

Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA)

Decision notice

Date: 10 March 2014

Public Authority: Chief Constable of Cumbria Constabulary
Address: Cumbria Constabulary Headquarters
Carleton Hall
Penrith
Cumbria
CA10 2AU

Decision (including any steps ordered)

1. The complainant requested information from Cumbria Constabulary about four visits to the area by members of the Royal family. Cumbria Constabulary advised that it does not hold all the requested information. However it confirmed that it held information about overtime costs incurred in relation to three of the visits enquired about. It refused to disclose that information citing sections 24(1) (national security), 31(1)(a) (law enforcement) and 38(1)(a) and (b) (health and safety) of the FOIA.
2. The Commissioner's decision is that Cumbria Constabulary withheld the information incorrectly.
3. The Commissioner requires Cumbria Constabulary to disclose the withheld overtime information to the complainant to ensure compliance with the legislation.
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. On 4 June 2013 the complainant wrote to Cumbria Constabulary with a request for information about a visit by the Duchess of Cambridge:

"Please can you provide me (as a Freedom of information request) with the total cost of the Royal visit from The Duchess of Cambridge on 21st March 2013 to Cumbria and if possible, a breakdown of that cost?"

Areas for consideration of cost may be, but not limited to:

1. Security

Including cost of police, risk assessments and health and safety considerations, road closures, crowd safety, barriers etc.

2. Catering

Including cost of food and drink, catering staff wages and equipment (hired and/or purchased) etc.

3. Organisation

Including cost of time spent by staff to arrange the visit, 'rest' facilities, building hire, administration and stationary costs, cost of any gifts, mementos or souvenirs, transport and stewarding etc.

Please could you also inform me if any of the cost was met by any other organisations or bodies or if you received any donations to help meet the cost, or received any sponsorship, who this was from and how much was given?"

6. The complainant made the same request - requesting information about security, catering and organisation - in relation to two other visits. Full details of the requests are contained in the annex to this decision notice.

7. In short, on 4 June 2013 the complainant requested:

"Please can you provide me (as a Freedom of information request) with the total cost of the Royal visit from The Prince Charles on 28th March 2013 to Cumbria and if possible, a breakdown of that cost?"

8. Similarly, on 27 June 2013 she requested:

"Please can you provide me (as a Freedom of information request) with the total cost of the Royal visit from the Duke of Kent on 7th May 2013 to Barrow-in-Furness and if possible, a breakdown of that cost?"

9. Requesting similar information in relation to a fourth visit, on 4 June 2013 the complainant made the following request:

"Please can you provide me (as a Freedom of information request) with the total cost of the Royal visit from Prince William and His wife, the Duchess of Cambridge on 5th April 2013 to Barrow-in-Furness and if possible, a breakdown of that cost?"

Areas for consideration of cost may be, but not limited to:

1. Security

Including cost of police, risk assessments and health and safety considerations, road closures, crowd safety, barriers etc.

2. Organisation

Including cost of time spent by staff to arrange the visit, 'rest' facilities, building hire, administration and stationary costs, cost of any gifts, mementous or souvenirs, transport and stewarding etc.

Please could you also inform me if any of the cost was met by any other organisations or bodies or if you received any donations to help meet the cost, or received any sponsorship, who this was from and how much was given?"

10. Cumbria Constabulary provided a single response to the four requests on 22 July 2013. It stated that it does not hold information relating to the total cost of each of the visits enquired about. It confirmed, however, that it holds information relating to the cost of overtime paid in respect of three of the visits – those on 28 March, 5 April and 7 May 2013. However, it refused to disclose that information, citing the following exemptions of FOIA:

- section 24(1) – National Security
- section 31(1)(a) – Law Enforcement
- section 38(1)(a)(b) – Health and Safety.

11. Following an internal review, Cumbria Constabulary wrote to the complainant on 5 September 2013. It upheld its original position in respect of the total cost of each of the visits and with respect to its citing of exemptions in relation to information about payments made for overtime. It also confirmed that it does not hold any information relating to payments or sponsorship received.

Scope of the case

12. The complainant contacted the Commissioner on 13 September 2013 to complain about the way part (1) of her requests for information had been handled.

13. In bringing her complaint to the Commissioner's attention, she told him:

"I do not accept the two reasons they give for turning the request down.... The first one being that they do not hold the informationThe second reason they give for not releasing this information is that it might be harmful to members of the royal family".

14. In correspondence with the Commissioner, the complainant said:

"... I am not asking for the yearly overall cost of security for the royals, just the cost of the individual visits themselves. I am also not asking details such as how many police officers were involved and what kinds etc, just the cost. I therefore fail to see how this information could pose a threat..."

15. The Commissioner understands from the complainant that some police forces would appear to have complied with similar requests for information. She referred to such information being provided *"either through freedom of information requests or freely to the press"*. However, the Commissioner does not consider that this sets an automatic precedent for disclosure under the FOIA. In his view, each case must be considered on its merits.

16. The Commissioner notes that the wording of each of the requests in this case states *"the total cost"* of the specified royal visits as well as stating *"and if possible a breakdown of that cost"*. The requests also seek to establish if any of the cost was met by organisations other than the Constabulary.

17. He also notes that, when requesting an internal review, the complainant told Cumbria Constabulary:

"Thank you for your response to my 4 FOI requests regarding the cost of recent royal visits in 2013.....The reasons I do not accept this decision is that the requests were only asking for the details of the cost for one specific visit, not the overall cost of security for the royals in question, or any other member of the royal family".

18. In this case, Cumbria Constabulary told the complainant that the only recorded cost in respect of the visits specified in the request relates to the visits on 28 March, 5 April and 7 May 2013.

19. During the course of the Commissioner's investigation, Cumbria Constabulary confirmed that the result of its enquiries was that:
- "the only recorded costs relating to the visits was in relation to overtime for all of the visits referred to above, with the exception of the visit of the Duchess of Cambridge on 21st March".*
20. Accordingly, the Commissioner considers the scope of his investigation to be whether Cumbria Constabulary is correct to say that it does not hold any relevant information which would enable it to answer the request about the visit by the Duchess of Cambridge on 21 March 2013.
21. The Commissioner has also considered whether Cumbria Constabulary correctly applied sections 24, 31 and 38 to the information it confirmed it holds – details of overtime payments made in connection with the visits which took place on 28 March, 5 April and 7 May 2013

Reasons for decision

Section 1 general right of access

22. Section 1 of FOIA states that:

"Any person making a request for information to a public authority is entitled –

(a) to be informed in writing by the public authority whether it holds information of the description specified in the request, and

(b) if that is the case, to have that information communicated to him."

23. In response to its statement that it does not hold information that would answer her request the complainant told the Commissioner:

"I don't think that it is credible that they aren't keeping this info – or at least something close to it... as they must have to plan staffing for the event and have budgets they work with".

24. She also expressed the view that:

"a royal visit is not a day to day occurrence and so the Police officers involved would have been taken away from what they would have been otherwise doing that day, if there hadn't been a royal visit. And therefore that is a cost to the public".

25. In correspondence with the complainant, Cumbria Constabulary explained:

"... staffing for organising and policing such events is, in the main, provided by police officers as part of their everyday policing duties".

26. It also advised:

"Whilst careful preparation does go into the planning of a royal visit, and other pre-planned high profile events for which a police presence is required, this does not mean that the total cost of policing such an event is recorded".

27. Similarly, Cumbria Constabulary told the Commissioner:

"The policing of a Royal visit is predominantly performed by police officers as part of their everyday policing duties".

28. The Commissioner finds it understandable that members of the public may well consider that such events need to be planned and separately budgeted for.

29. The Commissioner has sought to determine whether, on the balance of probabilities, Cumbria Constabulary holds any relevant information which would enable it to answer the request about the visit by the Duchess of Cambridge. Applying the civil test of the balance of probabilities is in line with the approach taken by the Information Rights Tribunal when it has considered the issue of whether information is held in past cases.

30. In deciding where the balance of probabilities lies, the Commissioner will consider the searches carried out by the public authority, in terms of the extent of the searches, the quality of the searches, their thoroughness and results the searches yielded. He will also consider any other information or explanation offered by the public authority which is relevant to his determination.

31. With respect to having processes in place to capture relevant costs, Cumbria Constabulary explained in its substantive response to the Commissioner:

"No such processes were in place within Cumbria Constabulary in advance of any of the visits referred to above and to date there has been no business need for the Constabulary to capture this information".

32. It also provided the Commissioner with information about the nature of the enquiries conducted for any relevant information which would enable

it to answer the request, including with respect to the department(s) consulted.

33. The Commissioner has considered the nature of the searches that have been conducted. He has also considered Cumbria Constabulary's reasons for saying that no information is held in respect of the request about the visit by the Duchess of Cambridge.
34. While appreciating the complainant's frustration that Cumbria Constabulary cannot answer that request because it does not hold the specific information she has asked for, the Commissioner is mindful of the comments made by the Information Tribunal in the case of *Johnson / MoJ* (EA2006/0085) that the FOIA:

"does not extend to what information the public authority should be collecting nor how they should be using the technical tools at their disposal, but rather it is concerned with the disclosure of the information they do hold".
35. On the basis of the evidence provided to him, the Commissioner is satisfied that Cumbria Constabulary does not hold any relevant information which would enable it to answer her request about that visit.

Withheld information

36. The Commissioner has next considered whether Cumbria Constabulary correctly applied exemptions to the information it confirmed it holds. That information comprises information relating to the cost of overtime paid in respect of policing the three other Royal visits specified in the complainant's requests - visits which took place on 28 March, 5 April and 7 May 2013.
37. Cumbria Constabulary confirmed that it considers that sections 24(1), 31(1)(a) and 38(1)(a) and (b) apply to that information. The Commissioner has first considered the Cumbria Constabulary's application of section 24(1).

Section 24 national security

38. Section 24(1) of the FOIA states:

"Information which does not fall within section 23(1) [information supplied by, or relating to, bodies dealing with security matters] is exempt information if exemption from section 1(1)(b) is required for the purpose of safeguarding the national security".
39. Section 1(1)(b) is the subsection which relates to the public authority having a duty to communicate information to the requester.

40. In broad terms, section 24(1) allows a public authority not to disclose information if it considers that the release of the information would make the United Kingdom or its citizens vulnerable to a national security threat.
41. When investigating complaints about the application of section 24(1), the Commissioner will need to be satisfied that the exemption from the duty to communicate the information is required for the purpose of safeguarding national security.
42. The approach of the Commissioner is that *required* in this context means reasonably necessary. It is not sufficient for the information sought simply to relate to national security, there must be a clear basis for arguing that disclosure would have an adverse effect on national security before the exemption can be engaged.
43. In the Commissioner's view, safeguarding national security includes, amongst other things, protecting potential targets even if there is no evidence that an attack is imminent.
44. In this case, the Constabulary explained to the complainant:

"The release of information which relates directly to the costs of security would result in harm to the national security of the United Kingdom. Releasing costs associated with the protection of any members of the Royal Family would provide those persons intent on committing acts of terrorism with valuable information as to the level of resistance they might expect to counter when undertaking such an act. Someone could reasonably infer comparable protection levels with other public figures whose receipt of protection is a matter of public record, namely the Prime Minister and The Queen. The costs of these protections remain undisclosed for the same reasons of national security, health and safety and law enforcement. Disclosing the information sought would also give valuable tactical information to those who seek to harm such figures.

The release of information which might assist a potential terrorist in planning an attack on a Member of the Royal Family, including the possibility of identifying protection surrounding the Head of State, her Heirs and the Prime Minister, would threaten the prime institution of the United Kingdom's constitutional arrangements, and thus the nation's security".

45. Cumbria Constabulary told the Commissioner that, in its view, "the disclosure of ANY information relating to the security provided for such

visits could start to identify or allow others to speculate” about the levels of security afforded to them.

46. It provided the Commissioner with further submissions in support of its view as to the risks which exist around the protection of the Royal family and why disclosing costs associated with such visits could assist in forming an overview of security arrangements. For example, it described the importance of publicly available information to individuals or groups gathering intelligence to commit criminal acts including terrorism.

47. In Cumbria Constabulary’s view:

“disclosure of the requested information places a piece of intelligence – one that would be of use to those with terrorist or criminal intent – into the public domain where it may be easily accessed and used to inform and plan terrorist or criminal activities”.

48. With respect to spend on Royal visits across all UK police forces, Cumbria Constabulary explained that while such figures may seem potentially harmless in isolation:

“If one cost is higher or lower than the other, an inference can immediately be drawn that greater policing is afforded to one than the other”.

49. It also argued that, while the requests in this case relate to members of the Royal Family, disclosure of the withheld information could potentially also impact on *“other protected individuals”*.

50. When deciding whether the section 24 exemption is engaged, it is the potential value of the disputed information in the hands of those who constitute a threat to national security that must be considered. There is no requirement for the public authority to demonstrate that there is a specific and imminent threat from disclosure, it is sufficient that the public authority has been able to demonstrate that the disputed information, in the wrong hands, could indirectly create a real possibility of harm to national security.

51. The Commissioner has considered the lengthy arguments provided by Cumbria Constabulary in this case. He recognises the strength of such arguments in respect of safeguarding the security of the United Kingdom and its people both from acts of terrorism and from the threat posed by lone individuals.

52. For example, the Commissioner recognises that terrorists can be highly motivated and may go to great lengths to gather intelligence. He

acknowledges that gathering information from publicly available sources may well be a strategy used by those planning terrorist activities.

53. In reaching his conclusion in this case, the Commissioner does not dispute the very real risks which exist around the protection of the Royal family and other high profile individuals. Nor does he dispute the potential for threats to be made to public figures. In cases involving the section 24 exemption the Commissioner recognises that, depending on the circumstances, there may be grounds for withholding what seems harmless information. For example it may be necessary to withhold it on the basis that it may assist terrorists or lone individuals when pieced together with other information they may obtain.
54. However, the Commissioner is mindful that the withheld information in this case comprises recorded information about the cost of overtime to Cumbria Constabulary in respect of policing each of four specified visits. He notes that Cumbria Constabulary has confirmed that it does not hold the total cost of the visits and has explained that the organising and policing of such events is carried out – in the main – by police officers as part of their everyday duties.
55. In the context of this case, having considered the arguments and viewed the withheld information, the Commissioner does not accept that an exemption from disclosure of this information is required to safeguard national security. Therefore the Commissioner finds that the exemption is not engaged.

Section 31 law enforcement

56. The Commissioner has next considered Cumbria Constabulary's application of section 31 to the withheld information.
57. Section 31 provides a prejudice based exemption which protects a variety of law enforcement interests. For the exemption to be engaged it must be at least likely that the prejudice identified would occur. Even if the exemption is engaged, the information should be disclosed unless the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosure.
58. In this case Cumbria Constabulary considers section 31(1)(a) applies. That section states:

"Information which is not exempt information by virtue of section 30 is exempt information if its disclosure under this Act would, or would be likely to, prejudice -

(a) the prevention or detection of crime".

59. Cumbria Constabulary told the Commissioner that it considers that the exemptions afforded by section 31(1)(a) and 24(1) "*are very closely related*". He notes that the reasons put forward by Cumbria Constabulary in support of its view that section 31 is engaged in this case are very similar to its submissions in relation to section 24.
60. In order for a prejudice based exemption, such as section 31, to be engaged the Commissioner considers that three criteria must be met.
- 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.
 - 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 to discharge.

The applicable interests

61. The public authority must show that the prejudice it is envisaging affects the particular interest that the exemption is designed to protect.
62. In applying this exemption, Cumbria Constabulary told the complainant:
- "any physical attack on any person, regardless of whether they are a member of the Royal Family or not, is a crime and therefore where release would harm their safety (or that of any other person) section 31(1)(a) is engaged"*.
63. By way of explanation, it told the Commissioner that it considers the exemption applies because disclosure in this case would prejudice the prevention or detection of crimes linked to national security.
64. The Commissioner accepts that Cumbria Constabulary's arguments relate to the law enforcement activity that the exemption is designed to protect.

The nature of the prejudice

65. Cumbria Constabulary told the complainant:

"Disclosing the cost for providing security to any named Members of the Royal Family would have the effect of disclosing the level of policing and/or security resources that are assigned to these specific people. This would compromise personal safety arrangements, as it would enable those wishing to circumvent those arrangements to form an assessment of the level of protection provided."

The likelihood of the prejudice occurring

66. Cumbria Constabulary confirmed that it considers the higher limb of the exemption – would prejudice – applies in this case.

Is the exemption engaged? Would disclosure prejudice law enforcement?

67. In the Commissioner's view, the exemption provided by section 31(1)(a) serves to protect society from crime. It can therefore be used to withhold information that would make anyone more vulnerable to crime. In considering whether the exemption is engaged, the Commissioner recognises that account can be taken of any harm likely to arise if the requested information were put together with other information.

68. In the circumstances of this case, having considered the disputed information – recorded overtime for each of three specific visits - and Cumbria Constabulary's arguments with respect to section 31(1)(a), the Commissioner does not find it plausible that the disclosure of the amounts of money spent on overtime would be prejudicial to law enforcement. It follows that he does not find the exemption engaged.

Section 38 health and safety

69. Section 38(1) of the FOIA provides that:

"Information is exempt information if its disclosure under this Act, would, or would be likely to –

(a) endanger the physical or mental health of any individual, or

(b) endanger the safety of any individual".

70. For the exemption to be engaged it must be at least likely that the prejudice identified would occur. Even if the exemption is engaged, the information should be disclosed unless the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosure.

71. In this case, Cumbria Constabulary considers that section 38(1)(a) and (b) apply to the withheld information *"as it is the consequence of any failure to prevent and detect crime"*. In other words it considers that disclosure of the information would, or would be likely to, endanger the physical health of an individual or endanger the safety of an individual as a consequence of crime.

The applicable interests

72. Cumbria Constabulary told the complainant:

"If Cumbria Constabulary was to provide costs of providing security to these named Royal figures it would compromise personal safety arrangements for these specific individuals. There is also the possibility of a mosaic effect being established whereby disclosed information could be matched with unofficial information to form comparisons with other Royal and public figures that may or may not be in receipt of protective security arrangements.

The release of information will also reveal policing tactics regarding these key figures of the Royal Family and could be used to form part of a wider assessment of levels of protection afforded to others not subject to this request. The release of this information would therefore be to the detriment of another who may not be in receipt of similar levels of protection".

The nature of the prejudice

73. Cumbria Constabulary told the complainant:

"To reveal information which exposes levels of protection to those persons intent on causing harm would increase the risk of harm to those individuals and to others who may be caught up in an attack, such as the Royal Family staff and members of the public".

The likelihood of the prejudice occurring

74. With respect to which limb of the exemption it considers applies in this case, Cumbria Constabulary told the complainant:

"The release of the information requested would endanger the physical health of individuals concerned".

Is the exemption engaged?

75. The Commissioner takes the view that the phrase "would or would be likely to" prejudice or endanger means that there should be evidence of

a significant risk to the physical or mental health or the safety of any individual.

76. In this case, the Commissioner's view is that Cumbria Constabulary has not provided cogent arguments to demonstrate how disclosure of the withheld information would endanger either the physical health or the safety of an individual. He is not satisfied that Cumbria Constabulary has evidenced a significant risk to the physical health or safety of any individual. He therefore finds that Cumbria Constabulary has failed to demonstrate a causal link between the disclosure of the withheld information and endangerment.
77. He therefore finds that the section 38 exemption is also not engaged in this case..

Other matters

78. From reading the correspondence, in the Commissioner's view there appears to have been some uncertainty in the minds of those handling these requests as to what cost information was actually requested - the total cost to Cumbria Constabulary of policing the visit or the total cost of the visit.
79. For example, Cumbria Constabulary told the Commissioner:
- "The Constabulary would have no reason to record such costs incurred by those other organisations if that were the case".*
80. The Commissioner considers it is implicit from the terms in which the requests were framed that the requester was seeking the total cost to Cumbria Constabulary of policing the specified visits rather than the total cost of the visits, including costs incurred by any other organisations that may have been involved in arranging/policing them. Unless recorded by Cumbria Constabulary, which the Commissioner considers would have been extremely unlikely, any costs incurred by other organisations would be out of scope of the request.
81. The Commissioner would take the opportunity to remind Cumbria Constabulary and other public authorities that, in circumstances where there is some doubt as to the information requested, section 1(3) of the FOIA makes explicit provision for seeking clarification. In addition public authorities must be mindful of their duty under section 16 is to provide applicants with advice and assistance when making information requests.

Right of appeal

82. 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: GRC@hmcts.gsi.gov.uk

Website: www.justice.gov.uk/tribunals/general-regulatory-chamber

83. 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.
84. 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

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

Annex

Full details of the four requests for information made by the complainant to Cumbria Constabulary are as follows:

On 4 June 2013, the complainant requested:

"Please can you provide me (as a Freedom of information request) with the total cost of the Royal visit from Prince William and His wife, the Duchess of Cambridge on 5th April 2013 to Barrow-in-Furness and if possible, a breakdown of that cost?"

Areas for consideration of cost may be, but not limited to

1. Security

Including cost of police, risk assessments and health and safety considerations, road closures, crowd safety, barriers etc.

2. Organisation

Including cost of time spent by staff to arrange the visit, rest facilities, building hire, administration and stationary costs, cost of any gifts, momentous or souvenirs, transport and stewarding etc.

Please could you also inform me if any of the cost was met by any other organisations or bodies or if you received any donations to help meet the cost, or received any sponsorship, who this was from and how much was given?"

The complainant made a second request for information on 4 June 2013:

"Please can you provide me (as a Freedom of information request) with the total cost of the Royal visit from The Duchess of Cambridge on 21st March 2013 to Cumbria and if possible, a breakdown of that cost?"

Areas for consideration of cost may be, but not limited to

1. Security

Including cost of police, risk assessments and health and safety considerations, road closures, crowd safety, barriers etc.

2. Catering

Including cost of food and drink, catering staff wages and equipment (hired and/or purchased) etc.

3. Organisation

Including cost of time spent by staff to arrange the visit, rest facilities, building hire, administration and stationary costs, cost of any gifts, momentous or souvenirs, transport and stewarding etc.

Please could you also inform me if any of the cost was met by any other organisations or bodies or if you received any donations to help meet the cost, or received any sponsorship, who this was from and how much was given?"

The complainant made a third request on the same date:

"Please can you provide me (as a Freedom of information request) with the total cost of the Royal visit from The Prince Charles on 28th March 2013 to Cumbria and if possible, a breakdown of that cost?"

Areas for consideration of cost may be, but not limited to

1. Security

Including cost of police, risk assessments and health and safety considerations, road closures, crowd safety, barriers etc.

2. Catering

Including cost of food and drink, catering staff wages and equipment (hired and/or purchased) etc.

3. Organisation

Including cost of time spent by staff to arrange the visit, rest facilities, building hire, administration and stationary costs, cost of any gifts, momentous or souvenirs, transport and stewarding etc.

Please could you also inform me if any of the cost was met by any other organisations or bodies or if you received any donations to help meet the cost, or received any sponsorship, who this was from and how much was given?"

On 27 June 2013 she wrote to Cumbria Constabulary with the following request:

"Please can you provide me (as a Freedom of information request) with the total cost of the Royal visit from the Duke of Kent on 7th

May 2013 to Barrow-in-Furness and if possible, a breakdown of that cost?

Areas for consideration of cost may be, but not limited to

1. Security

Including cost of police, risk assessments and health and safety considerations, road closures, crowd safety, barriers etc.

2. Catering

Including cost of food and drink, catering staff wages and equipment (hired and/or purchased) etc.

3. Organisation

Including cost of time spent by staff to arrange the visit, rest facilities, building hire, administration and stationary costs, cost of any gifts, mementos or souvenirs, transport and stewarding etc.

Please could you also inform me if any of the cost was met by any other organisations or bodies or if you received any donations to help meet the cost, or received any sponsorship, who this was from and how much was given?"