

Private Management

- Held by the creator for business benefit
 Information is a recognized asset with far greater potential and risks in a digital age 'toxic assets'
- In line with key responsibilities and public expectations
- Managed to enable access through time

Private Management

- Accountability is changing it may no longer be acceptable to inform clients that their data will destroyed after a certain period.
- GDPR will shift expectations in terms of retention and the 'right to be forgotten'. Archival derogations are key to moving this forward.
- Ideally have fair processing notices and informed consent

Private Management

- Solicitors and barristers must manage their records properly to provide a better service to clients and efficiently manage business resources more efficiently.
- Larger practices encouraged to employ or contract records management services
- In addition, archival considerations should be managed from the outset.

Public Authority – historic picture

Archivists: historically the gatekeepers of the past <u>dictatinc</u>	
	access
	Mainly paper acquisition
	Access regimes agreed with depositor
	'Loan', 'Permanent Ioan' or 'Gift'
	Copyright
	Few laws dictating the retention of information for
	historical purposes
	Lawyers records often deposited on mass in times of crisis without catalogues etc.

Public Authority – current picture

Α	rchivists: Currently mediators of the past & present navigating legislation:
	Subject to FOIA/EIRS and DP/GDPR etc
	Special terms for archives under some legislation
	Gift (loan is now very rare)
	Minimal closure but respecting considerations around confidentiality/privacy commercial and personal
	Accepting records in all formats
	Contract must be drawn up at point of deposit
	Sadly records still being deposited with archives ad hoc

Access: Freedom of Information (FOIA) Environmental Information Regulations (EIRs)

Deposit in a public authority alters control
 The contract and terms of deposit are key to manage the records in line with the depositors expectiations.
 It is to be noted that exceptions to access under EIRs weigh very heavily in favour of release.
 Cases around exceptions/exemptions impacting on the law more generally are being decided by the ICO and in First and Second Tier Tribunals.

ICO distills these in guidance.

Legal professional privilege - s.42 FOIA

Qualified exemption

- Advice privilege applies to confidential communications between client and professional legal adviser provided the advice has a legal function
- Litigation privilege can apply to communications with third parties
- Waiver

Legal professional privilege - s.42 FOIA

Bellamy v Information Commissioner & Secretary of State for Trade & Industry (EA/2005/0023)

Calland v Information Commissioner & the Financial Services Authority (EA/2007/0136)

Mersey Tunnel Users Association v Information Commissioner & Merseytravel (EA/2007/0052)

Three Rivers District Council and others v Governor and Company of the Bank of England [2004] UKHL 48

Confidentiality - s.41 FOIA

s.41(1) Information provided in confidence – absolute

- Whether the information has the necessary quality of confidence;
- Whether the information was imparted in circumstances importing an obligation of confidence;
- □ Whether an unauthorised use of the information would result in detriment to the confider.

Confidentiality - s.41 FOIA

s.41(1) Information provided in confidence cont.

- If the requested information is commercial in nature the disclosure will only constitute a breach of confidence if it would have a detrimental impact on the confider.
- The law of confidence recognises that a breach of confidence may not be actionable when there is an overriding public interest in disclosure.

Commercial interests – s.43 FOIA

s.43 Commercial interests

- □ Trade secrets
- □ Prejudice to commercial interests.

Health and safety - s.38 FOIA

- s.38 Health and safety
- □ Physical or mental health
- $\ \square$ Safety of an individual

Human Rights/ Data Protection/ GDPR

Article 8 Right to Privacy s.40 Freedom of Information/Data Protection/GDPR

- Client consents
- □ Reviews of legacy records
- Transparent retention/destruction processes

In conclusion there needs to be ...

- A responsible approach agreed between lawyers and archivists which acknowledges complexities and challenges.
- A sample retention schedule which provides transparency about different record sets and allows a debate around the future of these records
- □ Agreed client consent processes which are transparent about destruction and/or archival deposit.
- A templated deposit contract if possible agreed with ICO, SRA, ARA and BRA. This needs to agree legal costs for dealing with access disputes.