

Internal Review - FOI 2508 176

"FOI (North East CA)" <FOI@northeast-ca.gov.uk>

October 6, 2025 at 10:21 AM

To: "The Reasonable Adjustment"

<advocacy@thereasonableadjustment.co.uk>

Dear Kieron,

Thank you for your request for an Internal Review into the response issued to you for the Freedom of Information Request with the reference NECA 2508 176.

Your Request for an Internal Review and Responses

I request an internal review of FOI NECA 2508 176 on the following grounds:

1. Section 10 breach

The 20 working days run from the day after receipt of a valid request. My request was made on 08 Aug 2025 and met Section 8. Day one was 11 Aug 2025. The deadline was 08 Sept 2025. NECA is out of time.

Response:

As set out in Section 10(6) of the Freedom of Information Act, the date of receipt will be the day on which a request is received or 'if later, the day on which information is received referred to in section 1(3)'. This effectively means that when the requester is contacted for further clarification, the date of receipt will be the day clarification is received. The 20-working-day clock will start the day after receipt of the necessary clarification.

The original FOI response was sent on 9 September 2025, the day before the deadline and not in breach of Section 10. The deadline was 10 September 2025 due to the need to clarify some aspects of the request and as part of that correspondence an additional question was added to the request.

2) Inadequate disclosure under Section 1

You supplied two figures and general narrative only. You did not provide the recorded information that underpins those statements. Please disclose, for each listed award and delivery partner arrangement:

- Award letters, grant agreements, decision papers, and any schedules or variations
- Payment schedules, claims, remittance advice, output and monitoring returns, compliance reports
- Correspondence with Rocket Science and with North of Tyne, including emails, Teams messages, letters, and meeting notes where held on behalf of NECA
- Internal approvals or sign-offs, conflicts declarations, risk assessments, and any clawback terms
- Project codes, unique identifiers, and dates of each payment

If NECA holds the information on its behalf where Rocket Science was the managing agent, that information is in scope. If you contend it is not held by or for NECA, please identify the holder and explain the basis. If retrieval is feasible, your duty to advise and assist requires you to do so.

Response:

The original FOI asked how much funding TRJ has received through NECA, broken down by programme.

The response provided answers that question, the request did not ask for the information which underpins the programme.

3. Section 11 format preference not met

I asked for machine readable disclosure. Please provide tabular data in CSV or XLSX and documents as searchable PDFs.

Response:

We believe that the FOI email response provided, which contained no attachments, was in an accessible format.

4. Section 16 duty to advise and assist

No engagement on refinement or structure. If you believe Section 12 cost limit might apply, you must advise and assist with a reasonable narrowing, not wait until after a breach.

Response:

We believe we did advise and assist by seeking clarification on the FOI within a day of receipt and at

no point did we consider that the request would require the exemption allowed under section 12.

5. Record preservation and Section 77 risk

You linked to a retention policy, but you did not confirm that all records within scope have been preserved. Please provide a written confirmation that a hold is in place and list the locations searched and to be searched, for example email, Teams, SharePoint, network drives, OneNote, local archives, contractor portals.

Response:

The original FOI asked for confirmation that all records relevant to this issue are being retained in full.

Our response confirms that the records we hold are in accordance with our retention policy which sets out what we must keep and why. We believe that this is retaining all records in full and that our officer team are aware of their responsibilities in relation to appropriate record keeping. We are not required to conduct searches that would be unreasonable or disproportionate to the importance of providing access to the information.

6. Decision maker disclosure is incomplete

You state the decision not to clarify TRJ's claim was made by the Assistant Director for Communications, and that this was verbal with no internal communications. Please search and disclose any diary entries, Teams calls, calendar items, action logs, meeting agendas, minutes, or file notes. If none exist, confirm that no record was created and explain why a decision of that nature was not recorded, given the Section 46 Code.

Response:

This response is not incomplete. The original request asked, 'Who determined that NECA would not clarify the funding claim, and on what basis'. The response answers that question directly. There are no records of conversations which take place between individuals.

7. Substantive inconsistency

Your response states that TRJ has not directly received funding from NECA, then states that TRJ received £13,764.50 and £13,253.29 as a named delivery partner. This is hair splitting that undermines transparency. For public purposes, those are public funds routed to TRJ as part of NECA-managed programmes. Please correct the record or provide the authority's definition of "directly" and how it is applied in reporting.

Response:

We believe it is important to be accurate in describing how our funds are allocated and consider that

response appropriate because the North East CA has not directly entered into a grant agreement with the Recruitment Junction.

Right of Complaint

If you remain dissatisfied with this response, you have the right to appeal the decision to the Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) The ICO is an independent body responsible for overseeing compliance with the Freedom of Information Act. You can contact the ICO using the details below:

Information Commissioner's Office

Wycliffe House

Water Lane

Wilmslow

Cheshire

SK9 5AF

Phone: 0303 123 1113

<https://ico.org.uk/global/contact-us/>

Kind regards



Freedom of Information

foi@northeast-ca.gov.uk

www.northeast-ca.gov.uk

From: The Reasonable Adjustment <advocacy@thereasonableadjustment.co.uk>

Sent: 09 September 2025 15:56

To: FOI (North East CA) <FOI@northeast-ca.gov.uk>

Cc: Mayors Office (North East CA) <mayorsoffice@northeast-ca.gov.uk>; Complaints (North East CA)

<Complaints@northeast-ca.gov.uk>

Subject: Internal Review Request, FOI NECA 2508 176, Section 10 breach and inadequate disclosure

You don't often get email from advocacy@thereasonableadjustment.co.uk. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear FOI Officer,

I request an internal review of **FOI NECA 2508 176** on the following grounds.

1) Section 10 breach

The 20 working days run from the day after receipt of a valid request. My request was made on **08 Aug 2025** and met Section 8. Day one was **11 Aug 2025**. The deadline was **08 Sept 2025**. NECA is out of time.

2) Inadequate disclosure under Section 1

You supplied two figures and general narrative only. You did not provide the recorded information that underpins those statements. Please disclose, for each listed award and delivery partner arrangement:

- Award letters, grant agreements, decision papers, and any schedules or variations
- Payment schedules, claims, remittance advice, output and monitoring returns, compliance reports
- Correspondence with Rocket Science and with North of Tyne, including emails, Teams messages, letters, and meeting notes where held on behalf of NECA
- Internal approvals or sign-offs, conflicts declarations, risk assessments, and any clawback terms
- Project codes, unique identifiers, and dates of each payment

If NECA holds the information **on its behalf** where Rocket Science was the managing agent, that information is in scope. If you contend it is not held by or for NECA, please identify the holder and explain the basis. If retrieval is feasible, your duty to advise and assist requires you to do so.

3) Section 11 format preference not met

I asked for machine readable disclosure. Please provide tabular data in CSV or XLSX and documents as searchable PDFs.

4) Section 16 duty to advise and assist

No engagement on refinement or structure. If you believe Section 12 cost limit might apply, you must advise and assist with a reasonable narrowing, not wait until after a breach.

5) Record preservation and Section 77 risk

You linked to a retention policy, but you did not confirm that all records within scope have been preserved. Please provide a written confirmation that a hold is in place and list the locations searched and to be searched, for example email, Teams, SharePoint, network drives, OneNote, local archives, contractor portals.

6) Decision maker disclosure is incomplete

You state the decision not to clarify TRJ's claim was made by the Assistant Director for Communications, and that this was verbal with no internal communications. Please search and disclose any diary entries, Teams calls, calendar items, action logs, meeting agendas, minutes, or file notes. If none exist, confirm that no record was created and explain why a decision of that nature was not recorded, given the Section 46 Code.

7) Substantive inconsistency

Your response states that TRJ has not directly received funding from NECA, then states that TRJ received £13,764.50 and £13,253.29 as a named delivery partner. This is hair splitting that undermines transparency. For public purposes, those are public funds routed to TRJ as part of NECA-managed programmes. Please correct the record or provide the authority’s definition of “directly” and how it is applied in reporting.

Remedy sought

- Full disclosure as listed above, in the requested formats
- Corrected handling on the statutory clock and a written acknowledgment of the breach
- A clear confirmation of record preservation
- An explanation of steps taken to ensure future decisions of this nature are recorded

Given the breach and public interest, please conclude the internal review within **10 working days**.

Kind regards,
Kieron JH
Founder, The Reasonable Adjustment

--

The Reasonable Adjustment

An independent advocacy platform politely causing confusion for disorganised institutions, one lawful request at a time.

Lived Experience Advocate | Neurodivergence, Disability, Data Rights

 advocacy@thereasonableadjustment.co.uk

 www.thereasonableadjustment.co.uk

We offer **free peer-led advocacy** to neurodivergent, disabled, and marginalised people who've been mistreated or ignored by the systems meant to support them.

This email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the recipient. If you have received this email in error, please immediately notify the sender and delete it from your system. If you require further details regarding how we protect and manage our data please view our Privacy Policy here: <https://northeast-ca.gov.uk/privacy-policy> and our Cookie Policy here: <https://northeast-ca.gov.uk/cookie-policy>. For details of other policies and procedures, please visit our website at www.northeast-ca.gov.uk If you have received this email and you no longer wish to continue receiving emails from the North East Combined Authority (or any of its associated organisations and websites noted in the above named Policy) please notify us and request to unsubscribe by sending your details to enquiries@northeast-ca.gov.uk If your request relates to a Freedom of Information Request this can be directed to FOI@northeast-ca.gov.uk

