

## Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA)

### Decision notice

**Date:** 05 August 2013

**Public Authority:** The British Broadcasting Corporation ('the BBC')

**Address:** 2252 White City  
201 Wood Lane  
London  
W12 7TS

### Decision (including any steps ordered)

---

1. The complainant has requested information on the payment of sponsorship fees to conferences. The BBC explained the information was covered by the derogation and excluded from FOIA.
2. The Commissioner's decision is that this information was held by the BBC for the purposes of 'journalism, art or literature' and did not fall inside FOIA. He therefore upholds the BBC's position and requires no remedial steps to be taken in this case.

### Request and response

---

3. The complainant wrote to the BBC on 25 April and asked:  
*'I am told that the BBC sometimes pays sponsorship money to conferences. How much is paid out on behalf of the BBC Children's Department – CBBC and CBeebies? What does the BBC get in return for sponsorship fees?'*
4. The BBC responded on 24 May 2013. It explained that it believes that the information requested is excluded from the Act because it is held for the purposes of 'journalism, art or literature.'
5. It explained that Part VI of Schedule 1 to FOIA provides that information held by the BBC and the other public service broadcasters is only covered by FOIA if it is held for 'purposes other than those of journalism, art or literature'. It concluded that

the BBC was not required to supply information held for the purposes of creating the BBC's output or information that supports and is closely associated with these creative activities. It therefore would not provide any information in response to the request for information.

## Scope of the case

---

6. On 24 May 2013 the complainant contacted the Commissioner to complain about the way his request for information had been handled. In particular, he challenged the operation of the derogation in this case.
7. He argued that the *'Chair of the Public Accounts Committee, was quite clear ... that the BBC has not been transparent'* and *'the BBC should not enjoy blanket immunity from enquiries, and I am pretty sure that the Commons Public Accounts Committee as well as most of the licence-fee paying public would agree.'*

## Reasons for decision

---

8. Schedule One, Part VI of FOIA provides that the BBC is a public authority for the purposes of FOIA but only has to deal with requests for information in some circumstances. The entry relating to the BBC states:

*"The British Broadcasting Corporation, in respect of information held for purposes other than those of journalism, art or literature."*

9. This means that the BBC has no obligation to comply with part I to V of the Act where information is held for 'purposes of journalism, art or literature'. The Commissioner calls this situation 'the derogation'.
10. The House of Lords in *Sugar v BBC* [2009] UKHL 9 confirmed that the Commissioner has the jurisdiction to issue a decision notice to confirm whether or not the information is caught by the derogation. The Commissioner's analysis will now focus on the derogation.
11. The scope of the derogation was considered by the Court of Appeal in the case *Sugar v British Broadcasting Corporation and another* [2010] EWCA Civ 715, and later, on appeal, by the Supreme Court (*Sugar (Deceased) v British Broadcasting Corporation* [2012] UKSC 4). The leading judgment in the Court of Appeal case was made by Lord Neuberger of Abbotsbury MR who stated that:

*" .... once it is established that the information sought is held by the BBC for the purposes of journalism, it is effectively exempt from production under FOIA, even if the information is also held by the BBC for other purposes." (paragraph 44), and that "...provided there is a genuine journalistic purpose for which the information is held, it should not be subject to FOIA." (paragraph 46)*

12. The Supreme Court endorsed this approach and concluded that if the information is held for the purpose of journalism, art or literature, it is caught by the derogation even if that is not the predominant purpose for holding the information in question.
13. In order to establish whether the information is held for a derogated purpose, the Supreme Court indicated that there should be a sufficiently direct link between at least one of the purposes for which the BBC holds the information (ignoring any negligible purposes) and the fulfilment of one of the derogated purposes. This is the test that the Commissioner will apply.
14. If a sufficiently direct link is established between the purposes for which the BBC holds the information and any of the three derogated purposes – i.e. journalism, art or literature - it is not subject to FOIA.
15. The Supreme Court said that the Information Tribunal's definition of journalism (in *Sugar v Information Commissioner* (EA/2005/0032, 29 August 2006)) as comprising three elements, continues to be authoritative

*"1. The first is the collecting or gathering, writing and verifying of materials for publication.*

*2. The second is editorial. This involves the exercise of judgement on issues such as:*

*\* the selection, prioritisation and timing of matters for broadcast or publication,*

*\* the analysis of, and review of individual programmes,*

*\* the provision of context and background to such programmes.*

*3. The third element is the maintenance and enhancement of the standards and quality of journalism (particularly with respect to accuracy, balance and completeness). This may involve the training and development of individual journalists, the mentoring of less experienced journalists by more experienced colleagues, professional supervision and guidance, and reviews of the standards and quality of particular areas of programme making."*

However, the Supreme Court said this definition should be extended to include the act of broadcasting or publishing the relevant material. This extended definition should be adopted when applying the 'direct link test'.

16. The Supreme Court also explained that "journalism" primarily means the BBC's "output on news and current affairs", including sport, and that "journalism, art or literature" covers the whole of the BBC's output to the public (Lord Walker at paragraph 70). Therefore, in order for the information to be derogated and so fall outside FOIA, there should be a sufficiently direct link between the purpose(s) for which the information is held and the production of the BBC's output and/or the BBC's journalistic or creative activities involved in producing such output.
17. The complainant's request for how much the BBC has paid out on behalf of the BBC Children's Department on sponsoring conferences is well within the expected remit for the purposes of creating content and producing output.
18. The Commissioner considers that the second element of journalism within the definition above, the editorial process, is relevant in this instance. He recognises that the decision to attend conferences relates to editorial decisions about the content that the BBC wants to offer its customers and this in turn relates to the overall editorial decision making process and resource allocation. It is therefore intimately linked to the corporation's output and it is clear that the Commissioner has no jurisdiction in this matter.
19. The decision notices for the case references [FS50404473](#) and [FS50363611](#) are relevant to this request as they also considered requests for information concerning costs. The refusal of the BBC to provide the information was upheld by the Commissioner as he was satisfied that it was held for journalistic purposes and therefore fell under the derogation.
20. The Commissioner has accepted on a number of occasions (such as in case reference ( [FS50314106](#) ) that the BBC has a fixed resource in the Licence Fee and resource allocation goes right to the heart of creative decision making. The Commissioner is satisfied that the same rationale applies in this case.
21. For all of the reasons above, the Commissioner is therefore satisfied that the information requested is derogated. Therefore, the Commissioner has found that the request is for information held for the purposes of journalism and that the BBC was not obliged to comply with Parts I to V of FOIA.

## Right of appeal

---

22. 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: 0116 249 4253

Email: [informationtribunal@hmcts.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:informationtribunal@hmcts.gsi.gov.uk)

Website: [www.justice.gov.uk/guidance/courts-and-tribunals/tribunals/information-rights/index.htm](http://www.justice.gov.uk/guidance/courts-and-tribunals/tribunals/information-rights/index.htm)

23. 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.
24. 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 .....**

**Pamela Clements**  
**Group Manager, Complaints Resolution**  
**Information Commissioner's Office**  
**Wycliffe House**  
**Water Lane**  
**Wilmslow**  
**Cheshire**  
**SK9 5AF**