

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Freedom of Information Request: 322022

Thank you for contacting CITB requesting information under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). Your email, dated 15th December 2022, asked for the following information:

1 Why isn't there a breakdown of how £1.29m of public money has been spent beyond £166k for Roofcert sales and marketing in 2018?

2 Why aren't CITB able to provide a breakdown of how £1.29m of public money has been spent on Roofcert?

3 Why has CITB not paid the £2,892,616.00 awarded by CITB to the Home Builders Federation, the National Federation of Roofing Contractors, the Lead Contractors Association and the Federation of Traditional Metal Roofing Contractors to deliver the Roofcert scheme?

4 What were the KPIs and what were the reporting criteria and milestones attached to the Roofcert funding allocation?

5 Please could you send the funding agreement in its entirety

6 When were the targets of 792 accreditations and 1195 with tested knowledge set?

7 In 2017, when Roofcert was launched it was announced that joint £1.5m development funding was agreed with CITB with a target of accrediting 5000 roofers by 2020. Why was this target not achieved?

8 When was the target changed to deliver 2000 accreditations and a total contract issued for £2.5m? Why was the original target revised?

9 What has CITB learned from this pilot scheme?

10 Does CITB consider the funding spent on Roofcert good value for money for taxpayers?

11 Does CITB consider the funding spent on Roofcert good value for money for the roofing industry?

12 Roofcert has cost £5,733 to accredit each of its 225 Roofcert roofers, does CITB regret funding the scheme in the light of its failure to attain its targets - achieving just 4.5% of its original target or 11.25% of the revised goal?

13 The primary research for Roofcert engaged 141 roofing contractors and over 1000 "stakeholders". How does CITB account for the fact that only 225 roofing operatives have actually become Roofcert certified?

[REDACTED]

The response is as follows:

1. This question falls outside of the scope of an FOI request. CITB is therefore not obligated to formally respond to this question.
2. This question falls outside of the scope of an FOI request. CITB is therefore not obligated to formally respond to this question.
3. This question falls outside of the scope of an FOI request. CITB is therefore not obligated to formally respond to this question.
4. The original key outputs were:
 - 4 Research reports and action plans resulting from research
 - Approved Roofer programme System to track and monitor candidate's progress
 - 5000 Approved Roofers qualifies
 - 200 work-based recorders
 - 10 skills auditors
 - 60 instructors
5. See attached appendix. The redacted parts of the agreement are exempt from disclosure under Section 43 (2) Commercial Interest.
6. January 2022 is the last time the project was revised, at this point these targets were agreed.
7. This question falls outside of the scope of an FOI request. CITB is therefore not obligated to formally respond to this question.
8. In July 2020. The request about why this is the case falls outside of the scope of an FOI request. CITB is therefore not obligated to formally respond to this question.
9. This question falls outside of the scope of an FOI request. CITB is therefore not obligated to formally respond to this question.
10. This question falls outside of the scope of an FOI request. CITB is therefore not obligated to formally respond to this question.
11. This question falls outside of the scope of an FOI request. CITB is therefore not obligated to formally respond to this question.
12. This question falls outside of the scope of an FOI request. CITB is therefore not obligated to formally respond to this question.
13. This question falls outside of the scope of an FOI request. CITB is therefore not obligated to formally respond to this question.

If you are unhappy with this response, or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are



still dissatisfied, then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting Adrian Beckingham, Corporate Performance Director, CITB, Sand Martin House, Bittern Way, Peterborough, PB2 8TY or email adrian.beckingham@citb.co.uk.

If you remain unhappy following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioners website: <https://ico.org.uk/>

Yours sincerely

Jonathan Francis
Information Risk & Data Governance Manager