
ANONYMITY AND REDACTION

1. This statement sets out the Review's approach to redaction of information from documents before they are disclosed or published. It is a living document that will be revised and refreshed as the Review progresses.

Definitions

"Redaction" is the removal of information from a document, usually by blacking out or otherwise removing words or images.

"Publication" is the process of making available information on the Review website, which is accessible by members of the public, or as part of any interim or final report.

"Anonymity" is the protection of a person's identity from disclosure to others or publication.

Redactions, Personal Information, Relevance and Confidentiality

2. Documents provided to the Review may contain large amounts of personal information. A central purpose of redaction is to protect, where it is appropriate to do so, the identities of people and their personal information.
3. Redaction may also be used to exclude information which (i) is not relevant to the Review's Terms of Reference, or which (ii) is said by the provider of the information, or by any other person sufficiently affected, to be confidential or otherwise unsuitable for publication for a good and substantial reason.
4. When redacting to protect a person's identity, the Review will do so by removing, as necessary, the following information from all documents (including individuals' statements), before publication or any public reference to this information:
 - name;
 - date of birth;
 - other dates which might identify a person;
 - address(es) and other contact details;
 - names or other means of identifying a person's family members, such as their addresses, dates of birth etc.

The Review will protect the identify of patients and family members on this basis, avoiding publishing information which might identify them.

5. The Review's wish is that documents should be supplied to it without redactions (unless these are of a commercially sensitive nature and not material to the work of the Review), but accompanied by a letter or email, where applicable, which sets out what information is regarded as unsuitable for publication.
6. If, contrary to the above, documents are provided to the Review in a form that has been redacted by their provider (so that they are in a form considered suitable for publication on the Review's website), then the Review will examine the documents and any justification for withholding material that has been put forward. The Review may request further information from the provider, as appropriate.

Publication on the Review's Website

Transparency and Publication.

7. The Review regards it as important that it conducts itself in as open and transparent a manner as is possible. The Review will therefore seek to publish on its website the written statements and other documents provided to the Review, and recordings of the evidence that is heard in oral sessions. This commitment is subject to the observations on redactions, disclosure and publication contained in this document.

Personal testimonies.

8. The Review will not publish the personal testimonies of patients and their families affected by the three interventions with which the Review is concerned. It may, however, quote from such testimonies, once properly anonymised, in any published report.

Other documents.

10. Where documents are provided as evidence to the Review, by individuals or organisations, they will be reviewed by the Review team for relevance. If their contents are relevant to the Review's Terms of Reference, consideration will be given to whether any further information needs to be redacted. After any necessary redactions have been made, they will be published on the Review's website.
11. If a person or organisation providing documents or other information wishes to request that any of the information submitted should not be published as set out above, that person or organisation should notify the Review of its request, and the reasons for it, when submitting the document. Full details of the reason(s) why the information is said to

be confidential or otherwise unsuitable for publication should be given. The author should explain why it is said that publication would not be in the public interest. The Review's Chair will then decide on whether or not publication is in the public interest and/or is justified, or whether redactions should be made, and will let to the affected person or organisation know of her decision prior to publication.

Circulating personal information to allow responses to criticisms.

12. If a written statement contains criticism of another person or organisation, it may be appropriate to disclose the identity of the author of the statement, as well as the terms of the criticism made, to the person or organisation criticised, in order that they are afforded a fair opportunity to respond to the criticism.
13. However, anyone to whom personal information is disclosed in this way will be required to sign a written undertaking to keep it confidential and not to disclose the information to any other person.
14. If the Review intends to disclose the identity of a person making a criticism to the person being criticised, the Review will provide notice to the maker of the criticism, so as to allow him or her to request that the Review should not disclose his/her personal information, and to explain why.

Recordings and Transcripts of Oral Evidence

15. The Review intends to publish, on its website, recordings of the evidence given in oral sessions held. Prior to publication, information identifying patients and their families (if there is any) will be redacted from the recording and any transcript. Consideration may be given to further edits for a good and substantial reason, including for reasons of confidentiality, whether at the request of those who attended the session in question to give evidence, or by the Review on its own initiative.

Preventing Publication or Disclosure – General

16. Should a person or organisation seek to prevent disclosure or publication of information other than in the circumstances set out above, they may write to the Review Chair, asking for a decision not to make the disclosure or publication in question. The Chair will make a decision, having considered the issues raised.

14.09.18