



Freedom of Information Request FOI 23 130

Bibby Stockholm - risk assessments, FS advice, MAF records

Query and response:

You requested the following information:

- 1. I note your comment that the maximum occupancy is yet to be confirmed. I also note that the Home Office has publicly announce the BS will house 506 people plus crew. How has DWFR satisfied itself that the Risk Assessment are valid if the maximum number of people planned to be on board is unknow? What number has been used for the current risk assessment?*
- 2. Given that the Home Office has publicly announced that the BS will house 506 people plus crew what evidence have DWFR seen to confirm that the escape routes are of the correct width for this number of people? (For example, under building regulation for a building designed for 506 people the escape routes would need to be approx. 2.5m wide clearly not the case on the BS)*
- 3. In response to my question 6 you mention that you have not seen information regarding that "design capacity" is limited to 222 or information to suggest that the vessel was intended for single occupancy of the provided cabins. Please find attached a fact sheet from the owners of the BS publicly available when the Home Office announced the use of the vessel. The fact sheet states that the "Bibby Stockholm can accommodate up to 222 guests in high quality en suite bedrooms" In addition it states "222 single en suite bedrooms". Given that DWFR are now in possession of these facts what actions/enforcement actions will it consider taking to limit the occupancy to 222?*
- 4. Please could I have a copy or link to Fire Safety Matters letter to the Responsible Person with actions required, including additional means of escape requirements and protection to the existing escape routes that you mention in your reply regarding the BS.*

Question 4 Response :

Please find attached copy of the Safety Matters Letter as requested.

DWFRS confirms that it holds the information you have requested.

DWFRS has undertaken a public interest test and our Monitoring Officer (Qualified Person) has provided his opinion and has determined that the prejudice in Sections 36 (2)(b)(i), Section 36 (2)(b)(ii), Section 36 (2)(c) of the Freedom of Information Act would be likely to occur and therefore we are not releasing the information requested, and are relying on the following exemptions:

Section 36 exemption – Section 36 (2)(b)(i)&(b)(ii), section 36(2)(c) which states:



(2) Information to which this section applies is exempt information if, in the reasonable opinion of a qualified person, disclosure of the information under this Act—

(b) would, or would be likely to, inhibit—

(i) the free and frank provision of advice, or

(ii) the free and frank exchange of views for the purposes of deliberation, or

(c) would otherwise prejudice, or would be likely otherwise to prejudice, the effective conduct of public affairs.

DWFRS has undertaken a public interest test concerning withholding information under Section 36 (2)(b)(i)&(b)(ii), of the Freedom of Information Act and have set our arguments for and against disclosure below:

Public interest arguments in favour of disclosure:

There is a general desirability that DWFRS' activities are transparent, and we recognise that there is a clear public interest in transparency and accountability of public authorities. There is also a clear public interest in demonstrating that the Bibby Stockholm is safe from fire and that DWFRS is taking appropriate actions to promote and enforce fire safety law.

Public interest agreement against disclosure:

The Fire Safety Manager (FSM) needs to be able to engage with stakeholders from external organisations in an informal manner, to discuss matters at a high level outside the scope of regulatory action. This type of engagement allows him to build relationships with all types of stakeholders, including the Home Office and Landry and Kling. The threat of disclosure of information from these types of engagement would likely discourage the building of such relationships and could inhibit stakeholders, including the Responsible person under Fire Safety Law from providing information. This would therefore have an adverse effect on DWFRS' ability to effectively carry out its functions. In order to provide an effective fire safety enforcement role, the FSM needs to be able to communicate and internally discuss the results of his engagement with these stakeholders. The threat of disclosure of this internal correspondence would substantively inhibit his ability to perform his role effectively in future.

Conclusion

There would be prejudice to the effective conduct of public affairs if exchanges of information between relevant persons and fire officers and the deliberations of fire officers were to be disclosed. It cannot be in the public interest and must be prejudicial to the effective conduct of public affairs (public affairs in this case being the assessment of risk and the use of appropriate steps to keep people safe from fire) when public officials have credible grounds to fear repercussions if their views, deliberations, and conclusions are made public. We conclude that the balance of the public interest lies in maintaining the exemption and withholding the information.



Section 31 Exemption - Section 31(2)(c) states:

(2) The purposes referred to in subsection (1)(g) to (i) are

(c) the purpose of ascertaining whether circumstances which would justify regulatory action in pursuance of any enactment exist or may arise,

DWFRS has undertaken a public interest test concerning withholding information under Section 31 (2)(c) of the Freedom of Information Act and have set our arguments for and against disclosure below:

Public interest arguments in favour of disclosure:

We recognise that there is a clear public interest in transparency and accountability of public authorities. There is also a clear public interest in demonstrating that the Bibby Stockholm is safe from fire and that DWFRS is taking appropriate actions to promote and enforce fire safety law.

Public interest agreement against disclosure

DWFRS' role is as an enforcing authority to ensure that the "responsible person" has done what is necessary under fire safety law. The Service needs to be able to work with the responsible person in an honest, frank and meaningful way. The Service needs to be able to preserve and protect its routes for enforcement actions which could lead to prosecution. Disclosure of detailed information gathered during the Service's assessment of compliance with Fire Safety law could prejudice any future enforcement action that the Service needs to take as a regulator of fire safety.

Conclusion

We conclude that the balance of the public interest lies in maintaining the exemption and withholding the information.

Information/Detail accurate on the date provided: 15, September 2023