

Freedom of Information Act

Awareness guidance 2 Information provided in confidence



Information Commissioner's Office
Promoting public access to official information
and protecting your personal information

The Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) has produced this guidance as part of a series of good practice guidance designed to aid understanding and application of the Freedom of Information Act 2000. The aim is to introduce some of the key concepts in the Act and to suggest the approaches that may be taken in response to information requests.

The guidance will be developed over time in the light of practical experience. Here we consider the exemption relating to information subject to a duty of confidence. The exemption is set out in section 41 of the Act.

A) WHAT DOES THE ACT SAY?

Section 41 of the Act sets out an exemption from the right to know where the information requested was provided to the public authority in confidence. There are two components to the exemption:

- The information must have been obtained by the public authority from another person. A person may be an individual, a company, a local authority or any other "legal entity". It is not restricted to information provided verbally or in writing. For example, information recorded by a doctor carrying out a physical examination of a patient is information obtained from that patient. The exemption does not cover information which the public authority has generated itself, although it may cover documents (or parts of documents) generated by the public authority if these contain confidential information provided by a third party. It is the information itself, and not the document or other form in which it is recorded, which needs to be considered.
- Disclosure of the information would give rise to an actionable breach of confidence. In other words, if the public authority disclosed the information the provider or a third party could take the authority to court.

In deciding whether information received from a third party falls within this exemption, it may be necessary to think about two questions: "Can the authority disclose the information?" and, "Can the authority confirm or deny the existence of the information?" For instance, a financial regulator might decline to confirm or deny that it has been provided with a confidential report on a company since to confirm that it even held a report would indicate that it harboured suspicions about the activities of that company. However, if it was already public knowledge that a report had been sent to it, there would be no breach of confidence in confirming receipt. In both cases, the regulator might not wish to disclose the content of the report.

B) WHAT IS CONFIDENTIALITY?

A duty of confidence arises when one person (the “confidant”) is provided with information by another (the “confider”) in the expectation that the information will only be used or disclosed in accordance with the wishes of the confider. If there is a breach of confidence, the confider or any other party affected (for instance a person whose details were included in the information confided) may have the right to take action through the courts.

The law of confidence is a common law concept; it has been developed by the courts as individual cases have been brought before them. The common law has strengths; in particular it is flexible and develops over time. It also has some difficulties arising from that flexibility; for instance, it is often necessary to apply the lessons of one case to another set of facts which may have very different elements.

For the purposes of FOI, the key issue is likely to be the disclosure rather than the use of information. In trying to determine whether an obligation of confidence has arisen in a particular case, it is likely to be necessary to think first about the circumstances under which information was provided to the authority and second about the nature of that information.

a) The circumstances under which the information was provided

There are essentially two cases:

- When the confider provides information to the authority, explicit conditions are attached to its subsequent use or disclosure. This may take the form of a contractual term or may be stated, for instance, in a letter.
- Conditions are not stated explicitly, but are obvious or implied from the circumstances. For instance a patient does not need to tell a doctor not to pass his or her information on to a journalist; it is simply understood that those are the rules.

The second case is more likely to give rise to some uncertainty since there is always the risk that the expectations of the confider and the confidant may be different. Some of the circumstances which typically give rise to obligations of confidence are reasonably well known. In addition to the patient/doctor relationship, can be added a number of other relationships: client/lawyer, penitent/priest, customer/bank, client/social worker and so on.

Others are more difficult to pin down. For instance, employers clearly have obligations of confidence towards their employees although these are not all encompassing. While it is fairly obvious that information contained in staff appraisals should not be disclosed, other information such as names and job titles are unlikely to be confidential. If in doubt, it may be sensible to take some

advice and to consult whoever may be affected by the requested disclosure of information.

Public authorities that gather information by means of statutory powers, including regulatory and tax collecting bodies, should consider whether the law of confidence (in addition to any statutory prohibitions) would prevent the disclosure of that information to third parties.

b) The nature of the information

Information which is protected from disclosure by an obligation of confidence must have the necessary “quality of confidence”. There are two key elements to this:

- The information need not be highly sensitive, nor can it be trivial. The preservation of confidences is recognised by the courts to be an important matter and one in which there is a strong public interest. This notion is undermined if it is argued that even trivial matters are covered. However, otherwise trivial information may not be considered trivial if it relates to personal matters and the confider considers it important.
- The information must not be readily available by other means. Information which has been reported in the press or a chemical formula which can be worked out by any chemical analyst, for instance, are unlikely to be viewed by the courts as being confidential. On the other hand, it is not necessary that the information is completely secret. A patient does not lose the right to medical confidentiality, for instance, simply because he or she has given details of their condition to an employer or a friend.

C) WHEN CAN CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION BE DISCLOSED?

The duty of confidence is not absolute and the courts have recognised three broad circumstances under which confidential information may be disclosed. These are as follows:

- Disclosures with consent. If the person to whom the obligation of confidentiality is owed (whether an individual or an organisation) consents disclosure will not lead to an actionable breach of confidence.
- Disclosures which are required by law. “Law” in this context includes statute, rules of law, court orders etc. (Note, however, that if disclosures are requirements of law, it is unlikely that the person seeking the information will attempt to make use of FOIA in order to obtain it.)
- Disclosures where there is an overriding public interest. It is important to note that this is not the public interest test required in the qualified exemptions of the FOIA; it is a consideration required by the development of the common law. There are no hard and fast rules, but the important thing to note is that the courts have taken the view that the

grounds for breaching confidentiality must be valid and very strong. A duty of confidence should not be overridden lightly. Public authorities should weigh up the public interest in disclosure against both the wider public interest in preserving the principle of confidentiality and the impact that disclosure would have on the interests of the confider. Much will depend on the circumstances of each case, but particular weight should be attached to the privacy rights of individuals. The weight of the wider public interest in confidentiality will also depend to some extent on the context. In a medical context, for example, confidentiality is important because it reinforces the bond of trust between patients and doctors, without which people may be reluctant to seek medical advice. In a banking context, confidences are respected in order to maintain trust in the banking system as a whole. Examples of cases where the courts have required disclosure in the public interest include those where the information concerns misconduct, illegality or gross immorality.

D) ACTIONABLE BREACHES OF CONFIDENCE

Public authorities relying upon the exemption must be satisfied that any breach of confidence would be actionable. "Actionable" means that an aggrieved party would have the right to take the authority to court as a result of the disclosure. There are essentially two considerations.

- The authority must be satisfied the information in question is in fact confidential. If in doubt, it may be necessary to take advice, including from the person affected. In the final analysis, however, the authority itself must be satisfied that an obligation of confidence exists: there is no veto given to third parties who object to disclosure.
- The aggrieved party must have the legal standing to take action. The Act makes clear, for instance, that one government department or one Northern Ireland department cannot sue another.

E) CONTINUATION OF THE DUTY AFTER DEATH

It has been confirmed by the Information Tribunal¹ that the duty of confidentiality does continue after the death of an individual to whom that duty is owed. Where there is a legally enforceable duty of confidentiality owed to a living individual, after death it can be enforced by the deceased's personal representative. Every person on death has a personal representative and it will not be necessary to identify the individual who has this responsibility. This principle is of particular relevance to those public authorities holding records about an individual's personal details, such as health records, banking details or the provision of care.

¹ Mrs P Bluck v The Information Commissioner and Epsom and St Helier NHS Hospital Trust, 17th Sept 2007, [EA/2006/0090](#)

F) PRACTICAL ISSUES

Central government departments (and some other authorities) make use of systems of protective markings (e.g. Restricted, confidential, secret, top secret). While these markings may provide a useful preliminary indication, it would be a mistake to rely upon them to make final decisions. A document which contains only information generated by the public authority itself cannot be exempt under section 41, irrespective of any “confidential” marking, as the information must have been obtained from another to fall within the exemption. A document may have been marked “confidential” because it was sensitive at the time of creation, but is no longer so. If protective marking systems are to be of assistance, it may be necessary to also record the period of time for which the marking is anticipated to be relevant together with any other information that might assist an FOI decision maker.

Similar considerations will apply to information which has been provided to a public authority marked, “Confidential” or “Commercial in Confidence” and so on. Very often such markings do not provide a good indication of whether information has the necessary “quality of confidence”. As with internal markings, what was confidential at the time of writing may no longer be at the time of a request for disclosure. It is also quite likely that some information will have been provided to an authority in the expectation that it would not be disclosed, even though no explicit restriction was placed upon it. In all these cases, if in doubt, it will be sensible to check the position with the provider of the information and any third parties, bearing in mind that it is the authority and not a third party which must decide if the exemption is relevant.

Given the scope for misunderstanding, for instance over the extent of the obligation of confidence in respect of employees, it may be sensible to set out formally the circumstances under which the authority will regard information as confidential. This will alert anyone who wishes to place restrictions upon the use of information of the need to do so explicitly.

The Access Code issued under s.45 of the Act by the Lord Chancellor giving advice on the handling of requests under the Act contains the following passage about contract terms with commercial organisations:

“When entering into contracts with non-public authority contractors, public authorities may be asked to accept confidentiality clauses, for example to the effect that information relating to the terms of the contract, its value and performance will not be disclosed. Public authorities should carefully consider the compatibility of such terms with their obligations under the Act. It is important that both the public authority and the contractor are aware of the limits placed by the Act on the enforceability of such confidentiality clauses.”

Although the focus of this advice is commercial interests, it can apply equally to the authorities faced with decisions as to whether to accept other confidentiality clauses. (See also the Commissioner’s guidance on the exemption relating to commercial interests, [Awareness Guidance No 5](#)).

G) OTHER EXEMPTIONS

The law of confidence (and therefore section 41 of the Act) can present difficulties, particularly to those who do not have access to legal advice. For this reason, it may often be worth considering whether there are any other exemptions in the Act which may be more immediately relevant.

Although relations between government departments and internally generated information cannot be protected by the duty of confidence, it may be relevant to look at, say, the exemptions relating to defence, the economy or prejudice to the effective conduct of public affairs.

Information which a court might find was subject to an obligation of confidence because it had been obtained using statutory powers, may also be protected by the exemptions relating to investigations, law enforcement or audit.

Personal information about living individuals is protected by the Data Protection Act. Section 40 of the Freedom of Information Act is therefore relevant (see [Awareness Guidance No 1](#)).

More information

If you need any more information about this or any other aspect of freedom of information, please contact us.

Phone: 08456 30 60 60
01625 54 57 45

E-mail: please use the online enquiry form on our website

Website: www.ico.gov.uk

This guidance will be reviewed and considered from time to time in line with new decisions of the Information Commissioner, Tribunal and courts on freedom of information cases. It is a guide to our general recommended approach to this area, although individual cases will always be decided on the basis of their particular circumstances.