

Notice of Decision and Reasons for Decision

Applicant:	'FX5'
Agency:	Eastern Health
Decision date:	15 June 2025
Exemptions and provision considered:	Sections 25, 30(1)
Citation:	'FX5' and Eastern Health (Freedom of Information) [2025] VICmr 41 (15 June 2025)

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION – Comprehensive Report – incident report – incident investigation – incident review – RiskMan – factual information

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.

My decision on the Applicant's request differs from the Agency's decision in relation to Document 1 and more information is to be released.

I am satisfied information in Document 1 is not exempt under section 30(1) and both documents are to be released with irrelevant personal affairs information deleted in accordance with section 25.

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

A marked-up copy of Document 1 showing irrelevant information in accordance with my decision has been provided to the Agency.

Please refer to pages 7-8 for information about review rights through the Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal (**VCAT**).

My reasons for decision follow.

Penny Eastman
Public Access Deputy Commissioner

15 June 2025

Reasons for Decision

Background to review

1. The Applicant made a request to the Agency seeking access to an incident report and a feedback report in unredacted form. However, the Applicant also specified in their request that they agreed to the redaction of personal identifying information for staff members.
2. The Agency identified 2 documents in response to the Applicant's request and released them in part. The Agency relied on sections 25, 30(1) and 33(1) to redact information in the documents.
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.
5. I have examined a copy of the documents subject to review.
6. The Applicant and the Agency were invited to make a written submission under section 49H(2) in relation to the review.
7. I have considered relevant communications and submissions received from the parties.
8. 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.
9. 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.
10. 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'.¹ 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.

Attempted informal resolution

11. During the review, OVIC staff provided the Agency with their initial view that section 30(1) was unlikely to apply to all information the Agency exempted in Document 1 because it was factual in nature and would continue to be recorded by healthcare professionals as part of their

¹ *Drake v Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs* (1979) 24 ALR 577, [591].

professional responsibilities and obligations, irrespective of disclosure under the FOI Act in this particular case.

12. In response, the Agency agreed with OVIC staff's view concerning certain information in Document 1. However, it submitted that certain information it had redacted under section 25 on grounds it is irrelevant information would be exempt under section 30(1), if I did not accept the Agency's view that the information was irrelevant to the Applicant's request.
13. I have considered whether section 30(1) applies to the information that the Agency considered is irrelevant to the Applicant's request as I am not satisfied it is irrelevant. My decision on these points is set out further, below.

Review of exemption

14. As the Applicant specified in their request that they do not seek personal affairs information of staff members, and confirmed in their review application, it is unnecessary to consider the application of section 33(1) to information in the documents. Accordingly, the only exemption to consider in this matter is section 30(1) which was applied to Document 1.

Section 30(1) – Internal working documents

15. Section 30(1) exempts documents that contain opinion, advice or recommendation, or consultation or deliberation, where disclosure would be contrary to the public interest. A document is not exempt simply because it is an internal working document.²
16. To be exempt under section 30(1), three conditions must be satisfied:
 - (a) the document or information is matter in the nature of
 - (i) opinion, advice or recommendation prepared by an agency officer or a Minister or
 - (ii) consultation or deliberation that has taken place between agency officers or Ministers
 - (b) the matter was created during the deliberative process of an agency, Minister, or the government's functions
 - (c) disclosure of the matter would be contrary to the public interest.
17. There are four circumstances where section 30(1) does not apply:
 - (a) documents required to be made available for inspection and purchase under section 8
 - (b) purely factual information
 - (c) certain documents relating to adjudicative functions
 - (d) documents more than 10 years old.

² *Graze v Commissioner of State Revenue* [2013] VCAT 869, 25.

18. For more information about section 30 see the FOI Guidelines.³

Does Document 1 contain opinion, advice or recommendation, or consultation or deliberation?

19. I consider a substantial amount of the information that the Agency redacted under sections 25 and 30(1) contains factual information to which section 30(1) does not apply, due to section 30(3). I am satisfied this information is not intertwined with deliberative information.
20. I accept however certain information exempted by the Agency contains opinion and recommendation.

Was the matter was created during the deliberative process of an agency, Minister, or the government's functions?

21. I am satisfied the information was created during the deliberative processes of the Agency, being its internal quality review and service improvements purposes.

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

22. In deciding whether disclosure of the information would be contrary to the public interest, I have given weight to the following relevant factors:⁴
- (a) the right of every person to gain access to documents under the FOI Act
 - (b) the sensitivity of the issues involved and the broader context of how the documents were created
 - (c) the stage of a decision or policy development at the time the communications were made
 - (d) whether disclosure of the documents would be likely to inhibit communications between agency officers that are essential for the agency to make an informed and well-considered decision or for those officers to properly participate in a process of the agency's functions (such as an audit or investigation, regulatory or law enforcement function)
 - (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, but only where the agency would not otherwise be able to explain upon disclosure of the documents
 - (f) the likelihood that disclosure would inhibit the independence of officers, including their ability to conduct proper research and make detailed submissions
 - (g) the public interest in the community being better informed about an agency's deliberative, consultative and decision-making processes

³ See <https://ovic.vic.gov.au/freedom-of-information/foi-guidelines/section-30/>.

⁴ See <https://ovic.vic.gov.au/freedom-of-information/foi-guidelines/section-30/#disclosure-would-be-contrary-to-the-public-interest>.

- (h) the public interest in government transparency and accountability by enabling scrutiny or criticism of decisions and the decision-making process and building the community's trust in government and its decision-making processes
 - (i) whether there is controversy or impropriety around the decision or the decision-making process.
23. The Agency decided disclosure of certain information in Document 1 would be contrary to the public interest because it would inhibit staff from having frank and candid communications which would be detrimental to the quality improvement process.
24. As noted above, I consider only limited information in the document is matter in the nature of opinion and recommendation. With respect to this information, I have considered the following factors in making my decision:
- (a) The information is sensitive as it relates to the investigation of a clinical incident which occurred during a patient's medical treatment.
 - (b) I accept there is a public interest in those who are directly impacted by a clinical incident being properly informed of the event. Public knowledge of these events allows for informed decision making regarding personal health care and ensures accountability and transparency in the public health care system.
 - (c) The public interest must be balanced against the potential for the investigative process into clinical incidents to be undermined by the release of findings through FOI. It is essential for the public to have confidence, that when a serious incident occurs in a public hospital, it will be thoroughly investigated, and appropriate measures identified and put in place to mitigate the risk of a similar event occurring. In my view, this is an essential public interest of the kind envisaged by Parliament and enshrined in the object of the FOI Act when discussing the need for exemptions.⁵ Given that investigations and the findings from them promote continuous improvement in practices, policies and procedures within the public health system, I accept it is essential such processes are as thorough and detailed as possible. However, in this case, I am not satisfied that disclosure of the information will undermine the Agency's future investigations of incidents, or inhibit full and frank reporting, given the nature of the information in this matter.
25. On careful consideration, I am satisfied that disclosing the deliberative information in Document 1 would not be contrary to the public interest. Therefore, I am satisfied information in Document 1 is not exempt under section 30(1).

Section 25 – Deletion of exempt or irrelevant information

26. 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.

⁵ Section 3.

27. Deciding whether it is ‘practicable’ to delete exempt or irrelevant information requires an agency or Minister to consider:
- (a) the effort involved in making the deletions from a resources point of view⁶ and
 - (b) the effectiveness of those deletions – that is, whether the edited document still has meaning.⁷
28. Irrelevant information is information which is clearly outside the scope, or beyond the terms of the Applicant’s request. In this matter, it is the personal affairs information of other people. I note the only information refused by the Agency in Document 2 was the personal affairs information of an Agency officer which is therefore irrelevant information.
29. The Agency redacted certain information in Document 1 as irrelevant on the basis that it pertains to subsequent aspects of the Victorian Health Incident Management System process. I do not accept the Agency’s view in this case, and I consider that all information in Document 1 falls within the scope of the request. While the information may concern actions/steps taken after the initial reporting of the incident, the information nevertheless forms part of the report.
30. I have considered the effect of deleting irrelevant personal affairs information from the documents. In my view, it is practicable for the Agency to delete this irrelevant information, because it would not require substantial time and effort, and the edited documents would retain meaning.

Conclusion

31. On the information before me, I am satisfied information in Document 1 is not exempt from release under section 30(1). Therefore, I have decided to release additional information in this document to the Applicant where it is not irrelevant personal affairs information.
32. The only information redacted by the Agency in Document 2 is irrelevant personal affairs information. Therefore, my decision on this document is the same as the Agency’s.
33. The Schedule of Documents in **Annexure 1** sets out my decision in relation to each document.
34. A marked-up copy of Document 1 showing irrelevant information in accordance with my decision has been provided to the Agency.

Timeframe to seek a review of my decision

35. If either party to this review is not satisfied with my decision, they are entitled to apply to VCAT for it to be reviewed.⁸

⁶ *Mickelburgh v Victoria Police* [2009] VCAT 2786, [31]; *The Herald and Weekly Times Pty Limited v The Office of the Premier (General)* [2012] VCAT 967, [82].

⁷ *Honeywood v Department of Human Services* [2006] VCAT 2048, [26]; *RFJ v Victoria Police FOI Division (Review and Regulation)* [2013] VCAT 1267, [140], [155]; *Re Hutchinson and Department of Human Services* (1997) 12 VAR 422.

⁸ The Applicant in section 50(1)(b) and the Agency in section 50(3D).

36. The Applicant may apply to VCAT for a review up to 60 days from the date they are given this Notice of Decision.⁹
37. The Agency may apply to VCAT for a review up to 14 days from the date it is given this Notice of Decision.¹⁰
38. 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.
39. 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.¹¹

When this decision takes effect

40. 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.

⁹ Section 52(5).

¹⁰ Section 52(9).

¹¹ Sections 50(3F) and 50(3FA).

Annexure 1 – Schedule of Documents

Document No.	Date of document	Document Description	No. of pages	Agency Decision	OVIC Decision
1.	[Date]	Comprehensive Report	2	Released in part Sections 25, 30(1), 33(1)	Release in part Section 25 The document is to be released in accordance with the marked-up version provided to the Agency with my decision.
2.	[Date]	Comprehensive Report	2	Released in part Sections 25, 33(1)	Release in part Section 25 No further information is to be released.