

Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA)

Decision notice

Date: 14 February 2023

Public Authority: The Council of the University of Cambridge
Address: The Old Schools
Trinity Lane
Cambridge CB2 1TN

Decision (including any steps ordered)

1. The complainant requested information about the people involved in making the decision on their application for a specific role.
2. The University of Cambridge (the University) provided some information in scope of the request but refused to disclose the remainder, citing section 40(2) (personal information) of FOIA.
3. The Commissioner's decision is that the University was entitled to apply section 40(2) in this case.
4. The Commissioner requires no steps to be taken as a result of this decision.

Request and response

5. On 30 March 2022, following earlier correspondence, the complainant wrote to the University and requested information in the following terms:

"1. Who were the people involved in making the decision on my application for [role redacted]?"

2. [...] Therefore, the way the Center for Geopolitics was founded, the way it has recruited [name redacted] and [name redacted] [and others] should be publically explained and available for everyone to know.

[...]

Therefore, answers to the question of on what basis and how she was recruited ...would be in [the] public interest.

3. I would also like to ask for the disclosure of information as to the role of [name redacted] as the Chair of [redacted]. What kind of decisions has [redacted] been making in that role? Although [redacted] is not an employee of the University of Cambridge, what procedure has been used to appoint her as [role redacted]?
4. In view of the fact that I had applied for the post of [redacted], has the Human Resources of the University of Cambridge applied for any work permits to the Home Office and the Work Permit UK to obtain work permit for any non-British person who might have applied for the same post of [redacted]?"
6. The University responded on 28 April 2022. It provided information in response to part 3 of the request. However, it refused to provide the information requested at parts 1, 2 and 4, citing section 40(3A)(a) of FOIA (personal information).
7. Following an internal review the University wrote to the complainant on 30 May 2022, maintaining its view that the information is exempt from disclosure, citing section 40(2) of FOIA.
8. The following analysis explains why the Commissioner is satisfied that the University was entitled to withhold the information that has been requested in parts 1, 2 and 4 of the request.

Reasons for decision

Section 40 personal information

9. Section 40(2) of 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.
10. In this case the relevant condition is contained in section 40(3A)(a)¹. 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').

¹ As amended by Schedule 19 Paragraph 58(3) DPA.

11. 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 FOIA cannot apply.
12. 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?

13. Section 3(2) of the DPA defines personal data as "any information relating to an identified or identifiable living individual".
14. The two main elements of personal data are that the information must relate to a living person and that the person must be identifiable.
15. 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.
16. 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.
17. In this case, the request for information clearly states the names and roles of third parties. The Commissioner is satisfied that this information both relates to and identifies those individuals. This information therefore falls within the definition of 'personal data' in section 3(2) of the DPA.
18. The fact that information constitutes the personal data of an identifiable living individual does not automatically exclude it from disclosure under FOIA. The second element of the test is to determine whether disclosure would contravene any of the DP principles.
19. The most relevant DP principle in this case is principle (a).

Would disclosure contravene principle (a)?

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

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

21. 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.

22. In order to be lawful, one of the lawful bases listed in Article 6(1) of the GDPR must apply to the processing. It must also be generally lawful.

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

23. 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"².

24. In considering the application of Article 6(1)(f) of the GDPR in the context of a request for information under 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.

25. 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

26. 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

² 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".

However, section 40(8) FOIA (as amended by Schedule 19 Paragraph 58(8) DPA) provides that:-

"In determining for the purposes of this section whether the lawfulness principle in Article 5(1)(a) of the GDPR would be contravened by the disclosure of information, Article 6(1) of the 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".

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. They may be compelling or trivial, but trivial interests may be more easily overridden in the balancing test.

27. In this case, the complainant considers that, based on their experience, it is in the public interest to know about how the University selection panel operates.

Is disclosure necessary?

28. '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 FOIA must therefore be the least intrusive means of achieving the legitimate aim in question.
29. The Commissioner is satisfied in this case that there are no less intrusive means of achieving the legitimate aims identified.

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

30. 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 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.
31. 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.
32. 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.

33. It is also important to consider whether disclosure would be likely to result in unwarranted damage or distress to that individual.
34. In this case, the Commissioner accepts that the complainant clearly has a personal interest in the requested information and also that they consider that disclosure is in the public interest.
35. However, the Commissioner has also taken into account that none of the data subjects in question has consented to the disclosure of the personal data covered by this request. He also considers that none of them would reasonably expect that such data about their recruitment/employment, activities or visa status would be placed into the public domain.
36. Based on the above factors, the Commissioner has determined 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.
37. Given the above conclusion that disclosure would be unlawful, the Commissioner considers that he does not need to go on to separately consider whether disclosure would be fair or transparent.
38. The Commissioner has therefore decided that the University was entitled to withhold the information requested at parts 1, 2 and 4 of the request under section 40(2), by way of section 40(3A)(a).

Right of appeal

39. 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
Website: www.justice.gov.uk/tribunals/general-regulatory-chamber

40. 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.

41. 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

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