



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 14, 2015

Mr. Chad J. Lersch
Assistant General Counsel
Texas Department of Information Resources
P.O. Box 13564
Austin, Texas 78711-3564

OR2015-26151

Dear Mr. Lersch:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 590907.

The Texas Department of Information Resources (the "DIR") received a request for information pertaining to specified responses from a named company from a specified request for offers.¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.110, and 552.139 of the Government Code. You state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Gartner, Inc. ("Gartner"). You state, and provide documentation showing, you notified Gartner of the request for information and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information at issue should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances). We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

¹We note the DIR sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-business-day period to request attorney general opinion is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed).

You argue portions of the submitted proposal are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. We note, however, section 552.110 is designed to protect the interests of third parties not the interests of a governmental body. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110 (excepting from disclosure “[a] trade secret obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision” and “[c]ommercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained”). Thus, we will not consider the DIR’s argument under section 552.110.

We note an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body’s notice under section 552.305(d) of the Government Code to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from Gartner explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude Gartner has a protected proprietary interest in the submitted information. *See id.* § 552.110; Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3. Accordingly, the DIR may not withhold any portion of the submitted information related to Gartner on the basis of any proprietary interest it may have in the information.

Section 552.139 of the Government Code provides, in part:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information that relates to computer network security, to restricted information under Section 2059.055 [of the Government Code], or to the design, operation, or defense of a computer network.

(b) The following information is confidential:

(1) a computer network vulnerability report; [and]

(2) any other assessment of the extent to which data processing operations, a computer, a computer program, network, system, or system interface, or software of a governmental body or of a contractor of a governmental body is vulnerable to unauthorized access or harm, including an assessment of the extent to which the governmental body’s or contractor’s electronically stored information containing sensitive or critical information is vulnerable to alteration, damage, erasure, or inappropriate use[.]

Gov't Code § 552.139(a), (b)(1)-(2). Section 2059.055 of the Government Code provides in part:

(b) Network security information is confidential under this section if the information is:

- (1) related to passwords, personal identification numbers, access codes, encryption, or other components of the security system of a state agency;
- (2) collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental entity to prevent, detect, or investigate criminal activity; or
- (3) related to an assessment, made by or for a governmental entity or maintained by a governmental entity, of the vulnerability of a network to criminal activity.

Id. § 2059.055(b). The DIR states the submitted information “reveal[s] detailed network security information,” real and perceived network vulnerabilities, and the defense of these vulnerabilities. The DIR contends that the release of the submitted information “would invite additional network attacks,” which would “result in compromised IT security . . . which in turn would subject the state’s electronically stored information . . . to alteration, damage, erasure, or theft.” The department also provides an affidavit from the state’s Chief Information Security Officer (the “ISO”). The ISO states release of the information at issue “would be useful to third parties in planning and coordinating future attacks that could result in the unauthorized access and/or theft of citizens’ confidential data.” Based on the DIR’s representations and our review of the information, we conclude the DIR must withhold the submitted information under section 552.139 of the Government Code.²

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, or call the Office of the Attorney General’s Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure.

providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Ashley Crutchfield
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

AC/dls

Ref: ID# 590907

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Aaron Lee
Gartner, Inc.
56 Top Gallant Road
Stamford, Connecticut 06902
(w/o enclosures)