



## Response to Request for Information

Reference      FOI 0515113  
Date            26 May 2015

### ***Content Filtering Software***

**Request:**

1. Do you employ the use of content filtering software on the PCs based in your libraries which are connected to the internet and intended for use by the users of your library?

If answer to 1. is "yes", please:

Yes

2. Provide the name and annual cost of the content filtering software.

There is no annual renewal cost to the Council at this time.

3. Provide a full list of the categories of websites blocked (e.g. "pornography, gambling, phishing etc."). If these differ according to the user profile accessing the PC (e.g. child, student, adult, staff etc.) please provide a full list of categories of websites blocked for each user profile.

4. Confirm whether you also block specific URLs in addition to categories, and provide a complete list of these URLs.

5. Provide the relevant policy document or written documentation which outlines the procedure a user must follow in instances where they would like to gain access to a website that is blocked.

In respect of the named product in relation to your question 2 and for the entirety of questions 3, 4 & 5, The Council has decided not to disclose this information.

The Council is of the view that this would constitute information whose disclosure to the wider world would raise concerns around Law Enforcement and that Section 31 – Law Enforcement-of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 ("The Act") is engaged.

In considering the public interest for and against disclosure in this case, the Council has considered the public interest in disclosing categories blocked, blocking of specific URLs and policy documentation and procedures regarding gaining access to blocked URLs in terms of the contribution to demonstrating transparency of

processes followed, allowing accountability for decisions taken and money spent and scrutiny of decisions made.

In this instance, the Council judges that the public interest in disclosure is outweighed by the public interest in allowing the Council to ensure the integrity of its systems and ensure that its legitimate business and that of others is protected from criminal activity.

In this instance, the Council is of the view that disclosing details requested would lead to the need for increased spending to protect systems involved.

The Council is also of the view that releasing this information into the public domain would add to the sum of criminal knowledge and would impact on the potential conduct of business.

The Council also considers that the provisions of Section 38 of the Act – Health and Safety-are engaged. It considers that disclosure would or would be likely to endanger the physical or mental health of any person.

The Council considers that disclosure to the wider world (which is how any disclosure made under the provisions of The Act must be considered) would endanger the health and safety of individuals who use Council systems as disclosure of the requested information would expose the processes and approaches used to protect individuals.

In applying this exemption, the Council considers the public interest in demonstrating openness and transparency of process against the public interest in withholding the information in ensuring the health and safety of Council employees, service users and others is greater than the public interest in any disclosure.

6. From January 2013 until the present day, please provide a list of the URLs where users have requested access to despite them being blocked by the content filtering software.

7. Of the list provided in 6, please detail which URLs access was granted for and which were denied.

In respect of your questions 6-7, it has been established that the Council does not hold the above information and we are unable to provide any information relating to the above, and are informing you as required by Section 1(1) (a) of the Act.