

Sent via email only to: [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

**Ref: FOI-434**

24 May 2024

Dear [REDACTED]

1. Thank you for your email dated 25 April 2024, in which you requested information from UK Anti-Doping ('UKAD') under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 ('the Act'). You requested information relating to the communications and telephony systems in place at UKAD. Specifically, you asked for the following information:

*1. Telephony and UC Collaboration*

- a) Please confirm the manufacturer of your telephony system(s) that are currently in place.*
- b) When is the contract renewal date*
- c) Who maintains your telephony system(s)?*
- d) Do you use Unified Communications or Collaboration tools, if so which ones?*

*2. Microsoft*

- a) What Microsoft 365 licence do you have across the business e.g. E3/E5;*
- b) Which partner looks after your Microsoft tenant?*
- c) Where do you host your applications? Do you have on premise infrastructure or do you host your applications in public or private cloud?*

*3. Storage*

- a) Does your organisation use on-premise or cloud storage or both?*
- b) Please confirm the on-premise hardware manufacturer*
- c) Please confirm your cloud storage provider*
- d) What is your annual spend on cloud storage?*
- e) How do you back-up your data and with who*

## Summary of response

---

2. UKAD is disclosing the information you have requested at items 1a through to 3c inclusive and 3e.
3. UKAD is not disclosing the information you have requested at item 3d. The detail of the basis for this response is set out below.

## Response to request

---

4. UKAD confirms that it holds the information requested and provides a response to your request via the table below:

Item	Information held
1a	Microsoft Teams
1b	July 2024
1c	Koris 365
1d	Microsoft Teams
2a	Our core licencing does not use enterprise plans
2b	Elysian IT
2c	Microsoft Azure
3a	Cloud storage.
3b	Not applicable.
3c	Microsoft Azure
3d	Information withheld
3e	Azure backup service

### Item 3d of your request

---

5. UKAD confirms that it holds the information requested. However, we are withholding this information under the exemption provided in section 43 of the Act on the grounds that releasing the information would be likely to prejudice the commercial interests of both UKAD and a third party (Elysian IT).

6. Section 43(2) provides as follows:

*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).*

7. UKAD has concluded that information about its annual spend on calls and lines is exempt from disclosure because to do so would be likely to prejudice the commercial interests of both UKAD and Elysian. This is because revealing such commercially sensitive information to Elysian's competitors would be likely to place Elysian at a disadvantage in future negotiations with both UKAD and other organisations; specifically, disclosing Elysian's pricing structure could enable competitors to undercut Elysian in the future.

8. Likewise, revealing the fees paid by UKAD would likely adversely affect UKAD's bargaining position in any future negotiations for its contract and result in less competitive tender applications being made. Disclosing such information would also be likely to deter other companies from contracting with UKAD (and other public authorities) in the future, undermining UKAD's ability to obtain value for money in future contracts.

9. Having determined the prejudice that would likely arise from disclosing the costs of UKAD's annual spend on calls and lines, UKAD has gone on to consider whether the public interest test requires disclosure of this information.

10. UKAD recognises the public interest in public authorities being transparent and accountable, particularly in relation to expenditure of public funds. UKAD also recognises that it is in the public interest to ensure that authorities are obtaining value for money, and that disclosing the cost of UKAD's annual spend on calls and lines would allow the public to undertake such an evaluation.

11. Conversely, there is also the public interest in fairness of competition and in ensuring that the ability of public authorities to obtain value for money is not undermined. Disclosure of fees paid to Elysian would be likely to damage its ability to compete on a level playing field and cause fair competition to be reduced, simply because Elysian has contracted with a public authority. As a result, the risk

arises that fewer companies may be willing to contract with UKAD and that less competitive tender applications will be made, undermining UKAD's ability to obtain value for money in its future expenditure of public funds.

12. Having considered the public interest arguments both for and against maintaining the exemption, UKAD has concluded that the balance of the public interests falls in favour of non-disclosure in this instance.

### **Conclusion**

13. If you are dissatisfied with the handling of your request, you have the right to ask for an internal review. Internal review requests should be submitted within two months of the date of receipt of the response to your original request (i.e. two months from the date of this letter) and should be [foi@ukad.org.uk](mailto:foi@ukad.org.uk). Please remember to quote the reference number above in any further communications.
14. If you are not content with the outcome of the internal review, you have the right to apply directly to the Information Commissioner for a decision. The Information Commissioner can be contacted at: Information Commissioner's Office, Wycliffe House, Water Lane, Wilmslow, Cheshire, SK9 5AF.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "UK Anti-Doping". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly stylized font.

UK Anti-Doping