

Notice of Decision and Reasons for Decision

Applicant:	'FM7'
Agency:	VicScreen
Decision date:	3 January 2024
Sections and provisions considered:	Sections 30(1), 33(1), 25
Citation:	'FM7' and VicScreen (Freedom of Information) [2024] VICmr 2 (3 January 2024)

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION – grant application process – assessment – panel notes – interpreting terms of Applicant FOI request to determine relevance – signatures – conflict-of-interest details of Agency officer in administrative or observational role

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.

While I am satisfied certain information is exempt from release under sections 30(1) and 33(1), I am not satisfied other information to which the Agency refused access under section 33(1) is exempt from release.

As 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, I have determined to grant access to the documents in part.

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

My reasons for decision follow.

Please refer to the bottom of this decision for information about further review rights through the Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal.

Shantelle Ryan

Acting Public Access Deputy Commissioner
3 January 2024

Reasons for Decision

Background to review

1. The Applicant made a request to the Agency seeking access to the following documents:

I would like to request the following information in regards to my recent, unsuccessful application to the inaugural [specified program] Fund, for my project – [project name]

 - feedback from assessment panel/ minutes/notes taken as to why my project was not to be funded.
 - who the assessment panel members were; to know whether they have the appropriate knowledge, training and skills in dealing with First Nations people, culture and associated matters.
 - whether panel members selected to assess my application have any forms of conflict which would impact decisions/ outcomes of my application.
 - anything else relevant to my application to learn from and improve on.
2. The Agency initially identified four documents falling within the terms of the Applicant's request and granted access to the documents in part, deleting certain information under section 25, and refusing access to other information under section 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.

Concerns about the adequacy of document searches

5. During the review, the Applicant raised concerns about the adequacy of the Agency's document searches in relation to their FOI request.
6. In accordance with section 61B(3), these concerns were dealt with by this review.
7. OVIC staff made further enquiries with the Agency to address the Applicant's concerns. The outcome of those enquiries was communicated to the Applicant.
8. Based on the Agency's response, I am satisfied the Agency undertook a thorough and diligent search for the requested documents. Accordingly, I consider the Applicant's complaint has been fully pursued and there is no need to make further enquiries or take further action under the FOI Act in relation to those particular concerns.

Agency's fresh decision

9. Section 49M(1) permits an agency to make a fresh decision on an FOI request during a review.
10. On [date], the Agency made a fresh decision, locating two additional documents, releasing some additional information to the Applicant which was previously found to be irrelevant to their request, and applying section 30(1) to certain other information which was previously found to be irrelevant to the request. This fresh decision was made within the required 28 days under section 49M(2).

11. 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.

Review of Agency's fresh decision

12. I have examined a copy of the four documents subject to review.
13. The Applicant and the Agency were invited to make a written submission under section 49H(2) in relation to the review.
14. I have considered all communications and submissions received from the parties.
15. 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.
16. 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.

Review of exemptions

Section 30(1) – Internal working documents

17. The Agency applied section 30(1) to panel member comments contained in an Assessment Matrix (for shortlist selection) (**Document 2**).
18. 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; and
 - (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.
19. The exemption does not apply to purely factual material in a document.¹
20. The term 'officer of an Agency' is defined in section 5(1). It includes a member of the agency, a member of the agency's staff, and any person employed by or for the agency, regardless of whether they are subject to the *Public Administration Act 2004* (Vic) apply or not.

¹ Section 30(3).

21. I must also be satisfied releasing this information is not contrary to the public interest. This requires a 'process of the weighing against each other conflicting merits and demerits'.²

Does the document 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?

22. 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.
23. 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.³
24. Section 30(3) provides purely factual information is not exempt under section 30(1). This provision must be considered in conjunction with section 25, which allows for an edited copy of a document to be released with exempt or irrelevant information deleted, where it is practicable to do so.
25. In Document 2, the Agency exempted the comments made regarding other projects in the process of conducting an initial assessment of all proposals, to prepare a shortlist.
26. I am satisfied these comments are matter in the nature of opinion and recommendation of the individual assessors.

Was the document 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?

27. 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.⁴
28. In *Re Waterford and Department of Treasury (No.2)*,⁵ 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.

29. I am satisfied the comments were recorded in the course of a deliberative process of the Agency, being the determination of whether certain proposals should be shortlisted for funding by the Agency.

² *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].

³ *Mildenhall v Department of Education* (1998) 14 VAR 87.

⁴ *Brog v Department of Premier and Cabinet* (1989) 3 VAR 201 at [208].

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

Would disclosure of the document be contrary to the public interest?

30. In deciding if release is contrary to the public interest, I must consider all relevant facts and circumstances remaining mindful that the object of the FOI Act is to facilitate and promote the disclosure of information.
31. In deciding whether the information exempted by the Agency would be contrary to the public interest, I have given weight to the following relevant factors:⁶
- (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 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.
32. I understand Document 2 contains the assessment matrix used to take the entire pool of applicants to a shortlist stage. The information subject to review is the panel comments made as part of this process.
33. Following this, I understand Document 1 was used to record the transition from shortlist to selected projects, with a 'Rationale' for selection recorded against each funded project. I note this information was found by the Agency to be irrelevant to the terms of the Applicant's request.
34. There are strong similarities between the comments made in relation to the shortlisting process in Document 2, and the rationale for selecting the projects in Document 1. Accordingly, I consider the release of the comments from the shortlisting process would assist the Applicant in their stated purpose for seeking the documents. As a participant in this process who is

⁶ *Hulls v Victorian Casino and Gambling Authority* (1998) 12 VAR 483.

seeking to understand and improve for the future, I acknowledge the Applicant's genuine interest in this information.

35. I also consider there is a strong public interest in an agency's grant assessment processes being as transparent as possible to ensure confidence an agency has complied with its selection criteria and procedures. Transparency in grant assessment processes assists in demonstrating the funding decisions, made with public funds by an agency is fair, free from bias and based on merit.
36. In relation to transparency, I consider the Agency's decision to provide a copy of the Assessment Guide for Panel members provides a level of transparency without the need to disclose specific comments made. Having reviewed the comments made, they align with the criteria set out in this guide.
37. I consider it would be contrary to the public interest to disclose the panel comments due to the likelihood it would undermine the Agency's grant assessment processes and the ability of selection panel members to freely record their opinions and comments in such documents.
38. While Agency officers are professionally obliged to provide their opinions and comments in a grants assessment process, I accept there is a public interest in them being able to quickly and conveniently record their contemporaneous opinions and comments during an interview without concern that the notes will be disclosed to the applicant. Therefore, I am satisfied the impact of routinely disclosing documents of this nature would undermine the robustness and integrity of the Agency's grant assessment processes.
39. On balance, I am satisfied the panel comments from Document 2 would be contrary to the public interest to release. Accordingly, these are exempt under section 30(1).
40. The Schedule of Documents in **Annexure 1** sets out my decision in relation to section 30(1).

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

41. The Agency applied section 33(1) to certain content in Documents 1 and 3. I also consider section 33(1) needs to be considered in relation to Document 4.
42. A document is exempt from release 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 (a **third party**);⁷ and
 - (b) such disclosure would be 'unreasonable'.

⁷ Sections 33(1) and 33(2).

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

43. 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.⁸
44. A document will disclose a third party's personal affairs information if it is capable, either directly or indirectly, of identifying that person.
45. The Agency refused access to the following information under section 33(1):
 - (a) names, signatures and position titles of Agency officers; and
 - (b) name and email signature of the external assessor including their direct contact information and a brief biography.
46. I am satisfied this information is the personal affairs information of third parties.
47. Further, I have determined there is an entry in Document 4, the conflict-of-interest declaration table, which relates directly to the Applicant's request and is relevant to its terms, which I consider also constitutes personal affairs information.

Would disclosure of the personal affairs information be unreasonable?

48. The concept of 'unreasonable disclosure' involves balancing the public interest in the disclosure of official information with the interest in protecting an individual's personal privacy in the particular circumstances.
49. In *Victoria Police v Marke*,⁹ 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'.¹⁰ 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'.¹¹
50. In determining whether disclosure of the personal affairs information would be unreasonable in the circumstances, I have considered the following factors:
 - (a) The nature of the personal affairs information
 - (b) The circumstances in which the information was obtained
 - (c) The Applicant's interest in the information

⁸ Section 33(9).

⁹ [2008] VSCA 218 at [76].

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Ibid at [79].

- (d) Whether any public interest would be promoted by release of the personal affairs information
- (e) The likelihood of further disclosure of information, if released
- (f) Whether the individuals to whom the information relates object, or would be likely to object, to the release of the information

Consultation

- 51. The Agency consulted with the decision-making parties, being two Agency officers and the external assessor. The Agency provided a consultation table indicating that all three parties, including the external assessor whose details were found to be exempt, consented to release of their information to the Applicant.
- 52. I am satisfied the remaining third parties, being the Agency officers who were not involved in decision-making process, would likely object to their names being released.

Mandatory consideration

- 53. I am required to consider whether disclosure of the information would or would be reasonably likely to endanger the life or physical safety of any person.¹² I do not consider this is a relevant factor in the circumstances of this matter.

External assessor's details

- 54. As discussed above, I consider the public interest in the transparency of the Agency's process is a factor in this matter. I also acknowledge the personal interest of the Applicant in better understanding the Agency's decision on their individual project.
- 55. In the context of the personal affairs information in the documents, I consider the release of the external assessor's name and details is most relevant to these objectives, where this third party has been involved in the decision-making process on the grants.
- 56. The Agency's original decision letter states:

In addition to VicScreen's internal assessors, one external assessor participated in the Assessment Panel for [the specified program]. The external assessor was selected from VicScreen's list of assessors, published on VicScreen's website (<https://vicscreen.vic.gov.au/about-us/committees-assessment>).

VicScreen engages a pool of screen industry experts as external assessors to assess certain funding applications and make recommendations to VicScreen's Heads of Division, CEO or Board (as appropriate) for final approval.

...

VicScreen does not generally disclose the names of the external assessors involved in the assessment of individual applications for privacy reasons.

...

- 57. I acknowledge the Agency's intention to protect a third party's privacy, which I consider is a matter of public interest. However, privacy in the context of section 33(1) is a matter which

¹² Section 33(2A).

needs to be assessed on a case-by-case basis, rather than through established practices for a particular type of information.

58. As discussed above, this external assessor in this case has consented to the release of their personal affairs information to the Applicant.
59. In my view, the consent of the third party addresses considerations around their privacy in relation to the release of their name, biographical details and website link. As such, I am not satisfied the release of these details would be unreasonable.
60. However, even with the external assessor's consent, I remain of the view that release of their direct email address through an FOI process would be unreasonable.

Details of other Agency officers

61. As discussed above, Document 4 contains a conflict-of-interest declaration made in relation to the Applicant's project. The documents also contain the names and position titles of other Agency officers.
62. Based on the information before me, I am satisfied these Agency officers were involved in an administrative or observational capacity. As such, I consider the degree to which this information would assist the Applicant is limited.
63. I have also considered the impacts of release on the personal privacy of these individuals.
64. I am satisfied the personal affairs information of these Agency officers would be unreasonable to release.

Signatures

65. The signatures included in Document 1 are those of the decision-making Agency officers, whose names are already known to the Applicant.
66. I consider the Applicant is able to read and interpret the document without the inclusion of the specific Agency officer's signatures. Further, the personal affairs information does not add any material value to the document.
67. I am satisfied the signatures of Agency officers would be unreasonable to release.

Conclusion on section 33(1)

68. I am satisfied the following personal affairs information in the documents is exempt from release under section 33(1):
 - (a) signatures;
 - (b) direct contact information;
 - (c) details of Agency officers who were not involved in the process in a decision-making capacity, including the conflict-of-interest declared by a third party.

69. I am not satisfied the details of the external assessor, except for their direct email address, are exempt under section 33(1).
70. The Schedule of Documents in **Annexure 1** sets out my decision in relation to section 33(1).

Section 25 – Deletion of exempt or irrelevant information

71. 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.
72. Section 25 allows for information to be deleted from a document where it would ‘would reasonably be regarded as irrelevant to the request’.
73. Determining what is ‘practicable’ requires consideration of the effort and editing involved in making the deletions ‘from a resources point of view’¹³ 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 25.¹⁴
74. I have considered the information the Agency deleted from the documents as irrelevant.
75. The Agency’s decision letter states:

Each of the Documents contains information about other applications to [the specified program] and would reasonably be regarded as irrelevant to your request.

76. The Applicant made the following submissions in their application for review:

...VicScreen says all details for all other applications have been redacted on the basis that those details are “irrelevant”; however, in the circumstances of a competitive grant process with a limited amount of funding available, the success rate of and consideration given to other applications is relevant to the request for documents addressing ‘why (the) project was not to be funded’.

77. The Agency, having considered these submissions, determined to release some additional information which was previously deleted as irrelevant from the documents. The Agency’s fresh decision letter states:

Documents 1 (Assessment Panel - Agenda, Minutes, Recommendation & Approval Paper), 2 (Assessment Matrix) and 4 (Conflict of Interest Declaration & Action Table) contain information which is outside the scope of your request and is irrelevant. This includes information concerning other applications to the [specified program] which does not provide comparative or contextual data relevant to your own application.

78. The Applicant refers to ‘my project’, or similar, several times in the wording of the request. I accept the Agency has considered these key word terms in interpreting the Applicant’s request and deleted information about other projects as a result.

¹³ *Mickelburgh 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].

¹⁴ *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], [155].

79. However, I also note that consultation was not undertaken with the Applicant prior to deleting substantial information from the documents, and several pieces of information about the other projects has already been released.
80. On balance, I am satisfied the majority of information deleted from the documents under section 25 can reasonably be regarded as irrelevant to the Applicant's request.
81. However, as discussed above, I have identified certain information in Document 4 which was deemed to be irrelevant to the request but does relate specifically to the Applicant's project. I have discussed this information above in relation to section 33(1).
82. I have considered the effect of deleting irrelevant and exempt information from the documents. In my view, it is practicable for the Agency to delete the irrelevant and exempt information, because it would not require substantial time and effort, and the edited documents would retain meaning.

Conclusion

83. On the information before me, I am satisfied certain information in the documents is exempt from release under sections 30(1) and 33(1).
84. As 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.

Timeframe to seek a review of my decision

85. If either party to this review is not satisfied with my decision, they are entitled to apply to VCAT for it to be reviewed.¹⁵
86. The Applicant may apply to VCAT for a review up to 60 days from the date they are given this Notice of Decision.¹⁶
87. The Agency may apply to VCAT for a review up to 14 days from the date it is given this Notice of Decision.¹⁷
88. Information about how to apply to VCAT is available online at www.vcat.vic.gov.au. Alternatively, VCAT may be contacted by email at admin@vcat.vic.gov.au or by telephone on 1300 018 228.
89. 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.¹⁸

¹⁵ The Applicant in section 50(1)(b) and the Agency in section 50(3D).

¹⁶ Section 52(5).

¹⁷ Section 52(9).

¹⁸ Sections 50(3F) and 50(3FA).

Third party review rights

90. I note I have determined to release certain information found by the Agency to be exempt under section 33(1), being details of the external assessor.
91. In some circumstances where I have determined to release the personal affairs information of persons other than the Applicant, if practicable, I am required to notify those persons of their right to seek review by VCAT of my decision within 60 days from the date they are given notice.¹⁹
92. However, the Agency provided a copy of a consultation table which indicates the external assessor consented to their personal affairs information being disclosed to the Applicant prior to the Agency's decision on the request.
93. Accordingly, pursuant to section 50(3AB), I am not satisfied the external assessor would retain the right to make an application to VCAT. Accordingly, I do not consider I am required to notify them of any such rights in the circumstances.

When this decision takes effect

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

¹⁹ Sections 49P(5), 50(3).

Annexure 1 – Schedule of Documents

No.	Date of document	Description	Number of Pages	Agency's Decision	OVIC decision	OVIC comments
1.	[Date]	[Program name and date] - Assessment Panel - Agenda, Minutes, Recommendation & Approval Paper	13	Release in part Sections 33(1), 25	Release in part Sections 33(1), 25 In addition to the content released by the Agency under its fresh decision, the following information is not exempt or irrelevant and is to be released: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the name of the external assessor on page 1. 	<p>Section 33(1): I am satisfied the document contains the personal affairs information of third parties, being names, position titles and signatures.</p> <p>I am satisfied it would be unreasonable to release the signatures and details of Agency officers who participated in an administrative or observational capacity only. Accordingly, these details are exempt under section 33(1).</p> <p>However, I am not satisfied it would be unreasonable to release the name of the external assessor.</p> <p>Section 25: I am satisfied the document contains information which is irrelevant to the terms of the Applicant's request, being a document storage reference number, and details related to other projects.</p> <p>I am satisfied it is practicable to provide the Applicant with a copy of this document with exempt and irrelevant information removed in accordance with section 25.</p>

2.	[Date]	[Specified program] Assessment Matrix (for shortlist selection)	2	Release in part Sections 30(1), 25	Release in part Sections 30(1), 25 No further information is to be released.	<p>Section 30(1): I am satisfied the panel comments in this document are matter in the nature of opinion, advice and recommendation of Agency officers recorded during a deliberative process of the Agency.</p> <p>I am satisfied the comments would be contrary to the public interest to release for the reasons outlined in my Notice of Decision above.</p> <p>Section 25: I am satisfied the document contains information which could reasonably be regarded as irrelevant to the Applicant's request, being the project title, applicant name and financial ask of the other projects.</p> <p>I am satisfied it is practicable to provide the Applicant a copy of this document with exempt and irrelevant information removed in accordance with section 25.</p>
3.	[Date]	Email chain between VicScreen & External Assessor	2	Release in part Section 33(1)	Release in part Sections 33(1), 25 In addition to the content released by the Agency under its fresh decision, following information is	<p>Section 33(1): I am satisfied the document contains the personal affairs information of an Agency officer and the external assessor.</p> <p>I am satisfied it would be unreasonable to release the details of the Agency officer acting in an administrative capacity, and the direct email address of the external assessor,</p>

					<p>not exempt or irrelevant and is to be released:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the name and email signature of the external assessor, except for their direct email address. 	<p>for the reasons outlined in my Notice of Decision above.</p> <p>However, I am not satisfied the details of the external assessor, except for their direct email address, would be unreasonable to release for the reasons outlined in my Notice of Decision above.</p> <p>Section 25: I am satisfied it is practicable to provide the Applicant a copy of this document with exempt and irrelevant information removed in accordance with section 25.</p>
4.	Various	[Specified program] Conflict of Interest Declaration & Action Table	2	<p>Release in part</p> <p>Section 25</p>	<p>Release in part</p> <p>Sections 33(1), 25</p> <p>No further information is to be released.</p>	<p>Section 33(1): I am satisfied the conflict-of-interest declaration is the personal affairs information of the Agency officer.</p> <p>I am satisfied it would be unreasonable to release this information for the reasons outlined in my Notice of Decision above.</p> <p>Section 25: I am satisfied certain information deleted from this document under section 25 by the Agency, being a conflict declared in relation to the Applicant's project, is relevant to the Applicant's request.</p> <p>I am satisfied other information in the document, being conflict declarations in</p>

						<p>relation to other projects, could reasonably be regarded as irrelevant to the Applicant's request.</p> <p>I am satisfied it is practicable to provide the Applicant a copy of this document with exempt and irrelevant information removed in accordance with section 25.</p>
5.	[Date]	[Specified program]Assessment Guide for Panel Members	5	Release in full	Not subject to review	
6.	Various	[Specified program] - Guidelines [year]	4	Release in full	Not subject to review	