

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]@naht.org.uk>
Sent: 02 March 2020 11:51
To: directmarketingcode
Subject: Consultation response

External: This email originated outside the ICO.
Good afternoon

I'm submitting this response on behalf of NAHT, the trade union for school leaders.

- In general, we find the document hard to navigate. The majority of chapters/sections are difficult to read in isolation – we found that the entire code had to be read in full to give context. This makes it ineffective as a quick-reference guide.
- Similarly, the chapters/sections lack a distinctive nature/theme. For example, while it does have its own section, information about legitimate interest (LI) is scattered around the whole document. While I appreciate that some of the themes of the code overlap, it would be better if more time could be put in to ensure that (eg.) the LI section contains every policy on LI. Without doing so, there is a risk that people will inadvertently non-comply.
- An introduction providing clarity on the relationship, and difference, between the GDPR, PECR, etc with regards direct marketing would be helpful.
- More examples of what constitutes legitimate interest would help avoid future issues for many organisations. I would recommend using a trade union example in one of these.
- The LI example on page 36 seems contradictory to other information in the code. It implies that it is fine to direct market without consent if the purpose of the marketing is to make money. If 'profit' is an acceptable LI, will this not open the door to every cowboy organisation direct marketing without consent?
- The privacy statement on pages 50/51 provides an example of a bad-quality statement. Might it be more useful to showcase a good example? People will surely find it easier to learn from best practice than having to analyse a bad example and try to work out each aspect that is wrong. This applies to all of the other 'bad examples' used in the document.

Please let me know if you would like to discuss anything further.

All the best.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]@naht.org.uk

[REDACTED]
naht.org.uk

