

Redacted  
under FOI  
exemption  
section 40(2)

1

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 15 August 2016 14:18  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: For comment by Friday 19 August - FOIA - records misplaced whilst on requisition  
**Attachments:** RE: DN 1/33

Dear [REDACTED]

I have tried to send the below message to [REDACTED] but received an undeliverable message. A colleague at TNA [REDACTED] kindly passed to me your contact details as we wondered whether you would be able to assist with the below?

Kind regards

[REDACTED]  
Government and Remote Services Manager  
The National Archives  
[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 15 August 2016 08:08  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** For comment by Friday 19 August - FOIA - records misplaced whilst on requisition

Dear [REDACTED]

We have received an Freedom of Information request which asks for the following information:

*This is a Freedom of Information request regarding public records that have been lost. Please can you give me the numbers of public records lost while out on loan or requisitioned by public bodies over the last 5 years? Please supply this in the form of a table showing the name of the public body and the number of records lost.*

*Please also provide the number of public records lost at or by The National Archives over the last 5 years.*

*I do not need to know the titles or references of records lost, just the numbers.*

In terms of that part of the question that relates to the number of records which have been lost whilst on requisition then TNA has the following record listed as misplaced whilst on requisition to your department during the last five years:

DN 1/33

The response will therefore show that Public Health England (Health Protection Agency) has misplaced 1 record whilst on requisition during the past five years (the attached provides some background to discussions about this record). TNA is contacting all departments that will be included in this response. Please also note that TNA has received several recent FOI requests on misplaced records (although this is the first to ask about records misplaced whilst on requisition) and this theme has been covered in the media: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-36953199>

I would be grateful if you could please let me know whether you have any comments in relation to the above approach before close on **Friday 19 August**.

Many thanks.

Kind regards,

2

Government and Remote Services Manager  
The National Archives

Redacted  
under FOI  
exemption  
section 40(2)

3

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: 25 February 2016 16:07  
To: [REDACTED]  
Cc: [REDACTED]  
Subject: RE: DN 1/33

Redacted  
under FOI  
exemption  
section 40(2)

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for taking some time to check on this record. I think this confirms the position that [REDACTED] found in 2014.

I have a better idea of where this record might now reside (it may be in an old corporate affairs repository area at our Colindale site) after I visited there on Monday. However I don't have the time at present to search through the archive there, nor review some duplicate material that might qualify as a new original.

Can I therefore please suggest that we mark the record as mislaid for the moment (as originally agreed if we hit the end of Feb)? And I will endeavour to track it down or provide a new original past April this year.

Sorry to have taken up even more of your time re this. Kind regards [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: 22 February 2016 12:15  
To: [REDACTED]  
Cc: [REDACTED]  
Subject: DN 1/33

Morning [REDACTED]

Just to keep you updated with what we have been doing this end to trace this file.

I have, this morning, completed a thorough interrogation of our database and, although there is reference to this file, I cannot find any indication as to who ordered the file in January 2010.

There is an email trail between 2 TNA staff members, one of whom is [REDACTED] now retired, who was the IMC for HPA? An email from [REDACTED] in October 2009 says that the HPA contact is [REDACTED] so he might be a good starting point for you?

Regards,

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
GRS Operations Manager

[REDACTED]  
The National Archives, Kew, Richmond, Surrey TW9 4DU  
<http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk>



Redacted  
under FOI  
exemption  
section 40(2)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 19 February 2016 13:05  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Correction - Tracking issue: DN1/33  
**Attachments:** RE: Public Health England

Hi again [REDACTED]

With further apologies – my earlier interpretation was wrong, please ignore my earlier request below to search at TNA.

It appears that this record was indeed sent back by TNA to what was the Health Protection Agency, in January 2010 (please see attached), for re-review by us. There should be a record at your end of the transfer. My fault, as I've not looked at these e-mails for some time.

[REDACTED] was unable to find any evidence in 2014 as to who/where exactly the record was sent to at HPA, which is where the trail goes cold at my end.

I can only please ask again at this point, if there might be any further info at TNA re a HPA recipient in Jan 2010, that might have been missed? I think you've got all the info that [REDACTED] was able to pass to me previously.

I will be searching at Colindale again on Monday and will update. Kind regards, [REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 19 February 2016 11:34  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Tracking issue: DN1/33

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for the quick chat earlier. As discussed, this may be grasping at straws, but the last reference to a location for DN1/33 that I can find anywhere, is in the e-mail trail below that [REDACTED] kindly dug out. I've highlighted some key lines below.

In terms of tracking/tracing, a summary of the below email trail appears to indicate:

- DN1/33 was uplifted from Health Protection Agency to TNA c.2008/9 (incorrectly as an open record)
- TNA [REDACTED] identified it as sensitive/closed in 2009 (?)
- DN1/33 then possibly sent to MoJ Clearing House [REDACTED] for an opinion on sensitivity
- DN1/33 back at TNA with [REDACTED] team. Location in closed document room, October 2009

It's unclear if DN1/33 was then returned to HPA for sensitivity re-review, the contact being [REDACTED] (our current DRO in what's now PHE). As he can recall no file, and we have no trace of it here, I'm wondering if it might still be at TNA after all?

Next steps:

1. If you consider the trail below to justify my request, could I please ask if you could check if the record might still be at Kew, given last known location? I'm aware this was over six years ago, but would be grateful for your help.
2. I shall visit our Colindale site next week and search again either for the original or, failing that, a duplicate we can submit as a new original if it comes to this.
3. I'll endeavour to update you next week with the outcome of my further search.

4. If we cannot trace this at all we will have it marked as misplaced, unless a duplicate can be provided. (S)
5. I agree we will need to do a root cause analysis and lessons learned review, given that this is a closed sensitive record.

Kind regards, [REDACTED]

Redacted  
under FOI  
exemption  
section 40(2)

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: 09 July 2014 14:51  
To: [REDACTED]  
Subject: FW: RE: DN1/33

Hi [REDACTED]

Email chain is below. Although the department mentioned is the Health Protection Agency, (did your department have a name change?) the contact was [REDACTED]

I hope this helps.

[REDACTED]  
Resource, Finance and Business Administration Manager  
[REDACTED]  
The National Archives, Kew, Richmond, Surrey, TW9 4DU  
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: 26 November 2009 14:01  
To: [REDACTED]  
Subject: RE: RE: DN1/33[NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED]

Hi [REDACTED]

Finally got to the bottom of this one – I'm told that we do send departments a list of records that will come open in January, but that this only applies to extended closures. This means that as DN 1/33 is a normal 30 year closure, they would not have received this warning.

TNA does not send out this warning for normal 30 year closures due to the volume of warnings this would produce. Also if the file contains personal information the department should not have transferred it as a normal closure.

Hope this helps.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
Access Adviser  
Transfer and Access Team  
Information Policy and Services Directorate  
The National Archives  
[www.NationalArchives.gov.uk](http://www.NationalArchives.gov.uk)

GRO-C Ext GRO-C

6

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: 26 November 2009 11:41  
To: [REDACTED]  
Subject: FW: RE: DN1/33[NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED]

Redacted  
under FOI  
exemption  
section 40(2)

[REDACTED]  
We spoke.  
It would be good if you could let me know if we ever alerted HPA to the fact that this piece is due to come open next year.  
Best wishes  
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: 09 November 2009 17:55  
To: [REDACTED]  
Cc: [REDACTED]  
Subject: RE: [NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED] RE: DN1/33

Dear [REDACTED]  
  
With apologies for the delay, I have now discussed this with [REDACTED] and as no formal FOI request has been made, this does not fall within our remit as the Department need to request the file back and have their sensitivity reviewers consider it.  
  
We have shown it to [REDACTED] from Clearing House who has raised some concerns over potential sensitivities in the file and therefore recommends it be reviewed by the Department.  
  
If they wish to make an application for the file to be temporarily retained on the catalogue, they will need to liaise with yourself and [REDACTED] in order to do this.  
  
If you have any queries, [REDACTED] is happy to discuss it with you.  
  
Kind regards,  
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: 22 October 2009 16:48  
To: [REDACTED]  
Subject: [NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED] RE: DN1/33

[REDACTED]  
We spoke: the contact for this file at the Health Protection Agency is:

Email :	[REDACTED]
Tel :	[REDACTED]

Best wishes  
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: 20 October 2009 16:00  
To: [REDACTED]  
Subject: RE: DN1/33

Redacted under FOI  
exemption section  
36 & 40(2)

7

Hi [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] has now had a look at the file and has identified [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] It appears it is more complicated than previously thought.

I have his notes for you if you would like to see them, but in general he has recommended the file remain closed, thus a department re-review is likely to be necessary.

Let me know how you would like to proceed. I currently have the file in the closed document room.

Regards,

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: 05 October 2009 16:12  
To: [REDACTED]  
Subject: DN1/33

\*\* Protective Marking : NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED \*\*

[REDACTED]  
We spoke. Piece DN1/33 is dated 1979 and is due to come open next Jan.  
It is the only volume that was kept closed when the series was re-reviewed in 2004: I know that it contains a sensitive item, which is why it was not opened.

[REDACTED]  
I spoke to [REDACTED] about this item and he suggested that you might be able to let [REDACTED] have a look at it on his next visit.

If needs be, we will get the dept to re-review and if necessary, redact the item.

Thanks

[REDACTED]  
Information Management and Practice Department  
The National Archives

GTN [REDACTED] GRO-C  
[www.nationalarchives.gov.uk](http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk)

Please don't print this e-mail unless you really need to.

National Archives Disclaimer

This email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual(s) to whom they are addressed. If you are not the intended recipient and have received this email in error, please notify the sender and delete the email. Opinions, conclusions and other information in this message and attachments that do

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 01 February 2016 10:48  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Misplaced Document - DN 1/33

Redacted  
under FOI  
exemption  
section 40(2)

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

Hi [REDACTED]

Thanks for your email. Can I first apologise to [REDACTED] for not being in touch previously, this has been down to workload, tracing of this file has not been a priority.

Can I please suggest that you automatically mark the file as misplaced at the end of this month (February) if I cannot track it down before then?

I suspect it may be at our Colindale site and I will need to visit there shortly to review other PHLS records for uplift to TNA. I'm sorry for the delay here but I could find no tracing records at our end (!) when I did investigate previously.

It also may be that we have a duplicate that can be submitted as a new original – I will advise.

Kind regards, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
Records Manager, Information Governance & Policy Office  
Public Health England

[REDACTED]  
Zone A, 2nd Floor, Skipton House, 80 London Road, London SE1 6LH  
PHENet: <http://phenet.phe.gov.uk/Services/Pages/Information-Governance.aspx>  
Web: [www.gov.uk/phe](http://www.gov.uk/phe) Follow us on Twitter @PHE\_uk  
**Protecting and improving the nation's health**

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 26 January 2016 12:07  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Misplaced Document - DN 1/33

Good Morning [REDACTED]

DN 1/33

I am following up from my colleague, [REDACTED] regarding the above file that has been on requisition to your department since January 2010.

I understand that, despite your best efforts, this file has not been located. Therefore, in view of the length of time that has elapsed since we originally sent the file, I propose that we make the file as "Misplaced at department"

If you would please give this your consideration and let me know, I will then update our records as necessary.

9

Regards,

Redacted  
under FOI  
exemption  
section 40(2)

GRS Operations Manager

The National Archives, Kew, Richmond, Surrey TW9 4DU  
<http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk>



Please don't print this e-mail unless you really need to.

National Archives Disclaimer

This email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual(s) to whom they are addressed. If you are not the intended recipient and have received this email in error, please notify the sender and delete the email. Opinions, conclusions and other information in this message and attachments that do not relate to the official business of The National Archives are neither given nor endorsed by it.

\*\*\*\*\*  
The information contained in the EMail and any attachments is confidential and intended solely and for the attention and use of the named addressee(s). It may not be disclosed to any other person without the express authority of Public Health England, or the intended recipient, or both. If you are not the intended recipient, you must not disclose, copy, distribute or retain this message or any part of it. This footnote also confirms that this EMail has been swept for computer viruses by Symantec.Cloud, but please re-sweep any attachments before opening or saving. <http://www.gov.uk/PHE>  
\*\*\*\*\*

This email was scanned by the Government Secure Intranet anti-virus service supplied by Vodafone in partnership with Symantec. (CCTM Certificate Number 2009/09/0052.) In case of problems, please call your organisations IT Helpdesk.  
Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.

Redacted  
under FOI  
exemption  
section 40(2)

10

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 30 October 2015 10:26  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: For comment by close on 7 November: outstanding list

[REDACTED]

Between us we have been trying to arrange the below meeting up now for nearly a year, but I am determined we will get to discuss the record (DN 1/33). Alternatively, I wondered if you would be able to set out an email the background to this record, the circumstances in which it has been misplaced and the resulting searches?

Many thanks.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]  
Government and Remote Services Manager  
[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 10 July 2015 14:56  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: For comment by close on 7 November: outstanding list

[REDACTED]

My apologies for not responding sooner to your email below. I am still keen to meet to discuss this record, please could you let me know what availability you have over the coming weeks? I am happy to meet at your office or at TNA if you are here at any point

Many thanks.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]  
Government and Remote Services Manager  
[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 22 April 2015 16:24  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: For comment by close on 7 November: outstanding list

Hi again [REDACTED]

Yes let's try to finally meet, might Wednesday 27 or Thursday 28 May be possible for you? Morning or early-ish PM. I can come down to Kew if you wish (this might actually be easier for me).

Can I also please say again I'm sincerely sorry that I didn't respond to you earlier this month. I have literally just finally arranged a meeting with our IMC [REDACTED] from TNA, but this will now be a Skipton House where I'm based. I had hoped to get that and our one both at Kew, hence my delay replying.

In the meantime I will try and investigate further re this missing record; if I cannot make progress I think a chat with you at that point might be of great use re piecing together whatever happened before.

11

Kind regards, [REDACTED]

Redacted  
under FOI  
exemption  
section 40(2)

[REDACTED]  
Records Manager

Public Health England

Zone D, 2nd Floor, Skipton House, 80 London Road, London SE1 6LH

PHENet: <http://phenet.phe.gov.uk/Services/Pages/Information-Governance.aspx>

Web: [www.gov.uk/phe](http://www.gov.uk/phe) Follow us on Twitter @PHE\_uk

---

**From:** [REDACTED]

**Sent:** 22 April 2015 12:02

**To:** [REDACTED]

**Subject:** RE: For comment by close on 7 November: outstanding list

[REDACTED]

I wondered whether you had any availability in the week commencing 25 May to discuss DN1/33? If that week is not convenient please do feel free to suggest an alternative date.

Many thanks.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]  
Government and Remote Services Manager

---

**From:** [REDACTED]

**Sent:** 06 March 2015 11:43

**To:** [REDACTED]

**Subject:** RE: For comment by close on 7 November: outstanding list

Hi [REDACTED]

My sincere apologies – I think that I should have set up something with you as an action on my part, sorry.

It's currently extremely busy here as we are preparing a corporate submission on information governance to the NHS' Information Centre, for the end of March. Might sometime in April be possible for you?

Kind regards, [REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]

**Sent:** 06 March 2015 11:35

**To:** [REDACTED]

**Subject:** FW: For comment by close on 7 November: outstanding list

[REDACTED]

I am not sure that we did get round to meeting to have a chat about DN 1/33 (as discussed below) and wondered if you had any availability in the coming weeks?

Many thanks

Kind regards,

Government and Remote Services Manager

Redacted  
under FOI  
exemption  
section 40(2)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 13 November 2014 14:03  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: For comment by close on 7 November: outstanding list

My apologies for the length of time it has taken me to reply. I would be happy to meet on 26 November if that day is still available – please do feel free to suggest a time? If this day is convenient then happy to meet at your office or alternatively if you are TNA to meet here.

Did you have any further luck with the tracking of DN 1/33?

Thanks

Kind regards,

Government and Remote Services Manager

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 28 October 2014 09:47  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: For comment by close on 7 November: outstanding list

Hi again

Thanks for replying – yes it would be no problem to defer a chat etc. until after you've settled in. I'm not sure when I'll be at TNA next, but we could certainly feel arrange a phone conversation. Perhaps say Wed 26 November might be okay for this?

In the meantime I'll try and track down this record.

(NB. If you're not aware already, it might be worth noting for the report that [REDACTED] has (sadly) retired from TNA (he was our IMC); [REDACTED] is filling in at the moment I believe.)

Kind regards

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 28 October 2014 08:43  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: For comment by close on 7 November: outstanding list

Thanks for your e-mail and it is good to make your introduction. I have attached the list and you are quite right the record in question is DN1/33 and separately yes I have taken on the role vacated by [REDACTED] I would be happy to meet to have an initial chat with you in any event and also to hear about DN1/33. It might make sense to put any meeting at a couple of weeks hence so that I can familiarise myself with my role and work at TNA but do feel free to suggest dates. (Happy to meet at your office).

Thanks.

Kind regards,

[Redacted]

Government and Remote Services Manager

[Redacted]

Redacted  
under FOI  
exemption  
section 40(2)

---

**From:** [Redacted]  
**Sent:** 27 October 2014 15:50  
**To:** [Redacted]  
**Subject:** RE: For comment by close on 7 November: outstanding list

Hi [Redacted]

By way of introduction I'm the records manager for Public Health England. I'm not sure if you might have taken on [Redacted] role at TNA, either way it's nice to make contact with you.

I'd be grateful if you could please send on the form which appears to have been attached to your note to [Redacted]? As I haven't had sight of this as yet.

If the outstanding record for us is DN1/33, it might be worth us having a quick word at some point, as tracking this hasn't been straightforward.

Kind regards [Redacted]

[Redacted]

Records Manager  
Public Health England  
PHEnet: <http://phenet.phe.gov.uk/Services/Pages/Information-Governance.aspx>  
133-155 Wellington House, Waterloo Road, London SE1 8UG

[Redacted]

[www.gov.uk/phe](http://www.gov.uk/phe) Follow us on Twitter @PHE\_uk

---

**From:** [Redacted]  
**Sent:** 24 October 2014 15:36  
**To:** [Redacted]  
**Cc:** [Redacted]  
**Subject:** RE: For comment by close on 7 November: outstanding list

Thanks [Redacted]

Our Records Manager [Redacted] is looking, or has looked into this issue.

I ask [Redacted] to contact you when he returns to work on Monday.

Thank you.

[Redacted]

Head of Information Governance  
Public Health England

[Redacted]

---

**From:** [Redacted]  
**Sent:** 24 October 2014 11:48  
**To:** [Redacted]  
**Subject:** FW: For comment by close on 7 November: outstanding list

Dear [Redacted]

I have recently taken on the role of Government and Remote Services (GRS) Manager at TNA and one of my first tasks in post is to send through to you the latest six monthly outstanding records list which I have attached to this email.

I would be grateful if you could please provide comments on this list in the form of an update on the status of each record and return the annotated list to me by close on **Friday 7 November**.



For each record on the list please:

- arrange for its return to TNA where the business need for its departmental recall has concluded;
- provide a reason for continued use of a recalled record;
- confirm that any continuing long term use of a record is a business necessity - in these instances please contact me about making copies for future use;
- a priority for TNA is the return of those records that have been with departments for over five years (before Oct 2009) - as above if a record is still required please contact me about making copies;
- confirm that you (or a team member) have had sight of each record (and can currently locate it within your department);
- report any records that cannot be located. (We should then discuss action taken/next steps in terms of locating a record and, in terms of transparency, reporting its current status on the TNA catalogue).

The statistics for outstanding records (those currently out with departments) are distributed within TNA and are regularly discussed at our Operational Governance Board. As such your assistance in ensuring that the total outstanding records are kept to a minimum is greatly appreciated.

Thank you for your time and assistance with the above return. I look forward to working with you.

Kind regards,

  
Government and Remote Services Manager  
The National Archives  


Redacted  
under FOI  
exemption  
section 40(2)

Please don't print this e-mail unless you really need to.

---

#### National Archives Disclaimer

This email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual(s) to whom they are addressed. If you are not the intended recipient and have received this email in error, please notify the sender and delete the email. Opinions, conclusions and other information in this message and attachments that do not relate to the official business of The National Archives are neither given nor endorsed by it.

---

\*\*\*\*\*

The information contained in the EMail and any attachments is confidential and intended solely and for the attention and use of the named addressee(s). It may not be disclosed to any other person without the express authority of Public Health England, or the intended recipient, or both. If you are not the intended recipient, you must not disclose, copy, distribute or retain this message or any part of it. This footnote also confirms that this EMail has been swept for computer viruses by Symantec.Cloud, but please re-sweep any attachments before opening or saving. <http://www.gov.uk/PHE>

15

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 09 July 2014 14:36  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Public Health England

Redacted  
under FOI  
exemption  
section 40(2)

Hi [REDACTED]

Just to clarify, the file was sent from TNA directly to yourselves. MOJ have their own ticket number and any documents ordered to their address would be under that number rather than PHE's.

I will forward you the email that mentions returning this document, although I'm not sure how much light that will throw on this.

Regards

[REDACTED]  
Resource, Finance and Business Administration Manager  
[REDACTED]  
The National Archives, Kew, Richmond, Surrey, TW9 4DU  
[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 07 July 2014 16:15  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Public Health England

I am sorry to chase this again but can I please make a further request for either:

- the e-mail trail that TNA has, relating to the below record, or
- for confirmation that – if the record was sent to MoJ – it will be for them to track down, as they last had possession?

I'm keen to put close to this record query if possible, so I'd be very grateful for a reply.

Kind regards [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
Records Manager, Chief Knowledge Officer's Directorate  
PHENet: <http://phenet.phe.gov.uk/Services/Pages/Information-Governance.aspx>  
Public Health England  
133-155 Wellington House, Waterloo Road, London SE1 8UG  
[REDACTED]  
[www.gov.uk/phe](http://www.gov.uk/phe) Follow us on Twitter @PHE\_uk

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 19 June 2014 15:34  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Public Health England

Hi again [REDACTED]

Redacted  
under FOI  
exemption  
section 40(2)

16

Thanks for this further info, it's very helpful.

In brief it sounds like this [REDACTED] may have requested the missing record direct from TNA to MOJ? If so, we wouldn't have records on the loan, unless there is some other trace of it having gone via HPA (PHE) first. I'm not aware of any log here indicating such a movement.

If it didn't first come to us, I'm not sure what we can do, other than suggest that MOJ would need to take this up.

Could I please ask if you could forward on to me the e-mail trails you have, and were referring from?

Kind regards, [REDACTED]

---

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: 17 June 2014 16:33  
To: [REDACTED]  
Subject: RE: Public Health England

Hi [REDACTED]

I've done a little more checking and have found a [REDACTED] that worked at Clearing House, MOJ, so it may be that the file was forwarded to him for opinion/review.

The email that I have seen was dated January 2010, so the timing fits. Do you keep logs of any documents that are forwarded to other departments?

Regards  
[REDACTED]

---

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: 17 June 2014 14:38  
To: [REDACTED]  
Subject: RE: Public Health England

Hi again [REDACTED]

I am sorry to ask another question regarding this missing file (details below) – could I please clarify if the [REDACTED] you mentioned, was a Health Protection Agency employee?

I ask as your reply read slightly ambiguously, in that I'm not sure if he was a TNA person discussing the file request, or the HPA person requesting it.

(To briefly update, I cannot find a [REDACTED] as having been an employee here, so haven't yet been able to locate the record – hence my query above. I'm pleased to say we have a copy of PHLS Board minutes in the PHE library so we can provide this as a new original record if I cannot succeed in tracking the missing one down.)

Kind regards, [REDACTED]

---

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: 20 May 2014 17:08  
To: [REDACTED]  
Subject: RE: Public Health England

Hi [REDACTED]

Apologies for the delay in response. I haven't been able to locate the original order form for this request. What I have found though are emails between TNA discussing that this file was to be looked at by [REDACTED] and that it needed to be sent back to yourselves for an application of extended closure to be made. This record contained personal data about living individuals, that was in November of 2009, the record was then sent out in January of 2010.

I hope this helps somewhat.

Regards  
[REDACTED]

Redacted  
under FOI  
exemption  
section 40(2)

---

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: 20 May 2014 11:00  
To: [REDACTED]  
Subject: RE: Public Health England

Dear [REDACTED]

I'm sorry to chase, but could I please ask if TNA colleagues might have found any more details on the below outstanding record?

I ask as I'm visiting our Colindale site tomorrow afternoon to consult with who I think is the record series owner; further details on the record probably aren't essential to have, but if they are available, they might be useful for when to I speak to PHE colleagues.

I'd be very grateful for a brief update if possible. Hopefully I can shed further light for you re this record after tomorrow.

Kind regards, [REDACTED]

---

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: 07 May 2014 12:13  
To: [REDACTED]  
Subject: FW: Public Health England

Hi [REDACTED]

Many thanks for your response. I'm having the original paperwork pulled so we can see who ordered it and if there is any relevant information that we can provide to you.

In the mean time the document description is as follows:

Public Health Laboratory Service Board: Minutes and Papers. Agenda, Minutes and Circulated Papers. Nos 79/51-79/108D.

- o Collection: Records of the Public Health Laboratory Service Board
- o Date range: 01 April 1979 - 31 December 1979
- o Reference: DN 1/33

Regards  
[REDACTED]

---

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: 07 May 2014 11:20

To: [REDACTED]  
Subject: FW: Public Health England

Redacted  
under FOI  
exemption  
section 40(2)

19

Dear [REDACTED]

By way of introduction I joined PHE in February as Records Manager (and deputy DRO) for the agency.

[REDACTED] has passed on your note (below) to me re an outstanding record. Based on the date it looks to be an old Health Protection Agency record.

Might you have any further info on it, like title or series, owner (other than the DRO), or where it was issued to etc.?

I ask as it may be quite difficult to trace this without some wider knowledge of the record, so I'd be very grateful for any background you might be able to provide.

Kind regards, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
Records Manager, Chief Knowledge Officer's Directorate  
PHENet: <http://phenet.phe.gov.uk/Services/Pages/Information-Governance.aspx>  
Public Health England  
133-155 Wellington House, Waterloo Road, London SE1 8UG  
[REDACTED]  
[www.gov.uk/phe](http://www.gov.uk/phe) Follow us on Twitter @PHE\_uk

---

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: 15 April 2014 09:24  
To: [REDACTED]  
Subject: Public Health England

Dear [REDACTED]

Please find attached the outstanding list for PHE. Just the one file is on the list, but as it has been with you since 2010, can this now be returned?

If you still require use of it, once it is returned to us, we can make a copy of it for your continued use.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
Government and Remote Services Manager  
[REDACTED]  
The National Archives, Kew, Richmond, Surrey, TW9 4DU  
[REDACTED]

\*\*\*\*\*  
The information contained in the EMail and any attachments is confidential and intended solely and for the attention and use of the named addressee(s). It may not be disclosed to any other person without the express authority of Public Health England, or the intended recipient, or both. If you are not the intended recipient, you must not disclose, copy, distribute or retain this message or any part of it. This footnote also confirms that this EMail

(19)

Redacted under FOI  
exemption section  
36 & 40(2)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 26 November 2009 14:35  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** DN1/33 - due to come open in the New Year [NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED]  
  
**Importance:** High  
  
**Categories:** NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

[REDACTED]  
Following on from my email below, to which you have yet to reply, I need to point out that the 1979 volume I referred to (DN1/33) is still considered to contain sensitive information and should not be allowed to come open in the New Year.

[REDACTED]  
In general he has recommended the file remain closed, thus a department re-review is necessary. Could you please arrange for this volume to be ordered back to HPA for your consideration? If the volume is in your possession on the 1 Jan it will ensure that there is no possibility of it being produced to a member of the public.  
Best wishes  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
Information Management and Practice Department  
The National Archives  
[REDACTED]  
GTM: GRO-C  
[www.nationalarchives.gov.uk](http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk)

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 05 October 2009 15:03  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Public Health Laboratory Service Board (DN 1)

\*\* Protective Marking : NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED \*\*

[REDACTED]  
Many thanks for this.  
What was the outcome of your meeting with the manager who has custody of these volumes? My assumption is that it will have mainly concerned the question of assessing any continuing sensitivity. If there is a period, say 15 or 20 years, after which the risk of the information still being sensitive is minimal, we would be quite happy for you to transfer only those volumes: the remainder could remain in your custody for later consideration, provided of course, that this was sooner than 30 years after the last date of the volume.

It is probably worth pointing out that, as was the norm, the earlier volumes (1961-1983) were subject to the 30 year access period when they were transferred here in 1985 (into the series DN1). Then, in 2004, prior to the FOI Act coming into force, [REDACTED] conducted a review of the volumes that were still closed at that time (1974-1983). [REDACTED]

the rest of the volumes were opened.

I hope that this is of some help and that we can push on with the transfer of this material, or at least, most of it.

Best wishes

[REDACTED]

Information Management and Practice Department  
The National Archives

G11 GRO-C  
www.nationalarchives.gov.uk

Redacted under FOI  
exemption section  
36 & 40(2)

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 11 September 2009 07:43  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Public Health Laboratory Service Board

[REDACTED]

I'm not sure when we are going to get round to reviewing these volumes. Will discuss with manager on here return from leave next week.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]  
Head of Information Governance

Health Protection Agency  
61 Colindale Avenue  
London  
NW9 5EQ

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 29 June 2009 13:41  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Public Health Laboratory Service Board

\*\* Protective Marking : NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED \*\*

[REDACTED]

Thanks for this update. Can you let me know how long this is likely to take?  
If you would like me to comment on the draft submission to the Board, I would be happy to.  
Best wishes

[REDACTED]

Information Management and Practice Department  
The National Archives

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 17 June 2009 10:06  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Public Health Laboratory Service Board

[REDACTED]

Just to update, I've been advised that this will be will need to go to our HPA Board before being archived to you. I understand it to be a formality.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]  
Head of Information Governance

Health Protection Agency  
61 Colindale Avenue  
London  
NW9 5EQ

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 12 May 2009 16:03  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Public Health Laboratory Service Board

\*\* Protective Marking : NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED \*\*

[REDACTED]

I wonder if I might remind you of the questions in my email below concerning the record set of the PHLS minutes and papers, etc?

I was reminded by finding a copy of an old PHLS Annual Report found during a clear-out of one of our strong rooms.

I hope that you have not been adversely affected by the recent outbreak of swine 'flu'(!)

Best wishes

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
Information Management and Practice Department  
The National Archives

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 11 March 2009 16:50  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Public Health Laboratory Service Board

[REDACTED]

Thank for the comments on the birth of the HPA. I wondered what was the source of references made to our exemption. I'll look at those references at a quieter time. And I will get back to you in answer to your questions.

22

Thank you,

Head of Information Governance

Health Protection Agency  
Corporate Governance Department  
81 Colindale Avenue  
London  
NW9 5EQ

Redacted  
under FOI  
exemption  
section 40(2)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 09 March 2009 16:20  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Public Health Laboratory Service Board

Thanks for your email the other week: unfortunately, I am not able to attend the IG4U event on 19 March.

Thanks also for your comments on the status of HPA records: I was under the impression that the Act that set up the agency specifically contradicts the view that they can be considered public records by declaring that its assets do not belong to the Crown. Maybe we need a legal opinion?

Anyway, we are on safer ground (I think) with the HPA's predecessor, the PHLS. The Board was formally abolished by section 190 of the Health and Social Care (Community Health and Standards) Act 2003 on 1st April 2005 but TNA only have their records up to 1983; see attached.

<http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/catalogue/DisplayCatalogueDetails.asp?CATID=85&CATLN=1&FullDetails=True>

Firstly, do you think that there is any prospect in the near future of obtaining the record set of the PHLS Board minutes and papers after 1983?

Also, do you have any description of the winding up of the PHLS functions, which could be usefully added to the administrative history section on our Catalogue? According to the HPA web site, it was set up in 2003 as a Special Health Authority and then in 2005 became a non departmental public body, when it took over the functions of the NRPB but it doesn't mention the demise of the PHLS, so I would be grateful if you could help clarify.

Best wishes

Information Management and Practice Department

The National Archives

GTN **GRO-C**

[www.nationalarchives.gov.uk](http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk)

Please don't print this e-mail unless you really need to.

National Archives Disclaimer

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: 17 August 2004 11:44  
To: [REDACTED]  
Subject: RE: PHLS Board papers held by the National Archive

Redacted under FOI  
exemption section  
36 & 40(2)

[REDACTED] I need to speak to you about this.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

I have rung your office but understand you are out today

I am away at Porton tomorrow (where this will be a big issue). Can we speak on Thursday?

best wishes

[REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

From: Stanley, Graham [mailto:graham.stanley@**GRO-C**]  
Sent: 17 August 2004 09:57  
To: 'SRMD, Col - Knight, Frances'  
Subject: RE: PHLS Board papers held by the National Archive

[REDACTED]

Thanks for letting me know.  
The piece reference is probably DN 1/33.

[REDACTED]

Don't worry about redaction at this stage: if the piece cannot be opened, the whole piece will remain closed until 2010 or until we get an FOI request for access, whichever is the sooner. We will then have to decide about [REDACTED] in the light of our experience of FOI and advice from the Information Commissioner's Office.

Look forward to your reply

Redacted under FOI  
exemption section  
36 & 40(2)

(24)

-----Original Message-----

From:

Sent: 13 August 2004 09:41

To:

Subject: PHLS Board papers held by the National Archive

Dear [REDACTED] - after a lot of "tooting and froeing" I have now got the go ahead to release the PHLS Board papers (1974 - 1983) held by TNA, [REDACTED]

The reference I have in my notes is DNI/33 1979.

Can you advise how I do this. Do I need to arrange to visit TNA and make the redaction myself?

Also - what is the position on keeping this information out of the public domain permanently

Grateful for your advice

Regards

[REDACTED]  
Corporate Services  
Health Protection Agency  
61 Colindale Avenue  
London  
NW9 0LG  
[REDACTED]

\*\*\*\*\*  
The information contained in the EMail and any attachments is confidential and intended solely and for the attention and use of the named addressee(s). It may not be disclosed to any other person without the express authority of the HPA, or the intended recipient, or both. If you are not the intended recipient, you must not disclose, copy, distribute or retain this message or any part of it. This footnote also confirms that this EMail has been swept for computer viruses, but please re-sweep any attachments before opening or saving. [HTTP://www.HPA.org.uk](http://www.HPA.org.uk)  
\*\*\*\*\*

-----  
This email has been scanned by the MessageLabs Email Security System.  
For more information please visit <http://www.messagelabs.com/email>  
-----

\*\*\*\*\*  
National Archives Disclaimer

This e-mail message (and attachments) may contain information that is confidential to The National Archives. If you are not the intended

PROTECT

25

Redacted  
under FOI  
exemption  
section 36

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]