

**Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA)
Environmental Information Regulations 2004 (EIR)**

Decision notice

Date: 22 May 2013

Public Authority: Department for Energy and Climate Change
Address: 3 Whitehall Place
London
SW1A 2AW

Decision (including any steps ordered)

1. The complainant requested details of meetings and correspondence between EDF Energy, Ministers and senior officials in relation to Electricity Market Reforms.
2. The Commissioner's decision is that the public authority was entitled to rely on the exceptions at regulations 12(4)(e), 12(5)(d) and 13 of the EIR to withhold the information it considered was exempt from disclosure.
3. The Commissioner does not require the public authority to take any steps.

Request and response

4. On 30 April 2012, the complainant wrote to the public authority and requested information in the following terms:
'This is an FOI request for details of meetings (dates, agendas, minutes, government briefing papers) and correspondence (emails, letters) between EDF and Ministers and senior civil servants (head of Department and above) concerning Electricity Market Reforms since 01 January 2011..'
5. The public authority responded on 20 August 2012. It stated that a search for the information within the scope of the request above

revealed internal briefings for meetings between former Department for Energy and Climate Change (DECC) Ministers and EDF Energy¹, a number of letters between EDF and DECC Ministers and an email exchange between EDF and a DECC Director General. It however withheld all of the information identified as in scope on the basis of the exemptions at sections 36(2)(b) and 43(2) FOIA.

6. On 31 August 2012 the complainant requested an internal review of the public authority's decision to withhold the information within the scope of his request. He expressed his dissatisfaction with the length of time it took for the public authority to respond to the request. He also queried whether the exemption at section 36(2)(b) had been correctly engaged and whether the public interest in disclosure outweighed the public interest in maintaining the exemption at section 43(2).
7. Following an internal review the public authority wrote to the complainant on 28 September 2012. It apologised for the delay in responding to the request and upheld the original decision to withhold all of the information in scope on the basis of sections 36(2)(b) and 43(2).

Scope of the case

8. On 1 October 2012 the complainant contacted the Commissioner to complain about the way his request for information had been handled. He requested that the public authority's decision to apply sections 36(2)(b) and 43(2) should be overturned on a number of grounds. In his own words:

'.....the public interest reasons for disclose [sic] override reasons for refusal, namely that the government is covertly seeking ways to subsidize nuclear power, despite a public assurance – as written in the Coalition – that it would not do [sic]. Moreover, given the urgency of climate change, there can be no greater public interest than our future energy supply.

DECC is trying to argue that releasing information might undermine its objective of securing low carbon energy. However, exactly the opposite

¹ EDF Energy is one of the United Kingdom's energy companies and is a wholly owned subsidiary of the EDF Group. See, <http://www.edfenergy.com/about-us/about-edf-energy/>

could happen. If EDF has undue influence over setting the carbon floor price which will be outlined in the Electricity Market Reform bill, it might favour nuclear power – whose carbon credentials over its cradle to grave life-cycle are questionable – from truly renewable sources of energy, such as wind, wave and solar. It also raises huge questions about large corporate influence on government policy.

[DECC] took four months to then decide not to release any documents. They did not seriously consider whether some documents could be released in part. I also question whether.....the Director of Energy Markets and networks is qualified to conduct a review.'

9. The Commissioner wrote to the public authority on 20 December 2012. He requested copies of the information identified as in scope and detailed submissions on the application of the exemptions at sections 36(2)(b) and 43(2) FOIA.
10. On 8 February 2013 the public authority provided copies of the information in scope and its full submissions on the application of exemptions. It also explained that having re-assessed the information in scope, it could disclose some of it to the complainant. It however continued to withhold the remaining information on the basis of sections 36(2)(b) and 43(2).
11. On 1 March 2013 the public authority provided the complainant with the information it considered was no longer exempt from disclosure.
12. On 4 March 2013 the Commissioner informed the public authority that in his view, the remaining information still considered exempt was 'environmental information' within the meaning of the EIR. He therefore invited the public authority to either disclose all of the information or provide detailed submissions in support of withholding the information on the basis of exceptions under the EIR.
13. On 15 March 2013 the public authority informed the Commissioner that it remained of the view that the information in scope (excluding the disclosed information) was not environmental information and the EIR did not therefore apply. However, without prejudice to its position, it considered the information in scope was in any event exempt from

disclosure under the EIR on the basis of regulations 12(4)(e)², 12(5)(d)³, 12(5)(e)⁴, 12(5)(f)⁵ and 12(3)⁶.

14. The information in scope consists of two briefing documents, letters and an email exchange. However, the public authority was of the view that some of the information in the briefing documents was not within the scope of the request because the information in question is not about Electricity Market Reforms (EMR).
15. The Commissioner accepts that the information considered out of scope could be objectively interpreted as not concerning EMR in the context of the complainant's request of 30 April 2012.
16. The Commissioner therefore considers that the scope of his investigation is to determine whether the public authority was entitled to withhold the letters, email exchange and portions of the internal briefing documents within the scope of the request on the basis of the exceptions at regulations 12(4)(e), 12(5)(d), 12(5)(e), 12(5)(f) and 12(3) of the EIR.
17. He has set out in detail below why he considers the withheld information is environmental information within the meaning of the EIR.

Reasons for decision

Environmental Information

18. Regulation 2(1) of the EIR defines environmental information as *'any information inany... material form on:*

(a) the state of the elements of the environment, such as air and atmosphere, water, soil, land, landscape and natural sites including wetlands, coastal and marine areas, biological diversity and its

² Disclosure of internal communications

³ Confidentiality of proceedings provided law

⁴ Confidentiality of commercial or industrial information provided by law

⁵ The interests of the person who provided information

⁶ Personal data

components, including genetically modified organisms, and the interaction among these elements;

(b) factors, such as substances, energy, noise, radiation or waste, including radioactive waste, emissions, discharges and other releases into the environment, affecting or likely to affect the elements of the environment referred to in (a);

(c) measures (including administrative measures), such as policies, legislation, plans, programmes, environmental agreements, and activities affecting or likely to affect the elements and factors referred to in (a) and (b) as well as measures or activities designed to protect those elements;

(d) reports on the implementation of environmental legislation;

(e) cost-benefit and other economic analyses and assumptions used within the framework of the measures and activities referred to in (c); and

(f) the state of human health and safety, including the contamination of the food chain, where relevant, conditions of human life, cultural sites and built structures inasmuch as they are or may be affected by the state of the elements of the environment referred to in (a) or, through those elements, by any of the matters referred to in (b) and (c)'

19. The public authority argued that although the subject of the requests includes EMR, a measure likely to affect the elements and factors, the request is more concerned with the role EDF may play in EMR rather than the impacts of the policy on the environment. The discussions with EDF are therefore sufficiently removed from the actual measure affecting the environment and so cannot be considered environmental information.
20. The Commissioner's general approach is to interpret the term '*any information.....on....*' fairly widely. The relevant Oxford English Dictionary definition of *on* is '*in reference to, with respect to, as to, concerning, about.*' The Commissioner's view in line with the purpose expressed in the first recital of the Directive⁷, is that *any information on* will usually include information concerning, about or relating to the measure, activity, factor etc in question. In other words, information that would

⁷ European Directive 2003/4/EC from which the EIR are derived.

inform the public about the matter under consideration and would therefore facilitate effective participation by the public in environmental decision making is likely to be environmental information.

21. Using this test the Commissioner finds that the withheld information directly relates to a measure (the EMR policy) likely to affect the elements and factors referred to in regulation 2(1) (a) and (b). The impact of the EMR policy on the environment is clear from what is set out on the public authority's website at;
<https://www.gov.uk/government/policies/maintaining-uk-energy-security--2/supporting-pages/electricity-market-reform>
22. Amongst other benefits of EMR mentioned on the website, the public authority states that the policy would help the United Kingdom (UK) power sector reduce its carbon emissions by the 2030s and consequently help towards meeting its legally binding carbon targets. It is clearly envisaged therefore that EMR would have an impact on the environment.
23. The Commissioner does not accept that the request could be objectively interpreted as one concerned about the role EDF may play in EMR without regard to whether it could have an impact on the environment. As can be seen from his email of 1 October 2012, the complainant is clearly also concerned that EDF's role may result in proposed legislation on EMR favouring nuclear power over renewable sources of energy. The Commissioner also does not accept that the discussions (i.e. part of the withheld information) are sufficiently removed from the EMR policy as a measure affecting the environment. The discussions relate to the EMR policy and are invariably going to help shape a *measure* (i.e. the EMR policy) within the meaning of regulation 2(1)(c). They are not too remotely linked to the impact of the EMR policy on the environment. However they may affect the direction of the policy would inevitably also have an impact on the environment one way or another.
24. The Commissioner additionally finds that withheld information also relates to the cost-benefit analyses of the EMR policy and for that reason, it is also environmental information within the meaning of regulation 2(1)(e).
25. The Commissioner therefore finds that the withheld information is environmental information within the meaning of regulations 2(1)(c) and 2(1)(e) of the EIR.
26. The Commissioner next considered the application of the exceptions.

Regulation 12(4)(e)

27. By virtue of regulation 12(4)(e), a public authority may refuse to disclose information to the extent that the request involves the disclosure of internal communications.
28. An internal communication is a communication that stays within one public authority. It will generally no longer be internal once it has been sent to someone outside the authority.
29. The public authority claimed that the internal briefing documents produced for DECC Ministers for their meetings with EDF amount to internal communications. Therefore, portions of the briefing documents within the scope of the request engaged the exception at regulation 12(4)(e).
30. The disclosures made by the public authority to the complainant on 1 March revealed that the first briefing document was produced by officials on 17 March 2011 in advance of a meeting between the former Secretary of State for DECC, Chris Huhne, The Rt Hon The Lord Marland (former Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State at the DECC) and the Chief Executive of EDF Energy. It also revealed that the second briefing document was produced by officials on 27 April 2011 in advance of a meeting between Chris Huhne and the Chief Executive of EDF.
31. The Commissioner finds that both briefing documents constitute internal communications within the meaning of regulation 12(4)(e). The exception was therefore correctly engaged in relation to the information in the briefing documents within the scope of the request which has not been disclosed to the complainant.

Public Interest Test

32. As with all exceptions under the EIR, regulation 12(4)(e) is subject to a public interest test.⁸ The Commissioner must therefore determine whether in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exception at regulation 12(4)(e) outweighed the public interest in disclosing the information in the internal briefing documents within the scope of the request.

⁸ Regulation 12(1)(b) of the EIR imposes the duty to carry out a public interest test.

Public authority's arguments

33. By way of background, the public authority explained that the current UK electricity market faces a number of unprecedented challenges not least of which is that a fifth of the 2011 capacity is due to close by the end of the decade and demand is likely to grow over the next 40 years as the population turn increasingly to electricity for heat and transport. EMR is the biggest change to the UK's electricity market since privatisation and will transform the UK's electricity sector. EMR is intended to attract the £110 billion investment that is needed in this decade alone to replace ageing energy infrastructure with a more diverse and low-carbon energy mix. Hinkley Point C power plant⁹ would be a significant portion of the £110 billion investment, and thus is an investment which would be a major contribution to security of supply.
34. EDF's decision on whether to invest in a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point C was a live policy issue at the time of the request and key decisions are yet to be taken by Government and by EDF. It is a major decision for both parties and maintaining an open and frank relationship is very important during the ongoing negotiations.
35. It argued that disclosure at the time of the request would have definitely had a negative impact on the negotiations as it would have made EDF and the wider industry less likely to be open and frank in discussions with the government. Such an outcome would affect the government's ability to gain candid input to a key proposed development which would contribute directly to the government's policy of securing low-carbon and secure electricity supplies. Frank input from the energy industry, in confidence, is an essential element of the EMR policy making process. The loss of that input would have an adverse impact on the ability of the government to make sound and robust policy which would not be in the public interest.
36. The public authority further argued that EDF and wider industry would adopt a less open and frank approach in future negotiations should the withheld information be disclosed. This would threaten the future success of the design and implementation of the EMR programme, in particular, and also delivery of the government's nuclear new build programme.

⁹ At the time of the request it was one of the proposed sites for a new nuclear power station. On 19 March 2013, EDF Energy was granted planning permission to construct a nuclear power station at Hinkley Point C. See, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-21839684>

37. The public authority explained that it had carefully balanced the public interest in transparency and accountability in disclosing the withheld information against the significant public interest in ensuring that the government was able to make sound and robust decisions in relation to the EMR policy. In recognition of the public interest in transparency and accountability, it had disclosed information to the complainant during the course of the Commissioner's investigation while being careful that the disclosed information did not relate to, or have the potential to affect the ongoing negotiations with EDF. The government had also explicitly committed that if it does reach agreement over the terms of an investment contract for Hinkley Point C, it will publish both the contract and a summary of the information and analysis on which the decision to enter the contract was based.

Balance of the public interest

38. As explained by the public authority, EMR is clearly vital to the future of the UK's electricity market. Encouraging private investment in new nuclear power plants in the UK is a cornerstone of the government's EMR policy. It has attracted support and criticism from those in favour of new nuclear energy and those against it. The complainant has specifically questioned whether the government is trying to subsidise nuclear power at the expense of more renewable sources of energy. There is also ongoing debate about the terms of any final agreement on investment between the government and EDF, specifically whether it would represent best value for money for tax payers and consumers in the long run. It is against this background that the Commissioner has to consider where the balance of the public interest lies.
39. The Commissioner agrees there is a public interest in disclosing the withheld information which would shed light on the nature of the negotiations between the government and EDF in relation to EMR, particularly in relation to the proposal (at the time of the request) to build a new nuclear power plant at Hinkley Point C. Disclosure would enhance the transparency of the negotiations and the accountability of the government in relation to the EMR policy. He accepts that disclosure could also shed light on the nature of the relationship between the government and EDF in the context of EMR.
40. A balance has to be struck, however, between the public interest in transparency and accountability against the public interest in ensuring that the public authority and EDF have the necessary safe space to conduct negotiations freely and frankly. The Commissioner accepts that disclosure, in the circumstances of this case, would very likely result in less free and frank discussions between the government and EDF. Given the strength of feelings on both sides of the divide (i.e. those in favour

of, and those against, new nuclear energy and/or the financial implications of investing in new nuclear power plants), it is conceivable that in future, representatives of EDF would be unlikely to express their views freely and frankly during negotiations if opinions previously expressed were made public. In the Commissioner's view, it is also quite likely that officials would be less free and frank in their discussions with EDF if they knew that their views could be made public in the middle of ongoing negotiations. Both the government and EDF would be wary of having to constantly defend, clarify or contextualise their opinions to both sides. This would inevitably affect the ability of the government and EDF to engage in robust negotiations and it will consequently have a negative impact on EMR.

41. The timing of the request is a critical factor. In the circumstances, the need for safe space for the government and EDF to consider all options is very important. Otherwise this aspect of the EMR policy could be hampered by a lack of thorough consideration of all available options for fear that they might be unreasonable levels of disruptive scrutiny whilst the process was on-going.
42. However, the public interest in non-disclosure should not rest only on the fact that negotiations were ongoing. The withheld information has to be worthy of protection in the public interest. The Commissioner is satisfied that the withheld information would reveal significant details in relation to the ongoing negotiations. He believes that both parties would not expect the withheld information to be made publicly available in the middle of negotiations. Therefore, disclosing the information would very likely have a negative impact on the openness and frankness between both parties, particularly EDF (given its commercial interests considerations), in future discussions concerning EMR.
43. The Commissioner is mindful of the significance of the public interest in knowing the nature and extent of EDF's influence on the EMR policy. However, weighed against the significant public interest in ensuring robust negotiations to secure effective EMR, regulatory oversight by way of securing planning permission for Hinkley Point C power plant and parliamentary oversight¹⁰ over any future investment contract will in the Commissioner's view be sufficient to meet this public interest.

¹⁰ The public authority explained that any investment contract would be laid before Parliament pursuant to paragraphs 1 and 4 of schedule 2 to the Energy Bill.

44. Therefore, in all the circumstances of the case, the Commissioner finds that the public interest in maintaining the exception at regulation 12(4)(e) outweighed the public interest in disclosing the withheld information in the briefing documents.
45. In light of his decision above, the Commissioner did not need to consider any other exception applied to the withheld information in the briefing documents other than regulation 12(3).

Regulation 12 (3) / Regulation 13

46. The public authority also claimed that, separate to other exceptions applied, the names and contact details of junior officials caught by the request are exempt from disclosure on the basis of regulation 12(3). The relevant names and contact details were identified in the briefing documents.
47. Regulation 12(3) states:

'To the extent that the information requested includes personal data of which the applicant is not the data subject, the personal data shall not be disclosed otherwise than in accordance with regulation 13.'
48. By virtue of regulation 13(1), information is exempt from disclosure if it constitutes third party personal data (i.e. the personal data of anyone other than the individual making the request) and either first or second condition at regulation 13(2) is satisfied.
49. Personal data is defined in section 1 of the Data Protection Act 1998 (DPA) as:

'.....data which relate to a living individual who can be identified from those data or from those data and other information which is in the possession of, or likely to come into possession of, the data controller; and includes any expression of opinion about the individual and indication of the intentions of the data controller or any person in respect of the individual.'
50. As mentioned, the public authority withheld the names and contact details of junior officials. The Commissioner finds that the names and contact details of the junior officials withheld constitute personal data within the meaning of section of the DPA as they clearly relate to identifiable individuals.

Would the disclosure of the withheld names and contact details contravene any of the data protection principles?

51. As mentioned, for regulation 13 to apply, either the first or second condition in regulation 13(2) must be satisfied. The first condition in regulation 13(2) states that disclosure of personal data would contravene any of the data protection principles or section 10 of the DPA.

52. The first data protection principle states:

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

At least one of the conditions in schedule 2 [DPA] is met...

53. The public authority submitted that disclosing the names and contact details of the junior officials would be unfair in light of the nature of the information, and the expectations of the individuals concerned when they provided the information.

54. In considering the fairness element of the first data protection principle, the Commissioner takes into account factors such as the reasonable expectations of the data subjects, circumstances in which the personal data was obtained, distinction between private and public life and the impact of disclosure.

55. The Commissioner believes that in the circumstances, the junior officials concerned would have had a reasonable expectation that their names and contact details would not be disclosed as part of information provided in the context of the request. He is of the view that in carrying out public functions, officials should expect to be subjected to a greater level of scrutiny than would be the case in respect of their private lives. However, he is also mindful of the fact that the officials did not exercise any significant level of authority in relation to the documents from which their names and contact details were redacted. Therefore, disclosing their names and contact details pursuant to the request could have placed them in similar position to senior officials in that they might be seen as exercising a significant level of authority in relation to the subject matter of the request. The junior officials would reasonably expect that their names and contact details would not be disclosed in that context.

56. The Commissioner therefore finds that it would have been unfair to disclose the names and contact details of the junior officials identified in the briefing documents. Disclosure would have contravened the first

data protection principle and the information was therefore exempt on the basis of regulation 13.

Regulation 12(5)(d)

57. The public authority claimed that the remaining withheld information, consisting of letters and an email exchange was exempt from disclosure on the basis of the exception at regulation 12(5)(d).
58. By virtue of regulation 12(5)(d) a public authority may refuse to disclose information to the extent that its disclosure would adversely affect the confidentiality of the proceedings of that or any other public authority where such confidentiality is provided by law.
59. The relevant correspondence was between the DECC and EDF. The public authority explained that they relate to negotiations leading to (if successful) an investment contract between the government and EDF. As mentioned, the government is looking at ways to invest in new nuclear energy to boost electricity capacity.
60. In the Commissioner's opinion, the term '*proceedings*' in the context of the exception implies some formality and will include, but not limited to; formal meetings to consider matters that are within the authority's jurisdiction, situations where an authority is exercising its statutory decision making powers, and legal proceedings.
61. The public authority submitted that the *proceedings* in this context are in the exercise by the Secretary of State of his functions under the Energy Bill¹¹ in relation to investment contracts. The negotiations (as evidenced in the correspondence) between the government and EDF being necessary for the Secretary of State to exercise those functions.
62. Although it would appear the Energy Bill was introduced to the House of Commons in November 2012, it is clear from the withheld information that the government was already formally engaged in negotiations with EDF in relation to its EMR policy prior to April 2012 when the request was made. The Commissioner accepts that those negotiations between the public authority and EDF in relation to the government's EMR policy

¹¹ On 29 November 2012, the Secretary of State announced the introduction of the Bill to the House of Commons. According to the public authority's website, the Bill will establish a legislative framework for delivering secure, affordable and low carbon energy and includes EMR.

(which is included in the Energy Bill) constitute *proceedings* within the meaning of regulation 12(5)(d).

63. The exception also clearly suggests that the proceedings should be confidential and that the confidentiality must be provided by law. The public authority drew the Commissioner's attention to the fact that the correspondence was at a high level between Ministers, a senior official and senior EDF representatives. It is generally accepted that discussions at that level would be confidential and a common law duty of confidence therefore exists.
64. In the Commissioner's view, the confidentiality envisaged in the exception may be provided in statute or derived from common law. As mentioned, the discussions relate to the government's EMR policy, aimed specifically towards an investment contract between the government and EDF. Contractual negotiations are generally confidential. The withheld correspondence is therefore not trivial. The high level negotiations add weight to the expectation that the correspondence between the parties would be confidential. The Commissioner therefore also accepts that a common law duty of confidence exists in relation to the negotiations.
65. The Commissioner next considered whether disclosing the withheld correspondence '*would adversely affect*' the confidentiality of the negotiations between the government and EDF in relation to EMR.
66. The public authority emphasised the need for the parties to feel able to communicate frankly and openly with each other in confidence. It explained that although the exchanges which were at a very senior level contain limited material on the details of the negotiations, it was important to the process that such communications are able to take place. Parties to the negotiation will be less willing to engage in similar dialogue in future should the withheld correspondence be disclosed. It submitted therefore that disclosure would adversely affect the negotiations as EDF in particular would be less frank and open with officials in future.
67. In the Commissioner's opinion, '*adversely affect*' means there must be an identifiable harm to or negative impact on the interest identified in the exception. Furthermore, '*would*' adversely affect as opposed to '*would be likely to*' suggests that the threshold for establishing adverse effect is a high one. In the Commissioner's opinion, this means that it should be more probable than not the adverse effect would occur if the withheld information was disclosed.

68. The Commissioner accepts the high threshold has been met in this case. Given the nature of the withheld correspondence (i.e. in relation to an investment contract), he is persuaded that disclosure would have a negative impact on negotiations between the government and EDF in the manner explained by the public authority. There is clearly an expectation from both parties that details of ongoing discussions towards an investment contract as part of the government's EMR would be held in confidence, not least because premature disclosure could adversely affect the commercial interests of both parties. It is therefore more probable than not that disclosing the withheld correspondence will harm further negotiations and for that reason, adversely affect the confidentiality of the proceedings.
69. The Commissioner therefore finds that the exception at regulation 12(5)(d) was correctly engaged in respect of the withheld correspondence.

Public Interest Test

70. The Commissioner must next consider whether in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exception at regulation 12(5)(d) outweighed the public interest in disclosing the withheld correspondence.

Public authority's arguments

71. The public authority reiterated the public interest arguments it made in relation to the application of regulation 12(4)(e). To summarise, it is not in the public interest for EDF to be less open and frank in future discussions in relation to the investment contract.

Balance of the public interest

72. The public interest arguments for disclosure already mentioned by the Commissioner equally apply to this exception. The Commissioner however considers that there is a significant public interest in protecting the confidentiality of the negotiations between the government and EDF. It would not be in the public interest to disclose information during ongoing negotiations which would not only negatively affect the quality of the discussions but could also harm the commercial interests of both parties.
73. In view of the above and the other public interest factors against disclosure mentioned in relation to regulation 12(4)(e), the Commissioner finds that in all the circumstances of the case, the public

interest in maintaining the exception at regulation 12(5)(d) outweighed the public interest in disclosure.

74. In light of his decision that regulation 12(5)(d) was correctly engaged, the Commissioner did not need to consider any other exceptions applied to the withheld correspondence.

Procedural Breaches

75. A public authority is required under regulation 14(2) to issue a refusal notice within 20 working days after the date it receives a request.
76. The Commissioner finds the public authority in breach of regulation 14(2) for not issuing its refusal notice to the complainant's request which was made on 30 April 2012 within the statutory 20 working days. The refusal notice was issued on 20 August 2012.

Right of appeal

77. 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: informationtribunal@hmcts.gsi.gov.uk

Website: www.justice.gov.uk/guidance/courts-and-tribunals/tribunals/information-rights/index.htm

78. 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.

79. 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

Steve Wood
Head of Policy Delivery
Information Commissioner's Office
Wycliffe House
Water Lane
Wilmslow
Cheshire
SK9 5AF