



[REDACTED]

14 May 2026

Dear [REDACTED]

Freedom of Information request: FOI2026/00333

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request received on the 15 April in which you requested the following:

Your request:

1. *Between 2005 and 2013, did the Daresbury Laboratory contract with any third-party company to provide security and/or maintenance services for its data centre facilities? If so, please provide:*

- (a) The name(s) of the company/companies contracted*
- (b) The approximate dates of the contract(s)*
- (c) A brief description of the services provided*

2. *During this period, did any third-party company providing IT, network, or security services to Daresbury Laboratory have offices or workspace based in or at the same site as the Laboratory?*

Our response:

I can confirm that UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) does hold some information relevant to your request. Please see the information below.

1. *Between 2005 and 2013, did the Daresbury Laboratory contract with any third-party company to provide security and/or maintenance services for its data centre facilities? If so, please provide:*

- (a) The name(s) of the company/companies contracted*
- (b) The approximate dates of the contract(s)*
- (c) A brief description of the services provided*

UKRI's data retention policy for contract information is 7 years, therefore contract information is not held that covers the period of 2005 to 2013. Some spend data is held from 2010 to 2013, therefore we can confirm that the following suppliers provided services relating to security and/or maintenance for Daresbury Laboratory between 2010 and 2013:

- Arco Limited (November 2011) – Weatherproof padlock purchases
- Insight Direct (UK) Ltd (January 2011) – Security cable lock purchase
- Premier Farnell UK Ltd (multiple contracts) July 2010 to September 2012) – Key tab, Keyrings, padlock and door chime purchases
- RS Components (September 2010) – Converter set purchase

Section 31 – Law enforcement

We have determined that disclosure of some of the information requested in scope of part 1 of your request, which relates to CCTV and communications infrastructure, would prejudice the prevention or detection of crime as per

Section 31(1)(a) of the Freedom of Information Act.

Section 31(1)(a) is a qualified exemption and therefore subject to a public interest test. UKRI applied the Public Interest Test to this request as set out below.

Public interest in favour of disclosure:

- There is a public interest in favour of release of the information, to uphold the principles of transparency and accountability, in disclosing information about government or public authority infrastructure and contracts.

Public interest test in favour of withholding the information:

- The release of this information would make UKRI more vulnerable to crime.
- The crime in question would be a malicious attack on UKRI's security infrastructure and systems.
- The release of this information would be seen to prejudice the prevention or detection of crime, by making UKRI's security infrastructure more vulnerable and therefore facilitate the possibility of a criminal offence being carried out.
- There is an overwhelming public interest in keeping government or public authority security systems secure, which would be served by non-disclosure.

UKRI has therefore reached the conclusion that, on balance, the public interest is better served by withholding this information under Section 31(1)(a).

2. During this period, did any third-party company providing IT, network, or security services to Daresbury Laboratory have offices or workspace based in or at the same site as the Laboratory?

Security provisions for the Daresbury Laboratory site and campus buildings are provided by a UKRI employed in-house security team and are not contracted to a third party.

No information is held that confirms whether any third-party companies providing IT, network or security services to Daresbury Laboratory had offices or workspace based in or at the same site as the Laboratory from 2005 to 2013.

Your rights

If you have any queries regarding our response please do let us know. If you are dissatisfied with the handling of your request, you have the right to ask for an internal review, explaining which elements of this decision you disagree with and why. Internal review requests should be submitted within 40 working days of the date of our response and should be addressed to:

Head of Information Governance

Email: foi@ukri.org


Please quote the reference number above in any future communications.

If you are still not content with the outcome of the internal review, you may apply to refer the matter to the Information Commissioner for a decision. Generally, the ICO cannot make a decision unless you have exhausted the review procedure provided by UKRI. The Information Commissioner can be contacted at: www.ico.org.uk.

If you wish to raise a complaint regarding the service you have received or the conduct of any UKRI staff in relation to your request, please see [UKRI's complaints procedure](#)¹.

¹ <https://www.ukri.org/who-we-are/contact-us/make-a-complaint/#skipnav-target>

Yours sincerely,


Information Governance
Information Rights Team
UK Research and Innovation
foi@ukri.org | dataprotection@ukri.org