



[REDACTED]

10 February 2023

Dear [REDACTED],

**Freedom of Information request: FOI2022/00378**

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request received on the 19 November in which you requested the following:

**Your request:**

*I am interested in obtaining a document that I was unable to find on your website.*

*I am looking for a report of a Medical Research Council ad hoc meeting "to examine evidence relating measles or measles vaccine to chronic gastrointestinal inflammation". This meeting took place on 23 March 1998 at the Royal College of Surgeons, Lincoln's Inn Fields, London. The image [attached] is what I assume to be the first page of this report (obtained from Andrew Wakefield misled Medical Research Council (archive.org)) and includes the names of the individuals included in the meeting.*

**Our response:**

I can confirm that UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) hold information relevant to your request.

Please find attached a redacted copy of the requested report, "FOI2022 00378 Report of MMR Meeting 23 March 1998\_Redacted".

In considering your request we considered the application of exemptions Section 36, prejudice to effective conduct of public affairs, Section 38, health and safety, and Section 41(1), information provided in confidence. However, following further review and deliberation we have determined that these exemptions should not be engaged.

The copy of the report provided with this response has had some personal data redacted as we consider the names of participants, as well as some comments and opinions that can be attributed to individuals, would be exempt under Section 40(2) of the FOIA. Disclosing this information would contravene the first Data Protection Principle as defined under Section 86 of the Data Protection Act 2018 and Article 5 of UK General Data Protection Regulation (UK GDPR).

To further explain, this meeting was held under "Chatham House" rules, with attendees having participated with the expectation that any comments that could be attributed to, or which related directly to individuals or their pre-publication data, would not be made public. We therefore consider that comments made, and opinions given, by individuals can be considered as personal information. Section 40(2) is an absolute exemption and does not require a public interest test.

In applying this exemption, we also considered the passage of time and that the pre-published data, which was presented and discussed at the meeting, is now available in the public domain. We therefore do not consider Section 40(2) to apply where published information is being referenced or referred to.

If you have any queries regarding our response or you are unhappy with the outcome of your request and wish to seek an internal review of the decision, please contact:

Head of Information Governance

Email: [foi@ukri.org](mailto: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](http://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 policy: <https://www.ukri.org/about-us/policies-and-standards/complaints-policy/>

Yours sincerely,

  
Information Governance  
Information Rights Team  
UK Research and Innovation  
[foi@ukri.org](mailto:foi@ukri.org) | [dataprotection@ukri.org](mailto:dataprotection@ukri.org)