

## **Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA)**

### **Decision notice**

**Date:** 31 August 2023

**Public Authority:** HM Treasury  
**Address:** 1 Horse Guards Road  
London SW1A 2HQ

#### **Decision (including any steps ordered)**

---

1. The complainant has requested email correspondence between HM Treasury (HMT) and US officials on the subject of Rt Hon Rishi Sunak MP's green card for a period prior to his visit to the US as Chancellor of the Exchequer in October 2021. HMT refused, citing section 40 (personal data) and section 35 (ministerial communications) as its basis for doing so. It upheld this at internal review.
2. In the course of the Commissioner's investigation, HMT changed its position. It supplied the Commissioner with the email correspondence it had initially considered but argued that it was out of the scope of the request. Where the Commissioner disagreed, it argued that sections of it were exempt under section 40 and section 35. It also introduced reliance on section 27 (international relations).
3. The Commissioner's decision is that the majority of the information in question is within the scope of the request. There is a small section which HMT insisted was out of scope of the request and the Commissioner agrees with this. However, he has decided that HMT is entitled to rely on the exemptions it has cited in respect of other information. HMT cited these exemptions in the alternative to its "out of scope" arguments. There is a small section of the information which it supplied to the Commissioner during his investigation which it did not

mark as exempt. Furthermore, it did not insist that this information was out of scope either.

4. The Commissioner requires HMT to take the following steps to ensure compliance with the legislation.
  - Disclose to the complainant that information which is identified in the confidential annex to this Notice.
5. The public authority 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**

---

6. On 8 June 2022, a colleague of the complainant (acting on behalf of their employer) requested information of the following description:

“Please can you provide me with the following:

All emails that passed between HM Treasury and US officials on the subject of Rishi Sunak's US green card for the period 1 August 2019 to 31 October 2021.”

7. During the course of the Commissioner's investigation, the complainant's employer confirmed that the complainant (rather than their colleague) was subsequently dealing with the request on its behalf.
8. On 6 July 2022, HMT responded. It said it needed further time to consider the balance of public interest in respect of section 35(1)(d) (ministerial communications).
9. HMT wrote to the complainant again on 29 July 2022 and argued that it was relying on section 40(2) (personal data) as its basis for withholding some of the information and that section 35(1)(d) applies to certain information, with the balance of the public interest favouring the maintenance of the exemption. It gave a brief explanation as to why it believed it was entitled apply both these exemptions as its basis for refusing the request.
10. The complainant requested an internal review on 1 August 2022. They argued why they believed section 40 did not apply. They argued that the balance of public interest in respect of any information caught by section 35 favoured disclosure.

11. On 30 August 2022, HMT sent the complainant the outcome of its internal review. It upheld its original position and provided a brief explanation of the factors it had considered.

### **Scope of the case**

---

12. The complainant contacted the Commissioner on 8 September 2022 to complain about the way their request for information had been handled.
13. The Commissioner has considered whether HMT is entitled to rely on section 40(2) and section 35(1)(d) as its basis for withholding the information it holds within the scope of the request. HMT has applied these exemptions to separate parts of the withheld information. HMT also introduced reliance on section 27 (international relations) as its basis for withholding a small amount of the information caught by the scope of the request. The Commissioner has therefore also considered whether HMT is entitled to rely on this exemption.
14. Initially, HMT tried to argue that some of the information, to which it had applied section 40, was not, in fact, within the scope of the request. The Commissioner is satisfied that most of this information is within the scope of the request. It is difficult for him to explain why this is the case on the face of this decision notice without specific reference to the withheld information. His reasoning is set out instead in a confidential annex to this Notice.
15. There is some information to which HMT did not apply any exemptions and which it did not insist was out of scope. More detail about this is in the confidential annex to this Notice. Given that HMT has made no additional assertions that it is out of scope of the request nor has it identified it as being exempt from disclosure, the Commissioner is satisfied that it is not exempt from disclosure and is within the scope of of the request. It must therefore be disclosed.

### **Reasons for decision**

---

16. Section 40(2) of the FOIA provides that information is exempt from disclosure if it is the personal data of an individual other than the requester and where one of the conditions listed in section 40(3A)(3B) or 40(4A) is satisfied.

17. In this case the relevant condition is contained in section 40(3A)(a)<sup>1</sup>. This applies where the disclosure of the information to any member of the public would contravene any of the principles relating to the processing of personal data ('the DP principles'), as set out in Article 5 of the UK General Data Protection Regulation ('UK GDPR').
18. The first step for the Commissioner is to determine whether the withheld information constitutes personal data as defined by the Data Protection Act 2018 ('DPA'). If it is not personal data then section 40 of the FOIA cannot apply.
19. Secondly, and only if the Commissioner is satisfied that the requested information is personal data, he must establish whether disclosure of that data would breach any of the DP principles.

### **Is the information personal data?**

20. Section 3(2) of the DPA defines personal data as:

"any information relating to an identified or identifiable living individual".

21. The two main elements of personal data are that the information must relate to a living person and that the person must be identifiable.
22. An identifiable living individual is one who can be identified, directly or indirectly, in particular by reference to an identifier such as a name, an identification number, location data, an online identifier or to one or more factors specific to the physical, physiological, genetic, mental, economic, cultural or social identity of the individual.
23. Information will relate to a person if it is about them, linked to them, has biographical significance for them, is used to inform decisions affecting them or has them as its main focus.
24. As noted above, HMT disputed that the information to which it had applied section 40 was within the scope of the request. For reasons set out in the confidential annex to this Notice, the Commissioner is satisfied that this information is within the scope of the request.
25. In the circumstances of this case, having considered the withheld information, the Commissioner is satisfied that the information relates to Rishi Sunak and named individuals who were involved in the exchange of correspondence. He is satisfied that this information both relates to

---

<sup>1</sup> As amended by Schedule 19 Paragraph 58(3) DPA.

and identifies the individuals concerned. This information therefore falls within the definition of 'personal data' in section 3(2) of the DPA.

26. The fact that information constitutes the personal data of an identifiable living individual does not automatically exclude it from disclosure under the FOIA. The second element of the test is to determine whether disclosure would contravene any of the DP principles.
27. The most relevant DP principle in this case is principle (a).

### **Would disclosure contravene principle (a)?**

28. Article 5(1)(a) of the UK GDPR states that:

"Personal data shall be processed lawfully, fairly and in a transparent manner in relation to the data subject".

29. In the case of an FOIA request, the personal data is processed when it is disclosed in response to the request. This means that the information can only be disclosed if to do so would be lawful, fair and transparent.
30. In order to be lawful, one of the lawful bases listed in Article 6(1) of the UK GDPR must apply to the processing. It must also be generally lawful.

### **Lawful processing: Article 6(1)(f) of the UK GDPR**

31. Article 6(1) of the UK GDPR specifies the requirements for lawful processing by providing that "*processing shall be lawful only if and to the extent that at least one of the*" lawful bases for processing listed in the Article applies.
32. The Commissioner considers that the lawful basis most applicable is basis 6(1)(f) which states:

"processing is necessary for the purposes of the legitimate interests pursued by the controller or by a third party except where such interests are overridden by the interests or fundamental rights and freedoms of the data subject which require protection of personal data, in particular where the data subject is a child"<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>2</sup> Article 6(1) goes on to state that:-

"Point (f) of the first subparagraph shall not apply to processing carried out by public authorities in the performance of their tasks".

33. In considering the application of Article 6(1)(f) of the UK GDPR in the context of a request for information under the FOIA, it is necessary to consider the following three-part test:-
- i) **Legitimate interest test:** Whether a legitimate interest is being pursued in the request for information;
  - ii) **Necessity test:** Whether disclosure of the information is necessary to meet the legitimate interest in question;
  - iii) **Balancing test:** Whether the above interests override the legitimate interest(s) or fundamental rights and freedoms of the data subject.
34. The Commissioner considers that the test of 'necessity' under stage (ii) must be met before the balancing test under stage (iii) is applied.

### ***Legitimate interests***

35. In considering any legitimate interest(s) in the disclosure of the requested information under FOIA, the Commissioner recognises that a wide range of interests may be legitimate interests. They can be the requester's own interests or the interests of third parties, and commercial interests as well as wider societal benefits. These interest(s) can include broad general principles of accountability and transparency for their own sakes, as well as case-specific interests. However, if the requester is pursuing a purely private concern unrelated to any broader public interest, unrestricted disclosure to the general public is unlikely to be proportionate. Interests may be compelling or trivial, but trivial interests may be more easily overridden in the balancing test.
36. The Commissioner recognises a legitimate and compelling interest in learning more about exchanges with US officials regarding the then
- 

However, section 40(8) FOIA (as amended by Schedule 19 Paragraph 58(8) DPA and by Schedule 3, Part 2, paragraph 20 the Data Protection, Privacy and Electronic Communications (Amendments etc) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019) provides that:-

"In determining for the purposes of this section whether the lawfulness principle in Article 5(1)(a) of the UK GDPR would be contravened by the disclosure of information, Article 6(1) of the UK GDPR (lawfulness) is to be read as if the second sub-paragraph (dis-applying the legitimate interests gateway in relation to public authorities) were omitted".

Chancellor's US green card. According to the US Citizenship and Immigration Services website, having a green card allows the holder to live and work permanently in the United States.<sup>3</sup> According to the website of the US Embassy in London, a foreign dignitary such as a senior UK politician would normally travel on an A1 visa which must be arranged in advance.<sup>4</sup>

37. It is now a matter of public record that Rishi Sunak had a green card and according to news reports, he rescinded this card before his visit to the US as Chancellor in October 2021<sup>5</sup>. There is a legitimate interest in the public knowing more about the details of discussions with US officials given that green card status.
38. The complainant argued that there was a "legitimate interest in transparency in public life and the accountability of one of the most senior UK ministers in his dealings with the US authorities."

***Is disclosure necessary?***

39. 'Necessary' means more than desirable but less than indispensable or absolute necessity. Accordingly, the test is one of reasonable necessity and involves consideration of alternative measures which may make disclosure of the requested information unnecessary. Disclosure under the FOIA must therefore be the least intrusive means of achieving the legitimate aim in question.
40. HMT argued that the necessity test would not be met because this matter had already had been addressed in an independent report which had been commissioned in early 2022<sup>6</sup>. The Commissioner notes a comment in the report that:

"Considering the Card against the specific responsibilities of the Chancellor's ministerial offices subsequent to his first role, I do not consider that its possession would constitute an inherent conflict of interest. Being subject to the obligations imposed by the Card in his personal life could not reasonably be said to be in tension with the faithful discharge of his duties as Chief Secretary to the Treasury or as Chancellor of the Exchequer" (Paragraph 16).

---

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.uscis.gov/green-card>

<sup>4</sup> [https://uk.usembassy.gov/visas/diplomats-international-organization-nato-employees/diplomats\\_govt\\_officials-visas/](https://uk.usembassy.gov/visas/diplomats-international-organization-nato-employees/diplomats_govt_officials-visas/)

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-61044847>

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/advice-from-the-independent-adviser-on-ministers-interests-about-the-chancellor-of-the-exchequers-outside-interests>

41. The complainant argued that disclosure was necessary for transparency and accountability referred to earlier in his submissions.
42. The Commissioner has concluded that disclosure could be seen as necessary to serve the legitimate interest in transparency given that this is a very unusual situation. That said, any potential for conflict between Mr Sunak's possession of a green card and his role as Chancellor is considered in the report at paragraph 17 where it states:

"To test whether there were any explicit instances where individual decisions could have given rise to a conflict, I [Lord Geidt] asked HM Treasury to search for whether in either ministerial office specific policy or tax decisions were taken which would have affected holders of the Card [this means the green card]. They have confirmed that searches have found no such evidence. In particular the tax treaty between the UK and the USA dates back to 2003 and has not been amended in the period that the Chancellor has served as a Minister at HM Treasury".

43. The fact of discussions with US officials is referred to at paragraph 18 of the report where it states:

"He [Mr Sunak] also discussed the matter with the relevant authorities in the United States and, as a result of those discussions, decided that it would be appropriate at that point to relinquish the Card".

44. The Commissioner thinks that there is a legitimate interest in knowing more about these discussions. He accepts that reasonable necessity has been met as, in line with that test, disclosure would provide greater transparency about the extent to which what is described by HMT as ostensibly a private matter was considered via a publicly resourced channel of communication.

***Balance between legitimate interests and the data subject's interests or fundamental rights and freedoms***

45. It is necessary to balance the legitimate interests in disclosure against the data subject's interests or fundamental rights and freedoms. In doing so, it is necessary to consider the impact of disclosure. For example, if the data subject would not reasonably expect that the information would be disclosed to the public under the FOIA in response to the request, or if such disclosure would cause unjustified harm, their interests or rights are likely to override legitimate interests in disclosure.
46. In considering this balancing test, the Commissioner has taken into account the following factors:
  - the potential harm or distress that disclosure may cause;
  - whether the information is already in the public domain;



- whether the information is already known to some individuals;
- whether the individual expressed concern to the disclosure; and
- the reasonable expectations of the individual.

47. In the Commissioner's view, a key issue is whether the individuals concerned have a reasonable expectation that their information will not be disclosed. These expectations can be shaped by factors such as an individual's general expectation of privacy, whether the information relates to an employee in their professional role or to them as individuals, and the purpose for which they provided their personal data.

48. It is also important to consider whether disclosure would be likely to result in unwarranted damage or distress to that individual.

49. The complainant argued the following in respect of both section 35 (see later in this notice) and section 40:

"The rights of Mr Sunak are outweighed and it would not be unfair to disclose it (he could not reasonably expect this info to be kept private). We did not suggest that the public interest test applied to section 40(2) of FOIA. The Treasury seem to believe that because it is an absolute exemption that they have absolute discretion as to whether to reject a FOIA request, without a proper consideration of the lawfulness or fairness of disclosure. We disagree that disclosure would cause any prejudice to the effective running of a ministerial private office. This information does not relate to the operation of that office or an administrative task; it relates to Mr Sunak's interactions with the US authorities. He could have undertaken these discussions himself, but chose to involve his private office. It was not part of a 'safe space' discussion concerning policy or other decision-making. Mr Sunak and his private office would have expected this communications with a foreign government to be disclosed under FOIA. There is an overwhelming public interest in disclosure."

50. HMT recognised a legitimate interest in transparency but argued that this was ostensibly information about a private matter and that disclosure of the information would be wholly outside Mr Sunak's reasonable expectation of privacy. It pointed to two key factors in weighing the balance of legitimate interests in favour of withholding the information.

"a) The Lord Geidt investigation [see Note 6] and Mr Sunak's public statement provide publicly available information that deals with this issue. As this information does not shed any further light on the matter the balance is in favour of not disclosing

b) We maintain the information relates to personal residency status. The intrusion into the data subject's private life is therefore apparent."

51. The Commissioner acknowledges that Mr Sunak's green card is a personal matter. It was obtained in his capacity as a private citizen and not as an elected official and a government minister. The October 2021 trip in question to the US was in his official capacity as the then Chancellor of the Exchequer. In this case, any correspondence with US officials on the matter of his green card would inevitably relate to his impending official trip made in his public capacity.
52. The Commissioner therefore recognises that a balance must be struck between Mr Sunak's legitimate interest in keeping private any correspondence which relates to his green card and the legitimate interest in transparency about arrangements for his official trip to the US and about the use of publicly resourced channels to discuss these matters. He acknowledges that the legitimate interest in disclosure has been served to a large extent by the report referred to in Note 6.
53. Based on the above factors, the Commissioner has determined by a narrow margin that there is insufficient legitimate interest to outweigh the data subjects' fundamental rights and freedoms. The Commissioner therefore considers that there is no Article 6 basis for processing and so the disclosure of the information would not be lawful.
54. The Commissioner has also included some analysis of section 40 in a confidential annex to this Notice. It is necessary to explain to HMT why he has concluded that certain information is within the scope of the request but he is unable to do so in the main body of the Notice without making specific reference to the detail of that information.
55. For the avoidance of doubt, the Commissioner is satisfied that the names of junior officials are caught by section 40 and do not have to be disclosed. The Commissioner can see no reason in this case why his long established position of accepting that the names of junior officials are exempt from disclosure under section 40 should be departed from. Disclosure would be unfair and wholly outside their reasonable expectations. The Commissioner's consideration on those names therefore differs to his "narrow margin" conclusion on section 40 in respect of Mr Sunak's personal information. He has made further comment about this in the confidential annex to this Notice.

### **The Commissioner's view**

56. The Commissioner has therefore decided that HMT was entitled to withhold the information to which it has applied section 40(2), by way of section 40(3A)(a).

## Section 35(1)(d)

57. Section 35(1)(d) covers information relating to the operation of ministerial private offices. HMT applied this exemption to some of the withheld information.

58. The Commissioner's guidance on this exemption explains that:

"All government Ministers have their own private offices comprising a small team of civil servants. They form the bridge between the Minister and their department. The private office's role is to regulate and streamline the Ministerial workload and allow the Minister to concentrate on attending meetings, reading documents, weighing facts and advice, and making policy decisions".<sup>7</sup>

59. Section 35(5) defines 'ministerial private office': 'Ministerial private office' means any part of a government department which provides personal administrative support to a Minister of the Crown, to a Northern Ireland Minister or a Northern Ireland junior Minister, or any part of the administration of the Welsh Assembly Government providing personal administrative support to the members of the Welsh Assembly Government'.

60. The Commissioner's guidance explains that:

'The exemption covers information that 'relates to' the operation of the private office. This is generally interpreted broadly: see the section on '[How do we interpret 'relates to'?](#)' above. However, this does not mean that all information with any link to a Ministerial private office is covered. Section 35(1)(d) refers specifically to the **operation** of a Ministerial private office, which itself is defined as providing administrative support. In other words, it covers information relating to the administrative support provided to a Minister.

The upshot is that this exemption is interpreted fairly narrowly. In effect, it is limited to information about routine administrative and management processes, the allocation of responsibilities, internal decisions about Ministerial priorities and similar issues.

The exemption is likely to cover information such as routine emails, circulation lists, procedures for handling Ministerial papers or prioritising issues, travel expenses, information about staffing, the Minister's diary,

---

<sup>7</sup> [Section 35 - Government policy | ICO](#)

and any purely internal documents or discussions that have not been circulated outside the private office.”

61. A small section of the withheld information has been withheld under section 35(1)(d). Having had sight of this information, the Commissioner is satisfied that the information is exempt under section 35(1)(d) as it is administrative in nature and does not contain substantive discussion of the relevant issue.
62. Section 35(1)(d) is a qualified exemption and therefore the Commissioner must consider whether, in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

### **Public interest arguments in favour of disclosing the withheld information**

63. HMT stated:

“We took into consideration the public interest in establishing the facts surrounding ministers’ compliance with the Ministerial Code and the potential public interest in understanding the operation of a Private Office. Mr Sunak and the then-Prime Minister recognised the public interest in the former in response to public reporting on adherence to the Ministerial Code. The then-Prime Minister determined that the most appropriate way to fulfil that public interest was to ask the Independent Adviser on Ministers’ Interests to report on a range of Mr Sunak’s interests, including his possession of a Green Card until October 2021. This set out the relevant facts, and was published on 27 April 2022 - Advice to the Prime Minister from the Independent Adviser on Ministers’ Interests about the Chancellor’s outside interests ([publishing.service.gov.uk](https://publishing.service.gov.uk)) [see Note 6]. The Independent Adviser concluded: ‘I advise that the requirements of the Ministerial Code have been adhered to by the Chancellor, and that he has been assiduous in meeting his obligations and in engaging with this investigation’”.

64. As set out above, the complainant said

“This information does not relate to the operation of that office or an administrative task; it relates to Mr Sunak’s interactions with the US authorities. He could have undertaken these discussions himself, but chose to involve his private office. It was not part of a ‘safe space’ discussion concerning policy or other decision-making. Mr Sunak and his private office would have expected this communications with a foreign government to be disclosed under FOIA. There is an overwhelming public interest in disclosure”.

### **Public interest arguments in favour of maintaining the exemption**

65. HMT's arguments in favour of maintaining the exemption focussed on protecting the safe space in which a private office functions. It noted the importance of protecting that space to avoid "distraction and possible disruption to its operations". It referred to the importance of a protected space for that operation based on candour and which ensured the efficiency of the office's operation. It said:

"It is important that a Private Office runs smoothly, with two-way trust being an essential part of that working relationship. Private Offices must be able to rely on these arrangements and must be confident that Private Office administration can continue unhindered".

### **Balance of the public interest arguments**

66. The Commissioner accepts that significant weight should be given to safe space arguments. In this instance, that is the importance of providing a safe space for a private office to focus on managing a minister's work efficiently without external interference and distraction. There is also a public interest in the protection of officials, since public accountability for decisions should remain with ministers and should not fall on civil servants providing administrative support. Another important factor is age of the information. At the time of the request the information was just under one year old and so relatively recent.
67. Having had sight of the small amount of information exempt under section 35(1)(d), the Commissioner is satisfied that its public interest value and weight, in terms of the transparency and accountability that it would bring to any public discussion of Rishi Sunak's green card, is minimal. The Commissioner considers that this public interest is outweighed by the public interest in providing the Minister's office with a safe space to manage arrangements for a Minister's overseas visit.

### **Section 27 – prejudice to international relations**

68. HMT withheld some information on the basis of section 27(1)(a). This states that:

"(1) Information is exempt information if its disclosure under this Act would, or would be likely to, prejudice—

(a) relations between the United Kingdom and any other State..."

69. It said:

"Although not cited in the initial request or the internal review, we now consider that some of the information engages s27(1)(a) as the information is communications between a UK Government Private Office and officials in the US Embassy. In such matters when arranging travel

abroad for ministers, Private Offices rely on candour from Embassy officials, and therefore we consider that releasing the information could harm the relationship between the UK and the USA.”

70. In order for a prejudice based exemption, such as section 27, to be engaged the Commissioner believes that three criteria must be met:

- Firstly, the actual harm which the public authority alleges would, or would be likely, to occur if the withheld information was disclosed has to relate to the applicable interests within the relevant exemption.
- Secondly, the public authority must be able to demonstrate that some causal relationship exists between the potential disclosure of the information being withheld and the prejudice which the exemption is designed to protect. Furthermore, the resultant prejudice which is alleged must be real, actual or of substance.
- Thirdly, it is necessary to establish whether the level of likelihood of prejudice being relied upon by the public authority is met – i.e., disclosure would be likely to result in prejudice or disclosure would result in prejudice. If the likelihood of prejudice occurring is one that is only hypothetical or remote the exemption will not be engaged.

71. With regard to the first criterion of the three limb test described above, the Commissioner accepts that the potential prejudice described by the HMT clearly relates to the interests which the exemptions contained at section 27(1)(a) is designed to protect.

72. With regard to the second and third criteria, the Commissioner accepts that disclosure of material withheld on the basis of section 27(1)(a) could encroach on the confidential space needed to conduct effective relations with senior representatives of other states, especially those which value the UK’s trust and discretion. In turn, the Commissioner accepts that disclosure of such information would be likely to harm the UK’s relations with such states, taking in account the threshold for prejudice in the context of section 27 as set out above.

### **Public interest test**

73. Section 27(1) is a qualified exemption and therefore subject to the public interest test set out in section 2(2)(b) of FOIA. The Commissioner has therefore considered whether in all the circumstances of the case the public interest in maintaining the exemption cited by HMT outweighs the public interest in disclosing the small amount of information in question.

74. The Commissioner has taken the complainant’s general public interest arguments for disclosure into account which are set out above.

75. HMT's arguments make specific reference to the withheld information. These focus on the importance of confidentiality of communications between the UK and the US and of avoiding the harm disclosure could cause to relations between the two countries. It also referred to the potential chilling effect on everyday exchanges of correspondence in similar circumstances.
76. The Commissioner has considered the competing arguments and has read the small amount of information to which this exemption has been applied. He has concluded that, in the circumstances of this case, there is a stronger public interest in ensuring that the UK maintains effective relations with the US.

## 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: 0203 936 8963

Fax: 0870 739 5836

Email: [grc@justice.gov.uk](mailto:grc@justice.gov.uk)

Website: [www.justice.gov.uk/tribunals/general-regulatory-chamber](http://www.justice.gov.uk/tribunals/general-regulatory-chamber)

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 .....

**Alexander Ganotis**  
**Group Manager**  
**Information Commissioner's Office**  
**Wycliffe House**  
**Water Lane**  
**Wilmslow**  
**Cheshire**  
**SK9 5AF**