16 November 2020

Email: ltheanine29@protonmail.com

Dear Murray Jones,

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST

Thank you for your request for information received on 16 October 2020 about funding from specific companies. I apologise for the delay in responding to this request.

The University's response is provided below.

I am writing to request information regarding your university's funding from certain manufacturing companies, under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.
Has the university received funding from any of the following companies since 2013: BAE Systems, Babcock International, Qinetiq, Rolls-Royce; Serco; Cobham and Raytheon UK, Airbus, DXC Technology, General Dynamics UK, Leonardo MW UK, Lockheed Martin UK?
If so, please include the following details:

a. **Total funding supplied by the company**
b. **The titles of the projects it is associated with**
c. **Descriptions of the projects it is associated with**

Please provide the information in digital form.

Invoices raised for research since 1 August 2014	
	£
Rolls Royce	100,000.00
Qinetiq	79,200.00
Airbus Operations Ltd	117,420.00
Babcock International Group	2,200.00
BAE Systems - Applied Intelligence Ltd	22,400.00
Leonardo MW Ltd	198,000.00

The table above sets out invoices raised for research for the companies listed. Please note that we do not hold information prior to 1 August 2014.

The University holds information on the titles and descriptions of projects. However, after careful consideration, the University has concluded that this should be withheld under the following exemptions:

- Section 43(2) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (commercial interests). The information requested would be of use to competitors and would be likely to harm the University's commercial interests if released. The public interest test was used and in

consideration of the arguments for disclosing or withholding the information, the finding was that public interest in withholding the information outweighed the public interest in releasing the information.

- Section 31(1) (a) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (prevention or detection of crime). The information requested would be strategically useful to criminals and likely to prejudice the prevention or detection of crime. In consideration of the arguments for disclosing or withholding the information, the finding was that public interest in withholding the information outweighed the public interest in releasing the information.

If you are dissatisfied with the way in which your request has been handled, you may request an internal review and should contact me again in the first instance.

If you then believe that your request has not been dealt with properly, you may apply to the Information Commissioner for a decision at: The Information Commissioner's Office, Wycliffe House, Water Lane, Wilmslow, Cheshire SK9 5AF.

Yours sincerely

J Anstee