



Dr Rob Faure Walker
rw52@soas.ac.uk

FOI : 59961
04th September 2020

Dear Requester,

Thank you for your e-mail of 17th August 2020, in which you request information about the cost and production of the Prevent video.

You specifically ask:

1. The financial costs of commissioning and producing the videos uploaded as the "Prevent" playlist on the Home Office YouTube channel. These include videos titled: Moner - Prevent Coordinator; Prevent in the health and education sectors; Supporting friends and family; Prevent tackling the far right; Prevent: An Introduction.
2. Details of any companies or external organisations involved in the outsourcing of the design and production of the videos.
3. Details of the tendering process that was followed to engage these companies and organisations.

Your request has been handled as a request for information under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

In relation to questions 1 and 2, we confirm we hold the information but are withholding it under sections 24 and 43 of the FOI act. Please find further details of these exemptions in the Annex to this letter.

In relation to question 3 we can confirm that we do hold the information. The 'Moner – Prevent Coordinator' video was produced internally by the Home Office. The work on the other videos you mention was undertaken as part of an existing contract tendered following standard procurement processes.

If you are dissatisfied with this response you may request an independent internal review of our handling of your request by submitting a complaint within two months to FOIRequests@homeoffice.gov.uk, quoting reference **59961** If you ask for an internal review, it would be helpful if you could say why you are dissatisfied with the response.

As part of any internal review the Department's handling of your information request will be reassessed by staff who were not involved in providing you with this response. If you remain dissatisfied after this internal review, you would have a right of complaint to the Information Commissioner as established by section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act.

Yours sincerely

**Freedom of Information
Home Office**

Annex

Public Interest Test

Section 24 (1)

24 National security.

(1) Information which does not fall within section 23(1) is exempt information if exemption from section 1(1)(b) is required for the purpose of safeguarding national security.

Considerations in favour of disclosing the information

There is a general public interest in disclosure and the fact that openness in government increases public trust in, and engagement with, the government. In relation to revealing levels of funding, the disclosure of this information could enhance the openness of government and help the public understand, in greater depth, how the government is targeting its resources to most efficiently safeguard vulnerable individuals from being radicalised.

Considerations in favour of withholding the information

Releasing how much money was spent on this content could be used, alongside other FOI's, to build up a detailed picture of how the Prevent budget is spent. There is a risk that knowledge of how Prevent resource is allocated could identify weaknesses in Prevent delivery. These could be exploited to better target radicalisation efforts.

Balance of the public interest

We assess that safeguarding national security is of paramount importance and that in this instance the public interest is best served by non-disclosure of the funding of this content under section 24 (1).

Section 43 (2)

43 Commercial Interests

(1) Information is exempt information if it constitutes a trade secret.

(2) Information is exempt information if its disclosure under this Act would, or would be likely to, prejudice the commercial interests of any person (including the public authority holding it).

Considerations in favour of disclosing the information

There is general public interest in the disclosure of the information within the scope of your request. Openness in government increases public trust in, and engagement with, the Government. The disclosure of the requested information could enhance the openness of government and help the public understand how the government is targeting its resources to most efficiently safeguard vulnerable individuals from being radicalised..

Considerations in favour of withholding the information

Releasing how much money was spent on this content could be used, alongside other FOI's, to build up a detailed picture of how the Prevent budget is spent. There is a risk that knowledge of how Prevent resource is allocated could identify weaknesses in Prevent delivery. These could be exploited to better target radicalisation efforts.

Disclosing the identities and the charges of any companies which were involved in outsourcing/preparing the videos would be likely to prejudice their commercial interests, as well as that of the Home Office.

Disclosure would be likely to prejudice the commercial interests of the Home Office. If fewer companies are willing to work with Prevent due to fears of unilateral disclosure via FOI then the Home Office will be forced to draw from a smaller pool of partners. This would distort the market and prejudice the Home Office's ability to obtain value for money for the taxpayer.

Balance of the public interest

We assess that safeguarding the commercial interests of security is of paramount importance and that in this instance the public interest is best served by non-disclosure of the details requested under section 43 (2).