

Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA)

Decision notice

Date: 16 July 2014

Public Authority: The Office for Standards in Education (OFSTED)

Address: Aviation House
125 Kingsway
London
WC2B 6SE

Decision (including any steps ordered)

1. The complainant has requested information relating to OFSTED's inspection of Walton High School in September 2013. OFSTED first responded refusing to release any information under section 31(1)(g) of the FOIA. A second request was then made by the complainant for the same information a few months later. OFSTED responded to this fresh request releasing some information it previously withheld. However, it informed the complainant that it considered some of the information falling within the scope of her request to be exempt from disclosure under sections 33, 40 and 41 of the FOIA.
2. The Commissioner has considered the remaining withheld information. Regarding the application of section 33 of the FOIA, the Commissioner has decided that this exemption does not apply to the information specified by OFSTED.
3. In respect of the application of section 40 of the FOIA, the Commissioner has decided that this has been correctly applied to the information specified by OFSTED except for the following information:
 - (a) Details of discussions between the inspection team prior to the inspection. Section 40 of the FOIA applies to the contact details of the inspectors concerned and to the personal data of any pupils discussed in this information. However, the Commissioner has decided that section 40 of the FOIA does not apply to the remaining elements of this information.

- (b) The joining instructions for the inspection team. The Commissioner has decided that section 40 of the FOIA does not apply to this information.
4. Concerning the application of section 41(2) of the FOIA, the Commissioner has decided that OFSTED has acted appropriately in this case by refusing to confirm or deny whether any complaint is held about the inspection of Walton High School.
5. As the Commissioner has decided that some of the information is not exempt from disclosure under the FOIA, he requires OFSTED to take the following steps to ensure compliance with the legislation -
- OFSTED should disclose the following information to the complainant:
- (a) the Evidence Base Review completed by Tribal;
- (b) details of discussions between the inspection team prior to the inspection with the personal data of the inspectors concerned and any pupils redacted;
- (c) the joining instructions for the inspection team; and
- (d) OFSTED's Risk Assessment of Walton High (as no exemption was applied to this information as paragraph 14 further explains).
6. OFSTED must take these steps within 35 calendar days of the date of this decision notice. Failure to comply may result in the Commissioner making written certification of this fact to the High Court pursuant to section 54 of the Act and may be dealt with as a contempt of court.

Request and response

7. On 21 November 2013, the complainant wrote to OFSTED and requested information in the following terms:
- " Tribal's internal risk assessment of Walton High.
 - All the evidence forms associated with the inspection of Walton High in September 2013.
 - All communications by members of the inspection team relating to the inspection and complaint, including any recordings of telephone conversations.

- All communications with Tribal concerning this inspection and complaint, including those with Ofsted and any recordings of telephone conversations.
 - All communications with the investigating officer concerning Walton High's inspection or complaint, including any recordings of telephone conversations.
 - Any other information relating to the inspection of Walton High or the investigation of its complaint.”
8. OFSTED responded on 13 December 2013. It stated that it considered all the requested information was exempt from disclosure under section 31(1)(g) of the FOIA.
9. The complainant requested an internal review on 13 December 2013.
10. OFSTED wrote to the complainant on 23 January 2014. It confirmed that it remained of the view that the requested information was exempt from disclosure under section 31(1)(g) of the FOIA. It also stated that it considered sections 33 and 40 of the FOIA applied to the requested information.

Scope of the case

11. The complainant contacted the Commissioner on 13 February 2014 to complain about the way her request for information had been handled. Specifically, the complainant stated that she believed the requested information could be redacted in such a way to prevent the disclosure of personal data and that it is in the public interest to ensure that only accurate judgements based on evidence are published in OFSTED final reports.
12. Prior to the Commissioner's involvement the complainant made a fresh request to OFSTED for the same information. OFSTED responded to this fresh request by releasing some of the previously withheld information to the complainant.
13. The Commissioner's investigation has focussed on the remaining withheld information, which has been described by OFSTED as follows:
- (a) Evidence forms gathered during the inspection. OFSTED confirmed to the Commissioner that all evidence forms have now been disclosed except those forms containing the third party personal data of pupils, teachers or inspectors, as this information is exempt from disclosure under section 40 of the FOIA. (The

personal data of inspectors has also been withheld under section 33 of the FOIA and therefore this information is also included in item (b) below).

- (b) The evidence base review by Tribal, which has been withheld under section 33 of the FOIA.
 - (c) Details of some discussions, including safeguarding issues, between the inspection team prior to the inspection. OFSTED confirmed that these discussions have been withheld under section 40.
 - (d) The 'joining instructions' for the inspection team which have partially been withheld under section 40.
 - (e) Any information which may or may not be held relating to a complaint about this inspection. OFSTED has refused to confirm or deny whether this information is held citing section 41(2) of the FOIA.
 - (f) OFSTED's Risk Assessment of Walton High – no exemption applied has been applied. OFSTED confirmed that it is happy to disclose this information to the complainant on receipt of the Commissioner's decision notice.
14. As item (f) is not being withheld and there is no exemption for the Commissioner to consider it is excluded from the remainder of this notice. The Commissioner requests OFSTED to disclose this to the complainant on receipt of this notice.
15. The Commissioner will now consider each category of information listed above and the application of the exemption(s) cited.

Reasons for decision

Evidence forms

- 16. OFSTED supplied the Commissioner with a number of evidence forms for his consideration – some have been withheld in full, some have been released and some have been partially redacted and OFSTED explained its approach to this information.
- 17. OFSTED confirmed that evidence forms categorised as lesson observations have been withheld in their entirety. It explained that these forms detail individual observations of pupils at work and provide scoring and copious detail that can be perceived as an evaluation of the

performance of the known teacher of each lesson. OFSTED stated that it regards these forms to be the personal data of the teachers observed and that disclosure of this information under the FOIA would be unfair on those teachers, in breach of the first data protection principle outlined in the Data Protection Act (DPA) and therefore exempt by virtue of section 40 of the FOIA.

18. OFSTED explained that other types of evidence forms covered a ranged of different scenarios – discussions with pupils, visual observations, statistical data, discussions about school policies and procedures and also contained the quality review or quality assurance check of the inspectors themselves. Each of these forms was reviewed on an individual basis in response to this request and a decision made on whether the entire form or part of it should or should not be disclosed under the FOIA.
19. Some forms were released to the complainant in their entirety, as it was regarded that these evidence forms discussed school policies, approaches and procedures and such information was not regarded to be personal data. Some forms contained notes from the end of day meeting which took place after the inspection. Again OFSTED stated that it did not regard such notes to be personal data and so it could be disclosed.
20. Other forms were redacted prior to disclosure to the complainant. The redactions made were of information that OFSTED regarded as the personal data of a particular teacher, pupil or inspector. OFSTED confirmed that the redactions were given detailed consideration and it was decided that disclosure of the information removed from these forms would be unfair to the teacher, pupil or inspector that could be identified and therefore section 40 of the FOIA applied.
21. The Commissioner has reviewed a sample of the evidence forms and considered the general approach adopted by OFSTED in this case. He is satisfied that section 40 of the FOIA has been applied correctly in this case and he will now explain why.
22. Section 40(2) of the FOIA states that information is exempt from disclosure if it constitutes the personal data of a third party and disclosure of that data would be in breach of any of the data protection principles outlined in the Data Protection Act (DPA).
23. Personal data is defined as:
...“data which relate to a living individual who can be identified-
(a) from those data, or

(b) from those data and other information which is in the possession of, or is likely to come into the possession of, the data controller,

and includes any expression of opinion about that individual and any indication of the intentions of the data controller or any other person in respect of the individual..."

24. The Commissioner considers the first data protection principle is most relevant in this case. The first data protection principle states -

"Personal data shall be processed fairly and lawfully and, in particular, shall not be processed unless -

(a) at least one of the conditions in Schedule 2 is met, and

(b) in the case of sensitive personal data, at least one of the conditions in Schedule 3 is also met."

25. The Commissioner must first consider whether the requested information is personal data. If he is satisfied that it is, he then needs to consider whether disclosure of this information would be unfair and/or unlawful. If he finds that disclosure would be unfair and/or unlawful the information should not be disclosed and the consideration of section 40 of the FOIA ends here. However, if he decides that disclosure would be fair and lawful on any of the data subjects concerned (whether a teacher, pupil or inspector), the Commissioner then needs to go on to consider whether any of the conditions listed in schedule 2 and 3 (sensitive personal data) if appropriate are also met.

26. *Is the requested information personal data?*

27. The Commissioner is satisfied that the withheld information is the personal data of pupils and teachers observed and interviewed during the inspection that took place. He is also satisfied that some redactions made are the personal data of the inspectors, as they contain comments of their own performance during the inspection that took place. The Commissioner accepts that the pupils, teachers and inspectors concerned could be identified from the withheld information if it were disclosed or from a combination of the withheld information and other information otherwise available to a member of the public.

28. As the Commissioner is satisfied that the withheld information here constitutes the personal data of a number of third parties, he now needs to consider whether disclosure would be unfair to these data subjects as OFSTED has alleged.

29. Before he does, the Commissioner considers it is important to highlight here what disclosure under the FOIA effectively means. If information is

disclosed under the FOIA it is essentially being released into the public domain for anyone to see. The consideration here is not whether the requested information should be disclosed to the complainant but whether the information should be released to the world at large.

30. Addressing the personal data of pupils first, the Commissioner considers that pupils would have no expectation whatsoever that the information they supplied to inspectors during the inspection process could possibly be disclosed to the world at large. In addition to discussing curricular and teaching related issues, pupils are often questioned on more sensitive subjects such as bullying or their personal experiences at the school. It is the Commissioner's view that pupils are in a particularly vulnerable position. They will have little knowledge if none at all of how the information they supply will be used and will have no comprehension whatsoever of the implications of the disclosure of their personal data. He therefore considers that any information which is regarded as the personal data of a particular pupil should be treated as confidential, private and in a respectful manner.
31. As pupils will have no expectations at all about the usage of the information they have supplied during the inspection process, the Commissioner considers disclosure under the FOIA would be unfair. Disclosure would amount to an unwarranted intrusion into the private lives of these individuals and would cause them considerable distress and upset. He is therefore satisfied that disclosure would be in breach of the first data protection principle outlined in the DPA and therefore that section 40 of the FOIA applies.
32. Turning now to the personal data of those teachers observed or interviewed as part of the inspection in question, OFSTED confirmed that the requested information was considered piece by piece. Some forms were withheld in their entirety and others were released in part.
33. The evidence forms withheld in their entirety are the lesson observations that were carried out during the inspection. OFSTED explained that it perceived these forms to be an evaluation of the performance of the known teacher of each lesson and therefore it considered disclosure of this information would be unfair.
34. The Commissioner considers it would be possible to identify the specific class to which each observation relates and from that the individual teacher and the pupils present during that observation. He is of the view that each lesson observation amounts to a detailed performance assessment of the teacher concerned and also contains the personal data of the pupils observed. (As the personal data of pupils has already been addressed above it will not be considered again here).

35. The Commissioner accepts that the teachers concerned will have more knowledge of how this information will be used when compared to the pupils that were observed or interviewed. The teachers at the school in question are well aware that the information collated by the inspectors during the inspection process will inform OFSTED's overall decision of the school and will contribute to the final inspection report that is published. However, it is the Commissioner's view that the teachers concerned will have no expectation that detailed analyses of their performance within a particular lesson could be released into the public domain in response to a request of this nature. The teachers will be aware that a final report is published and that their performance will inform and assist the production of that final report but the teachers will expect the final report to focus on the school as a whole and not their individual performance.
36. As the Commissioner is satisfied that the teachers would have no expectation that details of their performance in a particular lesson could be disclosed to the world at large, he accepts that disclosure of the lesson observations in this case would be in breach of the first data protection principle outlined in the DPA. The Commissioner has therefore concluded that section 40 of the FOIA applies to this information.
37. The Commissioner has considered the disclosure of lesson observations previously in other cases submitted to him. The decision outlined in this case is in accordance with the previous decisions he has reached on the same information in case references FS50123184 and FS50167506.
38. The decision notices issued on these two cases can be accessed via the following link and by entering either the case reference or the public authority into the appropriate search field:

<http://search.ico.org.uk/ico/search/decisionnotice>
39. The Commissioner considers the same arguments apply to those evidence forms redacted and partially released. The redactions made are of comments that teachers or pupils have made which are regarded more personal in nature to, for example, teachers' comments about a particular policy or school practice. Again the Commissioner considers the disclosure of such comments would be unfair on the teachers or pupils concerned for the reasons outlined above. Pupils will have no expectation that information they have supplied to inspectors could be disclosed into the public domain. Teachers would have the general expectation that any information which is about their specific performance or relating to a particular pupil would remain confidential and private.

40. As stated previously, some of the evidence forms also contain the personal data of the inspectors concerned. Some of the evidence forms contain comments, annotations and reviews of the inspection evidence by the lead inspector. These redactions contain OFSTED's internal quality controls to ensure the inspection was properly conducted and are also effectively comments and notes on the individual performance of the inspectors concerned. The Commissioner considers this information should be treated the same as the personal data of the teachers at the school. He will not outline the same arguments here, as this would be repetitive. However, he is satisfied that the inspectors themselves would not expect a review of their own professional performance to be disclosed to the world at large. Disclosure would be unfair of the inspectors concerned, in breach of the first data protection principle outlined in the DPA and is therefore exempt from disclosure under section 40 of the FOIA.

The Evidence Base Review completed by Tribal

41. OFSTED has applied section 33 of the FOIA to this information. Section 33 of the FOIA applies to any public authority which has functions in relation to –
- (a) the audit of the accounts of other public authorities; or
 - (b) the examination of the economy, efficiency and effectiveness with which other public authorities use their resources in discharging their functions.

Information held by a public authority to which this section applies is exempt information if its disclosure would, or would be likely to, prejudice the exercise of any of the authority's functions in relation to any of the matters referred to in (a) or (b) above.

42. OFSTED confirmed that this information contains the outcome of the independent review that was undertaken of the inspection evidence gathered during the inspection at the school. The document is referred to as the Evidence Base Review and was carried out by an independent reviewer.
43. OFSTED stated that it has internal quality controls in place to ensure that inspections are properly conducted and this information details the quality control review that was undertaken of the inspection evidence that was gathered. OFSTED confirmed that its internal critique and rigorous analysis of the inspection team's own actions and performance poses a risk of likely prejudice to the published inspection report if disclosed. It stated that the purpose of the quality assurance process is to robustly test the inspectors' findings to ensure the evidence and

reasoning is secure and to provide feedback and professional development to the inspectors. That therefore means, by definition, that quality assurance assessors will highlight all, even minor, aspects where improvements to the inspection process could be made – even when these have no material impact on the inspection findings. OFSTED confirmed that if this information was placed into the public domain, even with substantial explanation, it would be used as a basis to attempt to undermine or detract attention from the report's findings. It stated that this is almost certain to occur in those cases where schools do not agree or wish to accept the findings of a particular inspection.

44. OFSTED further explained that the final inspection report is a product of statutory obligations (section 11 of the Education Act 2005) and the audit function is intended to be expressed to the public solely through the publication of the final inspection report. The report is not intended to be read alongside and balanced against internal discussions. OFSTED considers the publication of internal documentation which critiques the report and evidence would provide a means to undermine parliament's intentions here, when it originally determined that schools attempts to discharge their functions must be audited by OFSTED with the outcomes placed in a report.
45. The Commissioner is satisfied that school inspections and the issues inspectors are required to consider during such inspections constitute a function falling within section 33(1)(b) of the FOIA. This follows the decision reached by the First-tier Tribunal in the hearing of *OFSTED v Information Commissioner EA/2009/0121* in which the disclosure of inspection evidence was considered.
46. The Commissioner now needs to consider whether the disclosure of the Evidence Base Review would or would be likely to prejudice OFSTED's ability to carry out this audit function. The arguments OFSTED has to date presented argue that disclosure would be likely to prejudice this function. The Commissioner will therefore consider the lower threshold of *would be likely* rather than the higher threshold of *would* in this case.
47. As the Commissioner has already decided that any personal data of the inspectors concerned is exempt from disclosure under section 40 of the FOIA, he has only considered the application of section 33 of the FOIA to the information that remains (i.e. the information which is not the personal data of the inspectors concerned).
48. The Commissioner has reviewed the information. He accepts that the document contains the internal critique of OFSTED's independent reviewer and that OFSTED relies on its quality assurance function to ensure that inspections are carried out in accordance with procedure. He also notes that the quality assurance function is in place to ensure that

the final inspection report reflects the evidence gathered during the inspection. However, he cannot accept from the arguments supplied by OFSTED that disclosure of this information would be likely to prejudice its ability to carry out this audit function. He agrees that the final inspection report is published to inform the public. However, he does not agree that disclosure of the quality assurance review post inspection and post the publication of the final report would undermine parliament's original intentions. Parliament intentions were that schools are audited regularly to ensure that they are meeting certain standards and are discharging their own functions efficiently. Disclosure of OFSTED's own internal quality assessment of a particular inspection compliments these intentions. It demonstrates that the function is exercised in accordance with OFSTED's own procedures and would instil more public confidence in the inspection process.

49. Disclosure of this information would not hinder OFSTED's ability to carry out further inspections and would not discourage those participating from participating so freely and frankly in the future. Inspectors are aware that their work is under close scrutiny both internally within OFSTED itself and by the general public. Disclosure of this information supports the work they carry out and demonstrates that OFSTED has procedures in place to assess its own functions, making improvements and recommendations for future inspections where necessary.
50. Without further evidence to demonstrate more clearly exactly how disclosure would be likely to prejudice OFSTED's audit functions, the Commissioner can only conclude that section 33 of the FOIA is not engaged for this information.

Details of discussions between the inspection team prior to the inspection.

51. OFSTED has withheld these discussions under section 40 of the FOIA. It stated that these discussions detail a safeguarding matter for the school and the personal interactions of the inspectors concerned, including their personal telephone numbers and email addresses.
52. The Commissioner has already outlined section 40 of the FOIA and how this applies in paragraphs 22 to 25 above so he will not repeat himself here.
53. The Commissioner has reviewed this information. He notes that it does contain the email addresses and telephone numbers of some inspectors and also the details of some specific complaints from which pupils could be identified. The Commissioner is satisfied therefore that this information falls within the definition of personal data as outlined in paragraph 23 above.

54. The Commissioner considers it would be unfair for the personal email addresses and the telephone numbers of inspectors to be disclosed in response to this request. He is satisfied that the inspectors would have no expectation that their contact details would be released in an uncontrolled manner into the public domain. He notes that these contact details may be provided in certain circumstances alongside specific public functions they have carried out. However, such disclosure is proportionate and controlled and released to particular organisations or individuals in the course of their work. Disclosure under the FOIA is to the world at large, for anyone to see and use however they see fit. The Commissioner considers such wholesale disclosure would be unfair on the inspectors concerned and could cause them distress.
55. This information also contains the details of some complaints or concerns that have been raised in relation to pupils attending the school. The Commissioner considers these elements of this information constitute the personal data of the pupils concerned and that disclosure of this information would be unfair and in breach of the first data protection principle outlined in the DPA for the same reasons detailed in paragraphs 30 and 31 above.
56. However, the Commissioner is of the opinion that this information could be redacted by OFSTED so as to remove the personal data of inspectors and the pupils concerned. During his investigation he suggested this approach to OFSTED with the view to it reconsidering its position in respect of this information and releasing a redacted version to the complainant.
57. OFSTED confirmed that it *may* find this approach acceptable but no further action was taken. As the Commissioner is of the view that this information can be redacted to remove the personal data of third parties, he is now requesting OFSTED to do this in response to this notice.

The joining instructions for the inspection team

58. The Commissioner understands that this document was sent to the inspectors prior to the inspection taking place providing details of the tasks allocated to each inspector. OFSTED confirmed that it has withheld the entire document under section 40 of the FOIA, as it considers the end of the document includes details of team deployment based on the skill-sets and experience of individual inspectors. It considers this information constitutes the personal data of the inspectors concerned and that disclosure may be unfair, as it provides more in depth detail on how the inspection was organised and confirms the tasks allocated to those undertaking the inspection.

59. The Commissioner has reviewed this information. He considers the first part of the document is general guidance, which does not constitute the personal data of any third party and so can be disclosed. With regards to the end of the document and the information which details how the inspection was organised and which inspector was doing which element of it, the Commissioner agrees that this information is information from which the inspectors concerned could be identified and so falls within the definition of personal data.
60. However, it is the Commissioner's view that disclosure of this specific information would not be unfair of the inspectors concerned. The information in question simply details the elements of the inspection each inspector was instructed to carry out. It is reasonable to say that inspectors are trained to carrying out these specific tasks and such experience or knowledge is more general to the position they hold and the public function they are carrying out. The information does not contain *more* personal information on the specific skills or individual knowledge or experience of a particular inspector.
61. As the Commissioner considers that disclosure of this specific element of the document would not be unfair, he now needs to consider condition six of schedule two of the DPA which states –
- “The processing is necessary for the purposes of legitimate interests pursued by the data controller or by a third party or parties to whom the data are disclosed, except where the processing is unwarranted in any particular case by reason of prejudice to the rights and freedoms or legitimate interests of the data subject”.
62. The Commissioner considers there is a legitimate public interest in the disclosure of information which helps members of the public understand more clearly exactly how the school inspection was arranged and carried out. He considers this information only reveals the specific tasks and public functions each inspector was asked to carry out and such information is more job-specific rather than personal to the inspectors concerned. He therefore does not consider disclosure would prejudice the rights and freedoms of these individuals.
63. The Commissioner asked OFSTED to consider his view in relation to this information during his investigation suggesting that the information should be disclosed to the complainant. OFSTED responded that it may find such an approach to this element of the request to be acceptable but took no further steps to resolve this element of the complainant's request informally.

All information relating to the complaint made about the inspection

64. OFSTED confirmed that it wished to apply section 41(2) of the FOIA to this element of the complainant's request. It stated that it is OFSTED's usual practice to treat any complaints made to it in confidence. So, if a request was made for details of any complaints received, it would respond to these by refusing to confirm or deny whether the requested information is held. OFSTED considers that if it confirmed or denied whether it held a complaint or complaints about a particular school, inspection team or inspector this simple confirmation would give rise to an actionable breach of confidence.
65. Section 41(1) of the FOIA states that information is exempt if –
 - (a) it was obtained by the public authority from any other person (including another public authority), and
 - (b) the disclosure of the information to the public (otherwise than under this Act) by the public authority holding it would constitute a breach of confidence actionable by that or any other person.
66. Section 41(2) of the FOIA states that the duty to confirm or deny does not arise if, or to the extent that, the confirmation or denial that would have to be given to comply with section 1(1)(a) (confirming whether the information is held or not) would (apart from this Act) constitute an actionable breach of confidence.
67. The Commissioner must first consider whether the requested information if indeed it is held is information which is obtained by OFSTED from another person. Complaints of the nature specified in this request are generally raised with OFSTED by a third party – whether this is member of the public or a particular member of staff at the school in question. A complaint is therefore information obtained by OFSTED by another person and so this element of this exemption is met.
68. If a complaint is received this often generates investigatory information – responses internally, evidence from the complainant and further information from the school and its staff. Although arguably some of the complaint investigation will be of information which is internally generated, the Commissioner still considers this element of section 41 of the FOIA is met, as the information would not exist unless a complaint had been brought to it from a third party or another person.
69. The Commissioner now needs to consider whether confirming or denying whether a complaint has been received in relation to this inspection would in itself constitute an actionable breach of confidence.

70. The Commissioner is satisfied that the type of information requested here is information which would not otherwise be available to the public and is not of a trivial matter. The information if it is indeed held would therefore have the necessary quality of confidence.
71. The Commissioner also accepts that anyone raising a formal complaint with OFSTED about any aspect of an inspection or any other issues for which it has statutory functions would expect the matter to be treated privately and confidentially. The complainant would not expect OFSTED to disclose details of the complaint they have made to the world at large or indeed confirm that they have made a complaint. He is therefore satisfied that a complainant would expect privacy and confidentiality and therefore to confirm or deny whether a complaint has been received or not would in itself constitute a breach of confidence to which the complainant is owed and could be actionable by the complainant if they so wished.
72. For the above reasons, the Commissioner is satisfied that OFSTED correctly applied section 41(2) of the FOIA to this element of the request. He is satisfied that OFSTED was correct to refuse to confirm or deny whether any complaint has been made about the inspection of the school.

Right of Appeal

73. Either party has the right to appeal against this decision notice to the First-tier Tribunal (Information Rights). Information about the appeals process may be obtained from:

First-tier Tribunal (Information Rights)
GRC & GRP Tribunals,
PO Box 9300,
LEICESTER,
LE1 8DJ

Tel: 0300 1234504

Fax: 0116 249 4253

Email: GRC@hmcts.gsi.gov.uk

Website: www.justice.gov.uk/tribunals/general-regulatory-chamber

74. If you wish to appeal against a decision notice, you can obtain information on how to appeal along with the relevant forms from the Information Tribunal website.

75. Any Notice of Appeal should be served on the Tribunal within 28 (calendar) days of the date on which this decision notice is sent.

Signed

Rachael Cragg
Group Manager
Information Commissioner's Office
Wycliffe House
Water Lane
Wilmslow
Cheshire
SK9 5AF