

26 October 2023

Dear

ATISN 19089 – Ffos-y-Fran.

Thank you for your request submitted on 28 September, which I received on 29 September 2023.

Your request asked for:

- Please share any ministerial advice dated 28/07/23, for decision by the Minister for Climate Change, copied to the First Minister, and cleared by Neil Hemington from Planning Directorate.

The information caught by your request constitutes environmental information and has been considered for disclosure under the Environmental Information Regulations (“EIRs”). I have enclosed with this letter some of the information you requested as identified in the disclosure list. I have, however, decided some of the information described in the enclosed list is exempt from disclosure under Regulations 12(5)(b) and 13 of the EIRs. The reasons, for applying these exemptions is set out in full at Annex 1 to this letter.

Next steps

If you are dissatisfied with the Welsh Government’s handling of your request, you can ask for an internal review within 40 working days of the date of this response. Requests for an internal review should be addressed to the Welsh Government’s Freedom of Information Officer at:

Information Rights Unit,
Welsh Government,
Cathays Park,
Cardiff,
CF10 3NQ

or Email: Freedom.ofinformation@gov.wales

Please remember to quote the ATISN reference number above.

You also have the right to complain to the Information Commissioner. The Information Commissioner can be contacted at:

Information Commissioner’s Office,
Wycliffe House,
Water Lane,
Wilmslow,
Cheshire,
SK9 5AF.

However, please note that the Commissioner will not normally investigate a complaint until it has been through our own internal review process.

Any information released under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 or Environmental Information Regulations 2004 will be listed in the Welsh Government's Disclosure Log (at <https://gov.wales/about/open-government/freedom-of-information/responses/?lang=en>).

Yours sincerely,

Regulation 12(5)(b) - Course of justice, fair trial, criminal or disciplinary inquiry

Regulation 12(5)(b) provides an exception to the general duty to disclose environmental information where a disclosure would adversely affect the course of justice, the ability of a person to receive a fair trial or the ability of a public authority to conduct an enquiry of a criminal or disciplinary nature.

The course of justice is very wide in its coverage, and the other points may be viewed as subsets of that element. In *Rudd v the Information Commissioner & the Verderers of the New Forest* (EA/2008/0020, 29 September 2008), the Information Tribunal commented that 'the course of justice' does not refer to a specific course of action but is "a more generic concept somewhat akin to 'the smooth running of the wheels of justice'".

Advice subject to Legal Professional Privilege (LPP) falls within that general concept of the "course of justice" and, as such, may be exempt under regulation 12(5)(b), subject to the presumption in favour of disclosure and the public interest test. For regulation 12(5)(b) to apply to legally privileged information, the public authority must demonstrate that disclosure of the requested information would have an adverse effect on the course of justice.

The Welsh Government believes that release of correspondence between Legal Services, Government Legal Department and Planning Directorate that relates to the seeking and provision of legal advice and, as such, is subject to LPP, should be exempt from disclosure as we believe disclosure would likely result in harm.

First, the Welsh Government is of the firm view that it is highly important to maintain LPP and that, in the absence of at least equally strong countervailing considerations, any attempt to undermine the principle of LPP would result in substantial harm to the ability of the Welsh Government to obtain fulsome advice from its legal advisors. In the ICO Decision Notice FER0220864 (dated March 31 2010), the Commissioner clearly states:

"Legal professional privilege (LPP) is not defined by the Act or in any other legislation. It is a common law concept shaped by the courts over time. It is intended to provide confidentiality between professional legal advisers and clients to ensure openness between them and safeguard access to fully informed, realistic, candid and frank legal advice, including potential weaknesses and counter arguments. LPP belongs to the client and material protected by LPP cannot ordinarily be revealed without the consent of the client, even to a court".

We also note the case of *Bellamy v the Information Commissioner and the DTI* [EA/2005/0023] in which the Tribunal, on the subject of LPP, said:

"there is a strong element of public interest inbuilt into the privilege itself. At least equally strong countervailing considerations would need to be adduced to override that inbuilt interest....it is important that public authorities be allowed to conduct a free exchange of views as to their legal rights and obligations with those advising them without fear of intrusion, save in the most clear case...".

We believe that disclosure of the information would more likely than not adversely affect the course of justice. This is because it would involve public access to privileged information between Government Ministers and officials and their legal advisors.

Release would undermine the general principles of legal professional privilege and of the administration of justice within government.

The exception is therefore considered to have met the qualification, and the release of information is considered under the public interest test. This will consider the balance of the public interest in maintaining the exception over disclosing the information.

Public interest arguments in favour of disclosure

We recognise that there is a general public interest in openness of information and transparency in the working of government. The release of advice provided prior to reaching the decision is conducive to the effective conduct of public affairs in providing openness of information and transparency in the planning process. We believe there is a general public interest in the disclosure of information as greater transparency makes Government more accountable and there is a public interest in being able to assess the quality of information and advice which is used in decision making. We recognise the increased public interest in decisions which impact upon the places in which people live and work.

Finally, we appreciate that in order for the public to be appropriately equipped to challenge the decisions and activities of public authorities and demand greater accountability, they need to be properly informed. The disclosure of information can go a long way to helping promote this empowerment.

In this particular case, it involves the continued mining of coal at the Ffos-y-Fran opencast site in Merthyr Tydfil, which many residents living around the site consider could harm their surrounding environment. An understanding of the legal basis of the assessment process undertaken would allow them to come to their own view about whether the safety of the environment has been properly safeguarded.

Public interest arguments in favour of withholding

There is a strong public interest in the protection of the principle of LPP which allows Government to consult their lawyers in confidence, to be able to share information fully and frankly and to seek and obtain advice with the knowledge that such advice is privileged. Government needs to take decisions in a fully informed legal context and it is necessary for its lawyers to be able to fully explore the relevant arguments. To ensure that lawyers, officials and Ministers are free to fully examine the various alternatives, their deliberations, and the legal advice that underpins those deliberations, should be protected.

The public need to have trust that discussions they may have with their legal advisors can be properly protected. Any erosion, therefore, of the principle of confidentiality of LPP, particularly where they relate to ongoing, live, matters, is not in the wider public interest.

Balance of public interest test

While we acknowledge the public interest arguments in favour of disclosure as discussed above, we consider that the public interest balance in this case falls on the side of not disclosing the legal advice the Directorate has sought and received.

Regulation 13– Personal data

Regulation 13(1) together with the conditions in Regulation 13(2)(a)(i) and 13(2)(a)(ii) provides an absolute exemption if disclosure of the personal data would breach any of the data protection principles.

'Personal data' is defined in sections 3(2) and (3) of the Data Protection Act 2018 ('the DPA 2018') and means any information relating to an identified or identifiable living individual. An identifiable living individual is one who can be identified, directly or indirectly, in particular by reference to an identifier such as a name, an identification number, location data, an online identifier or to one or more factors specific to the physical, physiological, genetic, mental, economic, cultural or social identity of the individual.

We have concluded that, in this instance, the information requested contains third party personal data.

Under Regulation 13(1) of the EIRs, personal data is exempt from release if disclosure would breach one of the data protection principles set out in Article 5 of the GDPR. We consider the principle being most relevant in this instance as being the first. This states that personal data must be:

"processed lawfully, fairly and in a transparent manner in relation to the data subject"

The lawful basis that is most relevant in relation to a request for information under the FOIA is Article 6(1)(f). This states:

"processing is necessary for the purposes of the legitimate interests pursued by the controller or by a third party except where such interests are overridden by the interests or fundamental rights and freedoms of the data subject which require protection of personal data, in particular where the data subject is a child".

In considering the application of Article 6(1)(f) in the context of a request for information under FOIA it is necessary to consider the following three-part test:

- **The Legitimate interest test:** Whether a legitimate interest is being pursued in the request for information;
- **The Necessity test:** Whether disclosure of the information/confirmation or denial that it is held is necessary to meet the legitimate interest in question;
- **The Balancing test:** Whether the above interests override the interests, fundamental rights and freedoms of the data subject.

1. Legitimate interests

We have been unable to identify a legitimate interest the requester may have in accessing the personal data of those mentioned in the advice to the Minister.

2. Necessity test

We do not believe it is necessary to release the personal data for the advice to the Minister to be understood.

3. Balancing test

As we don't believe there is neither a legitimate interest nor is it necessary to release the personal data, we are of the view that disclosure would breach the GDPRs and, as such, should be withheld under Reg 13.