

STATES OF JERSEY



DRAFT FREEDOM OF INFORMATION AND DATA PROTECTION (AMENDMENTS) (JERSEY) LAW 201-

Lodged au Greffe on 31st March 2014
by the Chief Minister

STATES GREFFE



Jersey

**DRAFT FREEDOM OF INFORMATION AND DATA
PROTECTION (AMENDMENTS) (JERSEY)
LAW 201-**

European Convention on Human Rights

In accordance with the provisions of Article 16 of the Human Rights (Jersey) Law 2000 the Chief Minister has made the following statement –

In the view of the Chief Minister, the provisions of the Draft Freedom of Information and Data Protection (Amendments) (Jersey) Law 201- are compatible with the Convention Rights.

Signed: **Senator I.J. Gorst**

Chief Minister

Dated: 28th March 2014

REPORT

Introduction

The FOI Implementation Team in the Chief Minister's Department has been working closely with the Law Officers' Department in preparation for coming into force of the Freedom of Information (Jersey) Law 2011 (the "**Law**"). It is anticipated that the Law will come into force on 1st January 2015.

As work has progressed towards the implementation date for the Law, some difficulties have been identified with provisions of the Law that may cause practical difficulties or have unwanted effects following implementation of the Law. Some difficulties have also been identified with regard to the interaction between the Law and the Data Protection (Jersey) Law 2005 (the "**DP Law**"). The Draft Freedom of Information and Data Protection (Amendments) (Jersey) Law 201- (the "**draft Amendment Law**") is intended to address these issues and has 4 aims, namely –

1. To amend Article 16 of the Law to provide a sufficient basis for setting a cost limit separately from the means of calculating a fee.
2. To amend Article 46 of the Law to provide an additional ground concerning compliance with the requirements of Part 2 of the Law to the extent not otherwise covered by the other sub-paragraphs.
3. To amend Article 54 of the Law to –
 - (a) provide the Royal Court, on appeal, with an express power to substitute its own decision for that of the Information Commissioner;
 - (b) provide an express power to make rules of court that would allow the Royal Court to direct that material relevant to the determination of the issues be withheld from some of the parties on appeal and for some of the parties to the appeal to be excluded from part of the proceedings where necessary.
4. To modify the definition of "data" in the DP Law so that it covers information recorded on paper and held by a public authority that does not fall within the definition of "data" at present.

A full explanation of the effect of the Law is set out in the draftsman's **Explanatory Note**. However, a brief description of the reasons for bringing forward these changes is set out below.

Cost Limit

At present, Articles 15 and 16 of the Law allow provision to be made in Regulations so that a fee may be charged for answering an FOI request and so that, if the scheduled public authority estimates that the amount of the fee would exceed a particular level, the request may be refused.

The Chief Minister and the Council of Ministers agree that there should, as is the case in the UK and in other jurisdictions, be a cost limit applied to each request (i.e. a cap on the amount of time and cost that could be incurred in answering the requests). However, Article 16(1) of the Law does not currently provide a sufficient basis for setting a cost limit separately from the means of calculating a chargeable fee.

At present, the Council of Ministers does not wish to set a fee for answering requests falling below a cost limit. Further, even if a fee were to be charged in future, the

amount of the fee might be determined using a different method than that used to estimate whether the costs limit had been exceeded. So the amount of the cost limit and the method used to estimate whether it may be exceeded in respect of a request need to be capable of being set in a different way from the method of determining any chargeable fee.

To facilitate the setting of a cost limit distinct from the amount of any fee, the draft Amendment Law amends Article 16 so that a request can be refused simply where the Scheduled Public Authority estimates that the costs of compliance with the request would exceed any amount determined in a manner prescribed by the States by Regulations.

Article 46

The appeal provision under Article 46(1) of the Law do not presently provide a basis for an appeal to be made to the Information Commissioner about a public authority's compliance with many of the requirements in Part 2 of the Law. For example, a requester cannot complain to the Information Commissioner about the time taken to answer his or her request or whether the information has been supplied by a reasonable means. In order to ensure that compliance with the requirements of Part 2 of the Law is subject to the same appeal mechanism as other obligations in the Law, including any Regulations made under that Part an additional ground of appeal has been added.

Article 47

Article 47 provides a right of appeal against the decisions of the Information Commissioner under Article 46 of the Law. The grounds for an appeal to the Royal Court are that the decision of the Information Commissioner was not reasonable in all the circumstances.

The principal difficulty with Article 47 of the Law is the absence of an express power for the Royal Court to grant an appropriate remedy in response to the appeal. If a decision of the Information Commissioner is concerned with the application of a number of different exemptions to information covered by a particular request on appeal, the Royal Court may be inclined to allow the appeal in respect of some aspects of the Information Commissioner's decision under Article 46, but not others. Although the Royal Court may give reasons for its decision, in the absence of specific power the Royal Court cannot substitute a different decision, which is enforceable under Article 48 of the Law, for that given by the Information Commissioner. In the absence of such a power, the only remedy the Royal Court can grant on a successful appeal is to declare that the Information Commissioner's decision was not reasonable, which would render it unenforceable. If the requester might have been entitled to information as a result of the appeal decision, then they might need to make a fresh request for the same information with that request being subject to a fresh appeals process. That may cause unnecessary expense and delay to requesters and scheduled public authorities in handling duplicate requests and appeals.

The amendment to Article 47 and Article 48 of the FOI Law provides the Royal Court, on appeal, with an express power to substitute its own decision for that of the Information Commissioner.

Article 54

Article 54 of the Law provides the power to make Rules of Court under Article 13 of the Royal Court (Jersey) Law 1948, which includes the power to make Rules regulating the practice and procedure on any matter relating to the Royal Court under the Law. This provides the power to make Rules of Court that are in line with

generally accepted principles of natural justice and are compliant with Article 6 European Court of Human Rights (“ECHR”).

General principles of natural justice coupled with the need for legislation to be compliant with Article 6 ECHR usually require that the public and all parties to proceedings are entitled to be present throughout; and that the documents provided to the court for the determination of a matter are seen by all the other parties. However, in respect of appeals in the context of the Law, there will be cases in which it is essential to deviate to an extent from these principles.

Specifically, in some cases it will be necessary for the Royal Court to see the information that is the subject of the request so that the public authority can properly explain its case for applying exemptions to it, and the Court can check that the scheduled public authority is entitled to an exemption. In those cases, the disclosure of the information to everyone participating in the proceedings would defeat the object of the appeal, since there would be no point in the Royal Court deciding whether information should or should not be disclosed, if it already has been.

It is therefore considered necessary to expressly provide the power to make Rules of Court which prevent disclosure of material from one or other party and to prevent parties from attending open court, which may otherwise be viewed as contrary to principles of natural justice and Article 6 European Court of Human Rights.

Data Protection (Jersey) Law 2005 Amendments

Article 1 – “data”

Article 25 of the Law provides an absolute exemption from the disclosure obligations in the Law for information that constitutes “personal data” of which either the requestor is the “data subject” (as defined in the DP Law) or where the information is the personal data of a “third party” and the supply of the personal data would contravene any of the data protection principles in the DP Law. This exemption is intended to ensure that requests by individuals for their own personal data continue to be handled exclusively under the DP Law rather than the Law. It is also intended to ensure that personal data is not disclosed under the Law when to do so might breach the DP Law.

The current problem is that the definition of “data” in the DP Law is limited, and so personal information held in most paper files will not constitute “personal data” for the purposes of the DP Law. As a result, the exemption in Article 25 would not have the intended effect in relation to information held in paper files. The amendment will change the definition of “data” in Article 1(1) of the DP Law so that information contained in all paper files held by a public authority will be “data”. This means that personal information found in a public authority’s normal day-to-day paper files, whatever the content and however structured, can potentially be withheld from disclosure in reliance on the personal data exemption using the Article 25 exemption.

Article 33A

The amendment to the definition of “data” could bring all the rest of the DP Law to bear on the totality of a public authority’s personal information. The general application of the DP Law to all personal information held by public authorities is not an intended by-product of the change to Article 1 of the DP Law. The purpose of that change is just to ensure that the subject access right and the right of access under the Law work in harmony.

Article 33A achieves the objective of exempting the Data Controller from all of the substantive obligations of the DP Law in respect of their unstructured manual data, except the right of subject access and the sixth principle, in so far as it supports that

obligation. A similar change was made in the UK when it introduced the Freedom of Information Act 2000 for the same reasons.

Article 9A

A new Article 9A to the DP Law is intended to introduce an important qualification to the subject access right to unstructured public authority data.

Firstly, subject access will not be given to unstructured personal data unless the information is expressly described in the request (a request from a data subject for access to his or her own personal data usually has to be met by giving access to all of that subject's data, without his or her having to specify any of it).

Secondly, even where residual unstructured personal information has been described, the authority can rely on the cost limit prescribed for the purposes of FOI to refuse a request for personal data in so far as it estimates it would cost more than the prescribed limit to meet the request.

Financial and manpower implications

There are no financial or manpower implications for the States arising from the adoption of this draft Law.

Human Rights

The notes on the human rights aspects of the draft Law in the Appendix have been prepared by the Law Officers' Department and are included for the information of States Members. They are not, and should not be taken as, legal advice.

APPENDIX TO REPORT

Human Rights Note on the Draft Freedom of Information and Data Protection (Amendments) (Jersey) Law 201-

This Note has been prepared in respect of the Draft Freedom of Information and Data Protection (Amendments) (Jersey) Law 201- (“**the draft Amendment Law**”) by the Law Officers’ Department. It summarises the principal human rights issues arising from the contents of the draft Amendment Law and explains why, in the Law Officers’ opinion, the draft Amendment Law is compatible with the European Convention on Human Rights (“ECHR”).

Article 6 ECHR – Right to a Fair Trial

Article 6 of the draft Amendment Law amends Article 54 of the Law, which contains provisions for rules of court in connection with proceedings under the Law. In particular, the draft Amendment Law includes arrangements for restricting the disclosure of evidence. Such arrangements might be necessary in the context of appeals under the Law where, for example, to disclose the information to the parties to the appeal may frustrate the purposes of the appeal. It may also be necessary where for reasons of security or if it is contrary to the public interest, it is not possible to disclose to a party to the proceedings, or to any legal representative, material or information relevant to the proceedings under Article 47.

Such procedures might be referred to as “closed material procedures” and involve a departure from the normal principles of natural justice by preventing one party from attending court or seeing all the evidence relevant to their appeal. However, they need not be incompatible with Article 6 of the ECHR and the right to a fair trial. Taking into account the decision of the UK Supreme Court in *Home Office -v- Tariq* [2011] UKSC 35, a closed material procedure can be adopted in a manner compatible with Article 6 of the ECHR, provided that there is an express vires to make rules of court regulating such procedures and their adoption is proportionate in the particular context in which they are employed.

Closed material procedures are used in respect of appeals against decisions of the Information Commissioner in the UK, and there is no reason why their use should not also be compatible with Article 6 of the ECHR in Jersey. Therefore providing the vires to make rules of court that permit a closed material procedure to be adopted is compatible with Article 6 of the ECHR.

The draft Amendment Law is therefore compatible with Article 6 ECHR.

No other provisions of the ECHR are engaged by the draft Amendment Law.

Explanatory Note

This draft Law would amend the Freedom of Information (Jersey) Law 2011 and the Data Protection (Jersey) Law 2005.

Part 1 sets out amendments to the Freedom of Information (Jersey) Law 2011, referred to as the “FOI Law” for the purposes of this Part – see *Article 1*.

Article 2 amends Article 16 of the FOI Law with respect to the power of a public authority (that is, a public authority specified in Schedule 1 to the FOI Law) to refuse to supply information if it estimates that the costs of doing so would be excessive. Currently, Article 16 provides that a public authority can refuse to supply such information if it estimates that the costs of doing so would exceed a fee chargeable by a public authority for the supply of information, such fee being determined in accordance with Regulations under Article 15. The amendment made by *Article 2* allows the States to make Regulations setting out the manner in which an amount may be determined for the purpose of refusing a request regardless of whether or not Regulations under Article 15 are made with respect to a chargeable fee.

Article 3 amends Article 46 of the FOI Law with respect to appeals to the Information Commissioner against a decision of a public authority by adding an additional ground of appeal in relation to decisions that are not otherwise referred to in Article 46. The additional ground is to the effect that the public authority has made a decision that does not comply with a requirement of Part 2 of the FOI Law (access to information held by a public authority) or Regulations made under that Part. Article 46 already makes provision for appeals concerning decisions relating to fees and costs of supplying information; decisions relating to refusal to comply with vexatious and repeated information requests and refusal to comply with information requests on the ground that information is absolutely exempt or on the ground that the public interest in refusing to supply qualified exempt information outweighs the public interest in its disclosure.

Article 3 also extends the date by which an appeal under Article 46 must be made so that an appeal must be made by the date that is 6 weeks after the date any internal complaints procedure of the public authority has been exhausted, rather than 6 weeks after the date of the decision being appealed against.

Article 4 amends Article 47 of the FOI Law with respect to appeals to the Royal Court from a decision of the Information Commissioner under Article 46. The amendment allows the Royal Court to substitute its own decision for the Information Commissioner’s decision if the substituted decision is one which the Information Commissioner could have made.

Article 5 amends Article 48 of the FOI Law concerning the failure of a public authority to comply with a notice given by the Information Commissioner following an appeal under Article 46 against a decision of the authority. First, it adds an additional statement which the Information Commissioner may include in a notice served on a public authority to the effect that the public authority has not complied with a requirement in Part 2 of the FOI Law (or Regulations under Part 2) and that the authority must comply with that requirement. Some further consequential changes are made to Article 48.

Second, *Article 5* amends Article 48 by giving the Royal Court explicit power to substitute another notice for the Information Commissioner’s notice if the substituted notice is one which the Information Commissioner could have made.

Article 6 expands the power in Article 54 of the FOI Law to make rules of court. The power makes specific provision so that directions can be given to withhold material or to restrict disclosure or to conduct proceedings in the absence of any person.

Part 2 sets out amendments to the Data Protection (Jersey) Law 2005 “Data Protection Law” for the purposes of this Part – see *Article 7*.

Article 8 amends the definition of “data” in the Data Protection Law to include recorded information held by a public authority (that is a public authority specified in Schedule 1 to the Freedom of Information (Jersey) Law 2011) that is not otherwise included in the definition. The definition currently covers information processed by means of equipment operating automatically and information which is part of a relevant filing system (the latter being where a set of information is held in a structured way by reference to individuals or criteria relating to individuals). The amendment covers all recorded information not otherwise included in the definition regardless of how the information is structured or in what form it is held. “Held” is given the same meaning as in the Freedom of Information (Jersey) Law 2011. Thus information is held by a public authority if the authority holds it on its own account or if another person holds it on the public authority’s behalf. Under Article 25 of the Freedom of Information (Jersey) Law 2011, personal data is absolutely exempt information where an applicant requests personal information about himself or herself or where the supply of personal data would contravene any of the data protection principles in the Data Protection Law. Accordingly, the effect of the new limb in the definition of “data” means that requests concerning information within the meaning of Article 25 that involve unstructured personal data may be dealt with under the Data Protection Law (unless a public authority chooses to supply the information under Article 9(1) of the Freedom of Information (Jersey) Law 2011).

Article 9 inserts a new Article in the Data Protection Law in relation to the supply of personal data that falls within the new limb of the definition of “data” (see *Article 8* above), that is, unstructured personal data. The amendment exempts a public authority from the requirement in Article 7(1) of the Data Protection Law to inform an individual about such personal data concerning the individual (including a description of the data, its purposes and recipients) unless the individual gives the public authority a description of the data. Even if such a description is given, the public authority does not have to comply with all the provisions of Article 7(1) if the authority estimates that the cost of compliance would exceed a limit specified by the States in Regulations, except in relation to the specific provision in Article 7(1) that requires a public authority to inform an individual of the fact of whether it is processing information about the individual. The public authority is only exempt from the latter requirement if the costs of complying with that obligation alone would exceed a limit specified by the States in Regulations. The manner of determining whether the costs of compliance would exceed a specified limit must be made in accordance with Regulations under Article 16 of the Freedom of Information Law.

Article 10 inserts a new Article into the Data Protection Law to the effect that personal data that falls within the new limb of the definition of “data” (see *Article 8* above), that is, unstructured personal data, is exempt from the data protection principles except in so far as, broadly speaking, the Data Protection Law gives an individual rights of access to his or her data. The amendment also exempts such personal data from other parts of the Data Protection Law. In particular, an individual is not entitled to stop the processing of such data that causes distress or damage nor is an individual entitled to compensation arising from damage or distress suffered as a result of breach by the data controller of any requirement of the Data Protection Law. Also such data does not

fall within the offence of knowingly or recklessly disclosing or obtaining personal data without consent.

Article 11 amends Article 56 of the Data Protection Law which would prohibit information from the police, the Minister for Home Affairs, or the Minister for Social Security about a person's convictions, cautions and certain other matters from being required in relation to, broadly, the employment of persons, provision of services or supply of goods except in certain specified circumstances. These provisions have not yet been brought into force. However Article 11 amends Article 56 so that personal data falling within the new limb of the definition of "data" (see *Article 8* above), that is personal unstructured data, would not fall within the prohibition.

Part 3 contains *Article 12* which sets out the title of the Law and provides that it will come into force on the same date that the Freedom of Information (Jersey) Law 2011 comes into force.



Jersey

DRAFT FREEDOM OF INFORMATION AND DATA PROTECTION (AMENDMENTS) (JERSEY) LAW 201-

Arrangement

Article

| | |
|---|-----------|
| PART 1 | 15 |
| <hr/> | |
| FREEDOM OF INFORMATION (JERSEY) LAW 2011 AMENDMENTS | 15 |
| 1 Interpretation | 15 |
| 2 Article 16 amended | 15 |
| 3 Article 46 amended | 15 |
| 4 Article 47 amended | 16 |
| 5 Article 48 amended | 16 |
| 6 Article 54 amended | 17 |
| PART 2 | 17 |
| <hr/> | |
| DATA PROTECTION (JERSEY) LAW 2005 AMENDMENTS | 17 |
| 7 Interpretation | 17 |
| 8 Article 1 amended | 17 |
| 9 Article 9A inserted | 18 |
| 10 Article 33A inserted | 19 |
| 11 Article 56 amended | 19 |
| PART 3 | 19 |
| <hr/> | |
| CLOSING | 19 |
| 12 Citation and commencement | 19 |



Jersey

DRAFT FREEDOM OF INFORMATION AND DATA PROTECTION (AMENDMENTS) (JERSEY) LAW 201-

A LAW to amend further the Freedom of Information (Jersey) Law 2011 and Data Protection (Jersey) Law 2005.

| | |
|--|------------------------------|
| <i>Adopted by the States</i> | <i>[date to be inserted]</i> |
| <i>Sanctioned by Order of Her Majesty in Council</i> | <i>[date to be inserted]</i> |
| <i>Registered by the Royal Court</i> | <i>[date to be inserted]</i> |

THE STATES, subject to the sanction of Her Most Excellent Majesty in Council, have adopted the following Law –

PART 1

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION (JERSEY) LAW 2011 AMENDMENTS

1 Interpretation

In this Part “FOI Law” means the Freedom of Information (Jersey) Law 2011¹.

2 Article 16 amended

For Article 16(1) of the FOI Law there shall be substituted the following paragraph –

“(1) A scheduled public authority that has been requested to supply information may refuse to supply the information if it estimates that the cost of doing so would exceed an amount determined in the manner prescribed by Regulations.”.

3 Article 46 amended

In Article 46 of the FOI Law –

(a) after paragraph (1)(d) the word “or” shall be deleted;

- (b) at the end of paragraph (1)(e) for the full-stop there shall be substituted the word “; or”;
- (c) after paragraph (1)(e) there shall be added the following sub-paragraph –
 - “(f) taken in compliance, or purported compliance, with any requirement of Part 2 of the Law including Regulations made under that Part, such decision being one that is not otherwise referred to in sub-paragraphs (a) to (e).”;
- (d) in paragraph (2) after the words “being given” there shall be inserted the words “or, if later, within 6 weeks of the date the applicant has exhausted any complaints procedure provided by the scheduled public authority.”.

4 Article 47 amended

After Article 47(5) of the FOI Law there shall be inserted the following paragraph –

“(5A) Subject to paragraph (5), the Royal Court shall –

- (a) allow the appeal;
- (b) substitute for the Information Commissioner’s decision such other decision that the Information Commissioner could have made; or
- (c) dismiss the appeal.”.

5 Article 48 amended

In Article 48 of the FOI Law –

- (a) in paragraph (1) for the words “one of the statements set out in paragraph (2) and the authority has not supplied the information in accordance with the notice” there shall be substituted the words “one or more of the statements set out in paragraph (2) and the authority has not complied with the notice”;
- (b) at the end of paragraph (2)(e) for the full-stop there shall be substituted a semi-colon;
- (c) after paragraph (2)(e) there shall be added the following sub-paragraph –
 - “(f) that the authority has not complied with the requirements of Part 2 of the Law, namely the requirement [insert a description of the requirement and the applicable provision setting out the requirement in Part 2 or in Regulations under that Part] and that the authority must comply with the requirement.”;
- (d) in paragraph (3) for the words “should supply the information requested in accordance with the notice but has failed to do so” there shall be substituted the words “has failed to comply with one or more requirements in the notice”;
- (e) for paragraph (4) there shall be substituted the following paragraphs –
 - “(4) The Court may inquire into the matter and hear –

- (a) any witness who may be produced against or on behalf of the scheduled public authority; and
 - (b) any statement that may be offered in defence.
- (5) After inquiring into the matter, the Court may do either or both of the following –
- (a) deal with the scheduled public authority as if it had committed a contempt of court; and
 - (b) substitute for the Information Commissioner’s notice such other notice that the Information Commissioner could have made.”.

6 Article 54 amended

In Article 54 of the FOI Law –

- (a) the existing text shall be numbered paragraph (1);
- (b) after paragraph (1) there shall be added the following paragraphs –
 - “(2) Without prejudice to the generality of paragraph (1), such rules of court may, in particular, make provision for –
 - (a) enabling directions to be given to withhold material or restrict disclosure of any information relevant to proceedings under Article 47 from any party (including any representative of any party) to the proceedings; and
 - (b) notwithstanding Article 47(6), enabling the court to conduct such proceedings in the absence of any person, including a party to the proceedings (or any representative of a party to the proceedings).
 - (3) In making rules of court described in paragraph (2), regard shall be had to –
 - (a) the need to secure that the decisions that are the subject of such proceedings are properly reviewed; and
 - (b) the need to secure that disclosures of information are not made where they would be contrary to the public interest.”.

PART 2

DATA PROTECTION (JERSEY) LAW 2005 AMENDMENTS

7 Interpretation

In this Part, “Data Protection Law” means the Data Protection (Jersey) Law 2005².

8 Article 1 amended

In Article 1 of the Data Protection Law –

- (a) in paragraph (1), in the definition “data” the word “or” after sub-paragraph (b) shall be deleted and after sub-paragraph (c) there shall be added the following sub-paragraph –
- “, or
- (d) is recorded information held by a scheduled public authority and does not fall within any of sub-paragraphs (a) to (c);”;
- (b) after the definition “sensitive personal data” there shall be inserted the following definition –
- “ ‘scheduled public authority’ has the same meaning as in the Freedom of Information (Jersey) Law 2011³;”;
- (c) after paragraph (1) there shall be inserted the following paragraph –
- “(1A) In sub-paragraph (d) of the definition ‘data’ in sub-paragraph (1), the reference to information ‘held’ by a scheduled public authority shall be construed in accordance with Article 3 of the Freedom of Information (Jersey) Law 2011⁴ (as if that Article referred to a scheduled public authority).”.

9 Article 9A inserted

After Article 9 of the Data Protection Law there shall be inserted the following Article –

“9A Unstructured personal data held by scheduled public authorities

- (1) In this Article, ‘unstructured personal data’ means any personal data falling within sub-paragraph (d) of the definition of data in Article 1(1).
- (2) A scheduled public authority is not obliged to comply with Article 7(1) in relation to any unstructured personal data unless the request under that Article contains a description of the data.
- (3) Even if a request contains a description of data as referred to in paragraph (2), a scheduled public authority is not obliged to comply with Article 7(1) in relation to unstructured personal data if the authority estimates that the cost of complying with the request in so far as it relates to those data would exceed a limit specified by the States in Regulations.
- (4) Paragraph (3) does not exempt the scheduled public authority from its obligation under Article 7(1) to inform an individual whether unstructured personal data of which that individual is the data subject are being processed by or on behalf of the data controller unless the estimated costs of complying with that obligation alone in relation to those data would exceed a limit specified by the States in Regulations.
- (5) Any estimate for the purposes of this Article must be made in accordance with Regulations under Article 16 of the Freedom of Information (Jersey) Law 2011⁵ (whether or not any limit specified in Regulations for the purposes of this Article is the same as any

amount determined in accordance with Regulations under Article 16).”.

10 Article 33A inserted

After Article 33 of the Data Protection Law there shall be inserted the following Article –

“33A Manual data held by scheduled public authorities

- (1) Personal data falling within paragraph (d) of the definition ‘data’ in Article 1(d) are exempt from –
 - (a) the first, second, third, fourth, fifth, seventh and eighth data protection principles;
 - (b) the sixth data protection principle except so far as it relates to the rights conferred on data subjects by Articles 7 and 14;
 - (c) Articles 10 to 13;
 - (d) Part 3; and
 - (e) Article 55.”.

11 Article 56 amended

In Article 56 of the Data Protection Law, after paragraph (6) there shall be inserted the following paragraph –

“(6A) A record is not a relevant record to the extent that it relates, or is to relate, only to personal data falling within paragraph (d) of the definition ‘data’ in Article 1(1).”.

PART 3
CLOSING

12 Citation and commencement

This Law may be cited as the Freedom of Information and Data Protection (Amendments) (Jersey) Law 201- and shall come into force on the same date as the Freedom of Information (Jersey) Law 2011⁶ comes into force.

-
- ¹ *L.17/2011*
² *chapter 15.240*
³ *L.17/2011*
⁴ *L.17/2011*
⁵ *L.17/2011*
⁶ *L.17/2011*