

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Lee Bridges](#); [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: In confidence - security: FYI no actions needed
Date: 21 October 2021 14:45:00
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.jpg](#)
Sensitivity: Confidential

Hi

Following on from the email below [REDACTED] is removing FOI responses for this Parliament (Dec 2019 onwards) from the disclosure pages of the website pending the outcome of the wider security review of IPSA's publication policies, and to align with the postponement of the bi-monthly and annual publication rounds and removal of descriptor fields containing text showing locations, for example, of venues hired, and starting and destination points for travel as mentioned at this morning's IPSA team meeting.

Not all of our FOI responses include categories of information currently under review, such as, requests about IPSA's IT systems, copies of policies, I've asked [REDACTED] to check and note any FOI responses which include any information about:

- Travel locations
- Venues (e.g. hire of hall)
- Hotel locations
- Security arrangements or spending

This will help us to identify what may safely be republished and to review anything in the light of the findings of the investigation.

[REDACTED]

From: Lee Bridges [REDACTED]
Sent: 18 October 2021 18:03
To: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Subject: RE: In confidence - security

Thank you [REDACTED] and I think restricting access to this Parliament and postponing publication of those not yet published will be enough.

On the insensitivity point, if it demonstrates how awful people can be to them then maybe its best left as is?

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 18 October 2021 17:10
To: Lee Bridges [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Subject: RE: In confidence - security

We could:

- Postpone publication of anything not already published on the FOI Disclosure Log
- Temporarily suspend access either to the entire FOI Disclosure Log or just for recent disclosures, for example, the period after the last election, 2019/20, 2020/21 and this year.

Technically, all FOI disclosures are to the public domain, however our disclosure log provides a one-stop, searchable resource. We publish the request as well as the response, and, although requests are not published in full, some are phrased in a manner which, although not overtly offensive, might seem very insensitive in the current situation.

[REDACTED]

From: Lee Bridges [REDACTED]

Sent: 18 October 2021 16:51

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: In confidence - security

Sorry to be piecemeal, but this doesn't answer the disclosure log issue – perhaps we do have to restrict access to that temporarily?

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 18 October 2021 16:36

To: Lee Bridges [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: In confidence - security

Nothing in annual data has potential 'security' implications.

There's a couple of things where we could be making changes (staff absence etc) but those can wait until after the Board discussion.

When we are ready tomorrow we will line up the email from Richard/Ian in MailChimp.

From: Lee Bridges [REDACTED]

Sent: 18 October 2021 16:34

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: In confidence - security

Thanks [REDACTED]

Tomorrow afternoon would be fine as we are saying that we "are removing" rather than have

done.

I cannot see anything detailed enough in annual publication to cause similar concerns. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] am I missing something?

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 1 [REDACTED]
To: Lee Bridges [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Subject: RE: In confidence - security

Thanks Lee, Just had a quick chat with [REDACTED] who confirmed we have control over the annual publication data.

The detailed claims go through [REDACTED] and we will contact them asap today as they are 'touch and go' towards the end of the day. Things could still be done relatively quickly tomorrow, hopefully within a few hours of us sending the updated files.

It should be easy for [REDACTED] to fully unpublish the annual data, or re-upload files after we've removed some of the information. Please just let us know what to remove from the annual data. [REDACTED] [Here](#) is what we publish annually, if you would like to confirm what we might need to remove.

[REDACTED]

From: Lee Bridges [REDACTED]
Sent: 18 October 2021 16:17
To: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Subject: RE: In confidence - security

Thank you [REDACTED] (and for your creative thinking!) Green light from Ian, can we get that lined up?

I'd appreciate views on annual publication – it doesn't feel like there are security aspects to it

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 18 October 2021 15:58
To: [REDACTED] Lee Bridges
[REDACTED]
Subject: RE: In confidence - security

Yes: We've got twelve files with the detailed data for all the financial years since 2010-2011: We can start re-sending the files to [REDACTED] today, with all the description fields removed, starting from the most recent financial year, and ask them to re-upload the files urgently. I think everything could be updated by the end of tomorrow morning at the latest, but we should contact FS before 5pm today as they have been known not to respond after that time.

There is also the annual publication data for each financial year: Total spend against budget, Other financial information, and the other payment data (aggregated security and disability-assistance

costs, debts written-off, etc). If you are also considering removing any of this, it is managed on our side, by [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] depending on the information. It might be less sensitive, but includes connected party information (full name, salary range), and some other staff information (job titles, reward and recognition payments). You can view this on the website, but please let me know if you need more information.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 18 October 2021 15:55

To: Lee Bridges [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Subject: RE: In confidence - security

Hi

This sounds good. I'd be tempted to give this a try overnight.

[REDACTED] and [REDACTED] would be able to advise how tricky it is to make it happen and whether [REDACTED] need to be involved.

But removing the description field ought to be relatively easy and should help avoid the 'opportunism' charge that I was worried about this morning...

[REDACTED]

From: Lee Bridges [REDACTED]

Sent: 18 October 2021 15:41

To: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Subject: RE: In confidence - security

Thanks [REDACTED] would that be relatively straightforward thing to do (and quickly)?

From: [REDACTED]

Sent:

To: [REDACTED] Lee Bridges
[REDACTED]

Subject: RE: In confidence - security

Hi all,

Regarding removal of the detailed publication data, as discussed it will remain available on other websites, and this might have the detrimental impact of drawing traffic towards those other websites, which often present the data in a rather simplistic way, and not always with our latest updates. This could have a lasting impact, even after we resume publishing.

Can we consider instead keeping the data on the IPSA website, but removing the description fields only? We would still show: budget category, expense type, amount, status (paid, not paid, repaid).

Happy to go with your decision either way.

Many thanks,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

IPSA

www.theipsa.org.uk

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 18 October 2021 14:05

To: Lee Bridges [REDACTED]

RE: In confidence - security

Hi Lee

Yes, broadly OK. I'd just mention again that if we are removing all access to the publications part of the website we would have to do the same to the FOI part of the website as so many of those responses are for more information about other published claims. It would probably be good to involve [REDACTED] for that reason.

On annual publication I'm not sure MPs will want this hanging around for too long. The bulk of it will be published in due course. We did it the week before Christmas in 2019 after the election. Doing a four month block of publication in January would reflect what we did in July 2020 (we did not do a May 2020 publication due to the switch to homeworking).

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Lee Bridges [REDACTED]

Sent: 18 October 2021 13:43

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: In confidence - security

Colleagues

I've heard from Richard and he has authorised the following as Chair's action:

- We postpone the annual publication and bimonthly publication due in November
- As in our publication policy, we ask the police to review what we currently publish in light of whatever comes out of the joint security taskforce
- Richard and Ian will write to all MPs to announce this, offer condolences, commit to our ongoing collaboration on their security etc (once we have seen what happens this afternoon in case anything IPSA related comes out of it) – now agreed to be sent in the morning
- We remove access to the old stuff temporarily (although we know it is on other sites – it's a symbolic move really) – suggested 2 week period for us to have a look back in the light of Friday's attack
- We consider at the Board whether to not publish anything until we are in a position (February?) to enact all the changes that are currently in the Board paper and the security related ones, and then restart regular publication in April OR we do some tweaks and publish in ?January
- Data that should be published will be published eventually, just in a timeframe that allows us to get things in order
- I am rewriting the Board paper accordingly

I'm sure there are loads of operational issues coming out of this, so I will put some time in for us tomorrow to take stock.

Many thanks

L



[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 18 October 2021 09:52
To: Lee Bridges [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Subject: RE: In confidence - security

Thanks Lee, good to know and all sounds very sensible. Sorry obviously to hear about the tragic event on Friday.

Best

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

IPSA

www.theipsa.org.uk

From: Lee Bridges
Sent: 18 October 2021 08:55
To: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Subject: In confidence - security

Morning [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

There is some thinking to do on publication. s5 of the publication policy says that we would not publish certain costs/details based on police advice. In light of what happened on Friday and feedback we are getting about what we publish, we may be postponing the publications due in November whilst we get fresh police advice on the information we currently publish (travel; details of locations of surgeries etc). This may be more symbolic, but this may also include

temporarily taking down past publication information. Whatever the decision may be on that, I don't think that we should send the second annual publication email this week ahead of any major announcements on security measure due Friday/next Monday. Clearly, the original paper for the Board this month will be changing significantly.

Subject to the decision on publication, I would suggest that Richard write to all MPs and MP staff explaining what we are doing, as well as reinforcing the messages that we are working closely with the House and others and stand ready to do whatever we can etc. On balance, I think such a letter should come after we have heard the Commons session this afternoon, as there may be other things we need to address.

Sorry that there isn't any certainty yet, but ELT is meeting at lunchtime today and I will update you all again immediately afterwards.

Any q's just fire them over

L

Lee Bridges

Director of Policy & Engagement



www.theipsa.org.uk

[@ipsauk](#)

My pronouns are he/him/his