

## Notice of Decision and Reasons for Decision

---

Applicant: 'EU4'  
Agency: Game Management Authority  
Decision date: 7 September 2022  
Provision and exemption considered: Sections 25, 30(1)  
Citation: 'EU4' and Game Management Authority (Freedom of Information) [2022] VICmr 213 (7 September 2022)

---

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION – Game Management Authority – board meeting minutes – draft documents – duck hunting – disclosure would not be contrary to the public interest

All references to legislation in this document are to the *Freedom of Information Act 1982* (Vic) (**FOI Act**) unless otherwise stated.

### Notice of Decision

I have conducted a review under section 49F of the Agency's decision to refuse access to documents requested by the Applicant under the FOI Act.

Additional documents relevant to the terms of the Applicant's request were identified during the review.

My decision on the Applicant's request differs from the Agency's decision in that I am not satisfied Documents 1, 9A and 41 are exempt from release under section 30(1).

Where I am satisfied it is practicable to provide the Applicant with an edited copy of the documents with irrelevant and exempt information deleted in accordance with section 25, access is granted in part. Where it is not practicable to do, access is refused in full.

The Schedule of Documents in **Annexure 1** sets out my decision in relation to each document.

My reasons for decision follow.

**Joanne Kummrow**  
Public Access Deputy Commissioner

7 September 2022

## Reasons for Decision

### Background to review

1. The Applicant made a request to the Agency seeking access to the following documents:
  1. Minutes of all GMA senior management meetings and GMA Board Meetings held between [date] and [date] inclusive.
  2. All documents including emails, relating to the helicopter trial survey count of ducks in Victoria from [date] until the date of the Ministers decision to increase bag limit from 2 to 5.
  3. Any other documents, including emails, considered by GMA in recommending the increased 2021 duck season bag limit from 2 to from [date] until the date of the Ministers decision to increase bag limit from 2 to 5.

In this case, “considered” means documentation perused by GMA in the process of making their decision regarding an amended 2021 duck shooting season (increasing the 2021 season bag limit from 2 to 5.)

2. The Agency identified 48 documents falling within the terms of the Applicant’s request and refused access to 44 documents in part and two documents in full under sections 30(1), 32(1), 33(1), 34(1)(b) and 35(1)(b). Two documents were publicly available and are not subject to review.<sup>1</sup> The Agency’s decision letter sets out the reasons for its decision.

### Review application

3. The Applicant sought review by the Information Commissioner under section 49A(1) of the Agency’s decision to refuse access.
4. During the review, the Applicant advised they seek review of the Agency’s decision to exempt information under section 30(1) only.
5. The Applicant and the Agency were invited to make a written submission under section 49H(2) in relation to the review.
6. I have considered all communications and submissions received from the parties.
7. In undertaking my review, I have had regard to the object of the FOI Act, which is to create a general right of access to information in the possession of the Government or other public bodies, limited only by exceptions and exemptions necessary to protect essential public interests, privacy and business affairs.
8. I note Parliament’s intention the FOI Act must be interpreted so as to further the object of the Act and any discretions conferred by the Act must be exercised, as far as possible, so as to facilitate and promote the disclosure of information in a timely manner and at the lowest reasonable cost.

### *Preliminary view provided to Agency*

9. On [date], the Agency was provided with a preliminary view that Documents 1, 13, 40, 41 and 43 were not exempt from release under section 30(1). It was invited to provide a further submission or consider making a fresh decision under section 49M.
10. On [date], the Agency advised it no longer relies on section 30(1) to exempt from release information in parts of Documents 40 and 43.

---

<sup>1</sup> The attachments to Documents 1 and 19.

### ***Additional documents located***

11. In response to further inquiries made by OVIC, the Agency identified two further documents that fall within the terms of the Applicant's request. These documents have been numbered Documents 9A and 26A. The Agency relies on section 30(1) to refuse access to Document 9A in full and released Document 26A in full to the Applicant.
12. I have examined a copy of Documents 1, 9A, 13, 40 and 41, which are subject to review.

### **Review of exemptions**

#### ***Section 30(1) – Internal working documents***

13. Section 30(1) has three requirements:
  - (a) the document must disclose matter in the nature of opinion, advice or recommendation prepared by an officer or Minister, or consultation or deliberation that has taken place between officers, Ministers or an officer and a Minister;
  - (b) such matter must be made in the course of, or for the purpose of, the deliberative processes involved in the functions of an agency or Minister or of the government; and
  - (c) disclosure of the matter would be contrary to the public interest.
14. The exemption does not apply to purely factual material in a document.<sup>2</sup>

*Do the documents disclose matter in the nature of opinion, advice or recommendation prepared by an officer or Minister, or consultation or deliberation that has taken place between officers, Ministers or an officer and a Minister?*

15. For the requirements of section 30(1) to be met, a document must contain matter in the nature of opinion, advice or recommendation prepared by an agency officer, or consultation or deliberation between agency officers.
16. It is not necessary for a document to be in the nature of opinion, advice or recommendation. Rather, the issue is whether release of the document would disclose matter of that nature.<sup>3</sup>
17. Having reviewed the documents, I am satisfied they were prepared by an Agency officer and contain matter in the nature of opinion, advice or recommendation.

*Were the documents made in the course of, or for the purpose of, the deliberative processes involved in the functions of an agency or Minister or of the government?*

18. The term 'deliberative process' is interpreted broadly and includes any of the processes of deliberation or consideration involved in the functions of an agency, Minister or government.<sup>4</sup>
19. In *Re Waterford and Department of Treasury (No.2)*,<sup>5</sup> the former Victorian Administrative Appeals Tribunal held:

... "deliberative processes" [is] wide enough to include any of the processes of deliberation or consideration involved in the functions of an agency... In short, ...its thinking processes — the processes

---

<sup>2</sup> Section 30(3).

<sup>3</sup> *Mildenhall v Department of Education* (1998) 14 VAR 87.

<sup>4</sup> *Brog v Department of Premier and Cabinet* (1989) 3 VAR 201 at 208.

<sup>5</sup> [1984] AATA 67; (1984) 5 ALD 588; 1 AAR 1 at [58].

of reflection, for example, upon the wisdom and expediency of a proposal, a particular decision or a course of action.

20. I am satisfied Documents 1, 9A, 13 and 41 were prepared for the deliberative processes involved in the functions of the Agency, being the administrative functions associated with the regulation of duck hunting in Victoria.

*Would disclosure of the documents be contrary to the public interest?*

21. In determining if disclosure of a document would be contrary to the public interest, requires a 'process of the weighing against each other conflicting merits and demerits'.<sup>6</sup> I must also consider all relevant facts and circumstances, remaining mindful the object of the FOI Act is to facilitate and promote the disclosure of information.

22. The Agency's decision letter states:

The documents disclose rationale, deliberations, and decision-making processes. The documents that have been exempted under this exemption disclose advice regarding options for the board to consider, in order to make a recommendation to the Minister. Disclosure of the document would be reasonably likely to inhibit the ability of the Minister and the Board to receive frank, independent and confidential advice from GMA [Game Management Authority] staff.

It is essential that GMA staff can thoroughly research and present various options to the Board for their consideration without concern those communications will be released into the public domain. Release of recommendations prepared for consideration will impair the ability of the Board to receive well considered, frank and in-depth advice in future, which in turn will undermine the decision-making process.

23. In relation to Document 13, which is an undated draft of Document 1, the Agency submits:

Notwithstanding the fact that parts of the document contain deliberative material which canvasses GMA management's opinions and analysis..., we stress that this a draft and, therefore, a working document which is an incomplete version of a brief that was not provided to the GMA Board for consideration... Release of such documents would significantly affect the proper functioning of government and, ultimately, is not in the public interest. It is not in the public interest to release this information, having not gone through the process of various levels of management scrutiny before being ultimately approved.

24. Having reviewed the documents and considered the Agency's reasons for decision and the Applicant's and the Agency's submissions, on balance, I am satisfied disclosure of Documents 1, 9A and 41 would not be contrary to the public interest. In doing so, I have given weight to the following relevant factors:<sup>7</sup>

- (a) the right of every person to gain access to documents under the FOI Act;
- (b) the degree of sensitivity of the issues discussed in the documents and the broader context giving rise to the creation of the documents;
- (c) the stage of a decision or status of policy development or a process being undertaken at the time the communications were made;
- (d) whether disclosure of the documents would be likely to inhibit communications between Agency officers, essential for the Agency to make an informed and well-considered decision or

---

<sup>6</sup> *Sinclair v Maryborough Mining Warden* [1975] HCA 17; (1975) 132 CLR 473 at [485], adopted in *Department of Premier and Cabinet v Hulls* [1999] VSCA 117 at [30].

<sup>7</sup> *Hulls v Victorian Casino and Gambling Authority* (1998) 12 VAR 483.

participate fully and properly in a process in accordance with the Agency's functions and other statutory obligations;

- (e) whether disclosure of the documents would give merely a part explanation, rather than a complete explanation for the taking of a particular decision or the outcome of a process, which the Agency would not otherwise be able to explain upon disclosure of the documents;
- (f) the impact of disclosing documents in draft form, including disclosure not clearly or accurately representing a final position or decision reached by the Agency at the conclusion of a decision or process; and
- (g) the public interest in the community being better informed about the way in which the Agency carries out its functions, including its deliberative, consultative and decision making processes and whether the underlying issues require greater public scrutiny.

#### Documents 1, 9A and 41

25. Having reviewed the content of the documents, their purpose in connection with the functions of the Agency and the submissions received, I am satisfied disclosure of Documents 1, 9A and 41 would not be contrary to the public interest for the following reasons:

- (a) The Agency is an independent authority responsible for the regulation of game hunting in Victoria.
- (b) The Agency summarises its statutory responsibilities and functions on its website:

We have a range of responsibilities including:

- issuing Game Licences
- managing open and closed seasons for game species
- enforcing game hunting laws and taking action against those who do not hunt legally
- educating and informing hunters on how to hunt legally in Victoria.

We provide advice on managing natural resources across Victoria addressing:

- the sustainable harvest of game species
- the humane treatment of animals that are hunted and used in game hunting
- minimising any negative impacts on non-game wildlife, including protected and threatened species
- the conservation of wildlife habitats.

- (c) I accept the issue and regulation of game hunting, including duck hunting season is a sensitive issue within the community.
- (d) However, I consider there is a strong public interest in the public being better informed about the advice obtained and provided by the Agency given its independent role and statutory functions. This is regardless of the opinion and advice being a step in the decision making process at the time the communications were made.
- (e) The Agency is responsible for ensuring advice it receives is accurate, complete and properly considered. It is the role of government, supported and informed by analysis and advice undertaken by Agency officers, to make decisions and act in the best interests of the public – a role that is necessarily and appropriately the subject of public scrutiny.
- (f) In this instance, I am satisfied disclosure of the documents would promote transparency and accountability in government decision making processes in respect to the Agency's

independent statutory role, including to monitor the game duck population, which informs decisions made as to duck hunting season quotas.

- (g) I am not satisfied disclosure of the document would be likely to inhibit communications between Agency officers, including external consultants, from providing impartial and fulsome advice to the Board or the Minister in the future. In my view, public scrutiny of these types of advice and research can improve the robustness of such advice and related decisions where Agency officers know that they may be subject to public scrutiny. In this regard, I note the views of the Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal (**VCAT**) in *Graze v Commissioner for State Revenue*,<sup>8</sup> which observed the possibility of public scrutiny in some circumstances would provide for better government decision making.
- (h) As the Agency officers provided the advice in accordance with their professional duties as public sector employees, I do not accept its disclosure would have any material or lasting impact on the quality of future advice. Public sector employees and executives are required to provide impartial and responsive advice to the Agency's executive management and Board in accordance with their responsibilities and the public sector values under section 61 of the *Public Administration Act 2004* (Vic)<sup>9</sup> and the *Code of Conduct for Victorian Public Sector Employees* issued by the Victorian Public Sector Commission.
- (i) I consider there is a strong public interest in the community being better informed about the way in which the Agency carries out its functions, including its deliberative, consultative and decision making processes. Further, disclosure would likely contribute to greater public scrutiny and community participation in the Agency's role in the provision of advice about and oversight of game duck hunting in Victoria.

26. Accordingly, I am disclosure of Documents 1, 9A and 41 would not be contrary to the public interest, and these documents are not exempt from release under section 30(1).

#### Document 13

- 27. Document 13 is an early draft version of Document 1. I consider the Agency's internal process of making recommendations to its Board requires Agency officers to discuss relevant issues and options before preparing advice. In such circumstances, it is desirable for Agency officers to seek and exchange opinions in an open and fulsome way before providing an official position.
- 28. Where information appears to be a first iteration or draft of a final recommendation provided to the Board, I am satisfied it would be contrary to the public to release. Having viewed the documents, I am satisfied release of an earlier version would not clearly represent the final outcome or position reached by the Agency.
- 29. Accordingly, I am satisfied disclosure of Document 13 would be contrary to the public interest, and this document is exempt from release under section 30(1).
- 30. My decision in relation to section 30(1) is set out in the Schedule of Documents in **Annexure 1**.

#### ***Section 25 – Deletion of exempt or irrelevant information***

- 31. Section 25 requires an agency to grant access to an edited copy of a document where it is practicable to delete exempt or irrelevant information and the applicant agrees to receiving such a copy.

---

<sup>8</sup> [2013] VCAT 869 at [26].

<sup>9</sup> See, for example, the public sector value of 'Responsiveness' which requires Victorian public sector employees to demonstrate responsiveness by 'providing frank, impartial and timely advice to the Government'.

32. Determining what is 'practicable' requires consideration of the effort and editing involved in making the deletions 'from a resources point of view'<sup>10</sup> and the effectiveness of the deletions. Where deletions would render a document meaningless, they are not 'practicable', and release of the document is not required under section 25.<sup>11</sup>
33. Document 1 contains the names of two individuals who contributed to preparing the documents and Document 41 contains information exempted from release by the Agency under section 33(1). As the Applicant does not seek access to personal affairs information, I am satisfied this is irrelevant information for the purpose of section 25.
34. I have considered whether it is practicable to provide the Applicant with an edited copy of the documents with irrelevant and exempt information deleted in accordance with section 25.
35. In relation to Documents 1 and 41, I am satisfied it is practicable to delete the exempt and irrelevant information, as it would not require substantial time and effort and the edited documents would retain meaning. However, In relation to Document 13, I am satisfied it is not practicable to delete exempt and irrelevant information, as to do so would render the document meaningless.
36. My decision in relation to section 25 is set out in the Schedule of Documents in **Annexure 1**.

### Conclusion

37. On the information before me, I am not satisfied Documents 1, 9A and 41 are exempt from release under section 30(1).
38. Where I am satisfied it is practicable to provide the Applicant with an edited copy of the documents with irrelevant and exempt information deleted in accordance with section 25, access is granted in part. Where it is not practicable to do, access is refused in full.
39. The Schedule of Documents in **Annexure 1** sets out my decision in relation to each document.

### Review rights

40. If either party to this review is not satisfied with my decision, they are entitled to apply to VCAT for it to be reviewed.<sup>12</sup>
41. The Applicant may apply to VCAT for a review up to 60 days from the date they are given this Notice of Decision.<sup>13</sup>
42. The Agency may apply to VCAT for a review up to 14 days from the date it is given this Notice of Decision.<sup>14</sup>
43. Information about how to apply to VCAT is available online at [www.vcat.vic.gov.au](http://www.vcat.vic.gov.au). Alternatively, VCAT may be contacted by email at [admin@vcat.vic.gov.au](mailto:admin@vcat.vic.gov.au) or by telephone on 1300 018 228.
44. The Agency is required to notify the Information Commissioner in writing as soon as practicable if either party applies to VCAT for a review of my decision.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> *Mickelborough v Victoria Police (General)* [2009] VCAT 2786 at [31]; *The Herald and Weekly Times Pty Limited v The Office of the Premier (General)* [2012] VCAT 967 at [82].

<sup>11</sup> *Honeywood v Department of Human Services* [2006] VCAT 2048 at [26]; *RFJ v Victoria Police FOI Division (Review and Regulation)* [2013] VCAT 1267 at [140] and [155].

<sup>12</sup> The Applicant in section 50(1)(b) and the Agency in section 50(3D).

<sup>13</sup> Section 52(5).

<sup>14</sup> Section 52(9).

<sup>15</sup> Sections 50(3F) and 50(3FA).

***When this decision takes effect***

- 45. My decision does not take effect until the Agency's 14 day review period expires.
- 46. If a review application is made to VCAT, my decision will be subject to any VCAT determination.



## Annexure 1 – Schedule of Documents

Document No.	Date of Document	Document Description	No. of pages	Agency Decision	OVIC Decision	OVIC Comments
1.	[date]	BRIEF - ARI Report - Abundance Estimates for Game Ducks in Victoria	4	Refuse in full Sections 30(1), 33(1)	Release in part  Section 25 The document is to be released, except for irrelevant information, which is to be deleted in accordance with section 25, being: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the names of third parties on pages 1 and 4.</li> </ul>	Section 30(1): I am not satisfied the document is exempt from release under section 30(1) for the reasons set out in the Notice of Decision above.  Section 25: I am satisfied the document contains information that is irrelevant to the request, being the full names of third parties.  I am also satisfied it is practicable to provide the Applicant with an edited copy of the document with irrelevant information deleted in accordance with section 25.
1A	[date]	Attachment 1 - Victorian Game Duck Survey 2020 FINAL (1)	41	Released outside the FOI Act	Not subject to review	This is an attachment to Documents 1, 18 and 20 and is publicly available.
1B	[date]	[named] review of Vic	3	Released outside the FOI Act	Not subject to review	This is an attachment to Documents 1 and 20 and is a publicly available.
2.	[date]	BRIEF - Minister Recommendation to	6	Refused in part	Not subject to review	

Document No.	Date of Document	Document Description	No. of pages	Agency Decision	OVIC Decision	OVIC Comments
		vary 2021 duck season - FINAL signed (1)		Section 33(1)		
3.	[date]	Email: FW OFFICIAL preliminary duck abundance estimates	3	Refused in part Section 33(1)	Not subject to review	
4.	[date]	Email: RE OFFICIAL RE Abundance data and possible seasonal arrangements	2	Refused in part Section 33(1)	Not subject to review	
5.	[date]	Email: RE OFFICIAL RE Abundance data and possible seasonal arrangements	2	Refused in part Section 33(1)	Not subject to review	
6.	[date]	Email: RE MO enquiry - duck season data	2	Refused in part Section 33(1)	Not subject to review	
7.	[date]	Abundance Survey	2	Refused in part Section 33(1)	Not subject to review	
8.	[date]	Email: FW OFFICIAL-Sensitive RE Preliminary report	3	Refused in part Section 33(1)	Not subject to review	

Document No.	Date of Document	Document Description	No. of pages	Agency Decision	OVIC Decision	OVIC Comments
9.	[date]	Email: Fwd Review of game duck abundance estimates in Victoria	3	Refused in part Section 33(1)	Not subject to review	
9A.	[date]	Attachment – DRAFT Victorian Game Duck Survey 2020	8	Refused in full Section 30(1)	Release in part Section 25 The document is to be released, except for irrelevant information, which is to be deleted in accordance with section 25, being: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the names of third parties on pages 1 and 8.</li> </ul>	This is the attachment to Document 9.  Sections 30(1) and 25: See comments for Document 1.
10.	[date]	Email: RE OFFICIAL-Sensitive RE Preliminary report	4	Refused in part Section 33(1)	Not subject to review	
11.	[date]	Email: RE OFFICIAL-Sensitive RE Preliminary report	3	Refused in part Section 33(1)	Not subject to review	
12.	[date]	Email: Meeting	1	Refused in part Section 33(1)	Not subject to review	

Document No.	Date of Document	Document Description	No. of pages	Agency Decision	OVIC Decision	OVIC Comments
13.	[date]	Board Brief – Reconsideration of season arrangements	7	Refused in full Section 30(1)	Refuse in full Section 30(1)	<p>This is the attachment to Documents 14 – 17</p> <p><b>Section 30(1):</b> I am satisfied the document is exempt from release under section 30(1) for the reasons set out in the Notice of Decision above.</p> <p><b>Section 25:</b> I am satisfied it is not practicable to provide the Applicant with an edited copy of the document with exempt information deleted in accordance with section 25 for the reasons set out in the Notice of Decision above.</p>
13A.	[date]	Draft Board Brief – Reconsideration of season arrangements	1	Refused in part Section 33(1)	Not subject to review	
14.	[date]	Email: McLeod - review of the Vic waterfowl survey design and data analysis	1	Refused in part Section 33(1)	Not subject to review	

Document No.	Date of Document	Document Description	No. of pages	Agency Decision	OVIC Decision	OVIC Comments
15.	[date]	Email: FW OFFICIAL Game duck abundance report	2	Refused in part Section 33(1)	Not subject to review	
16.	[date]	Email: RE OFFICIAL Waterfowl count - duck season	2	Refused in part Section 33(1)	Not subject to review	
17.	[date]	Email: RE OFFICIAL Game duck abundance report	2	Refused in part Section 33(1)	Not subject to review	
18.	[date]	Email: FW OFFICIAL Game duck survey report	2	Refused in part Section 33(1)	Not subject to review	
19.	[date]	Email: RE Request for GMA Board's updated duck season recommendations	2	Refused in part Section 33(1)	Not subject to review	
20.	[date]	Email: RE Draft briefing note for comment	3	Refused in part Section 33(1)	Not subject to review	
21.	[date]	Email: RE OFFICIAL Game duck survey report	2	Refused in part Section 33(1)	Not subject to review	

<b>Document No.</b>	<b>Date of Document</b>	<b>Document Description</b>	<b>No. of pages</b>	<b>Agency Decision</b>	<b>OVIC Decision</b>	<b>OVIC Comments</b>
22.	[date]	Email - FW Recommendation to vary the 2021 duck season	2	Refused in part Section 33(1)	Not subject to review	
23.	[date]	Email: OFFICIAL RE Meeting to discuss report with stakeholders	1	Refused in part Section 33(1)	Not subject to review	
24.	[date]	Email: RE OFFICIAL Duck helicopter survey analysis update	2	Refused in part Section 33(1)	Not subject to review	
25.	[date]	Email: RE OFFICIAL Duck survey data update	3	Refused in part Sections 30(1), 33(1)	Not subject to review	
26.	[date]	Email: FW OFFICIAL Duck survey data update	2	Refused in part Section 33(1)	Not subject to review	
26A.	[date]	Attachment – compressed files	N/A	Released in full	Not subject to review	This is the attachment to Document 26.
27.	[date]	Email: RE OFFICIAL Ops plan	1	Refused in part Section 33(1)	Not subject to review	

Document No.	Date of Document	Document Description	No. of pages	Agency Decision	OVIC Decision	OVIC Comments
28.	[date]	Flight plan	1	Refused in part Section 33(1)	Not subject to review	
28A.	[date]	[name] Aircraft Operations GMA2020Draft	18	Refused in full Sections 33(1), 34(1)(b)	Not subject to review	This is the attachment to Document 28
29.	[date]	Email: OFFICIAL RE Flight plan	1	Refused in part Section 33(1)	Not subject to review	
30.	[date]	Email: RE OFFICIAL NSW DPI	2	Refused in part Section 33(1)	Not subject to review	
31.	[date]	Email: RE OFFICIAL RE Helicopter survey	2	Refused in part Section 33(1)	Not subject to review	
32.	[date]	Email: RE OFFICIAL surface water	2	Refused in part Section 33(1)	Not subject to review	
33.	[date]	Email: OFFICIAL duck estimates	1	Refused in part Section 33(1)	Not subject to review	
34.	[date]	Email: RE OFFICIAL preliminary duck abundance estimates	2	Refused in part Section 33(1)	Not subject to review	

Document No.	Date of Document	Document Description	No. of pages	Agency Decision	OVIC Decision	OVIC Comments
35.	[date]	Email re meeting request: Helicopter survey debrief	1	Refused in part Section 33(1)	Not subject to review	
36.	[date]	Email: RE Debrief on helicopter surveys	2	Refused in part Section 33(1)	Not subject to review	
37.	[date]	Email: OFFICIAL RE Flight plan	1	Refused in part Section 33(1)	Not subject to review	
38.	[date]	Email: OFFICIAL RE Briefing to Minister for Agriculture	1	Refused in part Section 33(1)	Not subject to review	
39.	[date]	Email: RE OFFICIAL RE Abundance data and possible seasonal arrangements	2	Refused in part Section 33(1)	Not subject to review	
40.	[date]	MINUTES Thurs [date]Board Meeting No. [reference]	13	Refused in part Sections 30(1), 33(1)	Release in part Section 25  The document is to be released, except for irrelevant information, which is to be deleted in accordance with section 25, being:	On [date], the Agency advised it no longer relies on section 30(1) to exempt from release information in this document.  Section 25: See comments for Document 1.



Document No.	Date of Document	Document Description	No. of pages	Agency Decision	OVIC Decision	OVIC Comments
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the redactions made by the Agency under section 33(1).</li> </ul>	
41.	[date]	MINUTES [date]BOARD Meeting No [reference]	13	Refused in part Sections 30(1), 33(1)	<p><b>Release in part</b></p> <p><b>Section 25</b></p> <p>The document is to be released, except for irrelevant information, which is to be deleted in accordance with section 25, being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the redactions made by the Agency under section 33(1).</li> </ul>	Sections 30(1) and 25: See comments for Document 1.
42.	[date]	MINUTES Mon, [date] GMA Board Meeting No. [reference]signed	3	Refused in part Sections 33(1), 35(1)(b)	<b>Not subject to review</b>	
43.	[date]	MINUTES Thurs, [date] GMA Board Meeting No. [reference]signed	11	Refused in part Sections 30(1), 33(1)	<p><b>Release in part</b></p> <p><b>Section 25</b></p> <p>The document is to be released, except for irrelevant information, which is to be deleted in accordance with section 25, being:</p>	On [date], in response to OVIC's preliminary view, the Agency advised it no longer relies on section 30(1) to exempt from release information in this document.

Document No.	Date of Document	Document Description	No. of pages	Agency Decision	OVIC Decision	OVIC Comments
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the redactions made by the Agency under section 33(1).</li> </ul>	Section 25: See comments for Document 1.
44.	[date]	MINUTES Mon, [date] GMA Board Meeting No. [reference]signed	4	Refused in part Section 33(1)	Not subject to review	
45.	[date]	MINUTES of Friday, [date] BOARD Meeting No. [reference]signed	11	Refused in part Section 33(1)	Not subject to review	