you to respond to this part of the request. I am happy to accept guidance from you on how best this can be done without exceeding the cost limit.
- 4. With respect to the voicemail messages that have been transcribed, is it the position of the Metropolitan Police that this seized material contains no other transcript of any voicemail message, whether typed or hand-written, whole or partial,

apart from the document which is already in the public domain?

The answers to your questions are as follows

In respect of question 1 "...simply a request for the total number of names or partial names which occur within the MPS database". As you have requested in your question, in arriving at a figure no attempt has been made to analyse those different names in order to try to establish how many individuals are represented by those names, nor has any attempt been made to distinguish between those named who are friends, family, acquaintances or contacts of Mulcaire or Goodman, targets of their work or potential victims of their illegal activity. Based on these provisos the total number is 4332. This figure is simply the total number of entries recorded on the MPS system as a consequence of all the material seized during our searches. It must be emphasized that this number is a wholly inaccurate number in terms of any attempt to establish the number of individuals who may have been of interest to Mulcaire and Goodman in any context as it includes every full name, partial name, initial(s) and multiple combinations thereof together with possible misspellings and duplications. Hence, multiple entries on the MPS system could and probably do relate to a single individual. The names could have been held for any purposes legitimate or otherwise.

For question 2 "...the total number of mobile phone numbers (or partial mobile phone numbers) which are recorded on the database," the number is 2978. This figure is simply the total number of entries recorded on the MPS system as a consequence of all the material seized during our searches, which we believe may be a mobile number. It includes partial and whole numbers, which may or may not be accurate and no attempt has been made to distinguish between those numbers of friends, family, acquaintances or contacts of Mulcaire or Goodman, targets of their work or potential victims of their illegal activity. It must be emphasized that this figure therefore provides a wholly inaccurate picture as to the numbers that may have been subject to interception.

For question 3 "... to provide the most convenient possible measure of the extent to which the material seized from Mulcaire and Goodman included recordings of voicemail messages". The most convenient figure is 30 tapes were seized by police that appear to contain, amongst other things, recordings of messages from one party for another. As explained in our previous reply, in the majority of cases neither the intended recipient nor the person speaking are readily identifiable nor is it possible with any certainty or degree of accuracy to say how many individuals feature in the recordings. In addition, some of the recordings do not appear to be in the format of a message left for another, but may well be recordings of Mulcaire's own conversations. Overall it is unclear how the recordings were made, their origins and whether they were made with or without the persons knowledge or consent. As such this figure provides a wholly inaccurate picture as to the numbers that may have been subject to interception.

For question 4, further to your previous request we have subsequently found one further partial, handwritten note a few lines long, which may or may not be the transcript of a voice mail message.

COMPLAINT RIGHTS

Your attention is drawn to the attached sheet, which details your right of complaint.

Should you have any further enquiries concerning this matter, please write or contact Gill Brown on telephone number quoting the reference number above.

Yours sincerely

Gill Brown Information Manager

In complying with their statutory duty under sections 1 and 11 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 to release the enclosed information, the Metropolitan Police Service will not breach the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988. However, the rights of the copyright owner of the enclosed information will continue to be protected by law. Applications for the copyright owner's written permission to reproduce any part of the attached information should be addressed to MPS Directorate of Legal Services, 1st Floor (Victoria Block), New Scotland Yard, Victoria, London, SW1H 0BG.

COMPLAINT RIGHTS

Are you unhappy with how your request has been handled or do you think the decision is incorrect?

You have the right to require the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) to review their decision.

Prior to lodging a formal complaint you are welcome and encouraged to discuss the decision with the case officer that dealt with your request.

Ask to have the decision looked at again -

The quickest and easiest way to have the decision looked at again is to telephone the case officer that is nominated at the end of your decision letter.

That person will be able to discuss the decision, explain any issues and assist with any problems.

Complaint

If you are dissatisfied with the handling procedures or the decision of the MPS made under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (the Act) regarding access to information you can lodge a complaint with the MPS to have the decision reviewed.

Complaints should be made in writing and addressed to:

FOI Complaint
Public Access Office
PO Box 57192
London
SW6 1SF

In all possible circumstances the MPS will aim to respond to your complaint within 40 working days.

The Information Commissioner

After lodging a complaint with the MPS if you are still dissatisfied with the decision you may make application to the Information Commissioner for a decision on whether the request for information has been dealt with in accordance with the requirements of the Act.

For information on how to make application to the Information Commissioner please visit their website at www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk. Alternatively, phone or write to:

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