

Legitimate Interest Assessment

This assessment covers the retention of email addresses by the School of Informatics's "iFriend" service beyond the period where the initial use case for registering with the service has passed. (Ongoing use of the service would be either by "contract" or "consent".)

a. Identifying a Legitimate Interest			
	Question	Answer	Guidance
1.	What is the purpose of the processing operation	The purpose of this processing operation is to maintain the security of data and facilities which were originally made accessible to selected iFriend users by the owners of those data or the managers of those services. In order to assure that iFriend identities (which are essentially email addresses) cannot be reissued to other users, which would be a security violation, we require to maintain a list of identities which were previously issued.	The first stage is to identify to a legitimate interest – what is the purpose for processing the personal data?
2.	Is the processing necessary to meet one or more specific organisational objectives?	Some of the material is of a confidential nature, or must have a restricted circulation. It is therefore necessary to assure that the identities of those people granted access cannot later be taken by others.	If the processing operation is required to achieve a legitimate business objective, then it is likely to be legitimate for the purposes of this assessment.
3.	Is the processing necessary to meet one or more specific objectives of a third party?	N/A	While you may only need to identify one legitimate interest, it may be useful to list all interests in the processing, including those of a third party.
4.	Does the GDPR specifically list the processing activity as a legitimate activity in one of the Recitals?	The activity is covered by Recital 49.	For example: Legitimate Interests might be relied on where an individual's information is processed by the University for the purposes of network security.
b. The Necessity Test			
	Question	Answer	Guidance
1.	Why is the processing	The processing is required to ensure that controlled	A legitimate interest may be

	activity important to the University?	material and resources do not become available to the wrong people.	elective or business critical; however, even if the University's interest in processing personal data for a specific purpose is obvious and legitimate and based on its objectives, it must be a clearly articulated and communicated to the individual.
2.	Why is the processing activity important to other parties the data may be disclosed to, if applicable?	N/A. The data will never be disclosed or used outside the iFriend system.	Just because the processing is central to what the University and/or a third party does, does not make it legitimate. It is the reason for the processing, balanced against the potential impact on an individual's rights, that is key.
3.	Is there another way of achieving the objective?	It is not practicable to trawl the entire system looking for identities which are no longer in use, nor would it be acceptable from a privacy point of view. The only reasonable way to assure that identities (essentially email addresses) are not misused is to ensure that they are never reissued. That requires us to maintain a list of old identities. We can not assume that outside bodies will never reissue those email addresses to others.	If there isn't, then it is likely that the processing is necessary; or: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If there is another way but it would require disproportionate effort, then the processing is still necessary; or • If there are multiple ways of achieving the objective, then a PIA should have identified the least intrusive means of processing the data which would be necessary; or • If the processing is not necessary (It is unlikely that there will be many scenarios where processing is not necessary where it has been identified as being the only way to achieve a stated business objective), then legitimate interests cannot be relied on as a lawful basis for that processing activity.

c. The Balancing Test

	Question	Answer	Guidance
1.	Would the individual expect the processing activity to take place?	It would be reasonable to assume that the individual would expect such security measures to be in place.	If individuals would expect the processing to take place then the impact on the individual is likely to have already been considered by them and accepted. If they have no expectation, then the

			impact is greater and is given more weight in the balancing test.
2.	Does the processing add value to a service that the individual uses?	The main value of the iFriend service to the individual happens earlier, when they are actively using the service. At this point they would not be using the service, so cannot actually gain any benefit from it as such.	
3.	Is the processing likely to negatively impact the individual's rights? If so, how?	As the list of identities would never be used for any other purpose, any negative impact would be minimal. The list would only be accessible to the iFriend service managers: two or three of the School of Informatics's Computing staff.	If processing would undermine or frustrate the ability to exercise those rights in future that might well affect the balance.
4.	Is the processing likely to result in unwarranted harm or distress to the Individual?	No.	
5.	Would there be a prejudice to the University or third party if processing does not happen? How?	Reissuing an old identity to a new user could allow that user to access resources or data inappropriately. This could allow data to be altered or divulged inappropriately.	
6.	Is the processing in the interests of the individual whose personal data it relates to?	It would be in the individual's interest that they were not impersonated in relation to their access to University data or resources. The issue is likely to be reputational.	
7.	Are the legitimate interests of the individual aligned with those of the University or the third party?	To the extent that impersonation would not be desirable, the individual's interest in preventing inappropriate access to University data or systems would be aligned.	What are the benefits to the individual or society? If the processing is to the benefit of the individual, then it is more likely that legitimate interests can be relied on, as the individual's interests will be aligned with those of the University. Where the processing is more closely aligned with the interests of the University or a third party than with those of the individual, it is less likely that the interests will be balanced and greater emphasis needs

			to be placed on the context of the processing and relationship with the individual.
8.	What is the connection between the individual and the organisation?	There are a number of prior associations with the University which could lead to this stage: for example, former research collaborator, former external examiner.	For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • existing student, • alumni, • employee or contractor.
9.	What is the nature of the data to be processed? Does data of this nature have any special protections under GDPR?	Solely a list of iFriend identities, in the form of email addresses. There are no special categories of data held.	If processing special categories of personal data, an Article 9 condition must be identified as the lawful basis of processing.
10.	Is there any imbalance in who holds the power between the University and the individual?	If the individual wishes to be removed from the list then they should contact our Support team to discuss this. Depending on what their previous use was in connection with, it may be that we would be unable to accede. Each case would have to be judged on its own merits.	Does the individual have a choice regarding the processing of their personal information? If the organisation has a dominant position, this will tip the balance slightly against the use of legitimate interests. The University will need to consider how it addresses any imbalance of power to ensure individuals' rights are not impacted.
11.	Can the individual control the processing activity in any way? Can the individual opt out easily?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No X Partly <input type="checkbox"/> Explain: Being able to opt out would defeat the security purpose of maintaining the list. As noted above, individuals may request removal, but in many circumstances it would not be possible to agree to this.	Giving the individual increased control or elements of control may help the University rely on legitimate interests where otherwise they could not. If individual control is not possible or not appropriate, explain why.

d. Outcome

	Outcome of Assessment: Appropriate.
	Decided by: George D M Ross MSc PhD CEng MBCS CITP, Computing Infrastructure Manager, School of Informatics
	Date: 2018-06-14