

**Freedom of Information Act 2000 - Request Reference Fol/21/254**  
**International Recruitment**

**Request Details**

- 1. International recruitment budget (If not an allocated budget, under which cost centre would the budget sit?)**

Cardiff and Vale University Health Board (the UHB) do not have a budget allocated specifically for international recruitment.

- 2. Current vacancies across: Doctors, Nursing & Midwifery and AHP (Allied Health Professionals, e.g. Radiographers) & HSS (Health Science Services, e.g. biomedical scientists) categories (Numbers only). See List of AHP/HSS Disciplines at the end of this email.**

Difference between Funded WTE establishment and WTE staff in post: -

Medical and Dental	311.43
Nursing and Midwifery Registered	409.43
Allied Health Professionals	11.21
Healthcare Scientists	50.66

- 3. Current supplier(s) for international recruitment projects/general permanent recruitment (Broken down into staff categories i.e. Doctors, Nurses, AHP/HSS)**

The UHB are currently using Medacs to help recruit international nurses. The contract was awarded through a tendering process

- 4. Any exclusive agreements or managed services used (Please include start and end dates of contracts)**

The UHB does not have any exclusive agreements or managed services.

- 5. Frameworks currently called off for International placements/general permanent recruitment (e.g. London Procurement Partnership, CCS RM6162)**

All Wales Framework

**6. The average fee for a Doctor, nurse, AHS/HSS that is placed with respective rebate periods. (Please provide break down for separate charges such as relocation and other elements)**

After considering your request, Cardiff and Vale University Health Board (the UHB) considers this information to be exempt from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (Section 43) Commercial Interests. This section of the Act sets out an exemption from the right to know if:

- The information requested is a trade secret, or
- Release of the information is likely to prejudice the commercial interests of any person. (A person may be an individual, a company, the public authority itself or any other legal entity).

This exemption was considered by the UHB when deciding whether to disclose information because it considered that in doing so there could be a significant risk in prejudicing the commercial interests of the company in question. As this is a qualified exemption, the UHB is required to complete a public interest test in deciding whether it is in the public's interest to withhold or disclose the information.

**In favour of disclosure:** There is a public interest in transparency and in the accountability of spending of public funds. Furthermore, it is in the public's interest that public funds be used effectively and that public sector bodies obtain the best value for money when contracting for the provision of services.

**Against disclosure:** There is a risk of disclosure prejudicing the commercial interests of the UHB by affecting its bargaining position with agencies. This in turn could lead to less effective use of public funds in future. It has been established above that releasing the information under the Freedom of Information Act, to which the UHB is subject, will give an unfair advantage to the supplier's competitors. The UHB believes that there is wider established public interest in companies not being prejudiced merely because they have contracted with a public sector body (as upheld in ICO decision notice FS50473543 ICO v Royal Marsden Hospital Trust).

**Decision:** The UHB considers that the public interest in withholding the information is greater than the interests in disclosing it and thereby giving unfair commercial advantage to competitors of the supplier to which this information concerns. The UHB believes that disclosure of information in a manner which fails to protect the interests and relationships arising in a commercial context could have the effect of discouraging companies from dealing with the Health Board because of fears that the disclosure of information could damage them commercially. In turn this could then jeopardise the Health Board's ability to compete fairly and pursue its function to bring forward development in the area and obtain value for money. It was therefore decided that it was not in the public's interest to disclose this information.