

Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA)

Decision notice

Date: 26 September 2017

Public Authority: HM Treasury
Address: 1 Horse Guards Road
London
SW1A 2HQ

Decision (including any steps ordered)

1. The complainant submitted a request to HM Treasury (HMT) for a copy of a file concerning information about the British Indian Ocean Territory, specifically compensation claims by members of the Ilois community living in Mauritius. HMT provided the complainant with some of the information contained within the file but withheld the remainder under the following sections of FOIA: sections 27(1)(a) and (b) (international relations), section 29(1)(b) (the economy) and section 40(2) (personal data).
2. The Commissioner's decision is that:
 - Some of the withheld information is exempt from disclosure on the basis of section 27 and for this information the public interest favours maintaining the exemption. Some of the information is also exempt from disclosure on the basis of section 40(2). The information to which these exemptions have been correctly applied is identified in the annex attached to this notice.
 - However, for the remainder of the withheld information, the Commissioner has concluded that neither section 27, section 29 or section 40 are engaged. Again, this information is identified in the annex to this notice.
3. The Commissioner requires the public authority to take the following steps to ensure compliance with the legislation.
 - Disclose the information identified in the annex attached to this notice.

4. The public authority must take these steps within 35 calendar days of the date of this decision notice. Failure to comply may result in the Commissioner making written certification of this fact to the High Court pursuant to section 54 of the Act and may be dealt with as a contempt of court.

Request and response

5. The complainant submitted the following request to HMT on 16 March 2015:

'Please would you consider this to be a Freedom of Information Act request.

Please let me have copies of all documents (including minute sheets) contained in a retained file:

T 442/53

British Indian Ocean Territory: gratia claim for compensation by members of the Ilois community living in Mauritius

1982 Jan 01 - 1982 Dec 31

Former file reference: DBER/U/552/323/452/01

My preference is to receive scanned copies of these documents (PDF) but if this is not possible then hard copies would be acceptable.'

6. On 9 September 2015, HMT informed the complainant that it considered the requested information to be exempt from disclosure on the basis of section 27(1)(a) (international relations) of FOIA.
7. The complainant contacted HMT on the same day and asked it to conduct an internal review of this decision. He also contacted HMT on 22 September 2015 and confirmed that he wanted a list of the documents falling within the scope of his request.
8. On 18 February 2016 HMT provided the complainant with a list of the documents falling within the scope of his request with certain names of officials redacted on the basis of section 40(2) of FOIA. HMT explained that it had concluded that some parts of the requested file could be disclosed albeit that other parts were exempt from disclosure on the basis of the exemptions contained at sections 27(1)(a) and (b), 29(1)(b) (the economy) and 40(2) (personal data) of FOIA. HMT explained that a scanned copy of the disclosable documents could be provided if the complainant paid a fee of £17.40.
9. The complainant subsequently forwarded HMT the fee requested.
10. HMT next contacted the complainant on 13 April 2016 and provided 32 pages of information with redactions made on the basis of sections 29(1)(b) and 40(2) of FOIA. However, HMT explained that it still needed

further time to determine whether the remaining information could be disclosed and it expected to reach a decision by May.

11. HMT informed the complainant of the outcome of its deliberations on 31 October 2016. HMT explained that it had concluded that the remaining information was exempt from disclosure on the basis of sections 27(1)(a) and (b), 29(1)(b) and 40(2) of FOIA.
12. During the course of the Commissioner's investigation, and following a further review of the requested information, HMT provided the complainant with additional information falling within the scope of his request in April 2017. HMT continued to withhold further information falling within scope of his request on the basis of the exemptions previously cited.

Scope of the case

13. The complainant contacted the Commissioner on 22 November 2016 in order to complain about HMT's decision to withhold information falling within the scope of his request.
14. There are 57 documents falling within the scope of the complainant's request. At the point this decision notice is being issued, eight of these documents have been released to the complainant in full; nine are being withheld in full and the remaining 40 have been disclosed albeit with redactions applied to them.
15. The Commissioner has attached an annex to this notice to clarify the status of each document. HMT is applying section 27(1)(a) to all of the withheld information, with the exception of the names of junior officials which are only being withheld on the basis of section 40(2) of FOIA. Sections 27(1)(b) and 29(1)(b) are only being applied to certain parts of certain documents as indicated on the attached annex.
16. In his submissions to the Commissioner the complainant explained that 21 of the documents that were being withheld were in fact already in the public domain by virtue of previous disclosures by the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO) to The National Archives (TNA). The Commissioner has also identified these documents on the annex. Finally, the annex also includes the Commissioner's findings in relation to any exemptions which have been applied to a particular document.

Reasons for decision

Section 27(1) – international relations

17. Sections 27(1)(a) and (b) of FOIA state that:

'Information is exempt information if its disclosure under this Act would, or would be likely to, prejudice—

(a) relations between the United Kingdom and any other State

(b) relations between the United Kingdom and any international organisation or international court'

HMT's position

18. In its responses to the complainant, HMT explained that despite the passage of time that has elapsed since the information was created, there remain live issues relating to the British Indian Overseas Territory (BIOT) that are still to be addressed. Consequently, HMT argued that despite the age of the information, its relevance and sensitivity in the present circumstances remains. In this context, HMT argued that disclosure of the withheld information would be likely to prejudice the UK's relationships with other states, and an international organisation, and affect the progress of the discussions in relation to the ongoing matters concerning BIOT. HMT explained to the complainant that it was unable to provide further detailed reasoning to support the application of these exemptions because this would involve the disclosure of information which itself was considered to be exempt from disclosure.
19. HMT provided the Commissioner with detailed submissions to support its reliance on the exemptions contained at sections 27(1)(a) and (b). However, the Commissioner has not included such submissions in this decision notice because of HMT's concerns that the inclusion of such information would risk causing similar levels of prejudice to disclosing the withheld information itself.

The complainant's position

20. With regard to HMT's position that the withheld information still relates to live issues concerning BIOT, the complainant assumed that such issues were those addressed in the government's policy review of BIOT. The complainant noted that this policy review was concluded in November 2016 and a Written Ministerial Statement was issued at this

time.¹ If this is the case, the complainant argued that the need to maintain the exemptions on this material would appear to no longer hold. The complainant acknowledged that the role of the Commissioner is limited to considering the circumstances of the case as they existed at the time of a request. However, he argued that it would be churlish for HMT to fail to take into account this development, and if it did so, this would simply necessitate a further request from him which could presumably not be resisted.

21. The complainant emphasised that 21 of the documents falling within the scope of his request had already been released into the public domain and were open records at TNA. The complainant noted that the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO) is the 'lead' government department concerned with BIOT and in his view the fact that the FCO did not consider the exemptions cited by HMT to apply meant that HMT's decision was inconsistent with the lead department. Furthermore, the complainant argued that the fact that these documents were at TNA did not mean that HMT would have been correct to refuse to disclose them to him on the basis of section 21.² This was on the basis that the complainant's ability to identify the individual documents in question had required a high degree of specialist knowledge of the various information sources which could not be ordinarily possessed by a member of the general public.
22. Furthermore, the complainant explained that the fact that 21 of the documents are in the public domain allowed him to analyse their contents. He suggested that this analysis suggested to him that none of the content would attract the exemptions applied by HMT. He argued that if the same criteria had been applied to the remaining information, as had been applied to these 21 documents, then it could only be concluded that the exemptions cited by HMT to these remaining documents was equally unwarranted.

The Commissioner's position

23. In order for a prejudice based exemption, such as section 27(1) to be engaged the Commissioner considers that three criteria must be met:

¹ <http://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-statement/Lords/2016-11-16/HLWS257/>

² Section 21 of FOIA provides an exemption to disclosure for information which is reasonably accessible to the applicant via other means.

- Firstly, the actual harm which the public authority alleges would, or would be likely, to occur if the withheld information was disclosed has to relate to the applicable interests within the relevant exemption;
 - Secondly, the public authority must be able to demonstrate that some causal relationship exists between the potential disclosure of the information being withheld and the prejudice which the exemption is designed to protect. Furthermore, the resultant prejudice which is alleged must be real, actual or of substance; and
 - Thirdly, it is necessary to establish whether the level of likelihood of prejudice being relied upon by the public authority is met – ie, disclosure 'would be likely' to result in prejudice or disclosure 'would' result in prejudice. In relation to the lower threshold the Commissioner considers that the chance of prejudice occurring must be more than a hypothetical possibility; rather there must be a real and significant risk. With regard to the higher threshold, in the Commissioner's view this places a stronger evidential burden on the public authority. The anticipated prejudice must be more likely than not.
24. Furthermore, the Commissioner has been guided by the comments of the Information Tribunal which suggested that, in the context of section 27(1), prejudice can be real and of substance *'if it makes relations more difficult or calls for a particular damage limitation response to contain or limit damage which would not have otherwise have been necessary'*.³
25. With regard to the first criterion of the three limb test described above, the Commissioner accepts that the potential prejudice described by HMT clearly relates to the interests which the exemptions contained at sections 27(1)(a) and (b) are designed to protect.
26. With regard to the second criterion, the Commissioner is satisfied that disclosure of **some** of the withheld information has the potential to harm the UK's relations with the other states and an international organisation.
27. In relation to the 21 documents that the complainant has identified as being available at TNA, the Commissioner does not consider that it is sustainable to argue that the disclosure of this information under FOIA would be likely to prejudice the UK's international relations. This is because in the Commissioner's view she sees no material difference between the publication of information under FOIA and the availability of

³ [Campaign Against the Arms Trade v The Information Commissioner and Ministry of Defence \(EA/2006/0040\)](#), paragraph 81.

information as an open record at TNA. In effect, a disclosure under FOIA or the previous transfer of information to TNA under the Public Records Act as open records both result in the same information being placed in the public domain. Consequently, in the Commissioner's view it is implausible to argue that disclosure of information under FOIA would result in some sort of prejudice when the very same information is already available at TNA. Such information is not therefore exempt from disclosure on the basis of sections 27(1)(a) or (b).

28. Furthermore, in the Commissioner's opinion the availability of these 21 documents in TNA also undermines HMT's reliance on section 27 in relation to parts of the withheld information contained in other documents falling within the scope of the request, documents which are not open at TNA. This because although such documents are not open at TNA, the information which has been redacted from these documents is reproduced in the documents available at TNA. In effect, such information is therefore also effectively in the public domain and for the same reasons as discussed in the preceding paragraph the Commissioner does not consider that there is a plausible causal link between disclosure of this category of information and the prejudice envisaged by HMT.
29. However, the Commissioner is prepared to accept, based upon HMT's submissions to her that there is a causal link between the disclosure of the remaining parts of the withheld information and the nature of the prejudice envisaged by HMT. Furthermore, the Commissioner is satisfied that in respect of the information which does meet the second criterion, if this information was disclosed there is more than a hypothetical chance of prejudice occurring. Rather, for such information the Commissioner is satisfied that if this information was disclosed there is a real and significant risk of the UK's relations either with other states or an international organisation being damaged. For such information, the third criterion set out above is met and therefore this information is exempt from disclosure on the basis of sections 27(1)(a) and (b).
30. The Commissioner has elaborated on her reasoning for reaching these various findings in a confidential annex which will be provided to HMT but not to complainant.

Public interest test

31. Section 27 is a qualified exemption and therefore the Commissioner must consider the public interest test and whether in all the circumstances of the case the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.
32. HMT acknowledged that this topic is one that generates interest, including from a research or human rights perspective. It also accepted

that there is a general public interest in release of the information in the interests of transparency and to inform public debate. HMT also accepted the strong public interest in matters involving public money but noted that in this case the amount of compensation that was offered to the Chagossians is in the public domain. However, HMT argued that there was an inherently strong public interest in ensuring that the UK maintains effective relations with other countries and institutions. Given the particular circumstances of this case, and the clear interaction with live and ongoing policy discussions, HMT concluded that the public interest clearly favoured withholding the information.

33. The complainant argued that withholding the information falling within the scope of his request prevented a correct historical interpretation of correspondence that had taken place between HMT and other government departments. He argued that there was therefore a clear public interest in the disclosure of this information.
34. The Commissioner agrees that there is a clear public interest in the disclosure of information in order to allow the public to fully understand decisions taken by the UK government. She also recognises the particular interest that information concerning BIOT generates. Moreover, she considers that disclosure of the information which she accepts is exempt from disclosure on the basis of sections 27(1)(a) and (b) would prove to be genuinely informative to those interested in the subject matter. However, the Commissioner agrees that there is an inherently strong public interest in ensuring that the UK maintains effective relations with other countries and international institutions. In the circumstances of this case, taking into account the specific points raised in HMT's submissions to her, in particular the link between the withheld information and ongoing live issues concerning BIOT, the Commissioner is persuaded that the public interest favours upholding the exemptions contained at section 27(1)(a) and (b) in order to protect the UK's ability to maintain effective international relations.

Section 29 – the economy

35. HMT also argued that some parts of the withheld information were exempt from disclosure on the basis of section 29(1)(b) of FOIA. This exemption states that information is exempt from disclosure if its disclosure would, or would be likely to, prejudice the financial interests of any administration in the United Kingdom.
36. However, for the very same reasons as set out above in relation to section 27, the Commissioner does not accept that information withheld on the basis of section 29(1)(b) can be exempt from disclosure if the very same information is available as an open record at TNA, or indeed if very similar information is contained in open records at TNA.

37. In respect of information which does not fall within this description but has been withheld on the basis of section 29(1)(b), the Commissioner has already concluded that such information is exempt from disclosure on the basis of section 27(1)(a). Therefore the Commissioner has not considered whether this category of information is also exempt from disclosure on the basis of section 29(1)(b) of FOIA.

Section 40(2) – personal data

38. Section 40(2) of FOIA states that personal data is exempt from disclosure if its disclosure would breach any of the data protection principles contained within the Data Protection Act 1998 (DPA).

39. Personal data is defined in section (1)(a) of the DPA as:

'.....data which relate to a living individual who can be identified from those data or from those data and other information which is in the possession of, or likely to come into the possession of, the data controller; and includes any expression of opinion about the individual and any indication of the intentions of the data controller or any person in respect of the individual.'

40. HMT withheld the names of junior staff on the basis of section 40(2). The Commissioner accepts that such information constitutes personal data within the meaning of section 1 of the DPA as they clearly relate to identifiable individuals.

41. HMT argued that disclosure of such information would breach the first data protection principle which states that:

'Personal data shall be processed fairly and lawfully and, in particular, shall not be processed unless –

(a) at least one of the conditions in Schedule 2 is met, and

(b) in the case of sensitive personal data, at least one of the conditions in Schedule 3 is also met.'

42. In deciding whether disclosure of personal data would be unfair, and thus breach the first data protection principle, the Commissioner takes into account a range of factors including:

- The reasonable expectations of the individual in terms of what would happen to their personal data. Such expectations could be shaped by:
 - what the public authority may have told them about what would happen to their personal data;

- their general expectations of privacy, including the effect of Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR);
 - the nature or content of the information itself;
 - the circumstances in which the personal data was obtained;
 - any particular circumstances of the case, eg established custom or practice within the public authority; and
 - whether the individual consented to their personal data being disclosed or conversely whether they explicitly refused.
- The consequences of disclosing the information, ie what damage or distress would the individual suffer if the information was disclosed? In consideration of this factor the Commissioner may take into account:
 - whether information of the nature requested is already in the public domain;
 - if so the source of such a disclosure; and even if the information has previously been in the public domain does the passage of time mean that disclosure now could still cause damage or distress?
43. Furthermore, notwithstanding the data subject's reasonable expectations or any damage or distress caused to them by disclosure, it may still be fair to disclose the requested information if it can be argued that there is a more compelling legitimate interest in disclosure to the public.
44. In considering 'legitimate interests', in order to establish if there is a compelling reason for disclosure, such interests can include broad general principles of accountability and transparency for their own sake, as well as case specific interests. In balancing these legitimate interests with the rights of the data subject, it is also important to consider a proportionate approach.
45. HMT argued that the officials in question had a reasonable expectation that their work details would not be made public and that they would not carry individual accountability for their official activities. In light these expectations, HMT argued that disclosure of this information would be unfair.

46. The information in the scope of this request obviously dates from long before FOIA was enacted and thus the expectations of the junior staff in question are arguably somewhat harder to judge than if the information was of a more recent provenance. Nevertheless, the Commissioner recognises that it is current established custom and practice within public authorities to redact the names of junior staff to disclosures made under FOIA. In line with this approach, and taking into account HMT's suggestion that the individuals in question would not have expected to carry individual accountability for their official activities, the Commissioner accepts that disclosure of the information would be unfair. The names of the junior officials are therefore exempt from disclosure on the basis of section 40(2) of FOIA.⁴
47. HMT also relied on section 40(2) to withhold information contained in documents 26 and 27 on the basis that these documents contained personal data about individual Chagossians. However, the Commissioner notes that these documents have been disclosed in full at TNA and therefore does not consider that disclosure of these documents would constitute a breach of the DPA if disclosed by HMT.

Other matters

48. As is evidenced by the chronology of the request set out in the decision notice itself, there were significant delays on the part of HMT in processing this request. Furthermore, it took HMT over four months to provide the Commissioner with a response to her enquiries in respect of this complaint. The Commissioner considers delays of this length, both in respect of the processing of this request and in relation to engagement with her to be unacceptable. She wishes to make it very clear that she does not wish to see a recurrence of such delays and handling issues in further requests handled by HMT.

⁴ The only exception to this is in relation to a limited number of documents open at TNA which include the names of junior staff. In respect of such documents the Commissioner does not consider that disclosure of these names would breach the DPA given that they are already in the public domain.

Right of appeal

49. 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

50. 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.

51. 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

**Gerrard Tracey
Principal Adviser
Information Commissioner's Office
Wycliffe House
Water Lane
Wilmslow
Cheshire
SK9 5AF**

Annex – Schedule of documents

Item	Document description	Released by HMT?	Exemptions being cited	Has complainant identified that document is at TNA?	Commissioner's findings on application of exemptions
1	FCO letter to HMT - 18/6/1981 : Ex gratia offer to Ilois community (untitled)	Yes, with redactions	Section 40(2)	Yes	Section 40(2) not engaged. Unredacted version of document needs to be disclosed by HMT.
2	Chief Secretary to the Treasury letter to FCO - 2/4/1979 : Ex gratia offer (untitled)	Yes, in full		Yes	Not applicable
3	W L St Clair (HMT) letter - 23/6/1981 : Offer of payment	Yes, with redactions	Section 40(2)		Section 40(2) engaged.
4	ODA letter & submission to HMT - 24/6/1981 - letter: Mauritius: The Ilois. Submission: Mauritius: talks on the	Yes, with redactions	Section 40(2)		Section 40(2) engaged.

	Ilois				
5	FCO Steering Brief 19/6/1981: UK/Mauritius talks on the Ilois	Yes, with redactions	Sections 40(2), 27(1)(a), and 29(1)(b) to paragraphs 5 and 7	Yes	Exemptions not engaged as document is at TNA. Unredacted version of document needs to be disclosed by HMT.
6	Letter to Mr St Clair - 26/6/1981 : Ex-gratia payment to members of the Ilois community in Mauritius	Yes, with redactions	Section 40(2)		Section 40(2) engaged.
7	W L St Clair to FCO - 29/6/1981 : Mauritius: The Ilois	Yes, with redactions	Sections 40(2), 27(1)(a), and 29(1)(b) to paragraph 5	Yes	Exemptions not engaged as document is at TNA. Unredacted version of document needs to be disclosed by HMT.

					information identified in the confidential annex.
12	Handwritten letter - 22/1/1982 : The Ilois	Yes, with redactions	Sections 40(2), 27(1)(a)		Sections 27(1)(a) and 40(2) are engaged.
13	Mr Luce (FCO) letter to Leon Brittan HMT - 20/1/1982 : untitled	Yes, with redactions	Sections 40(2), 27(1)(a), and 29(1)(b) to paragraph 4	Yes	Sections 27(1)(a) and 29(1)(b) not engaged. Section 40(2) only partly engaged. HMT needs to disclose the information identified in the confidential annex.
14	Handwritten letter 22/1 : The Ilois	Yes, with redactions	Section 40(2)		Section 40(2) engaged.
15	Handwritten letter - 22/1/1982 : The Ilois	Yes, with redactions	Sections 40(2), 27(1)(a)		Section 40(2) engaged but section 27(1)(a) is not. HMT needs to disclose this document with

					the information withheld on the basis of section 27(1)(a) unredacted.
16	Treasury Chambers letter - 25/1/1982 : The Ilois	Yes, with redactions	Sections 40(2), 27(1)(a) and (b)		Sections 27(1)(a) and 40(2) are engaged.
17	Letter 28/1/1982 : The Ilois	Yes, with redactions	Sections 40(2), 27(1)(a) and (b)		Section 40(2) is engaged. Section 27(1)(a) and (b) partly engaged. HMT needs to disclose this document with the information contained at paragraph 6 unredacted.
18	Mr Luce letter to Leon Brittain - 20/1/1982 : untitled	Yes, with redactions	Sections 40(2), 27(1)(a), and 29(1)(b) to paragraph 5	Yes	Section 40(2) engaged. Sections 27(1)(a) and 29(1)b) not engaged.

					HMT needs to disclose this document with the information withheld on the basis of sections 27(1)(a) and 29(1)(b) unredacted.
19	The Ilois dispute: Appendix A	Yes, in full			Not applicable
20	Attorney General Opinion of 1977 - 18/11/1977 : British Indian Ocean Territory: [Redacted personal data] v Attorney General	No	Sections 40(2), 27(1)(a) and s29(1)(b)	Yes	None of the exemptions are engaged. HMT needs to disclose this document.
21	Treasury Solicitor - 28/8/1981 : [Redacted personal data] v Attorney-General	Yes, with redactions	Section 40(2), 27(1)(a), 27(1)(b), and section 29(1)(b) to paragraphs 8, 18- 19, 41-43		Section 40(2) engaged. Sections 27(1)(a) and (b) and section 29(1)(b) partly engaged. HMT needs to disclose this

					document with the information at paragraphs 3, 8, 18 and 19 unredacted.
22	FCO legal team - 28/8/1981 : The Ilois	No	Sections 40(2), 27(1)(a), 29(1)(b)	Yes	None of the exemptions are engaged. HMT needs to disclose this document.
23	Treasury Counsellor's Joint Opinion of 28/9/81	No	Sections 40(2), 27(1)(a), 29(1)(b)	Yes	None of the exemptions are engaged. HMT needs to disclose this document.
24	FCO Legal team- 15/10/1981 : The Ilois: [Redacted personal data] v Attorney General	Yes, with redactions	Sections 40(2), 27(1)(a), 29(1)(b) to paragraphs 2-3, 6, 8-9	Yes	None of the exemptions are engaged. HMT needs to disclose this document.
25	Government House, Mauritius letter 24/6/1981 : Ilois	No	Sections 40(2), 27(1)(a), 29(1)(b)	Yes	None of the exemptions are

	Community in Mauritius				engaged. HMT needs to disclose this document.
26	Appendix A : Paper prepared by Front National de Soutien aux Ilois	No	Sections 40(2), 27(1)(a)	Yes	None of the exemptions are engaged. HMT needs to disclose this document.
27	Appendix B : Paper prepared by the Comité Ilois - Organisation Fraternelle	No	Sections 40(2), 27(1)(a)	Yes	None of the exemptions are engaged. HMT needs to disclose this document.
28	Annex B : The Ilois: Compensation: Revised Calculations by FCO Economists	No	Sections 27(1)(a), 29(1)(b)		None of the exemptions are engaged. HMT needs to disclose this document.
29	Law Officers' Department - 22/10/1981 : The Ilois	No	Sections 27(1)(a), 29(1)(b)	Yes	None of the exemptions are

					engaged. HMT needs to disclose this document.
30	Law Officers' Department - 30/10/1981 : [Redacted personal data] v Attorney- General	Yes, with redactions	Section 40(2)	Yes	None of the exemptions are engaged. HMT needs to disclose this document.
31	Letter - 2/2/1982 : The Ilois: Compensation Claim	Yes, with redactions	Section 40(2)		Section 40(2) engaged.
32	[Redacted personal data] - 3/2/1982 - The Ilois: Compensation Claim	Yes, with redactions	Sections 40(2), 27(1)(a), 29(1)(b) to paragraphs 6 and 8		Section 40(2) is engaged. Sections 27(1)(a) partly engaged. HMT needs to disclose the document with paragraph 5 unredacted.
33	Letter, Chief Secretary to	Yes, with redactions	Section 27(1)(a)		Section 27(1)(a)

	Richard Luce				is not engaged. HMT needs to disclose an unredacted copy of this document.
34	Letter - 2/2/1982 : The Ilois: Compensation Claim	Yes, with redactions	Section 40(2), 27(1)(a)		Both exemptions are engaged.
35	The Ilois: Compensation Claim, 5/2/1982	Yes, with redactions	Section 40(2), 27(1)(a), 29(1)(b) to paragraph 9		Section 27(1)(a) partly engaged. Section 40(2) engaged. HMT needs to disclose this document with the information previously withheld at paragraphs 7 and 10 unredacted.
36	HMT letter to FCO 8/2/1982 - The Ilois: Compensation Claim	Yes, with redactions	Section 27(1)(a)	Yes	Section 27(1)(a) not engaged. HMT needs to disclose an

					unredacted version of this document.
37	Hansard cutting - Ilois (Resettlement)	Released in full			Not applicable
38	Treasury chambers letter - 7/4/1982 - Ilois	Yes, with redactions	Section 40(2)		Section 40(2) engaged.
39	Treasury chambers letter - 19/4/1982 - The Ilois: Compensation Settlement	Yes, with redactions	Section 40(2)		Section 40(2) engaged.
40	Redacted personal data] (Diplomatic Wing) letter - 15/4/1982 The Ilois: Compensation Settlement	Yes, with redactions	Section 40(2)		Section 40(2) engaged.
41	Redacted personal data] letter to Treasury Chambers - 20/4/1982 : The Ilois: Compensation Settlement	Yes, with redactions	Section 40(2), 27(1)(a)		Section 27(1)(a) is not engaged. Section 40(2) is engaged. HMT needs to disclose this document with the information previously withheld on the basis of section 27(1)(a)

			Information Commissioner's Office	unredacted.
42	Treasury Chambers letter to FCO - 23/4/1982 - The Ilois: Compensation Settlement	Yes, with redactions	Section 40(2), 27(1)(a)	Section 27(1)(a) is not engaged. Section 40(2) is engaged. HMT needs to disclose this document with the information previously withheld on the basis of section 27(1)(a) unredacted.
43	FCO letter - 13/5/1982 - The Ilois: Compensation Settlement	Yes, with redactions	Section 40(2)	Section 40(2) engaged.
44	Agreement between the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of Mauritius	Released in full		Not applicable
45	Hand written letter, 15/5/1982 - The Ilois: Compensation Settlement	Yes, with redactions	Section 40(2)	Section 40(2) engaged.

46	(Treasury Chambers) letter - 17/5/1982 - The Ilois: Compensation Settlement	Yes, with redactions	Section 40(2)		Section 40(2) engaged.
47	Treasury Chambers letter - 24/5/1982 - The Ilois: PES and Cash Limits	Yes, with redactions	Section 40(2)		Section 40(2) engaged.
48	Letter - 27/5/1982 - The Ilois	Released in full			Not applicable
49	Treasury Chambers letter - 1/6/1982 - The Hois: PES and Cash Limits	Yes, with redactions	Section 40(2)		Section 40(2) engaged.
50	Letter letter - 2/6/1982 - The Ilois: Proposed PES Transfer and Summer Supplementary	Yes, with redactions	Section 40(2)		Section 40(2) engaged.
51	Newspaper cutting 14/6/1982 - Ref:U/552/323/452/01	Released in full			Not applicable
52	Newspaper cutting 14/6/1982 - Ref:U/552/323/452/01	Released in full			Not applicable
53	Times newspaper cutting 15/6/1982 -	Released in full			Not applicable

	Ref: U/552/323/452/01				
54	Treasury Chambers Letter (The Ilois: Proposed PES Transfer) and draft letter (The Ilois: Compensation Settlement) - 15/6/1982	Yes, with redactions	Section 40(2)		Section 40(2) engaged.
55	Treasury Chambers letter and revisions - 21/6/1982 - The Ilois	Yes, with redactions	Section 40(2)		Section 40(2) engaged.
56	Treasury Chambers letter - 22/6/1982 - The Ilois: Compensation Settlement	Yes, with redactions	Section 40(2)		Section 40(2) engaged.
57	Telegram - 20/7/1982 - To priority certain missions and Dependent Territories	No	Section 27(1)(a)	Yes	Section 27(1)(a) not engaged. HMT needs to disclose an unredacted version of this document.