

Code A

31525937

From: Andrew Ledgard [Code A]
Sent: 31 March 2010 16:52
To: Graziella Oragano [Code A]; Stephanie McNamara [Code A]
Cc: [Code A]; David Anson [Code A]; Neil Marshall [Code A]
 [Code A]; Julian Graves [Code A]
Subject: FW: For review: redacted version Barton support letters

Dear all, please find below [Code A] helpful review of the Barton support letters to help with your reviews.

Thanks

Andrew

From: [Code A]
Sent: 31 March 2010 14:39
To: Julian Graves [Code A]
Cc: Andrew Ledgard [Code A]
Subject: RE: For review: redacted version Barton support letters

Julian,

In response to your email, please find below my observations and suggestions relating to the redacted letters of support that it is proposed that we release.

To confirm, I have not reviewed the letters prior to them being redacted and so have not reviewed the accuracy of previous redactions. I provide the following comments based on the requirement to avoid identifying any individuals by disclosing the information that remains in the redacted letters.

Additional redactions to consider:

- Removal of logos from letters (P. 29, 116, 218).
- Remove reference to "Haslar" (an area of Gosport) (P.87)
- Remove generalised story that refers to local [REDACTED] (From "for example..." to "the wound" - P. 271).
- Remove mention of mother sending an email (P. 275).
- Remove the all references to "boys", this might help to identify an individual (P. 287).
- References to QOF and PACT data (is this public domain knowledge?).

Consider redaction or request consent to disclose:

- Removal of name of Ian Barker from MDU. (Is it already in the public domain that he represented Dr Barton?) (Most pages).
- References to being a lady GP (and in a neighbouring practice) and Fareham & Gosport Women/lady Doctors Group, which might help to more-easily identify individuals (P. 138, 151, 194, 253).
- Membership of other groups that Dr Barton was a part of – Gosport Primary Care Group (PCG) (P. 180), Gosport Medical Committee (P. 251). These individuals may be identifiable if a list of members was or became publicly available.

Consider request for consent to disclose:

- All GPs as letter at P. 87 mentions a small medical community they might all be potentially identified by minutiae in the letters.
- Particularly GPs/Partners from Dr Barton's surgery (P. 34, 129) (As mentioned in your email).

Consider request for consent to disclose or remove letters from disclosure bundle:

- Letter appears to be from Dr Barton's Practice Manager (or equivalent) (P. 102).
- Handwritten letters that along with other information may help to identify an individual (e.g. an example of the person's handwriting and the knowledge they work at Gosport War Memorial Hospital) (P. 209).

Consider heavy redaction or removal of letters from disclosure bundle:

- Support letters that contain information more appropriate to Dr Barton's personnel file (P. 152, 273) or a job reference (P. 235).

Other considerations:

- Some letters state that they would gladly state their views publicly or support Dr Barton at a hearing (e.g. P. 46). These names should be anonymised in the first instance for the sake of consistency, but it should be noted that some 'supporters' may be happy to air their views publicly. Likewise, it should be noted that some 'supporters' have not asserted this and therefore their privacy (and rights under the DPA) should be respected.
- Some letters are 'cut-off' – i.e. the copy has cut parts words off. These are mainly still legible (except at P. 201); also some handwritten letters are difficult to read.
- It would be a mistake to correct or redact letters in order to make them more easily read.
- The letter at P273-274 (as you point out in your email) was mentioned in the hearing and therefore has passed into evidence and should be disclosed (or should it!?!), it may need to be more heavily redacted to remove information appropriate to Dr Barton's personnel file as mentioned above.

In addition to these considerations, I would consider providing a summary of redaction – something along the following lines.

Redaction has been carried out where an individual may be identified, or their rights under the Data Protection Act 1998 or Human Rights Act 1998 otherwise contravened, due to disclosure of their name, signature, address, medical conditions, courses of treatment; or, if a medical professional, by their area of medical expertise, place or area of work or membership of groups, unions or societies.

I hope this all helps. If you require any further explanation or assistance, please do not hesitate to ask.

Kind regards,

Code A

Code A

General Medical Council

Tel: Code A

Email: Code A

From: Julian Graves Code A**Sent:** 29 March 2010 14:23**To:** Neil Marshall Code A Stephanie McNamara Code A Andrew Ledgard Code A**Cc:** Code A David Anson Code A**Subject:** For review: redacted version Barton support letters

Neil/Steph/Andrew

You will recall our discussion at the FOI Review Group meeting regarding the support letters provided in respect of the Dr Barton hearing.

As you will recall the current intention is to disclose the letters of support in an anonymised form once Hampshire Police have agreed that disclosure can be made. Dave advised that Niall Dickson expressed a desire for these to be checked thoroughly to ensure that the anonymisation process has been accurate and appropriate.

To that end I have attached a link to the proposed redacted copies of each letter and would be grateful if each of you could review these and feedback your views please.

http://livelink/edrms/lisapi.dll/REDACTED_COMPLETE_COPY.pdf?func=doc.Fetch&nodeId=31276405&docTitle=REDACTED+COMPLETE+COPY

I should specifically point out the following issues of concern:

Dr Beale's appraisal – this was referred to in the hearing transcript but not read in – p273-274 of PDF.

Two letters from GPs where we haven't been able to redact adequately – it is obvious these are/were GPs at Barton's surgery – p34 & 129 of PDF.

Many thanks

Julian