

Official

Ref: FOI-452

Sent via email only: [REDACTED]

08 November 2024

Dear [REDACTED]

1. Thank you for your email of 11 October 2024 in which you requested information from UK Anti-Doping ('UKAD') under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 ('the Act'). Specifically, you asked for the following information:
  - 1) *Do you use a social media management platform?*
  - 2) *If so, what tools do you use?*
  - 3) *What is your annual spend on a Social media management tool?*
  - 4) *What dates does your contract with your current supplier end (month & year)?*
  - 5) *Do you use a social listening / media monitoring platform?*
  - 6) *If so, what tools do you use?*
  - 7) *What is your annual spend on a social listening / media monitoring tool?*
  - 8) *What dates does your contract with your current supplier end (month & year)?*
  - 9) *Who is the senior person responsible for managing these contracts?*

## Summary of Response

---

2. UKAD is disclosing the information you have requested for the following questions: one (1), two (2), four (4), five (5), six (6), eight (8), and nine (9).
3. UKAD is not disclosing the information you have requested for questions three (3) and seven (7). The detail of the basis for this response is set out below.

## Response to request

---

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

Question	Information held
1	Yes
2	Falcon.io (Brandwatch)
4	October 2025 (Falcon.io)
5	Yes
6	UKAD uses Falcon.io and Tweetdeck for social listening and Onclusive for media monitoring.
8	June 2025 (Onclusive)
9	The Head of Communications

## Questions 3 and 7 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 third parties, specifically Brandwatch and Onclusive.
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 social media management and monitoring tools are exempt from disclosure because to disclose

such information would be likely to prejudice the commercial interests of UKAD, Brandwatch and Onclusive (hereafter referred to as the 'Suppliers'). This is because revealing such commercially sensitive information to the Suppliers' competitors would be likely to place them at a disadvantage in future negotiations with both UKAD and other organisations; specifically, disclosing their pricing structure could enable competitors to undercut them 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 contracts 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 social media management and monitoring tools, 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 social media management and monitoring tools 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 the Suppliers would be likely to damage the Suppliers' ability to compete on a level playing field and cause fair competition to be reduced, simply because they have 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 request and should be addressed via email to: [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**