



Foreign &  
Commonwealth  
Office

EU-Mediterranean Department  
Foreign and Commonwealth Office  
King Charles Street  
London SW1A 2AH

26 October 2016

Website: <https://www.gov.uk>

Dear

**FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 2000 REQUEST REF: 0593-16**

Thank you for your email of 16 June 2016 requesting information under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) 2000. You asked:

- 1. I wish to know the full text of the telegrams sent by Ms Janet Douglas, the Deputy Head of mission at the British Embassy in Ankara regarding proposals for granting visa entry to the UK for "special passport" holders?*
- 2. I wish to know the full text of any Foreign Office responses to the the telegrams sent by Ms Janet Douglas, the Deputy Head of mission at the British Embassy in Ankara regarding proposals for granting visa entry to the UK for "special passport" holders?*
- 3. If the Foreign Office doesn't hold this information, which other government department would be likely to hold this information?*

The Foreign Office has reviewed the information it holds falling within the terms of your request carefully and in the context of the Freedom of Information Act (2000). I am now able to provide the enclosed digest of the information you sought.

**Section 27(1)(a)**

Some of the information falling within the terms of your request is exempt under section 27(1)(a) which recognises the need to protect information that would be likely to prejudice relations between the United Kingdom and other states if it was disclosed. For this reason elements of the diplomatic telegrams you sought have been redacted (ie withheld).

The application of section 27(1)(a) requires us to consider the public interest test arguments in favour of releasing and withholding the information. Section 27(1)(a) recognises that the effective conduct of international relations depends upon maintaining trust and confidence between governments. If the United Kingdom does not maintain this trust and confidence, its ability to protect and promote UK interests through international relations will be hampered, which will not be in the public interest. For this reason we consider that the

public interest in maintaining this exemption, in relation to elements of these reports, outweighs the public interest in disclosure of the information.

### **Section 35(1)(a)**

Some of the information you requested is exempt under section 35(1)(a), which relates to the formulation or development of government policy. This exemption also requires the application of a public interest test. This recognises the public interest in greater transparency of public authority decision making to ensure accountability. However, officials also need to be able to conduct rigorous and candid risk assessments of policies without there being premature disclosure which might close off better options and inhibit the free and frank discussion of all options. It is our view that disclosure of some of the information falling within the terms of your request would risk undermining future decision making and discussion. For these reasons we consider that the public interest in maintaining this exemption, in relation to elements of these reports, outweighs the public interest in disclosure of the information.

### **Section 40**

Some of the information you have requested is personal data relating to third parties the disclosure of which would contravene one of the data protection principles. In such circumstances sections 40(2) and (3) of the Freedom of Information Act apply. In this case, our view is that disclosure would breach the first data protection principle. This states that personal data should be processed fairly and lawfully. It is the fairness aspect of this principle, which, in our view, would be breached by disclosure. In such circumstances, s.40 confers an absolute exemption on disclosure. There is, therefore, no public interest test to apply.

You also asked to see any responses to the points made in one telegram on the visa regime for holders of Turkish Special Passports. We have conducted a search for such material and can confirm that there is no response on record. We would also clarify that while the telegrams were authorised by Janet Douglas, in her capacity as Deputy Head of the British Embassy Ankara, the reporting was produced by the Embassy's political section.

You also asked which other government departments might hold the information you requested. We are unable to confirm what information other departments hold, but would point out that responsibility for visa policy rests with the Home Office.

Once an FOI request is answered, it is considered to be in the public domain. To promote transparency, we may now publish the response and any material released on [gov.uk](http://gov.uk) in the [FOI releases](#) section. All personal information in the letter will be removed before publishing.

The copies of information being supplied to you continue to be protected by the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988. You are free to use it for your own purposes, including any non-commercial research you are doing and for the purposes of news reporting. Any other re-use, for example commercial publication, would require the permission of the copyright holder. Most documents supplied by the FCO will have been produced by government officials and will be protected by Crown Copyright. To re-use Crown Copyright documents please consult the [Open Government Licence v3](#) on the National Archives website.

Yours sincerely,

EU-Mediterranean Department



We keep and use information in line with the Data Protection Act 1998. We may release this personal information to other UK government departments and public authorities.