

## Notice of Decision and Reasons for Decision

---

Applicant: 'EM6'  
Agency: Game Management Authority  
Decision date: 30 May 2022  
Exemptions considered: Sections 30(1), 33(1)  
Citation:  
Citation: 'EM6' and Game Management Authority (*Freedom of Information*)  
[2022] VICmr 142 (30 May 2022)

---

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION – overseas travel – study tour – agency funded – expenditure of public funds – reports – meeting minutes – meeting agenda – personal affairs information – disclosure not contrary to 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 fresh decision to refuse access to documents requested by the Applicant under the FOI Act.

My decision on the Applicant's request differs from the Agency's decision in that I have decided to release additional information in the documents where I am satisfied it is not exempt from release under sections 30(1) and 33(1).

I am also satisfied certain information does not fall within the terms of the Applicant's request for review and is irrelevant information for the purpose of section 25.

As I am satisfied it is practicable to provide the Applicant with an edited copy of the documents with irrelevant information deleted in accordance with section 25, access to the documents is granted in part.

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

30 May 2022

## Reasons for Decision

### Background to review

1. The Applicant made a request to the Agency seeking access to:
  - ... a copy of the following information and documents in relation to all overseas travel funded for GMA personnel in 2020:
    - a) Names of travellers and their GMA positions
    - b) Purpose of travel
    - c) Detailed itineraries
    - d) Why the purpose of the travel could not be achieved by virtual meetings, given there was a worldwide pandemic
    - e) Report(s) presented about the travel experience and learnings
    - f) Total cost for each trip.
2. The Agency identified seven documents falling within the terms of the Applicant's request and granted access to one document in full and refused access to two documents in part and four documents in full under sections 30(1) and 33(1).
3. The Agency's decision letter sets out the reasons for its decision.

### Review application

4. The Applicant sought review by the Information Commissioner under section 49A(1) of the Agency's decision to refuse access.

### *Fresh decision made by Agency*

5. Section 49M(1) permits an agency to make a fresh decision on an FOI request during a review.
6. On 9 March 2022, the Agency made a fresh decision to release further information in the documents, releasing each document in part. The fresh decision was made within the required 28 days under section 49M(2).
7. The Applicant did not agree with the Agency's fresh decision and, as required by section 49MA(2), I proceeded with my review on the basis of the fresh decision.
8. During the review, the Applicant stated that in relation to the information refused by the Agency under section 33(1), the Applicant only seeks access to the name and position title of executive level individuals.
9. I have examined a copy of the documents subject to review.
10. The Applicant and the Agency were invited to make a written submission under section 49H(2) in relation to the review.
11. I have considered all communications and submissions received from the parties.
12. 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.

13. 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.
14. In conducting a review under section 49F, section 49P requires that I make a new or 'fresh decision'. Therefore, my review does not involve determining whether the Agency's decision is correct, but rather requires my fresh decision to be the 'correct or preferable decision'.<sup>1</sup> This involves ensuring my decision is correctly made under the FOI Act and any other applicable law in force at the time of my decision.

## **Review of exemptions**

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

15. 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.
16. As described on the Agency's website:

The Game Management Authority is an independent authority responsible for the regulation of game hunting in Victoria. We regulate through education, research and enforcement to achieve responsible and sustainable game hunting in Victoria.
17. The documents subject to review concern a publicly-funded study tour to Denmark undertaken by two Agency officers.
18. The Agency's 2019-20 annual report provides the following information about the study tour and its connection to the Agency's statutory obligations:<sup>2</sup>

#### **Decision-making through research and monitoring**

Under the *Game Management Authority Act 2014*, the GMA is required to monitor, conduct research, and analyse the environmental, social and economic impacts of game hunting and game management. By monitoring and analysing the environment, the GMA tracks trends in hunting activity to ensure hunting does not adversely affect the sustainability of native game species.

#### **Overseas study tour**

... representatives of the GMA visited Denmark in March 2020 to consider its approach to the regulation and management of game hunting and its licensing and education framework. An important focus was on how Denmark had successfully reduced waterfowl wounding. Learnings will be used to inform possible areas of regulatory reform, hunter education and testing and research.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Drake v Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs* [1979] 24 ALR 577 at 591.

<sup>2</sup> Game Management Authority, *Annual Report 2019-20*, p 24 at [https://www.gma.vic.gov.au/\\_\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0012/612201/GMA-Annual-Report-2019-20.pdf](https://www.gma.vic.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0012/612201/GMA-Annual-Report-2019-20.pdf)

*Do the documents contain factual information?*

19. The exemption under section 30(1) does not apply to purely factual material in a document.<sup>3</sup>
20. Having reviewed the documents, I consider certain information is purely factual in nature and is not exempt from release by virtue of section 30(3).

*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?*

21. 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.
22. 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>4</sup>
23. I am satisfied certain documents contain the opinion, advice and recommendations of Agency officers and the first limb of section 30(1) is met.

*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?*

24. The term 'deliberative process' is interpreted widely and includes any of the processes of deliberation or consideration involved in the functions of an agency, Minister or government.<sup>5</sup>
25. In *Re Waterford and Department of Treasury (No.2)*,<sup>6</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 of reflection, for example, upon the wisdom and expediency of a proposal, a particular decision or a course of action.

26. I am satisfied certain information was provided in the course of the Agency's deliberative processes in determining whether to approve an Agency-funded study tour and also in presenting information on the management of game hunting, licensing and other game management issues.

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

27. Determining whether disclosure of the opinion, advice and recommendations would be contrary to the public interest in the circumstances requires a 'process of the weighing against each other conflicting merits and demerits'.<sup>7</sup> It also involves considering all relevant facts and circumstances remaining mindful the object of the FOI Act is to facilitate and promote the disclosure of information.
28. In doing so, I have given weight to the following factors:<sup>8</sup>

- (a) the right of every person to gain access to documents under the FOI Act;

---

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

<sup>4</sup> *Mildenhall v Department of Education* [1998] 14 VAR 87.

<sup>5</sup> *Brog v Department of Premier and Cabinet* [1989] 3 VAR 201 at 208.

<sup>6</sup> [1984] AATA 67; (1984) 5 ALD 588; 1 AAR 1 at [58].

<sup>7</sup> *Sinclair v Maryborough Mining Warden* [1975] HCA 17; (1975) 132 CLR 473 at [485], adopted in *Department of Premier and Cabinet v Halls* [1999] VSCA 117 at [30].

<sup>8</sup> *Halls v Victorian Casino and Gambling Authority* (1998) 12 VAR 483.

- (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 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.

29. On balance, I have determined disclosure of the documents would not be contrary to the public interest for the following reasons:

- (a) I acknowledge the management of game hunting is controversial within parts of the Victorian community and has been for a number of years. As such, I am satisfied there is a broad interest within the community about issues around the sustainability and management of game hunting in Victoria – responsibilities that fit squarely within the Agency's statutory responsibilities, including under the *Game Management Authority Act 2014* (Vic) (**GMA Act**) and related Regulations.
- (b) In relation to Document 1 which was prepared for the purpose of the Agency's Board determining whether or not to approve a publicly-funded overseas study tour, I do not consider the nature of this document is controversial given the statutory obligations of the Agency under the GMA Act, as discussed above. Nor do I consider the document is sensitive given the Board made a decision to approve the study tour in October 2019, the study tour has taken place and is publicly reported in the Agency's annual report. Further, I consider there is a strong interest in ensuring public transparency in the Board's decision making processes and the integrity of such processes given the overseas study tour was publicly funded.
- (c) In relation to Document 2 and similar documents, which is a paper submitted to the Agency's Board attaching a 'draft' report about the overseas study tour. The document makes clear it is part of a process of reporting to the Board that seeks feedback from the Board on the outcomes of the study tour and that further work will be undertaken in relation to any strategic or operational actions arising from the study tour. The fact a document is in 'draft' form is not a basis for refusing access to a document. The circumstances and context of a document must be considered in each case. Having reviewed the 'draft' report submitted to the Board, I am satisfied it is well considered and developed in terms of its thought processes and matters presented to the Board.
- (d) Although the documents may not accurately represent a final decision made by the Agency, in my view, the public is capable of understanding opinion, advice and recommendations are often provided to a decision maker at a particular point in time and may be one of a number of sources of advice contributing to the agency's overall assessment of an issue or any

subsequent decision made. Decision making is a process whereby various inputs are received and, following their consideration and deliberation, a decision is made taking into account a number of points of view and proposed options. In this case, I consider it would be open to the Agency to provide an explanation as to its current position regarding the proposals raised in the study tour report, should any be required. As such, I do not consider disclosure of the documents would promote 'unnecessary debate'.

- (e) While I accept there is a public interest in preserving the ability of public sector employees to openly communicate their opinion, advice and recommendations to a decision maker, I adopt the view greater transparency regarding government and agency decision making can improve the provision of such advice and the quality of government decision making.<sup>9</sup> In this case, the study tour participants included a [position description] officer who would be expected to provide accurate and well considered advice and proposals to the Agency's Board. As such, I do not accept 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 participate fully and properly in a process in accordance with the Agency's functions and other statutory obligations.
- (f) I acknowledge the Agency has carefully considered the documents in order to release additional information in its fresh decision and information that reflects a final position or view of the Agency. There is a strong public interest in ensuring information relating to publicly funded study tours is transparent. It is the role of government to ensure decisions made to undertake such tours are in the best interests of the public and the risks and mitigating factors have been identified and considered by the Agency before approval is granted.
- (g) Finally, I acknowledge the Agency's website includes information regarding current research projects and information taken from the Agency's study tour. However, I consider granting access to the documents would promote accountability for the expenditure of public funds and also promote the public interest in ensuring there is full transparency regarding the key learnings from a study tour and related proposals put forward for consideration by the Agency's Board in connection with its statutory functions and obligations.

30. Accordingly, I am not satisfied disclosure of certain information would be contrary to the public interest.

31. My decision in relation to section 30(1) is set out in the Schedule of Documents in **Annexure 1**.

### ***Section 33(1) – Documents affecting personal privacy of third parties***

32. A document is exempt under section 33(1) if two conditions are satisfied:

- (a) disclosure of the document under the FOI Act would 'involve' the disclosure of information relating to the 'personal affairs' of a person other than the Applicant;<sup>10</sup> and
- (b) such disclosure would be 'unreasonable'.

*Do the documents contain personal affairs information of individuals other than the Applicant?*

33. Information relating to a person's 'personal affairs' includes information that identifies any person or discloses their address or location. It also includes any information from which such information may be reasonably determined.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> *Graze v Commissioner of State Revenue* [2013] VCAT 869 (per Judge Macnamara, Acting President), in particular [25]-[27].

<sup>10</sup> Sections 33(1) and 33(2).

<sup>11</sup> Section 33(9).

34. A document will disclose a third party's personal affairs information if it is capable, either directly or indirectly, of identifying that person. As the FOI Act does not place any restrictions on an applicant's use or dissemination of documents obtained under FOI, this is to be interpreted by reference to the capacity of any member of the public to identify a third party.<sup>12</sup>
35. It has been held there is nothing particularly sensitive about matters occurring or arising in the course of one's official duties and disclosure of this type of information is generally considered not unreasonable.<sup>13</sup>
36. As stated above, the Applicant seeks access to the name and position title of executive-level individuals only. Accordingly, the name of the [personal descriptor], who are employed at an executive level, remain subject to review only. Any other personal affairs information to which the Agency refused access is irrelevant information in accordance with section 25.
37. The Agency exempted from release the names of two [personal descriptor] who attended meetings with the relevant Agency officers on behalf their respective organisations. I note both individuals occupy senior roles within their organisations.
38. I am satisfied this information relates to the personal affairs information of individuals other than the Applicant (**third parties**).

*Would disclosure of the personal affairs information be unreasonable?*

39. The concept of 'unreasonable disclosure' involves balancing the public interest in the disclosure of official information with the interest in protecting the personal privacy of a third party in the particular circumstances.
40. In *Victoria Police v Marke*,<sup>14</sup> the Victorian Court of Appeal held there is 'no absolute bar to providing access to documents which relate to the personal affairs of others'. Further, the exemption under section 33(1) 'arises only in cases of unreasonable disclosure' and '[w]hat amounts to an unreasonable disclosure of someone's personal affairs will necessarily vary from case to case'.<sup>15</sup> The Court further held, '[t]he protection of privacy, which lies at the heart of [section] 33(1), is an important right that the FOI Act properly protects. However, an individual's privacy can be invaded by a lesser or greater degree'.<sup>16</sup>
41. In determining whether disclosure of the personal affairs information in Document 3 would be unreasonable in the circumstances, I have considered the following factors:

(a) The nature of the personal affairs information

The Agency released most content in this document, including the third parties' position titles.

The Agency refused access to the names of two third parties which appear in the itinerary in Document 3. The third parties attended meetings with the relevant Agency officers on behalf their respective organisations.

---

<sup>12</sup> *O'Sullivan v Department of Health and Community Services (No 2)* [1995] 9 VAR 1 at [14]; *Beauchamp v Department of Education* [2006] VCAT 1653 at [42].

<sup>13</sup> *Milthorpe v Mt Alexander Shire Council* [1996] VCAT 368.

<sup>14</sup> [2008] VSCA 218 at [76].

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid* at [79].

(b) The Applicant's interest in the information

The FOI Act provides a general right of access that can be exercised by any person, regardless of their motive or purpose for seeking access to a document. However, the reasons why an applicant seeks access to a document is a relevant consideration in determining whether disclosure would be unreasonable under section 33(1).<sup>17</sup>

I acknowledge the Applicant's interest in obtaining a full copy of the documents, having indicated during the review their concern about the Agency's use of public funds to undertake an overseas study tour.

(c) Whether any public interest would be promoted by release of the personal affairs information

Where an applicant's motivation for seeking access to personal affairs information of a third party is more closely related to an applicant's personal interest or curiosity in obtaining the information without a broader public interest, access is more likely to be unreasonable.<sup>18</sup>

There is significant public interest in the subject matter of the Applicant's FOI request both in relation to the Agency's transparency in its expenditure of public funds and the fulfilment of its statutory functions and obligations.

(d) The likelihood of disclosure if the personal affairs information is released

The FOI Act does not place any restrictions on an applicant's use or dissemination of documents obtained under FOI.<sup>19</sup>

Accordingly, I have considered the likelihood of the personal affairs information in the document being further disseminated, if disclosed, and the effects broader disclosure of this information would have on the privacy of the relevant third parties. In doing so, I note the senior roles occupied by the relevant third parties on behalf of their respective organisations and the public nature of their roles and organisations.

(e) Whether the individuals to whom the information relates object, or would be likely to object, to the release of the information

In determining whether disclosure of a document would involve the unreasonable disclosure of a third party's personal affairs information, an agency must notify that person an FOI request has been received for documents containing their personal information and seek their view as to whether disclosure of the document should occur.<sup>20</sup> However, this obligation will generally not arise if consultation would cause a third party physical harm or undue distress, or is otherwise not reasonable or practicable in the circumstances.<sup>21</sup>

The Agency in its fresh decision determined it was not practicable to consult with the third parties. In any case, while the view of a third party is a relevant consideration, it is not determinative as to whether release of the documents would be unreasonable in the circumstances.

---

<sup>17</sup> *Victoria Police v Marke* [2008] VSCA 218 at [104].

<sup>18</sup> *Gunawan v Department of Education* [1999] VCAT 665.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid* at [68].

<sup>20</sup> Section 33(2B).

<sup>21</sup> Section 33(2C).



- (f) Whether disclosure of the information would or would be reasonably likely to endanger the life or physical safety of any person<sup>22</sup>

There is no information before me to suggest this is a relevant factor in this matter.

42. In balancing the above factors, I am satisfied disclosure of the names of the two third parties would not be unreasonable given their senior and public roles within their retrospective organisations and their meetings with the Agency officers occurred in their professional capacity rather than in a personal or private capacity. Accordingly, I am satisfied the relevant personal affairs information is not exempt from release under section 33(1).
43. My decision in relation to section 33(1) and Document 3 is set out in the Schedule of Documents in **Annexure 1**.

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

44. 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.
45. Determining what is ‘practicable’ requires consideration of the effort and editing involved in making the deletions ‘from a resources point of view’<sup>23</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>24</sup>
46. I have considered the information the Agency deleted from the documents as irrelevant. I agree it falls outside the scope of the Applicant’s request as it relates to matters other than those specified in their request.
47. Finally, I have considered the effect of deleting irrelevant information from the documents in accordance with section 25. I am satisfied it is practicable to do so, as it would not require substantial time and effort, and the edited documents would retain meaning.

### **Conclusion**

48. My decision on the Applicant’s request differs from the Agency’s decision in that I have decided to release additional information in the documents where I am satisfied it is not exempt from release under sections 30(1) and 33(1).
49. I am also satisfied certain information does not fall within the terms of the Applicant’s request for review and is irrelevant information for the purpose of section 25.
50. As I am satisfied it is practicable to provide the Applicant with an edited copy of the documents with irrelevant information deleted in accordance with section 25, access to the documents is granted in part.
51. The Schedule of Documents in **Annexure 1** sets out my decision in relation to each document.

---

<sup>22</sup> Section 33(2A).

<sup>23</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>24</sup> *Honeywood v Department of Human Services* [2006] VCAT 2048 [26]; *RFJ v Victoria Police FOI Division (Review and Regulation)* [2013] VCAT 1267 at [140] and [155].

## **Review rights**

52. If either party to this review is not satisfied with my decision, they are entitled to apply to the Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal (**VCAT**) for it to be reviewed.<sup>25</sup>
53. The Applicant may apply to VCAT for a review up to 60 days from the date they are given this Notice of Decision.<sup>26</sup>
54. The Agency may apply to VCAT for a review up to 14 days from the date it is given this Notice of Decision.<sup>27</sup>
55. 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.
56. 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>28</sup>

## ***Third party review rights***

57. As I have determined to release documents that contain the personal affairs information of two third party individuals, if practicable, I am required to notify the relevant persons of their right to seek review by VCAT of my decision within 60 days from the date they are given notice.<sup>29</sup>
58. In this case, I am satisfied it is not practicable to notify the relevant persons of their third party review rights given they are located overseas and the meetings they attended with the relevant Agency officers took place in April 2020.

## ***When this decision takes effect***

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

---

<sup>25</sup> The Applicant in section 50(1)(b) and the Agency in section 50(3D).

<sup>26</sup> Section 52(5).

<sup>27</sup> Section 52(9).

<sup>28</sup> Sections 50(3F) and 50(3FA).

<sup>29</sup> Sections 49P(5), 50(3) and 52(3).

## Annexure 1 – Schedule of Documents

Document No.	Date of Document	Document Description	No. of pages	Agency Fresh Decision	OVIC Decision	OVIC Comments
1.	[Date]	Agency Board Meeting No 2019/09 - Agenda Item 6.3 Brief: Study Tour	6	Released in part Sections 30(1), 33(1)	Release in part Section 25  The document is to be released with the personal affairs information deleted by the Agency under section 33(1) remaining deleted as irrelevant information in accordance with section 25.	<p><b>Section 25:</b> The Applicant does not seek access to the personal affairs information of third parties other than the names and position titles of executive-level individuals. Therefore, any personal affairs information, other than the names and position titles of such individuals, is irrelevant information for the purpose of section 25.</p> <p>I am satisfied it is practicable to provide the Applicant with an edited copy of this document with irrelevant information deleted in accordance with section 25.</p> <p><b>Section 30(1):</b> I am satisfied the document contains the opinion, advice and recommendations of Agency officers made in the course of the Agency's deliberative processes, specifically the Agency's Board determining whether to approve a proposed overseas study tour. However, I am not satisfied disclosure of this information would be contrary to the public interest for the reasons set out in the Notice of Decision above.</p>

Document No.	Date of Document	Document Description	No. of pages	Agency Fresh Decision	OVIC Decision	OVIC Comments
						<p>Accordingly, I am not satisfied information in the document is exempt from release under section 30(1).</p> <p><b>Section 33(1):</b> The personal affairs information refused by the Agency is the name, position title and contact details of a non-executive level Agency officer and the contact details of an executive level Agency officer. The Applicant does not seek access to this type of information. As such, it is irrelevant information for the purposes of section 25.</p>
2.	[Date]	Meeting 2020/02 - Agenda Item 5.1 Brief: Study Tour Report – Denmark 2020	3	Released in part  Section 33(1)	<p>Release in part</p> <p>Section 25</p> <p>The document is to be released with the personal affairs information deleted by the Agency under section 33(1) remaining deleted as irrelevant information in accordance with section 25.</p>	<p><b>Section 25:</b> See comments for Document 1.</p> <p><b>Section 33(1):</b> See comments for Document 1.</p>
3.	[Date]	Agenda Item 5.1 – Attachment 01	4	Released in part  Section 33(1)	<p>Release in part</p> <p>Section 25</p>	<b>Section 25:</b> See comments for Document 1.

Document No.	Date of Document	Document Description	No. of pages	Agency Fresh Decision	OVIC Decision	OVIC Comments
		Itinerary – Denmark Study Tour			<p>The document is to be released with the following information deleted in accordance with section 25:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>with the exception of the names of the executive-level Danish nationals, the personal affairs information deleted by the Agency under section 33(1) remaining deleted as irrelevant information.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Section 33(1):</b> I am satisfied disclosure of the names of the two third parties would not be unreasonable for the reasons set out in the Notice of Decision above. Accordingly, this information is not exempt from release under section 33(1).</p> <p>In relation to the remaining personal affairs information, see comments for Document 1.</p>
4.	Undated	Agenda Item 5.1 – Attachment 02 Detailed overseas study tour report – Denmark	18	Released in part Sections 30(1), 33(1)	<p><b>Release in part</b> Section 25</p> <p>The document is to be released with the personal affairs information deleted by the Agency under section 33(1) remaining deleted as irrelevant information in accordance with section 25.</p>	<p><b>Section 30(1):</b> I am satisfied disclosure of the relevant information would not be contrary to the public interest for the reasons set out in the Notice of Decision above. Accordingly, this information is not exempt from release under section 30(1).</p> <p><b>Section 33(1):</b> The personal affairs information concerns a nonexecutive Agency officer. See comments for Document 1.</p> <p><b>Section 25:</b> See comments for Document 1.</p>

Document No.	Date of Document	Document Description	No. of pages	Agency Fresh Decision	OVIC Decision	OVIC Comments
5.	[Date]	Minutes – Board Meeting 2020/02	22	Released in part Section 33(1)	<p><b>Release in part</b></p> <p>Section 25</p> <p>The document is to be released with the following information deleted in accordance with section 25:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the information deleted as irrelevant information by the Agency, except for the entry at 10:13am, which is to be released with irrelevant personal affairs information deleted; and</li> <li>the personal affairs information deleted by the Agency under section 33(1) remaining deleted as irrelevant information.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Section 25:</b> I am satisfied the information deleted by the Agency as irrelevant falls outside the terms of the Applicant's FOI request. See also comments for Document 1.</p> <p><b>Section 33(1):</b> The personal affairs information concerns persons who are not executive-level. See comments for Document 1.</p>
6.	Undated	Study Trip to Denmark – Cost-Benefit Analysis	2	Released in part Section 33(1)	<p><b>Release in part</b></p> <p>Section 25</p> <p>The document is to be released with the personal affairs information deleted by the Agency under section 33(1)</p>	<p><b>Section 25:</b> See comments for Document 1.</p> <p><b>Section 33(1):</b> The personal affairs information refused by the Agency is the position title of a non-executive Agency officer and the names of non-executive Danish</p>

Document No.	Date of Document	Document Description	No. of pages	Agency Fresh Decision	OVIC Decision	OVIC Comments
					remaining deleted as irrelevant information in accordance with section 25.	nationals. See comments for Document 1.
7.	[Date range]	Spreadsheet - Denmark Research Tour – Costs	1	Released in part Section 33(1)	Release in part Section 25  The document is to be released with the personal affairs information deleted by the Agency under section 33(1) remaining deleted as irrelevant information in accordance with section 25.	Section 25: See comments for Document 1.  Section 33(1): The personal affairs information concerns a non-executive Agency officer. See comments for Document 1.