

Decision 026/2008 Mr Ian Cameron and Aberdeenshire Council

Purchase of particular goods recorded in an inventory held by the Council

Applicant: Mr Ian Cameron
Authority: Aberdeenshire Council
Case number: 200700821
Decision Date: 18 February 2008

Kevin Dunion
Scottish Information Commissioner

Kinburn Castle
Doubledykes Road
St Andrews
Fife
KY16 9DS



Decision 026/2008 Mr Ian Cameron and Aberdeenshire Council

Information relating to the purchase of particular goods recorded in an inventory held by the Council – the Council responded to Mr Cameron’s request by providing certain information but claimed that other information was not held – Commissioner upheld the Council’s response generally but required certain action in relation to omissions and by way of advice and assistance

Relevant Statutory Provisions and Other Sources

Freedom of Information (Scotland) Act 2002 (FOISA) sections 1(1) (General entitlement); 8 (Requesting information); 10(1) (Time for compliance); 15 (Duty to provide advice and assistance); 17 (Notice that information is not held).

The full text of each of these provisions is reproduced in Appendix 1 to this decision. Appendix 1 forms part of this decision.

Facts

Mr Cameron submitted a request to Aberdeenshire Council (the Council) for various types of information concerning purchases which were recorded on a particular Inventory of Moveable Equipment and Property, which he identified to the Council.

The Council responded to Mr Cameron’s request by releasing information to him, which it considered addressed his request in full. Mr Cameron was not satisfied with this response from the Council, and so sought clarification on some of the responses which had been made by the Council. The Council subsequently provided a response to these points of clarification. Mr Cameron remained dissatisfied with this further response from the Council and submitted a request for a review of the responses which the Council had made to his points of clarification. The Council carried out a review and, as a result, notified Mr Cameron that it had answered his request in full and that all information had been provided to him.

Mr Cameron remained dissatisfied and applied to the Commissioner for a decision.



Following an investigation, the Commissioner found that the Council had provided full and adequate responses to certain parts of the request and correctly claimed that information which would address these parts was otherwise not held. He also found, however, that the Council had failed to respond to other parts of the request. As a consequence, the Commissioner required the Council to respond to those parts and (under its duty to advise and assist) to provide information to Mr Cameron which would give him a further explanation regarding the operation of its Financial Regulations.

Background

1. On 14 July 2006, Mr Cameron wrote to the Council to request the following information with reference to a particular Inventory of Moveable Equipment and Property which he identified to the Council.
 - All competitive written quotations for the pre-purchase of each item detailed below (submitted to the Council during the procurement/tendering process)
 - Detail who the successful supplier was for each item detailed below
 - Provide all receipts/invoices relative to each item detailed below.... 39 (pairs) Junior Boots (Salomon), 76 (pairs) Adult Boots (Salomon/Fischer), 85 (pairs) Junior Skis (Fischer), 65 (pairs) Adult Skis (Fischer), 51 (pairs) 3 Pin Leather Boots, 25 (pairs) Touring Skis, 7 (pairs) Telemark Skis, 12 (pairs) Marwe Skate Rollers (Marwe), 4 (pairs) Marwe Classic Rollers (Marwe), 6 (pairs) Red Classic Rollers (Swenor), 3 (pairs) Classic Rollers (Various), 4 (pairs) Classic Rollers (Various), 138 Poles (Various), 39 Roller Poles (Various), 3 Ski Bags (Fischer), 24 Roller Blades, 23 Mountain Bikes (Giant), 49 Helmets, 1 Nordic Track, 1 Fitness Machine, 6 Child Snow Tubes, 10 Adult Snow Tubes.
2. On 8 August 2006, the Council wrote to Mr Cameron in response to his request for information. In its response the Council disclosed information to him which it considered addressed his request in full.
3. On 17 August 2006, Mr Cameron sent an email to the Council in which he identified areas of the Council's response that he was not satisfied with. In this email, Mr Cameron asked that the Council provide responses to points of clarification that he raised concerning its response of 8 August 2007. A full version of these points of clarification is set out in Appendix 2, which forms part of this decision.



4. The Council responded to Mr Cameron's email on 27 September 2006. In this response the Council provided further explanations and information to Mr Cameron in seeking to respond to his points of clarification.
5. On 3 November 2006, Mr Cameron wrote to the Council requesting a review of its decision in response to the points that he raised in his email of 17 August 2006 only. In particular, Mr Cameron stated that he did not agree that the reply given to him on 27 September 2006 was accurate and claimed that it failed to answer the questions that he had asked. Mr Cameron also indicated that he considered the information contained in the response of 27 September 2006 to be contradictory to the answers given in the Council's earlier response of 17 August 2006.
6. On 29 November 2007, the Council wrote to notify Mr Cameron of the outcome of its review. The Council advised Mr Cameron that it considered that it had answered and provided accurate information in response to his request.
7. On 16 February 2007, Mr Cameron wrote to my Office, stating that he was dissatisfied with the outcome of the Council's review and applying to me for a decision in terms of section 47(1) of FOISA. He maintained that the Council had failed to answer the questions in his request properly.
8. The application was validated by establishing that Mr Cameron had made a request for information to a Scottish public authority and had applied to me for a decision only after asking the authority to review its response to that request. The case was then allocated to an investigating officer.

The Investigation

9. On 30 July 2007, the Council was notified in writing that an application had been received from Mr Cameron and was asked to provide my Office with specified items of information required for the purposes of the investigation. The Council responded with the information requested. The investigating officer also contacted the Council on 5 September 2007 and subsequently, seeking its comments on the application generally and on specific questions arising out of it.



10. This investigation will only focus on the six points of clarification which Mr Cameron sought to have addressed in his email to the Council dated 17 August 2007. It will not address the points raised in Mr Cameron's original request, as these did not form the basis of Mr Cameron's request for review. Mr Cameron only sought a review of the Council's responses to his points of clarification and therefore this is all I am empowered to consider in this investigation. In proceeding on this basis, I am satisfied that the points of clarification were themselves requests for information meeting the requirements of section 8 of FOISA and I will refer to the 17 August email as Mr Cameron's request for information (or request).

Submissions from the Council

11. The Council asserted in its submissions that it considered it had responded in full to Mr Cameron's request. The Council also argued that it had done the best it possibly could in the circumstances with respect to responding to Mr Cameron, seeking clarification from him as appropriate.
12. The Council has also provided me with copies of previous information requests that Mr Cameron had submitted to it under FOISA, and its responses to these.

Submissions by Mr Cameron

13. In his appeal to my Office, Mr Cameron has clearly set out his dissatisfaction with the responses he has received from the Council to his request for information. Mr Cameron is of the view that the Council has failed to answer his questions properly. He clearly believes that more (or different) information relevant to his request should be held by the Council and is being withheld from him. He claims that the information he has been provided with is (variously) inaccurate, contradictory or misleading. He believes that the Council's review did not examine all of the relevant information.
14. Some of the matters of dissatisfaction Mr Cameron has raised in his application to me concern his own interpretation of the information that has been provided to him by the Council, or his underlying concerns as to potential impropriety. These are not matters I am empowered to consider in my investigation.



The Commissioner's Analysis and Findings

15. In coming to a decision on this matter, I have considered all of the information and the submissions that have been presented to me by both Mr Cameron and the Council and I am satisfied that no matter of relevance has been overlooked.
16. As mentioned already, it is the opinion of the Council that it has provided what information it could in response to Mr Cameron's request, apart from certain information that would answer points 2 and 3 of Mr Cameron's request, which it claimed it did not hold.

Information not held

17. In responding to the second and third points raised by Mr Cameron in his request, the Council provided him with certain explanations but otherwise asserted that the information he was seeking was not held.
18. In considering the second point raised by Mr Cameron, in which he requested information in relation to the purchase of specific items of equipment, I understand from reading the response made by the Council that it sought to provide an explanation to him as to why it did not hold the information he was seeking.
19. In correspondence with the Council my investigating officer asked the Council to provide details of the searches it had carried out to ascertain whether this information was in fact held.
20. The response from the Council provided an explanation as to how long the Council would normally retain creditor invoices, batches and copies of purchase orders. The Council also provided details of the searches it had carried out to determine whether the information was held. These searches included a search of paper files held both at the Huntly Nordic Ski Centre and also centrally within the Council. The Council also explained that it had an electronic system with a limited capacity for searching for information, and which did not extend to allowing a search for particular items of equipment. Following all the searches that it carried out, the Council asserted that there was no information held by it which could be provided to Mr Cameron.
21. Having considered the submissions that have been presented by the Council, together with the information which the Council has already been able to disclose to Mr Cameron in response to his initial request of 14 July 2007, I am satisfied that the Council does not, and did not at the time of Mr Cameron's request hold information which would address the second point of clarification that he raised.



22. I am therefore satisfied that the Council was correct to claim that information relating to Mr Cameron's second point was not held, and that it met the requirements of section 17 of FOISA in doing so.
23. In considering the third point raised by Mr Cameron, it is clear from the response made to him by the Council that it did seek to provide an explanation as to the amount of ski bags which were purchased and what happened to some of these. The Council did not, however, provide Mr Cameron with information as when these bags were purchased or written quotations or invoices for them.
24. In its submissions to my investigating officer, the Council has indicated that it accepted there had been some confusion over the date of acquisition of the ski bags, and that this might be down to the fact that a search of the appropriate systems had not revealed any records which would provide a definitive answer. However, the Council explained that the acquisition of these bags was likely to have taken place any time between the facility being taken over by the Council and at the time of the 2003 audit taking place, and that staff would have indicated the date of purchase being 2003 as they were unaware of the actual date of purchase and they dated the bags as being in stock at the time of the audit.
25. The Council also provided my investigating officer with details of the nature of the searches carried out by it to determine whether information was held regarding the procurement of these bags. Within this submission, the Council outlined the searches of both paper and electronic records that were carried out.
26. Having considered the submissions that have been received from the Council, I am satisfied that it does not (and did not at the time of Mr Cameron's request) hold any information additional to the explanation that it provided to Mr Cameron which would address the third point in Mr Cameron's request for clarification.
27. Therefore, I am satisfied that the Council was correct to claim that information relating to Mr Cameron's third point was not held, and that it met the requirements of section 17 of FOISA in doing so.
28. I will now go on to consider whether the Council has addressed the other points which Mr Cameron set out in his request for clarification.

Information relating to the first point in Mr Cameron's request

29. Mr Cameron requested information as to written quotations submitted to the Council during the procurement process for the purchase of specified items. He also asked that where Council officers had not obtained quotations he be told why this was the case.



30. In responding to this part of Mr Cameron's request, the Council outlined to him the substance of the Financial Regulations which govern purchases made by the Council. Within this explanation, the Council advised Mr Cameron of the financial thresholds in these regulations, above or below which a competitive quote should be obtained, or when formal tender documents need to be issued to approved tenderers. The Council also explained that because of the value of the purchases recorded in the Inventory of Moveable Equipment and Property, which Mr Cameron was interested in, no formal tenders or written quotations were required for these. In effect, although perhaps not specifically, it claimed that the information Mr Cameron was seeking in relation to the quotations was not held.
31. I understand from reading both Mr Cameron's request for clarification and his appeal to my Office that he is concerned that the Financial Regulations which the Council applied to these purchases were not correct, as he was quoted different financial thresholds in a response that he received from the Council in December 2005 to a different FOI request, and also the in Council's response to this FOI request of 8 August 2006. Mr Cameron is also of the view that the Council is attempting to apply Financial Regulations which were current in 2006 to purchases made prior to that year.
32. In correspondence with my investigating officer, the Council confirmed that its Financial Regulations would have applied to the purchases in question. The Council also reiterated that the value of the purchases in question was not sufficient to trigger a requirement for a competitive quote or tender. On the basis of the explanations given, I am satisfied that the quotations requested by Mr Cameron are not (and were not at the time of his request) held by the Council, and that the Council effectively met the requirements of section 17 of FOISA in responding to Mr Cameron on this point.
33. The Council did, however, provide an explanation which set out how it kept these Financial Regulations up to date, and its records management policies for retention of these.
34. Although I accept that the Council has sought to address Mr Cameron's point by explaining why officers did not obtain quotations for the purchases in question, and therefore why it could not provide Mr Cameron with copies of written quotations, I consider that the Council could have provided Mr Cameron with more information which would have given him more of an insight into the operation of its Financial Regulations. I am of the view that under section 15 of FOISA, the Council should have explained to Mr Cameron the reason for the differences in the Financial Regulations that it quoted in its response, and also how these regulations were kept up to date together with details of the Council's retention policy for them. I also consider that the Council should have provided Mr Cameron with a better explanation of how relevant the Financial Regulations that it quoted were to the purchases in question.



35. I therefore require the Council to comply with its duties under section 15 of FOISA by providing Mr Cameron with the information referred to in paragraph 34 above, as I consider that this would aid Mr Cameron's understanding.

Information relating to the fourth point in Mr Cameron's request

36. Mr Cameron also asked for information as to the written text of the Council's "Buy Local Policy" (as referred to by the Council in response to his request dated 14 July 2006 in relation to the purchase of 23 Mountain Bikes).
37. In responding to Mr Cameron's request, the Council provided him with a hard copy of its "Sustainable Purchasing Policy", which it asserted the "Buy Local Policy" was part of and implicit to. The Council also provided Mr Cameron with a website link to this document.
38. In his appeal to the Commissioner, Mr Cameron indicated that the "Sustainable Purchasing Policy" that he was directed to by the Council had no relevance to the purchases he was interested in.
39. Having accessed the "Sustainable Purchasing Policy" that Mr Cameron was directed to, I note that this came into effect in November 2005. The purchases that Mr Cameron had been referring to were recorded in an inventory dated March 2005 and the date of purchase for the bikes was November 2003.
40. Following communication with the Council, it advised my investigating officer that an interim "Sustainable Purchasing Policy" was in place from September 2001 until the final policy was implemented in 2005. The Council provided my Office with a copy of this interim policy. The "Buy Local Policy" (such as it is) is also present within the terms of the interim "Sustainable Purchasing Policy". I am satisfied, on the basis of the submissions I have received from the Council, that this interim policy (incorporating a "Buy Local Policy" that was to all intents and purposes the same as the one in force now) would have been in place at the time of the purchases being made in 2003.
41. I accept that the Council has responded to Mr Cameron's request and has provided him with the text of the "Buy Local Policy" which he specifically requested, and which is in all essential respects the same in both the interim policy and the final policy. From the submissions the Council has made, I am satisfied that this represents all the information it could be expected to hold on the matter.
42. I am therefore satisfied that the Council has responded to this part of Mr Cameron's request in accordance with Part 1 of FOISA, insofar as required to do so.



Information relating to the fifth point in Mr Cameron's request

43. Mr Cameron requested the trading addresses and VAT numbers for two limited companies which he identified to the Council. In response to this part of his request, the Council provided Mr Cameron with the trading address and VAT registration number for one of these companies. It did not, however, provide him with the trading address or VAT number for Fischer Racquetline Limited as Mr Cameron requested, instead giving him the trading details of a completely different company.
44. When my investigating officer asked the Council to confirm whether it held any information in relation to the company details for Fischer Racquetline Limited, it indicated that this was a company set up by Fischer to retail racquet sports products and skis, and that the Sports and Leisure Manager was unsure where it was based, but did believe that the other company that the Council had given Mr Cameron details of was the UK main dealer in Fischer products. The Council considered that it had provided an appropriate response to this part of Mr Cameron's request.
45. In a further submission, the Council explained that it did not hold any information as to the trading address or the VAT registration number for Fischer Racquetline Limited. The Council advised that after Fischer Racquetline Limited ceased to be the sole importer of Fischer products, Huntly Nordic Ski Centre no longer had any interest in the company.
46. Having considered the information the Council provided to Mr Cameron in response to this part of his request and his request for a review, together with the recent submission from the Council, I appreciate that it was seeking to be helpful in providing Mr Cameron with details of the trader who took over from Fischer Racquetline Limited. However, I do not consider that the information the Council gave to Mr Cameron in this connection was sufficient to meet his request, as it related to a completely different company. It is my view that the Council should have notified Mr Cameron in terms of section 17 of FOISA in respect of this information, as it did not hold any information (at the time of his request) concerning the trading address and VAT registration number of the trader concerned. I am satisfied from the Council's submissions that this was in fact the case.
47. I am therefore not satisfied that the Council responded properly to Mr Cameron's request for company information for Fischer Racquetline Limited, as it should have issued Mr Cameron with a notice under section 17 of FOISA. In all the circumstances, however, see no purpose in requiring the Council to take any action in this respect now.



Information relating to the sixth point in Mr Cameron's request for clarification

48. In the final part of his request for clarification, Mr Cameron sought an explanation as to how competitive prices obtained by the Council for the purchase of specific equipment could be verified.
49. Having considered the response that the Council has made to Mr Cameron regarding this, along with the Council's submissions for the purposes of my investigation, I understand that the Council's response on this point was based on the recollections of the relevant members of staff rather than recorded information held by the Council. I am satisfied from the Council's submissions that it does not (and did not at the time of the request) hold any information falling within the scope of this part of Mr Cameron's request. There is, however, nothing in the Council's response on this point which would indicate that no recorded information was held, and therefore I cannot accept that the Council complied with the requirements of section 17 of FOISA in this respect. In all the circumstances, however, see no purpose in requiring the Council to take any action on this point now.

Technical breaches

50. In his appeal to me Mr Cameron set out his dissatisfaction regarding the fact that the Council did not respond to his request for information within 20 working days as set out in FOISA.
51. Section 10(1) of FOISA states that a Scottish public authority receiving a request for information which requires it to comply with section 1(1) of FOISA, must comply promptly; and in any event by not later than the twentieth working day after the date that they receive it.
52. Mr Cameron submitted his request for information on 17 August 2006 and that a reply was not made to this by the Council until 27 September 2006. Accordingly, I must conclude that the Council did not comply with section 10(1) of FOISA in making this response to Mr Cameron.
53. Although the Council did not comply with section 10(1) of FOISA in making its response to Mr Cameron, I do not require it to take any action as I am satisfied that this did not curtail Mr Cameron in exercising his rights.



Decision

I find that Aberdeenshire Council (the Council) partially complied with Part 1 of the Freedom of Information (Scotland) Act 2002 (FOISA) in responding to the information request made by Mr Cameron.

I find that by giving notice in terms of section 17 of FOISA in responding to the second and third points of clarification raised by Mr Cameron (and effectively in responding to his first point) the Council complied with Part 1.

I also find that the Council provided an adequate response for the purposes of Part 1 to the fourth point raised by Mr Cameron.

However, in failing to provide Mr Cameron with a full explanation relating to the manner in which it kept its financial regulations up to date and the relevance of the financial regulations quoted by the Council to the purchases in question, the Council failed to fulfil its duty under section 15 of FOISA.

I also find that in failing to provide Mr Cameron with a notice under section 17 of FOISA for elements of the information that he requested under his fifth and sixth points, the Council did not comply with Part 1 of FOISA. I do not, however, require any action to be taken in respect of these breaches.

I find that Aberdeenshire Council failed to comply with section 10(1) of FOISA in responding to Mr Cameron's request for information.

I therefore require Aberdeenshire Council to provide information to Mr Cameron which will provide him with a further explanation regarding the operation of the Council's Financial Regulations, in particular how they are maintained and retained and their relevance to the subject matter of Mr Cameron's request. I require Aberdeenshire Council to do this within 45 days after the date of intimation of this decision notice.



Appeal

Should either Mr Cameron or Aberdeenshire Council wish to appeal against this decision, there is an appeal to the Court of Session on a point of law only. Any such appeal must be made within 42 days after the date of intimation of this decision notice.

Kevin Dunion
Scottish Information Commissioner
18 February 2008



Appendix 1

Relevant statutory provisions

Freedom of Information (Scotland) Act 2002

1 General entitlement

- (1) A person who requests information from a Scottish public authority which holds it is entitled to be given it by the authority.

8 Requesting information

- (1) Any reference in this Act to "requesting" information is a reference to making a request which-
 - (a) is in writing or in another form which, by reason of its having some permanency, is capable of being used for subsequent reference (as, for example, a recording made on audio or video tape);
 - (b) states the name of the applicant and an address for correspondence; and
 - (c) describes the information requested.
- (2) For the purposes of paragraph (a) of subsection (1) (and without prejudice to the generality of that paragraph), a request is to be treated as made in writing where the text of the request is-
 - (a) transmitted by electronic means;
 - (b) received in legible form; and
 - (c) capable of being used for subsequent reference.

10 Time for compliance

- (1) ... a Scottish public authority receiving a request which requires it to comply with section 1(1) must comply promptly; and in any event by not later than the twentieth working day after –
 - (a) ... the receipt by the authority of the request; or



...

15 Duty to provide advice and assistance

- (1) A Scottish public authority must, so far as it is reasonable to expect it to do so, provide advice and assistance to a person who proposes to make, or has made, a request for information to it.
- (2) A Scottish public authority which, in relation to the provision of advice or assistance in any case, conforms with the code of practice issued under section 60 is, as respects that case, to be taken to comply with the duty imposed by subsection (1).

17. Notice that information is not held

- (1) Where-
 - (a) a Scottish public authority receives a request which would require it either-
 - (i) to comply with section 1(1); or
 - (ii) to determine any question arising by virtue of paragraph (a) or (b) of section 2(1),if it held the information to which the request relates; but
 - (b) the authority does not hold that information,it must, within the time allowed by or by virtue of section 10 for complying with the request, give the applicant notice in writing that it does not hold it.
- (2) Subsection (1) is subject to section 19.
- (3) Subsection (1) does not apply if, by virtue of section 18, the authority instead gives the applicant a refusal notice.



Appendix 2

Request for clarification from Mr Cameron to the Council dated 17 August 2006.

1. I'd like to draw your attention to Point 3....information given to me on 02 Dec 05 ACE/32775...

“Point 3 You asked for details of Aberdeenshire Council’s procurement policy. Under Council Standing Orders Officers are required to go out to open tender for any purchase of equipment or services above the value of £60,000. Below this value Officers are required to show best value by securing at least two competitive written quotations.”

You have now quoted the following legislation to me on 08 August 2006 in ACE/62286...

“In terms of the Council’s financial regulations, orders involving sums below £10,000 do not have to go out to formal written tender. In these circumstances, the Huntly Nordic & Outdoor Centre have not invited tenders. In some cases, the Huntly Nordic & Outdoor Centre has spread purchases across several suppliers to compare products in terms of quality and maintenance requirements. Normally purchases are based on the cheapest product available but there are circumstances where quality and maintenance requirements need to be taken into account to ensure that goods are the most fit for purpose.”

When I wrote my FOI request of 14 Jul 2006, I was making reference to the information Aberdeenshire Council provided 02 Dec 2005 ACE/23775 ... I am aware that this year in 2006, the change was made that written tender would be required for sums below £10,000 and not the higher £60,000 limit.

Therefore you have misled my request for information, applying revised legislation, to the procurement of items made prior to 2006.

It was clearly defined in the Procurement Policy given to me on 02 Dec 05 ACE/32775 that for sums under £60,000, *“Officers are required to show best value by securing at least two competitive quotations.”*

My question does not ask for a waffle about *“Huntly Nordic & Outdoor Centre has spread purchases across several suppliers to compare products etc etc”*.... I have asked simply for...

1. ‘All’ competitive written quotations for pre-purchase of each item detailed in the Inventory of Moveable Equipment & Property dated 31st March 2005 submitted to Aberdeenshire Council during the procurement/tendering process.



Therefore I would be grateful if you would please supply an answer to this question and relate it to all items mentioned in the 'Inventory of Moveable Equipment & Property'.

If Officers have not obtained written quotations, despite being stated as a requirement for procurement under £60,000, please say so and explain why.

2. In the information that you have supplied in Appendix 1... I asked for 1. the two competitive written quotations for, 2. itemise who the successful supplier was and 3. provide all receipts and invoices relative to each item detailed.

39 pairs Junior Boots (Salomon)

76 pairs Adult Boots (Salomon/Fischer)

85 pairs Junior Skis (Fischer)

65 pairs Adult Skis (Fischer)

25 pairs Touring Skis

There is a huge gap in the information supplied ... only 74 pairs of boots and 28 pairs of ski's have been accounted for in Appendix 1...

You have not provided any receipts/invoices... please provide them.

You haven't detailed who the supplier's were for the remaining 41 boots and 147 ski's left unaccounted. Please detail who they are.

I would be grateful if you could answer this question properly and provide the information I have originally asked for.

3. It states in the Inventory of Moveable Equipment & Property, that the 'date of acquisition' of the 3x Fischer Ski Bags was 2003... your answer states that ...

"There are no formal records for this purchase as they were purchased over 5 years ago. However they are part of a pack of bags bought for moving class equipment to the Clashindarroch and some were for resale by the Ski Centre"

There is a clear contradiction in the information that has been supplied here... why is that?

In the answer that is given, can you provide me with procurement information about the 'pack of bags' which were bought and how many were sold on as mentioned above. (Who they were bought from, when they were bought, the two competitive written quotations and the invoices/receipts).



4. You state in the ACE/62286 reply [this is the reply of 8/08/06], that Aberdeenshire Council has a “buy local” policy... can you supply me with the written text of the policy given to all Officer's that confirms this.

5. In the suppliers you mention in Appendix 1...can you provide me with the following information...Their trading postal address and VAT Registration Number... this information should be on the receipts and is not sensitive to the Data Protection Act ...

Fischer Racquetline Ltd

Salomon Taylor Made Ltd

6. Can you explain how competitive prices obtained by telephone and on the internet before placing an order with 'Tout Tele' for 12 Marwe Skate Rollers and 4 Marwe Classic Rollers can be verified?