

## CRS 606698 Public Interest Test results table

<b>Request for Information</b>	
<b>EIR Exemption S 12 (5) (e)– Commercial Interests</b>	
<b><i>Factors supporting disclosure</i></b>	<b><i>Factors supporting non-disclosure</i></b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a clear public interest in the work of government being closely examined to encourage the discharging of public functions in the most efficient and effective way;</li> <li>• There is an important public interest in the work of public bodies being transparent and open to scrutiny to increase diligence and to protect the public purse;</li> <li>• There is a public interest in disclosing information about public procurements to ensure there is transparency in the spending of public money and that public bodies are getting value for money when entering into contracts;</li> <li>• Following the snow, this winter it is in the public interest to show how the Agency prepared to manage the network in poor weather conditions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>GENERAL</b> The procurement process must be seen to be fair and that commercial interests of the suppliers of services are not unduly prejudiced by the release of commercially sensitive information. It is important to maintain the confidence of our suppliers in order to achieve best value for the tax payer</li> <li>• <b>COMMERCIALLY SENSITIVE F, H</b> Publishing prices which are still current in the market place would affect the commercial interests of those salt vendors currently tendering for business with other companies.</li> <li>• <b>COMMERCIALLY SENSITIVE A, E, G</b> Disclosure of private salt supplier –customer relationships could undermine or disadvantage the open commercial marketplace.</li> <li>• <b>COMMERCIALLY SENSITIVE B, C</b> The logistics (including elements of shipping, road haulage, and port distribution arrangements) of individual salt supplies forms a core of their operations and their business capability. Wider disclosure of this information could provide commercial advantage to their competitors.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Conclusion: The panel members have considered and weighed all arguments supporting disclosure and those supporting non – disclosure. The panel agrees unanimously that the factors considered in the Public Interest Test supporting non-disclosure of information contained with the information request out weigh those supporting disclosure of same and are accordingly redacted.</b></p> <p><b>PIT Members:</b> Chris Cottell, Jason Glasson, Darshan Ubhi, Robert Whittaker, Alan Rossiter</p> <p><b>Date of PIT:</b> 11/03/2009</p>	