

Mr J Hermes  
By email only



The University of  
**Nottingham**

UNITED KINGDOM · CHINA · MALAYSIA

8<sup>th</sup> December 2014

Our Ref.: 1456

Dear Mr Hermes,

**Internal Review of Freedom of Information Request**

Following your email dated 3 December 2014 requesting a review of your Freedom of Information request dated 20 October 2014, I can confirm that a thorough review of your request has been carried out.

I have reviewed your response and the points you have raised and shall deal with each in turn.

*"I understand from your 13 Nov 2014 response that the University reserves the right to withhold public disclosure of individual staff and their salaries, which was part (1) of this request. However, the University has not responded in full to parts (2) and (3) of this request, which do not require identification of individual staff members. Thus, I request the University respond to this original request in full:*

*Please identify all senior staff members making more than £150,000 in total emoluments for the year ended 31 July 2014. Since you are withholding the identity of these staff by name or title, please categorize them as one of the following, as per part (2) of this request: (a) academic staff, (b) clinical staff, or (c) administrative (non-academic) staff. Then, please provide the annual emoluments for the past five (5) years for each of the senior staff making more than £150,000 in total emoluments identified in the first part of this request, with the exception of the Vice Chancellor, since that information is already publicly accessible. As a guide, attached is an example of a completed response generated recently by the University of Cambridge answering an identical request to that which I have posed to the University."*

The main focus of my review has been to ascertain whether disclosure of the information in parts (2) and (3) of your request would in fact result in the re-identification of those individuals whom it has been established will not be identified, or whether the information should have been disclosed because there was not a realistic risk of those individuals being identified.