



information
and privacy
commission
new south wales

REPORT ON THE OPERATION OF THE GOVERNMENT INFORMATION (PUBLIC ACCESS) ACT 2009

2015 – 2016

Open Government, Open Access, Open Data

Letter of Transmission

The Honourable Trevor Khan MLC
Acting President of the Legislative Council
Parliament of NSW
Parliament House
Macquarie Street
Sydney NSW 2000

The Honourable Shelley Hancock MP
Speaker of the Legislative Assembly
Parliament of NSW
Parliament House
Macquarie Street
Sydney NSW 2000

Dear Mr President and Madam Speaker,

In accordance with section 37 of the *Government Information (Information Commissioner) Act 2009*, I am pleased to present the *Report on the Operation of the Government Information (Public Access) Act 2009: 2015 – 2016*.

I recommend that the Report be made public forthwith pursuant to section 39(2) of the *Government Information (Information Commissioner) Act 2009*.

Yours sincerely,



Elizabeth Tydd
Information Commissioner
CEO, Information and Privacy Commission NSW
NSW Open Data Advocate

Contents

Commissioner's Overview	2
Future Focus	4
The Year in Review	6
The GIPA Act and Open Data	8
The Right to Information - 2016 Community Attitudes	14
Information Release Pathways	17
Pathway 1: Mandatory proactive release of information	18
Pathway 2: Authorised proactive release of information	22
Pathway 3: Informal release of information	26
Pathway 4: Formal applications	29
Year at a glance	30
How many applications were lodged?	32
Invalid applications	34
Who applied?	38
What information was asked for?	40
Did applicants get what they asked for?	42
How quickly were decisions made?	50
How was the public interest test applied?	52
How were decisions reviewed?	56
Were applications transferred between agencies?	66
Appendices	69
Appendix 1: 2015 – 2016 All sectors	70
Appendix 2: 2015 – 2016 Government sector	76
Appendix 3: 2015 – 2016 Council sector	82
Appendix 4: 2015 – 2016 Ministerial sector	88
Appendix 5: 2015 – 2016 University sector	94
Appendix 6: Note on data sources and previous reports	100
Appendix 7: The Legislative Framework	102

Commissioner's Overview

Underlying the promotion of a more open and effective democratic system is a fundamental shift that recognises that governments serve citizens and the information they collect is a public good to be properly managed and publicly accessed.

Why is the right to access information important?

The right to access information enables citizens to actively and meaningfully participate in government decision making, the development of policies for the provision of services and the delivery of those services. Importantly, the right to information minimises the risk of corruption and enables citizens to hold governments to account.

Public confidence is essential to effective democracy and transparency is instrumental in promoting public confidence. Consequently, democratic governments promote a presumption in favour of access to information as a means of addressing the information asymmetry that exists between those who govern and the citizens they serve.

The right to access information as a fundamental tenet of democracy received full recognition in 2016 through Australia's submission of an inaugural National Action Plan (NAP) to achieve membership of the multilateral Open Government Partnership (OGP).

The establishment of the OGP as an independent international oversight, reform and resource platform responds to the right to information as an integral component of the right to freedom of expression.¹ Australia has now confirmed that it shares the OGP's commitment to government accountability and responsiveness to citizens.

In 2016 the Information and Privacy Commission (IPC) conducted a community attitudes survey regarding information access rights. The survey found that 89% of respondents believe having the right to access government information is important.

The 2016 survey results aligned with national findings² and recognised that increasingly citizens appreciate this right and acknowledge the strategic value of government information.

¹ Article 19, Universal Declaration of Human Rights; Resolution 59 UN General Assembly

² <http://www.pc.gov.au/inquiries/current/data-access/draft/data-access-draft.pdf>

Open Data is one of the strategic information assets managed by government and the survey included a particular focus on community attitudes to Open Data.

83% of respondents agreed that de-identified information should be used to inform the planning and delivery of government services. Additionally, 78% agreed that the data should be used to develop government agencies' policies and consult with the public.

This significant level of citizen support provides confidence in governments enabling information access. The *Government Information (Public Access) Act 2009* (GIPA Act) enshrines the right to access information and this significant, legislated commitment by the NSW Parliament must be reported upon annually.

How is the GIPA Act working? Significant trends and analysis 2015/16

The IPC's strategic regulatory approach facilitates the provision of unique and informed insights into the operation of the GIPA Act.

'Push' pathways:

- Pleasingly, within the government sector, the compliance rate for mandatory proactive release of information has increased to 89%, compared with 83% in 2014/15.
- There has been a consistent decline in the number of agency reviews of proactive release programs, from 85% in 2012/13 to 71% in 2015/16. This compliance rate is lower than any other measure of mandatory compliance across all four information access pathways.

Current trends indicate that:

- The proactive release of information is improving. However, at a more granular level, compliance with mandatory requirements for publication of contracts and Agency Information Guides (AIGs) by government agencies is low.³
- A continued focus is required to elevate compliance with contract reporting requirements. These requirements are proportionate to the significant expenditure of government funds through contractual arrangements. The GIPA Act facilitates access by citizens to information

³ http://www.ipc.nsw.gov.au/sites/default/files/file_manager/IPC_Report_Towards_a_NSW_Charter_for%20Public_Participation_FINAL.pdf
http://www.ipc.nsw.gov.au/sites/default/files/file_manager/IPC_Report_universities_compliance_GIPA_August_2015_ACC.pdf
<https://www.audit.nsw.gov.au/publications/latest-reports/special-report-agency-compliance-gipa-act>



held by contractors performing government services.⁴ Significantly, these mandatory legislative requirements provide visibility and certainty notwithstanding significant change across all sectors, including the proportion of contingent labour operating within the public sector.⁵

The contemporary 'push' model mandated under the GIPA Act provides a platform to actively and efficiently respond to the exercise of citizens' rights and their information access needs. These pathways require a greater focus by agencies.

'Pull' pathways:

- In 2015/16 there was a 14% increase in the number of applications.
- The overall information release rate in response to applications remained steady compared to 2014/15, at 68%, and represents a halt of the two year decline in the overall release rates.
- There was a 20% difference between the highest releases rates, 71% for applications by members of the public, private sector business, and the lowest release rate, 51% for not-for-profit organisations or community groups.
- The most significant increase in applicant type was Members of Parliament, from a small base of 147 in 2014/15 to 414 in 2015/16.
- The increase from 91% to 93% in compliance with statutory timeframes is commendable in the context of a significant increase in applications.
- Both review rates at 6% and review outcomes remain consistent with agencies reporting that, overall, 54% of reviews upheld the original decision.
- Reviews by the Information Commissioner now represent 47% of all reviews conducted.

What will be done to improve information access?

The data and trends confirmed in this report have enabled identification of strategic approaches and operational measures to authoritatively lead improved operation of current information access rights. In this context, continuing support to progress the statutory review of the GIPA Act will remain a priority.

Agencies and the Information Commissioner are required to assist citizens making applications. The IPC will build upon its successful case management tool and examine opportunities for digitisation of the GIPA application process.

The IPC will target operational and cultural factors impeding compliance with the push pathways intended to stimulate the ongoing, effective release of government-held information.

Building a culture of accountability has been identified as a factor to drive the progress of reform in the NSW public sector⁶ and the IPC is uniquely placed to collaborate in promoting this culture.

Increasing the amount of accessible government data improves transparency and accountability, supports evidence-based policy development and provides a platform for innovation. Following the publication of research into the most effective means of activating Open Government,⁷ the IPC has commissioned further research to identify international legal, policy and regulatory settings that enable Open Data and promote a culture of data sharing. My work as Open Data Advocate will continue to promote responsible stewardship and data accessibility.

As a result of leading the states and territory contribution to Australia's inaugural NAP, we are well placed to evaluate the effectiveness of the operation of information access laws throughout Australia in a contemporary context through a consistent set of measures that align with established international indicators.⁸

From this vantage point we can identify optimal information access regimes and their operation in practice. This work will be augmented by the initiative I led in 2016 to develop a compendium of all state and territory information access legislative regimes. Accordingly, the legislative arrangements and the outcomes of those arrangements can be scrutinised through a consistent lens with the aim of ensuring that citizens and governments realise the benefits of an effective and contemporary model of Open Government.

Elizabeth Tydd
Information Commissioner,
CEO Information and Privacy Commission NSW
NSW Open Data Advocate

4 S121 GIPA Act 2009

5 <https://www.psc.nsw.gov.au/reports---data/state-of-the-sector/state-of-the-sector-2016>

6 <https://www.psc.nsw.gov.au/reports---data/state-of-the-sector/state-of-the-sector-2016>

7 http://www.ipc.nsw.gov.au/sites/default/files/file_manager/REPORT_Advancing_the_objects_%20of_the_GIPA_Act_2015.pdf

8 World Justice Project Open Government Index

Future Focus

1

MANDATORY PROACTIVE RELEASE

IPC strategies:

- Produce enhanced regulatory guidance and continue to promote compliance with mandatory proactive release obligations, particularly for contract register requirements and the additional open access information requirements prescribed in Part 3, Clause 5 of the *Government Information (Public Access) Regulation 2009*.
- Continue implementing the steps that the IPC will take towards a NSW Charter for Public Participation, including:
 - engaging with principal departments to improve the quality of their Agency Information Guides (AIG)
 - hosting a summit on public participation and AIGs
 - co-creating a NSW Charter for Public Participation
 - promoting how agencies can connect AIGs with Open Government Plans
 - monitoring agencies' use of AIGs to understand the trends in AIGs facilitating public participation
 - monitoring disclosure logs and identification of the various kinds of government information held by agencies and made available by agencies with the objective of promoting Open Government and Open Data.

Agency strategies:

- Assess and ensure compliance with their additional open access information requirements prescribed in the *Government Information (Public Access) Regulation 2009*.
- Use IPC regulatory guidance to ensure compliance with contract register, AIG and disclosure log requirements.

2

AUTHORISED PROACTIVE RELEASE

IPC strategies:

- Work with the Secretaries Board to promote Open Data and a positive data sharing culture.
- Engage in targeted regulatory action to promote authorised proactive release programs for the release of government information.
- Identify improvements to the GIPA Tool to drive improved compliance and to improve ease and accuracy of agency reporting.

Agency strategies:

- Use IPC regulatory guidance to adopt better practices in the authorised proactive release of government information.
- Schedule and conduct a regular review of the agency's proactive release program, including the release of Open Data.
- Link the agency's proactive release program to its AIG.

3

INFORMAL RELEASE

IPC strategies:

- Continue to promote the appropriate use of the informal access pathway with agencies.

Agency strategies:

- Review and revise its AIG to ensure the informal release pathway is clearly available to the public.

4

FORMAL ACCESS APPLICATIONS

IPC strategies:

- Work with agencies to investigate and respond to the drivers behind release rate trends, the reasons for the increase in the percentage of agencies that uphold their original decision following a section 93 GIPA Act recommendation, transfers of applications, and the use of the top three overriding public interest against disclosure (OPIAD) considerations.
- Develop regulatory guidance on the release of audio visual information under the GIPA Act.
- Lead work under Australia's first Open Government National Action Plan to develop uniform metrics to better measure and improve our understanding of the public's use of rights under freedom of information laws.
- Examine opportunities for digitisation of the GIPA application process and online lodgement.

Agency strategies:

- At an executive level promote full engagement, training and a collaborative approach to investigating, analysing and responding to the issues identified in this report and applying an intelligence-led approach to meeting obligations under the GIPA Act and maximise achievement of Open Government.
- Work with the IPC to improve the recording of data for GIPA Act annual reporting, particularly in regard to recording of reviews.

The Year in Review

The 2014/15 Report identified a range of future focus priority actions to be taken by the IPC and agencies in 2015/16. The most significant outcomes of the IPC strategies identified in that Report are outlined below.

Mandatory proactive release

The 2014/15 Report identified that there were opportunities to maximise agencies' compliance with mandatory proactive release requirements in the GIPA Act, and identified contract register obligations as a future focus.

Action	Outcome
Create opportunities to maximise agencies' compliance with mandatory proactive release requirements, and identify strategies to enhance the use and impact of this pathway.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Published <i>Universities' Compliance with the GIPA Act: Audit Report 2015, and IPC Contracts Register Procedures</i>. • Conducted a University Forum in March 2016 to discuss and showcase approaches to compliance and provide feedback. • Conducted a follow-up audit and reported in June 2016: <i>Universities' Compliance with the GIPA Act: Audit Report 2016</i>
Conduct a contract register compliance program across the government sector.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided input into the Auditor General's performance audits of agency compliance with the GIPA Act. • Developed and released an e-learning module for contract reporting requirements.

Authorised proactive release

A priority for the IPC continues to be issuing guidance on the legislative provisions that support the GIPA Act's 'push' model of information release, including authorised proactive release.

Action	Outcome
Provide expert advice on information sharing and release initiatives across government.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Produced an Open Data Infographic to assist the community in understanding Open Data and the benefits derived from its use. • Conducted a survey of community attitudes to the use and release of government data, reported on pages 10-15. • Provided expert advice to support the development of the NSW Open Data Action Plan and resources.
Produce enhanced regulatory guidance on the proactive release of information.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Published, <i>Towards a NSW Charter for Public Participation</i>, which included guidance on using Agency Information Guides (AIGs) to proactively release information and data. • "Switch on Open Government" event for Right to Know Week 2015 showcased agency action to proactively release information.
Examine information access regimes in other jurisdictions and activate learnings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instituted and coordinated the development of a Jurisdictional Compendium to identify the similarities and differences of Australian legislative arrangements. • Provided expert input to the statutory review of the GIPA Act.

Informal release

The 2014/15 Report highlighted the benefits for agencies and citizens of the informal release pathway. This includes improving the accessibility of information and flexibility in responding to informal requests for information.

Action	Outcome
Review and update the IPC's regulatory guidance on informal release of information.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitored and publicly reported upon the use of AIGs by agencies to promote informal release of information
Promote agency use and understanding of the informal release pathway.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developed and distributed guidance materials to assist agencies in promoting informal release of information through AIGs.

Formal access applications

The GIPA Act provides citizens with an enforceable right to apply for and access government information, unless there is an overriding public interest against disclosure. The findings in the 2014/15 Report informed areas of future focus for the formal access application pathway.

Action	Outcome
Develop and publish guidance for the public on identified priorities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Published, Your Rights to Access Government Information in NSW. Published two fact sheets, Restraint Orders Under the GIPA Act and Offences Under the GIPA Act.
Develop and consult with agencies on regulatory guidance to improve the application of the public interest balancing test, including on third party objector matters.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conducted a practitioners' workshop regarding third party consultations. Issued a template letter for use by agencies in conducting third party consultations.

Action	Outcome
Promote a rigorous, comprehensive and citizen-centric approach to information management through sound leadership.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initiated an innovative community consultation platform, 'Your Say IPC', to inform promotion of public engagement. Launched an e-learning module on how to access information under the GIPA Act. Led the contribution of states and territory Information Commissioners/ Ombudsmen to the development of the Commonwealth's Open Government Partnership National Action Plan. Published for consultation a revised, values-oriented <i>IPC Customer Service Charter</i>.
Promote and support the use of the GIPA Tool to improve quality and timeliness of agency application management and annual reporting.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conducted an end-to-end review of the GIPA Tool and instituted enhancements.
Examine and respond to trends in information release rates and outcomes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trends in information release rates and outcomes for 2015/16 are examined in this report see pages 47-49.
Work with the NSW Civil and Administrative Tribunal (NCAT) to monitor the trend of GIPA Act matters, including dealing with applications involving the GIPA Act offence provisions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consulted NCAT in developing fact sheets on Restraint orders under the <i>GIPA Act and Offences under the GIPA Act</i>.

The GIPA Act and Open Data

2015/16 saw many developments in Open Data, both in NSW and nationally. The GIPA Act provides the authority for release of this information by agencies. Highlights are outlined below.

Appointment of the Information Commissioner as Open Data Advocate

In April 2016, the Minister for Innovation and Better Regulation, the Hon. Victor Dominello, appointed the Information Commissioner as NSW Open Data Advocate. This appointment coincided with the launch of the NSW Open Data Policy.

The Open Data Advocate plays a key role in ensuring that the NSW Open Data Policy is successfully implemented. As Open Data Advocate, the Information Commissioner encourages the proactive public release of government information by agencies in ways that are respectful of data sharing safeguards, as well as providing information, advice and assistance to agencies and members of the public on access to government information.

Open Data is an important aspect of Open Government that provides the public with access to information in a variety of formats. Increasing the amount of government data that is available improves transparency and accountability within government, supports evidence-based policy development and provides a platform for innovation.

Open Data can be made available on individual agency websites or at www.data.nsw.gov.au, which brings together a list of NSW Government datasets in one searchable website.

Open Data Advocate priorities

The nexus between Open Government and Open Data is clear, and together these aspirations deliver a better, more transparent, participatory and effective system of government.

Working to deliver a contemporary and inclusive approach to Open Government, the Information Commissioner has, following consultation, prioritised three outcomes:

- Guidance to agencies and citizens in promoting the availability of open access data.
- Contributing to the development of indicators and measures to better recognise the most effective Open Data practices.
- Promotion of Open Data as a cornerstone of Open Government.

These outcomes are being delivered through a program that maximises proactive release of information through a number of mechanisms that include:

- Agency Information Guides (AIGs)
- providing guidance into Open Data, its meaning and application
- conducting research to better understand community attitudes and evaluate the optimal legal, regulatory and policy setting to ensure that government data is open.

Proactive release under the GIPA Act and Open Data

Issue Highlight: Proactive release insights from agencies' responses in this report (page 24) includes responses provided by agencies in the government, council and university sectors in this reporting period on proactive release. It also indicates the progress that has been made in achieving the legislative intent of authorised proactive release.

Open Data Infographic

In October 2016 the IPC produced an Open Data Infographic. The first of its kind in Australia, this resource was developed to assist the community in understanding Open Data and what it means to them. The Infographic provides users with a simple explanation of Open Data, how it can be used, the benefits it offers, and some of the processes available for ensuring data is eligible to be made 'open'. The Infographic includes links to case studies of Open Data in action to service communities. The Infographic is available on the [IPC website](#).


Research into enabling an Open Data culture

The IPC has research underway to identify international legal, policy and regulatory settings that enable Open Data and promote a culture of data sharing. The research project is intended to produce a practical reference paper to identify and consider the conditions enabling Open Data and promoting a data sharing culture and a description of the positive outcomes in Open Data application. The aim is to move from a focus on barriers to strategies to overcome those barriers, drawing on international best practice.

OPEN DATA CASE STUDY: Request a Dataset

The Department of Finance, Services & Innovation (DFS) hosts the website www.data.nsw.gov.au, which brings together a list of NSW Government datasets available in a searchable website.

On the landing page of the website is a 'red button' that can be used to request additional datasets.



The screenshot shows a dark blue footer with the text "Keep up with the Open Data Community" on the left and "Need Something?" on the right. Below the text are three social media buttons: a blue Twitter button with the handle "@datansw", a blue Twitter button with the handle "@ICT_NSW", and a blue Facebook button with the handle "@NSWICTStrategy". To the right of these is a prominent red button with the text "Request a Dataset".

Users of the data.nsw website can use this button to contact DFSI and informally request the addition of a dataset or other information held. Under the informal release pathway in the GIPA Act (2009), an agency is authorised (but not required) to release information in response to an informal request, unless there is an overriding public interest against disclosing the information.

The informal release pathway is complementary to the proactive release pathway. Agencies have the opportunity to periodically identify the types of information requested and released allowing such information to be provided proactively. Information about the datasets that are requested is used to inform the datasets that are published under DFSI's proactive release program.


The GIPA Act and Open Data (cont.)

Survey of community attitudes to Open Data

During 2016, the IPC conducted a community attitudes survey on accessing government information, with a special focus on Open Data.


The survey found that the community is overwhelmingly interested in accessing a range of information, particularly about services provided by government and a government agency's policy documents. In total, 67% of respondents are interested in accessing information about those two agency functions (Figure 1).

Figure 1: Information most interested in accessing



Respondents were also asked their views on how important is allowing public access to information held by government for a number of purposes. **Over 85% of respondents considered it was 'quite important' or 'very important' to have access in order to support accountable, fair, transparent and effective decision-making as well as to support public participation.**

Figure 2: Important reasons for access to public information




De-identified information is increasingly recognised as an important input to support open, transparent government. Respondents were asked whether they agreed with its use and the overwhelming majority agreed it should be used to:

- inform planning and delivery of services
- develop government agencies' policies
- consult with the public
- work with the private sector to deliver better/more services
- work with the not-for-profit sector to deliver better/more services.

In particular, 83% of respondents agreed that de-identified information should be used to inform the planning and delivery of government services and enhance collaboration with the public in the development of government agencies' policies (Figure 3).

Figure 3: Agreement with uses of de-identified information



More details about the survey appear in the section, *The Right to Information - 2016 Community Attitudes* (page 14).

The GIPA Act and Open Data (cont.)

OPEN DATA CASE STUDY Improving travel - Transport for NSW Train Loads Survey: September 2015

The Bureau of Transport Statistics within Transport for NSW proactively releases transport data, advice and analysis online at www.bts.nsw.gov.au. A link to the Bureau of Transport Statistics is published on www.data.nsw.gov.au. In May 2016, Transport for NSW released the Train Loads Survey: September 2015. The primary purpose of the Train Loads Survey is to support service planning and rail timetabling.

The survey information is released as a data visualisation, using charts that help users to interact with the data. Users are able to select a peak period (AM or PM), a main line (for example, the T2 Airport, Inner West & South Line) and a sub line (for example, the Inner West Line). A chart is then displayed representing the load factor for certain times of the peak period. A load factor of 100% means there is a seat for each passenger. A load factor of 135% is the benchmark beyond which passengers experience crowding and dwell times can impact on-time running.

There are a number of benefits that, over time, flow from effective proactive release of information by agencies, including improved service delivery, increased community participation in government processes and decision-making, a better informed and energised community, reduced costs and more effective use of resources.

The GIPA Act provides four release pathways and information that is released by agencies, including data, can be provided through a number of mechanisms.


Access the statistics [here](#).

Train Loads Survey: March 2016 - By Line

Progressive Passenger Loading on T1 North Shore, Northern & Western Line in AM Peak

North Shore Line

Surveyed Station



INSTRUCTIONS

- Select
- Peak
 - Main Line
 - Sub Line
- Peak
- AM
 - PM
- Main Line
- Blue Mountains Line
 - Central Coast & Newcastle Line
 - South Coast Line
 - Southern Highlands Line
 - T1 North Shore, Northern & Western Line
 - T2 Airport, Inner West & South Line
 - T3 Bankstown Line
 - T4 Eastern Suburbs & Illawarra Line
 - T5 Cumberland Line
- Sub Line
- North Shore Line
 - Northern via Macquarie Park Line
 - Northern via Strathfield Line
 - Western Line
- Measure Names
- 100% Load
 - 135% Load

A load factor of 100% means there is a seat for each passenger. A load factor of 135% is the benchmark beyond which passengers experience crowding and dwell times can impact on-time running.

AM Peak is read from top to base, PM Peak is the reverse.

AM Peak = Origin Station and Central Arrival Time. PM Peak = Destination Station and Central Departure Time

The Right to Information - 2016 Community Attitudes

In July 2016, the IPC surveyed the NSW community about the importance of right to information, including their awareness of and experience in exercising this fundamental right. The survey sought to examine any change in awareness, attitudes and experience since the IPC first conducted this survey in 2014.

The survey found that the NSW community increasingly believe the right to access government information is important, with 89% believing such a right is important, up from 84% in 2014 (Figure 4).

Additionally, **the community is strongly aware of the right to access government information, with 79% reporting awareness of the right to access information** from at least one of the agency sectors that are required to observe that right. This growth in awareness ranges from 3 to 5% over the two years since the last survey.

Figure 4: Importance of having the right to access government information





Figure 5: Responses to the question, 'Did you know, under NSW access to information law, that you have a right to access information held by the following agencies?'




Particularly encouraging is that the community is more active in exercising their rights, with 77% reporting they had attempted to access information in the last three years. This is a statistically significant increase from 63% in 2014.

Importantly, the significant increase in the exercise of information access rights has been in four of the five sectors required to observe the right to access information. Across those four sectors, the increase has ranged from 32% to 48%.

Note on survey methodology:

A 'mixed-mode' sampling method was used to survey 340 adults aged 18 years and over from both capital and non-capital cities in NSW, with quotas set on Sydney and regional NSW, age and gender. Interviews were conducted using both online and in-house computer assisted telephone interviewing (CATI), following which the data was weighted by age, gender and areas to reflect the Australia Bureau of Statistic population estimates.


Figure 6: Responses to the question 'In the last three years have you tried to access information held by...'



In 2016 more respondents attempted to access information from other agencies other than local councils than in 2014. In 2014 63% of respondents said that they tried to access information from at least one of the listed agencies, in 2016 this was 77%.

However, the community has varying success in achieving access, with 97% gaining the information they sought from government departments (an increase from the 87% reported in 2014). However, only 80% were successful in gaining the information they sought from councils (a decline from 87% in 2014) (Figure 7).

Figure 7: Accessed information successfully





Information Release Pathways

Pathway 1: Mandatory proactive release of information

Improvement in compliance with mandatory proactive release provisions

Since 2010/11, the IPC has conducted an annual desktop audit of the compliance of all nine NSW principal departments, together with a changing sample of other agencies, with key requirements under the GIPA Act to make publicly available specified open access information.

The desktop audit identified whether each agency had on its website:

- an AIG
- agency policy documents
- an agency disclosure log
- an agency contracts register.

The desktop audit did not examine the comprehensiveness of the information made available. For example, it was not possible to assess if all relevant policy documents were available.


The desktop audit found that compliance with mandatory proactive release provisions has improved:

- 86% of sampled agencies had an AIG, an increase from 81% in 2014/15
- 97% of sampled agencies had policy documents available, an increase from 93% in 2014/15
- 86% of sampled agencies had a contracts register, an increase from 81% in 2014/15
- 86% of sampled agencies had a disclosure log, an increase from 80% in 2014/15.

The overall compliance rate for sampled government sector agencies increased to 89%, compared with 83% in 2014/2015 (Figure 8).

The increase across all four key requirements indicates that agencies have prioritised mandatory proactive release and improved the availability of government information to the public.

Figure 8: Sampled government sector compliance with mandatory proactive release



Additional open access information of certain agencies for the purpose of section 18(g) of the GIPA Act, is prescribed in Part 3, Clause 5 of the *Government Information (Public Access) Regulation 2009*.

Additional open access information of a minister includes:

- any media release issued by the minister
- details concerning overseas travel undertaken by the minister.

For government departments, additional open access information includes:

- details of the department's major assets
- the department's guarantee of service (if any)
- the department's code of conduct (if any).

Statutory bodies also have additional open access information, including:

- the total number and total value of properties disposed of by the statutory body during the previous financial year
- the statutory body's guarantee of service (if any).

These additional open access requirements have not been included in the desktop audit to date. The IPC will provide guidance to ministers, government departments and statutory bodies to support awareness and compliance, and will examine ways in which to include these requirements in future desktop audits.

Agency compliance with contract register requirements

An important element of mandatory proactive release requirements is for agencies to have a public register of contracts valued at \$150,000 or more. Increased transparency with respect to government contracts with the private sector can lead to improved performance of outsourced services, as well as increased efficiency and value for money.

Following the IPC's April 2015 audit of the university sector's compliance with contract reporting requirements under the GIPA Act, the Auditor-General conducted a performance audit. In October 2016 a special report in the NSW Parliament, *Agency compliance with the GIPA Act*, was tabled which outlined the results of a review of a selection of 13 agencies' compliance with the requirements of Part 3 Division 5 of the GIPA Act.

The Auditor-General's report found that all of the agencies had published an adequately designed Government contracts register, but:

- some contracts valued at \$150,000 or more were not recorded in the contracts register
- some contracts were not entered into the register within 45 working days of the contracts becoming effective
- there were instances where inaccurate information was recorded in the register when compared with the contracts
- additional information required for certain classes of contracts was not disclosed in some registers.

These findings are consistent with the IPC finding and recommendations arising from the review of university compliance with contract reporting requirements. The IPC will continue to work with co-regulators and with the Audit Office to ensure transparency through a collaborative regulatory approach and through the provision of guidance to agencies to support compliance. The Auditor-General's report is available on the Audit Office of NSW [website](#).

ISSUE HIGHLIGHT: Improvement in universities' compliance with contract register requirements

In April 2015, the Information Commissioner conducted the first audit of New South Wales universities' compliance with mandatory requirements for disclosure of government contracts with the private sector. The results were published in the *Universities' Compliance with the GIPA Act: Audit Report 2015*, which found a low level of compliance with the mandatory requirements for contract reporting under the GIPA Act. In accordance with the report's commitment to a collaborative and guiding regulatory approach, the IPC worked with the university sector to identify and develop tools and knowledge to elevate compliance.

In June 2016, the IPC conducted a follow-up compliance audit. This found that universities' compliance with the contract register provisions of the GIPA Act had improved significantly since the 2015 compliance audit, with contract registers capturing on average 21% more obligations than in 2015, and the information contained on these contract registers was on average 17% more complete than in 2015.

These improvements demonstrate the effectiveness of the IPC's regulatory engagement and preparedness by the sector to improve performance.

In October 2016, the IPC released an updated learning module on contract registers to provide guidance to assist all agencies to comply with the requirements under the GIPA Act. The learning module is available on the IPC's [E-learning Portal](#).

The *Universities' Compliance with the GIPA Act: Audit Report 2016* can be found on the IPC [website](#).

Compliance with the requirements to provide an Agency Information Guide (AIG)

Part 3 section 20 of the GIPA Act provides that a regulated NSW public sector agency (other than a minister) must have a current AIG that specifies, among other things, any arrangements that exist to enable members of the public to participate in the formulation of the agency's policy and the exercise of the agency's functions.

In 2015/16, the IPC conducted a desktop review of a sample of current agency AIGs in accordance with section 17(g) of the GIPA Act. Each of the principal departments of the 10 NSW 'clusters' were selected and monitored. The IPC's AIG was also monitored in recognition of the requirement for regulators to demonstrate transparency and model compliance practices.

All principal departments and the IPC had an AIG in place on their website. However, in a number of cases it was not clear that agencies had met the obligation to review their AIG and adopt a new AIG at intervals of not more than 12 months:

- 50% (five) of the principal department AIGs did not indicate when they were last updated
- of the five AIGs that contained a date of review, four had been updated within two years and one had last been updated in December 2013.

In regard to public participation in agency policy formulation and the exercise of agency functions, 50% (five) of the principal departments provide some detail in their AIGs. However, the general nature of the description of arrangements for public participation, together with the absence of integration with any other existing arrangements for public participation, reduce the utility of, and compliance with, the legislative provisions to promote public participation. Accordingly, the potential of AIGs to inform, educate and engage the public is not yet being realised.

ISSUE HIGHLIGHT: Enhancing the application of Agency Information Guides

In September 2015, at an event to celebrate Right to Know Week, the NSW Information Commissioner announced a commitment to collaborate with NSW citizens and agencies to promote public participation and assist agencies in better engaging with citizens through a NSW Charter for Public Participation.

The program will assist agencies and the public to enhance the application of AIGs, strengthen compliance with the GIPA Act and promote arrangements for public participation. For example, maximising the purpose and value of AIGs would be supported by including links from the AIG to current engagement processes, including consultations, reviews, web content, expert panels and opportunities to make submissions. These arrangements are predicated upon the disclosure of open access information to ensure that public participation commences from a position of public knowledge.

In June 2016, the IPC released a report, *Towards a NSW Charter for Public Participation*. The Report set out the future actions that the IPC will take to advance public participation and Open Government through raising awareness and providing assistance to ensure that agencies and citizens realise the benefits of meaningful engagement supported by the GIPA Act.

The actions are to:


1. engage through 'Your Say IPC' with the public and agencies to understand attitudes towards AIGs and public participation, and to develop ideas for improving AIGs and inputs to a NSW Charter for Public Participation
2. revisit and update its guidance to agencies on AIGs
3. update its own AIG to be a model of good practice for agencies
4. engage with the principal departments to improve the quality of their AIGs
5. host a summit on public participation and AIGs
6. co-create a NSW Charter for Public Participation
7. work through the Open Government Steering Committee on how agencies connect AIGs with Open Government Plans
8. monitor agencies' use of AIGs to understand the trends in AIGs facilitating public participation
9. monitor disclosure logs and identification of the various kinds of government information held by agencies and made available by agencies with the objective of promoting Open Government and Open Data.

Pathway 2: Authorised proactive release of information

Continuing decline in reviews of programs for release of government information

In 2015/16, 71% of agencies reported having conducted a review of their program for the release of government information. This is a decline from around 78% in 2014/15. This decline appears to be driven by the reduction in reviews conducted in the council sector and may be attributable to the impacts of council mergers (Figure 9).


Figure 9: Agencies that conducted annual information release reviews as a percentage of all agencies that reported, 2010/11 to 2015/16



The conduct of reviews varied between sectors in 2015/16 (Figure 10):

- 77% of agencies in the government sector conducted reviews – an increase from 73% in 2014/15
- 66% of councils conducted reviews – a significant decline from 80% in 2014/15
- 80% of universities conducted reviews – unchanged from 2014/15.

Figure 10: Agencies that conducted annual information release reviews as a percentage of all agencies that reported, by sector, 2010/11 to 2015/16



Agencies are required to conduct reviews of their program for the release of government information at least annually (section 7(3) of the GIPA Act).

Declining compliance with this obligation was identified in the 2013/14 Report and, since July 2015, the IPC has focused on assisting agencies with proactive release programs through the provision of fact sheets and case studies, and through the Open Data Advocate work program.


Additional practices to support proactive release may be implemented by agencies. However, in the absence of demonstrated compliance with this legislative obligation, the levels of compliance with this mandatory obligation are lower than other measures of mandatory compliance across the four release pathways provided under the GIPA Act. Accordingly, the IPC's forward work program contains a commitment to better identify factors impeding compliance and customise regulatory interventions to elevate compliance.

Release of additional information following a review increased significantly in the university sector and slightly in other sectors

Ideally, all agency information release reviews should result in additional information being released. In 2015/16, 74% of agencies that conducted a review released additional information. This is an increase from additional information release rates in 2013/14 (71%) and 2014/15 (72%). Figure 11 shows the trends in the percentage of reviews leading to the release of additional information in the government, council and university sectors and shows:

- 72% of agencies in the government sector released additional information following review – an increase from 70% in 2014/15
- 76% of councils released additional information following review – an increase from 75% in 2014/15
- 63% of universities released additional information following review – a significant increase from 50% in 2014/15.

Figure 11: Agencies that released additional information as a percentage of agencies that conducted a review, by sector, 2010/11 to 2015/16



ISSUE HIGHLIGHT: Practices to promote proactive release of information to the public

A key intention of the GIPA Act is to encourage a fundamental shift toward proactive public release of government information by agencies. The mandatory obligations for authorised proactive release is one of the major means for achieving the GIPA Act's broader goal of advancing democratic government that is open, accountable, fair and effective. The GIPA Act authorises agencies to have proactive release programs in place and requires these to be reviewed each year, with outcomes reported to the IPC. Release programs can be linked to the agency's information guide to support public participation in the formulation of the agency's policies and in the exercise of the agency's functions (see page 21 for a description of the IPC's recent activities to enhance the role of AIGs).

155 agencies reported to the IPC on actions they took during 2015/16 to improve the proactive release of information. A sample of actions are summarised below and are aligned to the strategies suggested by the IPC in its fact sheet, [Authorised proactive release of government information](#).

The IPC recommends that agencies integrate a commitment to proactive release into the agency's corporate culture.

Agencies have demonstrated adoption of this recommendation:

- Albury City Council consulted widely and established a dedicated working party to maximise the proactive release of information. "The methodology used in this review was consultation with the Albury City Website Working Party to identify the type of information requested by the community and the current process for the proactive release of information. The Website Working Party comprises of key members of staff from each of Albury City's directorates and chaired by the Director of Planning and Environment. The Website Working Party was provided with an overview of the obligations under the GIPA Act and an outline of the review process." This form of consultation to promote a more rigorous proactive release program received a positive response.
- The Department of Premier and Cabinet required all branches to identify and report on information holdings to release more information and "...continued this program by issuing a memorandum to groups and branches requiring them to report... on any information that they hold, which may be suitable for authorised proactive release."

The IPC recommends that agencies identify the information that can be released proactively.

Agencies have demonstrated adoption of this recommendation:

- The University of Wollongong implemented a comprehensive approach to its proactive release program that draws upon all release pathways. The "...current program for the proactive release of information involves: Actively consulting with key stakeholders across the University to identify the kinds of information which may be of interest to the public; reviewing the types of information requested by the public, both informally and formally, to assess whether it may be of interest to the public generally; conducting and assessing responses from staff/student surveys; and regularly promoting and actioning feedback from staff, students and members of the public..."
- The NSW Audit Office's review of its proactive release program included:
 1. an annual examination of information made publicly available by other agencies on their websites
 2. a quarterly review of information produced, such as new policies to determine whether the information is suitable for proactive release.
- The City of Canada Bay Council recognised the value of applying data to ensure that its program reflected the needs of the community.⁹

The IPC recommends that agencies improve the accessibility of the information that it identifies could be proactively released.

Agencies have demonstrated adoption of this recommendation:

- Lake Macquarie City Council harnesses social media to release information proactively.¹⁰
- Newcastle City Council used accessible and diverse channels to release information proactively.¹¹
- The NSW Environment Protection Authority addressed the needs of a diverse range of citizens by proactively releasing information in languages other than English, including Arabic, Mandarin, Cantonese and Vietnamese.

⁹ The City of Canada Bay advised that "...to identify categories of information repeatedly asked for, both formally and informally, statistics are compiled by Council regarding the type of access applications and the information requested. Regular meetings are held with responsible officers to determine if any repeat information can be proactively released. Council is highly committed to community engagement and as a result, initiatives, developments and projects relevant to the community are continually proactively released on Council's website."

¹⁰ "This year, Council used social media platforms Facebook, Twitter, Instagram and YouTube to distribute information to the community."

¹¹ "Development of video content has been a priority this year as a tool to better inform our community."



Pathway 3: Informal release of information

The informal release of information provides benefits for agencies and citizens, and helps to increase access to information. The effectiveness of this pathway can be enhanced through sound agency practices, recognising the safeguards for staff who release information informally and by linking the pathway to broader agency access mechanisms, in particular AIGs.

Agency practices

Agencies may release any information informally unless there is an overriding public interest that would prevent release.

Informal release under the GIPA Act can be quicker and less costly for the applicant and for the agency, and can be applied and interpreted flexibly. Agencies can decide how information is released: by phone, email, letter, fax, or in person. Conditions can also be imposed on the use of the information released. An example of one agency's approach in regard to closed circuit television (CCTV) is discussed in the case study on page 27.

Some agencies present applicants with a spectrum of choices to highlight the ways information can be made available:

- mandatory disclosure (see page 18)
- proactive release (see page 22)
- informal release
- as a 'last resort', release in response to a formal application.

Highlighting the role of the informal pathway avoids the time and effort needed to prepare an application and may also create opportunities for agencies to streamline the handling of common requests.

The IPC recommends that agencies exercise the discretion to deal with requests informally wherever possible as a way that furthers the object of the GIPA Act. It facilitates and encourages, promptly and at the lowest reasonable cost, access to government information.

Agencies retain the discretion to refuse an informal request or require a formal application to be lodged in appropriate circumstances such as where:

- searching for and retrieving the information sought would require a significant use of resources
- the material contains information about a third party that cannot be deleted easily or without rendering the information useless, and consultation would need to occur
- the material is sensitive in nature and requires careful balancing of public interests.

If an agency does decide to refuse an informal request for information, the agency should inform the applicant. The person seeking the information can then choose to apply for the information formally, or make a complaint to the Information Commissioner about the agency's conduct in dealing with the informal request.

In June 2016, the IPC published a template letter that agencies can use to communicate options to applicants for accessing information when advising applicants of a decision to refuse an informal release request.

Safeguards for staff who release information informally in good faith

Staff of agencies who decide to release information informally, and who believe in good faith that the decision is permitted or required by the GIPA Act, are not exposed to any personal liability, or to any action in defamation or breach of confidence, that may result from the disclosure, as provided for by sections 113 and 115 of the GIPA Act. Section 114 also protects staff from criminal liability that may arise merely because of a decision to disclose information made in good faith under the GIPA Act.

Agency Information Guides can be used to encourage informal release

AIGs are an important mechanism for accessing information that can be used to promote proactive and informal release of information. AIGs assist agencies to ensure that citizens have knowledge of, and access to, government information that is both current and significant in relation to the formulation of policy and service delivery by agencies, together with access to arrangements to participate in the formulation of policy and service delivery by agencies.

AIGs will sometimes be the starting point for applicants seeking information. They are therefore an important opportunity to highlight the use of the informal pathway and encourage its use when appropriate. Strengthening the role of AIGs to encourage the informal pathway can also contribute to the broader goal of improving public participation and Open Government.

CASE STUDY: Informal release of audio visual information

If an agency uses the informal pathway in the GIPA Act, it is able to release information subject to any reasonable conditions that the agency thinks fit to impose.

A government sector agency has used the informal pathway to release CCTV information to media applicants subject to conditions, such as a requirement to pixelate and remove personal information, before publishing the information. In order to achieve this outcome, the agency offers the applicant the opportunity to withdraw their formal request under the GIPA Act and make an informal request instead.

Using the informal pathway in this way has facilitated prompt access to the CCTV information at the lowest reasonable cost to the applicant and the agency. However it should be noted that conditions on informal release are not enforceable under the GIPA Act.



Pathway 4: Formal applications

In 2015/16, there was a significant increase in the number of applications lodged and a halt in the two year decline in the overall release rate.

The GIPA Act provides citizens with a right to access government information, unless there is an overriding public interest against disclosure.

Agencies must assess each application for information that is received. For valid access applications, agencies must apply the public interest balancing test and consider the factors for and against the disclosure of the information that is being requested.

The main benefits of the formal access pathway are that:

- the right to seek access is legally enforceable
- agencies are not subject to the direction or control of any Minister in the exercise of the agency's functions when dealing with an access application
- agencies must apply the public interest balancing test and consult with third parties to whom the information relates
- applicants have a right to seek review of an agency's decision about the application through a number of review avenues: an internal review by the agency, an external review by the Information Commissioner and an external review by NCAT.

ISSUE HIGHLIGHT: Open Government Partnership and understanding the public's use of freedom of information rights

The Information Commissioner co-ordinated the contribution of right to information jurisdictions in Australia towards collecting and publishing uniform data on public use of freedom of information rights. That contribution has now been incorporated in Australia's inaugural Open Government Partnership National Action Plan. As a democratic society it is important that we have systems in place to measure how citizens are using the legislated right to information and the provision of information in a timely, effective manner by governments in response to citizen requests.


Although the Commonwealth, states and territories already collect data and produce statistics about applications to access government information, the data collected is not uniform across jurisdictions. This makes it difficult to compare and analyse how freedom of information rights are used across the country.

The proposed measures will facilitate an assessment of the right to information, the exercise of that right and the effectiveness of that right in providing information to citizens. The measures will be designed to align with established international metrics including the World Justice Project Open Government Index and could include the type of applicant, application rates per capita, release rates, review rates and refusal rates.

The inclusion of the measurement of how citizens are using information access rights in the Open Government Partnership National Action Plan demonstrates Australia's commitment to assessing the effectiveness of this fundamental right. The analysis of these measures, including international benchmarking, will provide an assessment that contributes to Australia's commitment to the Open Government Partnership and to the advancement of Open Government in NSW.


Year at a glance

Where were applications lodged?




- NSW Police Force
- Roads and Maritime Services
- SafeWork NSW
- Department of Family and Community Services
- Department of Justice
- Other

Were applications invalid?




- Invalid applications that subsequently became valid applications
- Remained invalid applications

Who applied?




- Members of the Public (by legal representative)
- Members of the Public (other)
- Private sector business
- Media
- Members of Parliament
- Not for profit organisations or community groups

What was asked for?




- Personal information applications
- Access applications (other than personal information applications)
- Access applications that are personal information applications and partly other

How quickly were decisions made?




- Decided within the statutory time frame (20 days plus any extensions)
- Decided after 35 days (by agreement with applicant)
- Not decided within time (deemed refusal)

Did applicants get what they asked for?




- Access granted in full
- Access granted in part
- Access refused in full
- Other

How were decisions reviewed?



- Internal review
- Review by Information Commissioner
- Internal review following recommendation under section 93 of Act
- Review by NCAT

What were the main review outcomes?



- Decisions upheld
- Decisions varied

How many applications were lodged?

The number of applications received increased significantly in 2015/16

At the time of reporting, agencies had advised they received 14,761 valid applications during 2015/16. This compares with 12,968 applications in the previous financial year and represents a total increase of 14% in applications received. The trend in applications is shown in Figure 12.¹¹ This overall increase represents a return to the numbers of applications received in 2012/13.

The number of applications received by agencies can be affected by a number of factors, such as the type of information sought, the extent to which agencies proactively make information available, and the use of the informal access pathway.


Most applications were made to the government sector

The government sector continued to account for the great majority (12,599 or 85%) of valid applications.

In 2015/16, the NSW Police Force and Roads and Maritime Services (RMS) combined accounted for 52% of all valid applications (Figure 13). This is a decline from 55% in 2014/15. There continues to be an upward trend in the number of applications received by the NSW Police Force since 2014. Conversely, the number of applications received by RMS has continued to decline since 2013.


The number of applications received by SafeWork NSW (previously WorkCover Authority) increased from 637 to 701, and the number received by the Department of Family and Community Services declined from 739 to 659. As a result, SafeWork NSW received the third highest number of valid applications in 2015/16 and the Department of Family and Community Services moved from the third highest number of applications in 2014/15 to the fourth highest in 2015/16.

Figure 12: Total number of valid applications received, 2010/11 to 2015/16



¹¹ It should be noted that: a) the number of reported applications received includes applications that may be transferred to other agencies, and b) numbers for 2014/15 vary slightly to those reported in the 2014/15 Report due to the late submission of data by some agencies.


Figure 13: Distribution of valid applications received, by agency, 2015/16



Applications increased significantly in all sectors except the minister sector

- Applications to the government sector increased by 1,457 or 13%, from 11,142 in 2014/15 to 12,599 in 2015/16.
- Applications to the council sector increased by 305 or 18%, from 1,704 in 2014/15 to 2,009 in 2015/16.
- Applications to the university sector increased by 49 or 79%, from 62 in 2014/15 to 111 in 2015/16.
- Applications to the minister sector declined by 18 or 30%, from 60 in 2014/15 to 42 in 2015/16.

Figure 14: Number of applications received, by sector, 2010/11 to 2015/16



'How many applications were lodged?' is reported and measured by the requirement for agencies to report on the total number of formal applications received during the year and that were assessed as valid in clause 7(b) of the GIPA Regulation.

Invalid applications

The level and trend in invalid applications is one indicator of the extent to which the GIPA Act is understood by applicants and agencies, as well as the flexibility offered to applicants to amend their applications so they can be considered.

Figure 15 shows the flow of applications from receipt, to initial assessment and subsequent processing, as well as the number of applications considered in 2015/16.


Section 52(3) of the GIPA Act requires agencies to provide reasonable advice and assistance to enable applicants to make a valid application.

The rate of invalid applications received rose slightly compared with 2014/15, but varied between sectors

In 2015/16, agencies received 1,451 invalid applications. This was equivalent to 10% of all formal applications received (Figure 16). As a percentage of all formal applications received, the proportion of invalid applications has increased from 8% in 2014/15, and declined overall from a high of 13% in the first year of the GIPA Act's operation.


In 2015/16, the dominant reason for invalidity (applying in 97% of invalid applications) was that the application did not comply with formal requirements. This is consistent with the 99% for invalidity attributed to non-compliance with formal requirements reported in 2014/15.

Figure 15: Flow of valid and invalid formal applications



'Invalid applications' are reported and measured by the requirement for agencies to report on the number of invalid applications specified in Table C of Schedule 2 to the GIPA Regulation.

Figure 16: Invalid applications as a percentage of all formal applications received, 2010/11 to 2015/16



Clear agency communication, including the provision of fact sheets and guidance to potential applicants, can help minimise the number of invalid applications and reduce time and effort that may be spent on preparing or assessing applications. The IPC provides guidance to agencies on the processing of valid and invalid applications and a template access application form to assist the provision of information required to make a valid application, available on the IPC website.

Year on year data confirms that most applications are made by members of the public. The requirement for certainty and assistance to applicants to ensure that valid applications are lodged has been recognised by the IPC. Building on the functionality supporting case management of GIPA applications in the 'GIPA Tool' developed to promote agency compliance, the IPC will examine further opportunities for digitisation of the GIPA application process.


The university and government sectors had the highest percentage of invalid applications

As seen in Figure 17, the pattern of invalid applications as a percentage of all applications varied across sectors. The government and university sectors had the highest percentage of invalid applications.

The number of invalid applications received by the minister sector has significantly declined

The percentage of invalid applications as a percentage of all formal applications received by the minister sector declined from 12% in 2014/15 to only 2% in 2015/16. This is a positive outcome when compared to 2014/15 and a return to earlier low levels of invalid applications. However, the variation should be considered in the context of the overall low numbers of applications received by the minister sector.

Figure 17: Invalid applications as a percentage of all formal applications received, by sector, 2015/16



Invalid applications are increasingly becoming valid

An invalid application can subsequently become valid, for example, through the applicant providing further information to comply with the requirements of the GIPA Act.

In 2015/16, 43% of invalid applications subsequently became valid (Figure 18). This continues the upward trend in the percentage of invalid applications that became valid.

Figure 18: Invalid applications that became valid as a percentage of all invalid applications, 2010/11 to 2015/16





Figure 19: Invalid applications that became valid as a percentage of all invalid applications, by sector, 2010/11 to 2015/16



Note: In some years, some sectors did not receive any invalid applications that became valid.

As Figure 19 shows, the percentage of invalid applications that subsequently became valid has increased steadily from 15% in 2010/11 in the government sector.

Figure 19 also shows that the percentage of invalid applications received by universities that became valid increased significantly from 0% in 2014/15 to 57% in 2015/16.

The increase in the percentage of applications that became valid is a positive illustration of agencies discharging their responsibilities under the GIPA Act. The trend is consistent with efforts by agencies and the IPC to improve guidance to applicants and to raise their awareness of how to lodge a valid application.

ISSUE HIGHLIGHT: Information Commissioner approves additional facilities for making an access application and paying an application fee

The IPC is continually exploring ways to promote the objects of the GIPA Act and assist agencies with the exercise of their functions under the Act. Since June 2014, the Information Commissioner has provided approval under section 41(2) of the GIPA Act to three government agencies for additional facilities for the making of an access application or the payment of an application fee.

The Information Commissioner commends these agencies' efforts to create a more accessible platform for applicants to request access to government information. The additional facilities include applications via email, payment via bank transfer, and online services on an agency's website.

Benefits for members of the public can include:

- assistance to applicants through automated and real-time checks to ensure that the application is valid on submission
- 'any-time' lodgement of applications
- better accessibility of services for customers with mobility issues
- overall improved customer service through the provision of both face-to-face and online facilities
- immediate issue of application and receipt numbers that can be used for customer enquiries relating to progress of applications.

The IPC publishes a register of the Information Commissioner's approvals on the IPC [website](#).

Who applied?

Most application outcomes were by or on behalf of members of the public

In 2015/16, over 80% of outcomes related to applications from either a member of the public or their legal representative. The largest single source (45%) related to applications by legal representatives. This is an increase from 42% of applications lodged by legal representatives in 2014/15.

As apparent from Figure 13, the volume and source of applications received by the NSW Police Force heavily influenced overall reported outcomes.

Figure 20 shows these differences in distribution. For example, the percentage of outcomes relating to applications by legally represented members of the public was 45% across all agencies and declined to 33% if NSW Police Force data was excluded. This is an increase from 2014/15 from 42% and 30% respectively.

Significant changes in applicant type were experienced in the university and minister sectors


In 2015/16, the distribution of applicant types varied markedly across sectors. As Figure 21 shows, the greatest percentage of outcomes in the government and council sectors related to applications by members of the public (or their legal representative).

There was a significant decline in the percentage of outcomes in the university sector related to applications by members of the public (or their legal representative). In 2015/16, 55% of outcomes related to applications by members of the public (or their legal representative). This is a significant decline from 87% in 2014/15. There was an increase in the percentage of outcomes in the university sector related to applications by media and not-for-profit organisations or community groups.


There was an increase in the percentage of outcomes in the minister sector related to applications by Members of Parliament. In 2015/16, 46% of outcomes related to applications by Members of Parliament, an increase from 31% in 2014/15.

Figure 20: Outcomes by type of applicant, 2015/16

All agencies including NSW Police Force




All agencies excluding NSW Police Force



'Who applied' is reported and measured by the requirement for agencies to report on the number of outcomes for applications by type of applicant. As an application can have multiple outcomes, the total number of outcomes reported in this section will usually be higher than the number of applications reported. This section draws on data from Table A of Schedule 2 to the GIPA Regulation.

Figure 21: Percentage of outcomes by sector and type of applicant, 2015/16




The trend of increasing outcomes for members of the public continues. However, the number of outcomes relating to applications by Members of Parliament has significantly increased in 2015/16.

Figure 22 shows how the number of outcomes for each applicant type has varied since 2010/11. The greatest increase in the number of outcomes was for applications by members of the public (by a legal representative). In 2014/15, 5,508 outcomes related to members of the public (by a legal representative) and this significantly increased by 18% to 6,524 in 2015/16.

Outcomes for private sector business had the greatest decline in the number of outcomes. In 2014/15, 2,054 outcomes related to private sector businesses, significantly declining by 18% to 1,715 in 2015/16.

However, the most significant percentage increase was in the number of outcomes by Members of Parliament, which rose from a small base of 147 in 2014/15 to 414 in 2015/16. This represents a 182% increase in the number of outcomes attributable to applications by Members of Parliament.

Figure 22: Number of outcomes by type of applicant, 2010/11 to 2015/16



What information was asked for?

The trend of decreasing applications for personal information continued in 2015/16


In 2015/16, the outcomes across all sectors remained consistent with 2014/15 outcomes. However, the three year decline in applications for personal information has continued:

- 52% of outcomes related to personal information applications compared with 55% in 2014/15 and 59% in 2013/14
- 39% of outcomes related to applications for other than personal information compared with 38% in 2014/15
- 9% of outcomes related to applications for both types of information compared with 7% in 2014/15. (Figure 23)

As Figure 24 shows, in 2015/16 the number of outcomes across all application types increased compared with 2014/15:


- personal information outcomes increased by 6%. However, when compared to the 14% increase in total application numbers, this represents a decline in the share of all outcomes which were for personal information to 52%
- other than personal information outcomes increased significantly by 15%
- outcomes that were partly personal information and partly other also increased significantly by 30%.

Figure 23: Outcomes by type of information applied for, 2015/16



- Personal information applications
- Access applications (other than personal information applications)
- Access applications that are partly personal information applications and partly other

Figure 24: Number of outcomes by type of information applied for, 2010/11 to 2015/16




'What information was asked for?' is reported and measured by the requirement for agencies to report on the number of outcomes for applications made for personal information, other than personal information, or a combination of both types of information from Table B, Schedule 2 to the GIPA Regulation.

The type of information sought varied across sectors and in the university sector applications for personal information significantly declined

Different sectors experienced markedly different patterns of outcomes in 2015/16. This was consistent with the outcomes reported in 2014/15.

In the government sector, 60% of outcomes related to applications for personal information. As Figure 25 shows, this fell to 33% if outcomes relating to the NSW Police Force were excluded (as 87% of outcomes for that agency related to applications for personal information). This pattern of use is consistent with the data reported in 2014/15, when this pattern was identified for the first time.

Figure 25: Percentage of all outcomes by type of information applied for, including and excluding NSW Police Force data, 2015/16



In the council sector, nearly 80% of outcomes related to applications for other than personal information. This is a decline of 6% from 2014/15.

The university sector displayed a significant change in reported outcomes. In 2015/16 the university sector reported that 16% of applications were for personal information. This is a significant decline from the 51% reported in 2014/15.

Coinciding with this decline there has been a significant increase in outcomes relating to applications for non-personal information from 34% in 2014/15 to 69% in 2015/16.

Did applicants get what they asked for?

There has been a plateauing of overall 'release rates' driven largely by the government and council sectors

In 2015/16, the overall release rate was 68%, representing the combined access granted in full and in part outcomes (Figure 26). This is consistent with the combined release rate of 69% in 2014/15. These rates indicate a plateauing of release rates over the past two years and a decline from a high in 2012/13 when the overall release rate was 80%.


At the sector level, in 2015/16, 68% of outcomes from the government sector resulted in access being granted in full or in part. This is similar to the release rates reported in 2014/15 and continues the decline from a high of 80% in 2012/13 (Figure 27).

For the council sector, 70% of outcomes granted access in full or in part in 2015/16, a decline from 73% in 2014/15.

The minister sector demonstrated a significant increase in access being granted in full or in part with a release rate of 54% in 2015/16, an increase from 34% in 2014/15. This variation should be considered in the context of the overall low numbers of applications received by the minister sector.


For the university sector, 52% of outcomes granted access in full or in part in 2015/16. This is similar to the release rates reported in 2014/15 of 53%.

Figure 26: Overall release rate across all sectors, 2010/11 to 2015/16



'Did applicants get what they asked for?' is reported and measured by the requirement for agencies to report on the outcomes of applications for information by the type of applications (listed in Table A of Schedule 2 to the GIPA Regulation) and the type of information that is applied for (listed in Table B of Schedule 2 to the GIPA Regulation). The term 'other outcomes' refers to the following outcomes – access refused in full, information not held, information already available, refuse to deal with application, refuse to confirm or deny whether information is held, and application withdrawn.


Figure 27: Overall release rate by sector, 2010/11 to 2015/16



Applicants were more likely to be granted access in part than access in full

In 2015/16, 28% of all outcomes granted access in full (Figure 28). This is consistent with the 27% reported in 2014/15 and confirms the decline from a high of 55% in 2010/11.

Figure 28: Release outcomes across all sectors, 2010/11 to 2015/16




However, there has been an increase in access granted in part outcomes, from 25% in 2010/11 to 40% in 2015/16. For each year since 2012/13 there have been more outcomes granting access in part than granting access in full.

This gap between access granted in full and in part outcomes is attributable to the government sector:

- In 2015/16, 25% of all outcomes provided by the government sector granted access in full (Figure 29), consistent with 2014/15 and a decline from a high of 45% in 2010/11. Access granted in part represented 43% of all outcomes, consistent with 2014/15, and an increase from 30% in 2010/11.

- In 2015/16, 45% of all outcomes provided by the council sector granted access in full consistent with 2014/15, and a decline from a high of 79% in 2010/11. Access granted in part represented 25% of all outcomes, consistent with 2014/15, and an increase from 12% in 2010/11.
- In 2015/16, 26% of all outcomes provided by the minister sector granted access in full, an increase from 22% in 2014/15. Access granted in part represented 28%, a significant increase from 12% in 2014/15.

Figure 29: Release outcomes by sector, 2010/11 to 2015/16




Applications for personal information resulted in a greater release of information. However, applications for 'other than personal' information were more likely to have access granted in full

The overall release rate of information for applications for personal information and applications for other than personal information were similar in 2015/16, at 71% and 65% respectively. These release rates are consistent with those reported in 2014/15.

However, the composition of outcomes for each type of application was different (Figure 30):

- In 2015/16, 21% of all outcomes for applications for personal information granted access in full and 50% of all outcomes granted access in part. The gap between access granted in full and access granted in part outcomes has remained consistently large since 2012/13, averaging around 31%.
- In 2015/16, 40% of all outcomes for applications for other than personal information granted access in full and 25% of all outcomes granted access in part. However, access granted in full outcomes declined from a high of 58% in 2010/11.

Figure 30: Release outcomes by application type, 2010/11 to 2015/16



Overall release rates are highest for members of the public and private sector business. However release rates for not-for-profit organisations or community groups are significantly lower.


The highest release rates in 2015/16 were for applications by members of the public (71%), private sector business (71%) and members of the public (by a legal representative) (67%) (Figure 31).

The lowest overall release rate (51%) was for not-for-profit organisations or community groups, an increase from 46% in 2014/15. However, the 20% difference in release rates between members of the public and not-for-profit or community groups is significant and will be monitored.

The composition of outcomes for the top three applicant types varied in 2015/16 from 2014/15 in relation to private sector business, but remained consistent for members of the public and legally represented members of the public:

- For members of the public, 33% of outcomes granted access in full and 38% granted access in part. Access granted in full outcomes declined from a high of 61% in 2010/11, while access granted in part outcomes increased from 24% in 2010/11.
- For private sector business, 42% of outcomes granted access in full, an increase from 38% in 2014/15 and 29% granted access in part, a decline from 32% in 2014/15. Private sector businesses continue to be likely to have access granted in full compared to other applicant types. However, the percentage of access granted in full outcomes declined in 2015/16 from over 60% between 2012/13 and 2013/14.
- For legal representatives, 19% of outcomes granted access in full and 48% granted access in part. The gap between access granted in full and access granted in part outcomes has remained consistently large since 2012/13, at around 32%.

Figure 31: Outcomes by applicant type, 2010/11 to 2015/16



ISSUE HIGHLIGHT: Trends in agency release rates

The 2014/15 Report noted that the rate at which agencies decided to release information in response to formal applications either in full or in part – the ‘release rate’ – had fallen from 80% of decisions in 2012/13 to 69% in 2014/15.

In response, the IPC identified as a priority to “Examine and respond to trends in information release rates and outcomes”. This Issue Highlight presents in more detail the trends in release rates, discusses some possible explanations for the trends, and describes actions the IPC will take to address these trends.


Growth in other outcomes

Under the GIPA Act reporting requirements, agencies must record formal application outcomes according to eight categories. Two of these outcomes reflect decisions to provide access to information and represent the overall release rate. The remaining six outcomes provide alternatives to the release of information. Data on each of these six outcomes has been examined by the IPC. Of those, five outcomes have increased. These increases have been identified as a factor impacting upon the overall decline in release rates over the period 2012/13 to 2015/16:

- Information Not Held outcomes have increased from 5.5% to 11.9%
- Refused to Provide Access in Full outcomes have increased from 8.2% to 11.6%
- Application Withdrawn outcomes have increased from 3.7% to 4%
- Information Already Available outcomes have increased from 0.7% to 2.4%
- Refused to Deal with Application outcomes have increased from 1.3% to 1.6%.

The rise in these five outcomes across all sectors is demonstrated in Figure 32 below.

Figure 32: Trend in selected outcomes 2012/13 to 2015/16 as a percentage of all outcomes




The primary increases influencing the decline in release rates from 2012/13 to 2015/16 relate to two of these five outcomes: Information Not Held (which increased by 993 application outcomes) and Access Refused in Full (which increased by 584 application outcomes).

As noted on page 32, the NSW Police Force and RMS collectively account for 51% of all access applications and, accordingly, trends in decision-making by those agencies have a significant impact upon overall trends.

An examination of agency level data confirms that these two agencies demonstrated the most significant increase in Access Refused in Full outcomes compared to all sectors. The NSW Police Force also demonstrated a more significant increase in Information Not Held outcomes compared to all sectors.

Application outcomes for the NSW Police Force and RMS are demonstrated in Figure 33 below.


Figure 33: Trend in selected outcomes 2012/13 to 2015/16 as a percentage of all outcomes – NSW Police Force and Roads and Maritime Services



The identification of the NSW Police Force and RMS in influencing overall release rates as a result of their increasing Refusal in Full and Information Not Held outcomes is further demonstrated in Figure 34 below which contains sector outcomes excluding the NSW Police Force and RMS.

When the NSW Police Force and RMS are excluded from sector outcome trends, the overall Refused in Full and Information Not Held outcomes decrease from 11.6% and 11.9% respectively to 4.4% and 10.5% respectively.

Figure 34: Trend in selected outcomes 2012/13 to 2015/16 as a percentage of all outcomes – excluding NSW Police and Roads and Maritime Services



Conclusions

Using the data available to the IPC it is possible to identify some factors affecting the decline in overall release rates:

Access Refused in Full outcomes increasing

- The growth in overall refusal rates is largely attributable to two government sector agencies that account for a large proportion of applications and decision outcomes. The increasing number of outcomes that reflect a decision to Refuse Access in Full by these agencies will inform the IPC's regulatory interventions with these agencies through a closer examination of application type, applicant type, operational processes and organisational culture.

Information Not Held outcomes increasing

- The growth in Information not Held outcomes also has some impact upon overall release rates. There is also a disproportionate representation of this outcome by the NSW Police Force. However, outcomes of this type also suggest that a greater focus is required to assist applicants in determining the scope and target of their information access application. This issue will be considered in the context of exploring options to improve both the validity of applications and the application process generally.

The IPC will continue to investigate the drivers behind these trends in agency decision-making over 2016/17 and engage with agencies having the most significant impact on overall release rates.

As part of the Open Government Partnership National Access Plan, the IPC is leading work to develop uniform metrics to better measure and improve our understanding of the public's use of rights under freedom of information laws. These will be used by the IPC to inform the development of benchmarks and guide future regulatory actions.

How quickly were decisions made?

Agencies are improving the timeliness of decisions


In 2015/16, 12,678 or 93% of applications received by agencies were decided within the statutory time frame (Figure 35). This was an increase in timeliness from 2014/15 (91%). This result continues an upward trend that has occurred since 2013/14. That trend is accompanied by a decline in applications that were deemed to be refused, from a high of 15% in 2013/14 to 3% in 2015/16.

All sectors are achieving positive results for the timeliness of decision-making

In 2015/16 (Figure 36) the:


- government sector decided 93% of applications within the statutory time frame, consistent with 91% in 2014/15
- council sector decided 90% of applications within the statutory time frame, and have consistently been deciding 90% or more applications within time since 2010/11
- minister sector decided 79% of applications within the statutory time frame, which is a significant increase from 59% in 2014/15
- university sector decided 74% of applications within time, which is a significant increase from 62% in 2014/15.

Figure 35: Timeliness of applications as a percentage of all applications received, 2010/11 to 2015/16



'How quickly were decisions made?' is reported and measured by the requirement for agencies to report on how quickly they dealt with access applications that they received. The data used in this section draws on Table F, Schedule 2 of the GIPA Regulation.

Figure 36: Applications that were decided within the statutory time frame as a percentage of all applications received, by sector, 2010/11 to 2015/16



ISSUE HIGHLIGHT: Local council 'fast track' fee inconsistent with the GIPA Act

In 2015, the IPC received a complaint about a local council that had introduced a 'fast track fee'. The council offered the public the option of paying a \$150 'fast track fee', in addition to the \$30 application fee, processing charges, and photocopying fees, to expedite decision-making on GIPA applications to a service standard of 5 business days.

The council advised that the fee had been introduced under the Local Government Act 1993 (LGA) provisions, which authorise councils to introduce fees in certain circumstances.

The Information Commissioner wrote to the council to advise that the GIPA Act identifies and sets both the fee to be paid for an access application (section 41) and the processing charges (section 64) that may be imposed. An agency is able, under section 127, to waive, reduce or refund any fee or charge payable under the GIPA Act. The Information Commissioner also drew the council's attention to section 610 of the LGA, which states that a council may not determine a fee for service that is inconsistent with an amount determined under another Act, or that is in addition to an amount determined under another Act.

The Information Commissioner informed the council that the introduction of a 'fast track fee' of \$150 was inconsistent with both the object of the GIPA Act in section 3 and the statutory fee set by section 41. The council was asked to remove the option of a 'fast track fee' from its access application form.

In response to the advice from the Information Commissioner, the council was co-operative in resolving the complaint and advised that it would comply with the request, that the fee had not been used and that it would no longer apply the 'fast track fee' to access applications.


How was the public interest test applied?

This section examines:

- the number of applications that were refused because of a conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure (CPOPIAD)
- which categories of CPOPIADs were applied
- the use of categories of considerations for which there is an overriding public interest against disclosure of information (OPIAD).

More than one CPOPIAD and OPIAD may apply in respect of an application. Each consideration is recorded only once per application.

Figure 37: A snapshot of the use of CPOPIADs and OPIADs public interest test, 2015/16



Only a small number of applications were refused because of a CPOPIAD

In 2015/16, 829 applications (or 6% of total applications received) were refused wholly or partly because of a CPOPIAD.

Legal professional privilege continues to be the most applied CPOPIAD, however application of the 'excluded information' CPOPIAD has increased


In 2015/16, legal professional privilege remained the most applied CPOPIAD across all sectors (Figure 37). The CPOPIAD was applied 36% of all the times that CPOPIADs were applied. This is an increase from 29% in 2014/15.

The excluded information consideration was the second most applied CPOPIAD, being applied 21% of all the times that CPOPIADs were applied in 2015/16. This is an increase from 15% in 2014/15, when it was the third most applied CPOPIAD. It is a significant increase from the percentage of times that the excluded information consideration was applied in 2010/11, which was 2%.

In 2015/16, the care and protection of children consideration was the third most applied CPOPIAD, being applied 20% of all the times that CPOPIADs were applied. This consideration was the second most applied CPOPIAD in 2014/15, at 27%.

Figure 38 demonstrates the significant decline in the application of overriding secrecy laws as a CPOPIAD from 26% in 2011/12 to 3% in 2015/16.

Figure 38: Percentage distribution of CPOPIADs, 2010/11 to 2015/16



'How was the public interest test applied?' is reported in Tables D and E of Schedule 2 of the GIPA Regulation.

The application of the legal professional privilege CPOPIAD remained high in the government and university sectors but declined in the council sector.


In the government sector, the most applied CPOPIAD in 2015/16 was legal professional privilege (32%) (Figure 39). The primary government agencies applying this CPOPIAD were the Department of Education, NSW Self Insurance Corporation and SafeWork NSW. The second most applied CPOPIADs in the government sector were the care and protection of children (23%) and excluded information (also 23%).

The Department of Family and Community Services was the main agency that applied the care and protection of children CPOPIAD. The NSW Police Force was the main agency that applied the excluded information CPOPIAD.

The legal professional privilege consideration remained the most applied CPOPIAD for the council sector at 66% but declined moderately from 2014/15 when it represented 78% of all CPOPIADs.

In the university sector the most applied CPOPIAD in 2015/16 was legal professional privilege (88%). This was an increase from 78% in 2014/15 (Figure 39).

Figure 39: Percentage distribution of CPOPIADs applied, by sector, 2010/11 to 2015/16



Note: In some years, certain CPOPIADs were not applied to received applications in the council, university and minister sectors.

Individual rights, judicial processes and natural justice was the most applied OPIAD


The most frequently applied OPIAD in 2015/16 was individual rights, judicial processes and natural justice across all sectors (70%) (Figure 37). This was the dominant OPIAD applied by the government sector (71%) and councils sector (60%) in 2015/16 (Figure 40). Reliance on this OPIAD is consistent with all previous years since 2010/11.

At an agency level, the consideration was applied 94% of the time by Roads and Maritime Services (RMS), 74% by the NSW Police Force, 57% by SafeWork NSW, and 56% by the Department of Family and Community Services.

There was a significant increase in the proportion of use of this OPIAD by the RMS in 2015/16 compared with 2014/15 (55%). This was commensurate with a decline in its use of the secrecy OPIAD from 42% in 2014/15 to 0% in 2015/16. The application of the secrecy OPIAD by RMS was highlighted in the 2014/15 Report.

This category of OPIAD contains a broad range of specific considerations, from personal information and privacy through to court proceedings, a fair trial and unsubstantiated allegations. As such, the application of this OPIAD by the NSW Police Force and other agencies could have been related to any of these specific considerations in this category and is likely to reflect the nature of the information held by these agencies.

Figure 40: Percentage distribution of OPIADS applied, by sector, 2010/11 to 2015/16



Note: In some years, certain OPIADS were not applied to received applications across all sectors.

In relation to the personal information consideration, the IPC's [Guideline 4: Personal information as a public interest consideration under the GIPA Act](#) assists agencies to understand what personal information means and how to properly apply the considerations when carrying out the public interest test.

ISSUE HIGHLIGHT: CCTV and other video and audio recordings

In 2015/16, the IPC identified that Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) and other video and audio recordings are an emerging form of information sought by applicants under the GIPA Act. In light of this, CCTV and other video and audio recordings were identified as an area for examination in the Information Commissioner's Regulatory Plan 2016/17.

In particular, some of the common issues raised in the external review of agency decisions by the Information Commissioner include:

- how access to CCTV footage is provided
- availability of technology resources
- cost and time to pixelate footage
- addressing the personal information within the footage.

It is reasonable to expect that there will be an increase in access applications relating to audio visual information as information is increasingly becoming more digitised or captured and held in digital form.

The IPC is working with the State Archives and Records Authority, Department of Finance, Services and Innovation, NSW Office of Local Government, NSW government agencies that receive a high volume of access applications or are likely to hold audio visual information, and other stakeholders that have an interest in the efficient and robust management of digital information. The IPC hosted a round table to collaborate and discuss the opportunities and challenges posed by this issue. The round table will inform the development and publication of regulatory guidance on the release of audio visual information under the GIPA Act.

How were decisions reviewed?

The right of review can be exercised by the original information access applicant or by third parties whose information is the subject of the application.

This section reports on the:

- number of reviews as a percentage as the number of relevant applications – a ‘review rate’
- number of reviews, by type
- composition of reviews, by type.

Figure 41 shows the different pathways available for reviews in the GIPA Act.


‘How were decisions reviewed?’ is reported and measured by the requirement for agencies to report on the number of applications reviewed under Part 5 of the Act in Tables G and H of Schedule 2 of the GIPA Regulation.

The overall review rate for total valid applications was 6%

Using the most reliable sources of data to calculate the total number of reviews, reviews were equivalent to 6% of total valid applications received across all sectors in 2015/16. This is consistent with the review rate of 7% reported in 2014/15.

As shown in Figure 42, data on reviews under the GIPA Act is available from agency reported data and data held by the IPC and published by NCAT.

Figure 41: The relationship between the review pathways in Part 5, GIPA Act



‘How were decisions reviewed?’ is reported and measured by the requirement for agencies to report on the number of applications reviewed under Part 5 of the Act in Tables G and H of Schedule 2 of the GIPA Regulation.

Figure 42: Agency, IPC and NCAT data on internal and external reviews, 2015/16

Review type	A: Agency reported data for all reviews	B: Using agency, IPC and NCAT data
Agency internal review of initial decision	214	214
External review by the Information Commissioner	219	387
Review by NCAT	70	151
Agency internal review/reconsideration following a recommendation by the Information Commissioner	66	66
Total	569	818

Figure 43: Reviews as reported by agencies, 2015/16





Figure 44: Reviews, using agency, IPC and NCAT data, 2015/16




The distribution of reviews across all review avenues as reported by agencies is shown in Figure 43. If the most reliable source for each review avenue is used to calculate the total number of reviews, a total of 818 reviews were conducted. This distribution is shown in Figure 44.

This is a significantly higher number of reviews than reported by agencies, particularly in respect of external reviews by the Information Commissioner.

The discrepancy may be attributed to the completion of reviews this reporting period that were received in the previous financial year. The IPC will continue to engage with agencies across all sectors to examine this discrepancy and improve the reporting of GIPA data.

The proportion of all reviews conducted by the Information Commissioner has increased by 5%. In 2015/16, the review applications to the Information Commissioner represented 47% of all reviews and in 2014/15 they represented 42% of all reviews.

Figure 45: Number of external reviews conducted by the Information Commissioner, 2010/11 to 2015/16




Using IPC data, there has been a rise in the number of external reviews conducted by the Information Commissioner, from 156 in 2010/11 to 387 matters in 2015/16 (Figure 45). In 2014/15, the Information Commissioner conducted 359 external reviews and in 2015/16 the Information Commissioner conducted 387 external reviews. Applying this source data there has been an 8% increase in the number of applications for external review by the Information Commissioner in 2015/16.

Similarly, the 151 review applications reported by NCAT in its 2015/16 Annual Report is significantly higher than the 70 reviews reported by agencies.

For reporting purposes, the remainder of this section uses data reported by agencies to allow for comparison across review avenues, across sectors and to examine changes over time.

Figure 46: Total number of reviews as a percentage of all applications received, by sector, 2010/11 to 2015/16



Review rates have increased significantly in the university and minister sectors and remained steady in other sectors

The percentage of applications for review received by the minister sector as a percentage of all applications to that sector increased significantly to 48% in 2015/16, from 13% in 2014/15.

The percentage of applications for review received by the university sector as a percentage of all applications to that sector also increased significantly to 28% in 2015/16, from 13% in 2014/15.

These two sectors received relatively small numbers of review applications and the changes to numbers result in variable data presentation. These trends will remain under observation to ensure that an appropriate sector specific regulatory response is implemented.

The percentage of applications for review received by the council sector remained consistent with last year at 6% of all applications received by the sector (Figure 46).

Similarly, the percentage of applications for review in 2015/16 for the government sector was 3% of all applications received by the sector and was consistent with 2014/15.

The majority of applications for review were made by the original applicant for information


In 2015/16, 428 (88%) applications for review were made by the original applicant. This is consistent with levels observed in 2014/15 when 87% of applications for review were made by the original applicant. The number of applications made by third party objectors in 2015/16 was 56 (12%) and is consistent with the levels observed in 2014/15 of 58 (13%).

Internal reviews continued to decrease as a percentage of all reviews conducted

Internal reviews represented 38% of all reviews conducted in 2015/16 (Figure 47), compared to 45% of all reviews conducted in 2014/15 and 75% in 2013/14. This is a significant shift in review avenues over the three years of reporting.

This shift is also reflected in the overall rates of internal reviews, equivalent to 1% of total valid applications received across all sectors in 2015/16, compared to 2% in 2014/15.

Figure 47: Internal review as a percentage of all reviews 2010/11 to 2015/16



The proportion of Information Commissioner reviews significantly increased

Using data reported by agencies, external reviews by the Information Commissioner represented 38% of all reviews conducted in 2015/16, an increase from 23% in 2014/15 (Figure 48). However, using the more reliable IPC data, the number and share of reviews that were external reviews by the Information Commissioner rises to 387 and 47% of all reviews conducted.

There was a decline in reviews by NCAT

Reviews by NCAT represented 12% of all reviews conducted in 2015/16 (Figure 49). This is a decline from 2014/15 when NCAT reviews represented 19% of all reviews conducted. While this reflects a decline in the percentage of all reviews conducted by NCAT, it remains elevated compared with the percentages reported between 2010/2011 and 2013/14.

Figure 49: NCAT reviews as a percentage of all reviews, 2010/11 to 2015/16






Figure 48: External reviews by the Information Commissioner as a percentage of all reviews, 2010/11 to 2015/16



Overall, internal and external review outcomes remain consistent

In 2015/16, 54% of all internal and external reviews conducted upheld agencies' decisions. This is consistent with 2014/15 when 53% of reviews upheld agencies' decisions (Figure 50).


Figure 50: Reviews where the decision was upheld as a percentage of all reviews, 2010/11 to 2015/16



Overall there has been a significant decline in the number of internal reviews upholding agencies' decisions

In 2015/16, 45% of all internal reviews upheld agencies' decisions, which is a significant decline from 2014/15 when 56% of internal reviews upheld the decisions (Figure 51). However, these rates remain higher than the reported percentage of outcomes that upheld the agency decisions between 2011/12 and 2013/14.

Figure 51: Internal reviews where the decision was upheld as a percentage of all internal reviews, 2010/11 to 2015/16




There was an increase in the number of Information Commissioner reviews where there was no recommendation to reconsider the decision by the agency

Agencies reported that 60% of reviews by the Information Commissioner in 2015/16 did not result in a recommendation to agencies to reconsider their decisions, an increase from 50% in 2014/15 (Figure 52). This increase to 60% is a return to the levels reported in 2012/13 and 2013/14. The outcomes are also consistent with the outcomes following an NCAT review.

The majority of internal reviews that followed a section 93 recommendation upheld the original decisions of agencies.


Figure 52: Reviews by the Information Commissioner where there was no recommendation to reconsider the decision as a percentage of all reviews by the Information Commissioner, 2010/11 to 2015/16



Agencies reported that in 2015/16, 62% of internal reviews that followed a section 93 GIPA Act recommendation upheld agencies' original decisions. This is a significant increase from 38% in 2014/15 (Figure 53).

The IPC will explore the reasons for this increase in the percentage of agencies that uphold their original decision following a section 93 GIPA Act recommendation, and engage with all sectors to ensure that agencies continue to apply the objects of the GIPA Act in their decision-making.


Figure 53: Percentage of internal reviews following a section 93 recommendation that upheld agencies' original decision, 2010/11 to 2015/16



Reviews by NCAT that upheld agencies' decisions

Agencies reported that 57% of reviews by NCAT upheld agency decisions in 2015/16. This outcome is consistent with the 59% reported in 2014/15 (Figure 54).

Figure 54: Reviews by NCAT where the decision was upheld as a percentage of all reviews by NCAT, 2010/11 to 2015/16



External review by the Information Commissioner of agencies' use of CPOPIADs and OPIADs

The IPC's internal data provides further insight into external reviews by the Information Commissioner in relation to agencies' application of the considerations against disclosure.

The Information Commissioner conducts external reviews that cover a range of different issues that go to the process for dealing with applications and agencies' decisions to provide or refuse access to information.

The proportion of all reviews conducted by the Information Commissioner relating to CPOPIADs was 10% in 2015/16, consistent with the 8% reported in 2014/15.

There was an increase in the proportion of all reviews conducted by the Information Commissioner relating to OPIADs, from 33% in 2014/15 to 45% in 2015/16.

Other issues that were the subject of review by the Information Commissioner include:

- the conduct of searches by agencies
- imposition of fees and charges
- the invalidity of applications
- decisions that the information was not held and decisions that the information was already available to the applicant
- refusals to deal with applications and the requirements to give reasons in a notice of decision.

Reviews regarding these more administrative or mechanical matters can provide insights into the operational and cultural environment in which access decisions are made within agencies. Accordingly, intelligence gathered through conducting these reviews is being collected and analysed to inform the Information Commissioner's forward work program.

CPOPIADs: Legal professional privilege remains the primary CPOPIAD subject of external review by the Information Commissioner

The top three CPOPIADs that were relied on by agencies and were subject to the Information Commissioner's review were:

- legal professional privilege (48%)
- cabinet information (17%)
- care and protection of children (10%).

In 2015/16, care and protection of children was the third most considered CPOPIAD. In 2014/15 excluded information was the third most used CPOPIAD.

CPOPIADs: Over 60% of external reviews by the Information Commissioner of CPOPIADs did not result in a recommendation to agencies to reconsider

In 2015/16, 65% of all the CPOPIADs that were the subject of review by the Information Commissioner did not result in a recommendation to agencies to reconsider the decision. This is consistent with the 66% reported in 2014/15.

The Information Commissioner's findings following a review in respect of the top three CPOPIADs were:

- for reviews of the legal professional privilege consideration, 52% resulted in a recommendation to reconsider the decision
- for reviews of the care and protection of children consideration, 20% resulted in a recommendation that agencies reconsider the decision
- for reviews of the cabinet information consideration, 12% resulted in a recommendation that agencies reconsider the decision.

OPIADs: Individual rights, judicial processes and natural justice was the main OPIAD that was the subject of external review by the Information Commissioner

The top three OPIADs that were relied on by agencies and were subject to the Information Commissioner's review were:

- individual rights, judicial processes and natural justice (39%)
- responsible and effective government (36%)
- business interests of agencies and other persons (13%).

These ranking and percentages are consistent with those reported in 2014/15.

OPIADs: Around 60% of external reviews by the Information Commissioner of OPIADs resulted in a recommendation to agencies to reconsider

In 2015/16, 57% of all the OPIADs that were the subject of review by the Information Commissioner resulted in a recommendation to agencies to reconsider the decision. This is consistent with the 56% reported in 2014/15.

The Information Commissioner's findings following a review in respect of the top three OPIADs were:

- for reviews of the individual rights, judicial processes and natural justice consideration, 52% resulted in a recommendation to agencies to reconsider the decision, compared to 53% in 2014/15
- for reviews of the responsible and effective government consideration, 54% resulted in a recommendation to agencies to reconsider the decision, compared to 53% in 2014/15
- for reviews of the business interests of agencies and other persons consideration, 61% resulted in a recommendation to agencies to reconsider the decision, compared to 65% in 2014/15.

These outcomes demonstrate that there is an opportunity for the IPC to continue to work with agencies to improve their understanding and use of the top three most reviewed OPIADs. This issue will inform the Information Commissioner's forward work program.

ISSUE HIGHLIGHT: IPC produces resources on fees and charges

In 2015/16, the IPC analysed performance data and identified and responded to the need for enhanced guidance to agencies and the public to support improvements in dealing with fees and charges under the GIPA Act. In consultation with stakeholders, the IPC developed and published three resources which are available on the IPC's website:

- [Guideline 2 – Discounting Charges](#) (revised) – to assist agencies to decide whether to reduce processing charges on the grounds that the information is of special benefit to the public generally in accordance with section 66(3) of the GIPA Act.
- [Fact Sheet: GIPA Act fees and charges](#) (revised) – aims to clarify the circumstances in which fees and charges for access to information may be levied, reduced, waived or refunded under the GIPA Act.
- [Fact Sheet: Substantial and unreasonable diversion of agency resources](#) (new) – aims to clarify what may be considered an unreasonable and substantial diversion of resources and what review rights apply if an agency decides to refuse to deal with an access application.
- Importantly, the resources include authority from two recent decisions of the NSW Civil and Administrative Tribunal (NCAT) which were summarised in IPC case notes *Shoebridge v Forestry Corporation [2016] NSWCATAD 93* and *National Tertiary Education Union v Southern Cross University [2015] NSWCATAD 151*.

In *Shoebridge*, NCAT observed:

- Agencies must have regard to guidelines issued by the Information Commissioner in determining whether there is an overriding public interest against disclosure. The Information Commissioner's guidelines on other issues such as fees and charges are helpful aides, but not bound to be considered under section 15(b) of the GIPA Act.
- When considering a statute which is to be construed beneficially in favour of disclosure, there is no requirement for an extraordinary or exceptional benefit to the community at large, but merely something which is different from the ordinary or usual.
- When considering whether information applied for is of a special benefit to the public generally, a decision maker must decide whether he or she is satisfied that there is a benefit that is different from what is ordinary or usual to the general public and thus not merely the private interests of the applicant alone.

In *National Tertiary Education Union*, NCAT determined:

- Processing charges are imposed at the time an application is decided. Communication with an applicant advising estimated processing charges is not a decision to impose processing charges, merely an indication of what the charges are likely to be.
- An agency can apply reductions to the amounts calculated as an advance deposit in terms of sections 65 (financial hardship) and 66 (special public benefit) of the GIPA Act, but that the 50% reductions provided by these sections are not cumulative.

ISSUE HIGHLIGHT: In 2015/16, NCAT affirmed or partly affirmed the majority of agencies' decisions

The IPC examined 50 NCAT cases that were decided and published in 2015/16 to provide further insight into the use of NCAT as a review avenue.

Twelve of the NCAT decisions concerned matters outside the external review function of NCAT under the GIPA Act. Those 12 decisions concerned:

- leave to make an application out of time (five cases). Of these, four were dismissed for want of jurisdiction. None of these applications were the subject of an external review by the Information Commissioner
- approval for the making of access applications in compliance with section 110 orders made by NCAT (three cases)
- orders for contempt. Both applications were dismissed by NCAT (two cases)
- operation of a section 29 certificate under the Children and Young Persons (Care and Protection) Act 1998 (one case)
- reporting of improper conduct under section 112 (one case).

The remaining 38 decisions include seven Appeal Panel decisions. Of the 38 decisions, 30 related to the government sector, five to local councils, and three to universities.

The distribution of decisions across the regulated sectors was consistent with the number of cases for 2014/15, with the government sector representing the largest category.

The grounds of review for the NCAT decisions included:

- 13 decisions (41%) included issues relating to CPOPIADs, of which eight (26%) related to legal professional privilege
- 15 decisions (48%) included issues relating to OPIADs, of which nine (29%) related to personal information and seven (23%) related to prejudice of agency functions
- 11 decisions (35%) related to operational matters, including reasonable searches for information conducted by agencies, processing charges, advance deposits, disclosure logs, creation of new records, refuse to deal because of unreasonable and substantial diversion of resources or previously decided.

The number of cases that were lodged with NCAT and which had been subject of external review by the Information Commissioner was 14%. This is consistent with 2014/15.

All the cases dealt with by NCAT relating to personal information were attributed to the government sector.

In 80% of the cases, NCAT affirmed or partly affirmed the agencies' decision. 48% of cases affirmed the decisions of the agencies and 32% partly affirmed the decision of the agency. This is consistent with the combined outcomes of cases in 2014/15.

In 2015/16, there were seven Appeal Panel cases, an increase from three in 2014/15. Five applications to the Appeal Panel were made by individuals and two were made by an agency.

Of the appeal cases:

- one related to personal information and the Appeal Panel upheld the decision in full
- one related to legal professional privilege and was upheld in part and dismissed in part
- one related to the decision of NCAT not to issue summonses and was upheld
- one related to obtaining confidential information from another government entity, supply of confidential information and exempt documents under interstate freedom of information law which was granted in part and dismissed in part
- two were related to prejudice agency function (conduct, effectiveness or integrity of any audit, investigation or review, found action against agency decision, information provided in confidence, personal information and prejudice professional interests) and were dismissed
- one related to prejudice agency function (conduct of test or investigation, revealing the identify of an informant and prevention, detection or investigation of contravention of law and refuse to confirm or deny that the agency held the requested information). The Appeal Panel affirmed the decision in part and set aside the decision in part, remitting that part of the decision to refuse to confirm or deny back to the agency for reconsideration.

Applications to NCAT for review reflect a higher proportion of applications requiring CPOPIADs than applications made to the Information Commissioner. This may be reflective of the requirement for certainty in determination of these applications and the proper application of judicial guidance.

Similarly, the percentage of applications to the Information Commissioner that necessitate consideration of more administrative or operational aspects of the legislation is higher than the percentage of applications concerning those matters in NCAT. However, the proportion of applications to NCAT remained consistent with the 38% reported in 2014/15.

ISSUE HIGHLIGHT: Good faith under the GIPA Act

In 2015/16, NCAT handed down two significant decisions dealing with section 112 of the GIPA Act, which enables NCAT to refer to the relevant minister any circumstances where an officer of an agency may be thought to have acted inappropriately with respect to his or her functions under the GIPA Act. The decisions were; *Zonneville v Department of Education and Communities [2016] NSWCATAD 49* and *Zonneville v NSW Department of Finance and Services [2016] NSWCATAD 47*.

NCAT confirmed that the object of section 112 of the GIPA Act is to enable the relevant minister to be informed of any circumstances where an officer of an agency may be thought to have acted inappropriately with respect to his or her functions under the GIPA Act. A referral would permit that minister to take appropriate administrative or disciplinary steps and thereby achieve the objects of the GIPA Act and ensure greater compliance with the GIPA Act in the future.

In summary, NCAT found that any referral under section 112 must be made in relation to an “officer of an agency”, not against the agency generally; and the conduct complained about must be a failure “to exercise in good faith a function conferred on the officer by or under the GIPA Act”.

In these decisions, NCAT confirmed that the exercise of good faith requires an honest and conscientious approach, which means that to show the officer lacked good faith the officer’s conduct needs to show more than honest ineptitude. The test of good faith is predominantly a subjective one, however there are some objective components, including any attempt made to respond to the request for information and the level of consideration given to the application for access to information by the agency.

In both cases NCAT found the applicant had failed to demonstrate that the respondent was not honest and conscientious in their approach to the functions conferred under the GIPA Act, and therefore found that action under section 112 of the GIPA Act was not warranted.

ISSUE HIGHLIGHT: Discounting charges under the GIPA Act and guidelines issued by the Information Commissioner

The Information Commissioner has an important role under the GIPA Act to issue guidelines and other publications for the assistance of agencies in the exercise of their functions and for the public in connection with their rights under the GIPA Act. This was noted in the 2015/16 decision of the NCAT in [Shoebridge v Forestry Corporation \[2016\] NSWCATAD 93](#), which confirmed the requirements under section 15(b) of the GIPA Act that agencies must have regard to guidelines issued by the Information Commissioner in determining whether there is an overriding public interest against disclosure.

NCAT also observed that the guidelines issued by the Information Commissioner – *GIPA Guideline 2 Discounting charges* – are “helpful aides”, yet not bound to be considered under section 15(b) of the GIPA Act.

In considering the application of this test, NCAT provided guidance regarding the construction of ‘special benefit’ and ‘the public generally’. NCAT recognised the consistency of interpretation of the ‘public generally’ contained through illustrative examples in the Information Commissioner’s guidance and within existing case law.

In considering the construction of ‘special benefit’ as contained in section 66(1), NCAT observed that the GIPA Act is to be construed beneficially in favour of disclosure. Accordingly, NCAT was satisfied that there is no requirement to construe ‘special’ as having “an extraordinary or exceptional benefit to the community at large, but merely something which is different from the ordinary or usual.”

NCAT concluded that a decision maker, in considering whether the information applied for is of special benefit to the public “must decide whether he or she is satisfied that there is a benefit that is different from what is ordinary or usual to the general public and thus not merely the private interests of the applicant alone”.

NCAT then considered the wording of the guidelines and section 66 of the GIPA Act and the facts of the case. NCAT was satisfied that a ‘special benefit’ was derived by the public generally for a number of reasons. NCAT found that Mr Shoebridge had made out the requirements of section 66(1), and that there should be a 50% reduction in the processing fees and charges to be paid by Mr Shoebridge

The Information Commissioner considered this decision in the review and re-publication of Guideline 2.

Were applications transferred between agencies?

New reporting requirements and a significant increase in reported transfers between agencies

During 2015/16, agencies reported that 601 applications were transferred to another agency (Figure 55). This is a significant increase from the 93 transfers reported in 2014/15.

A contributing factor to this increase may be that agencies' understanding of reporting requirements developed in 2015/16 following an amendment to the GIPA Regulation on 12 December 2014.


Figure 55 shows that the government sector accounted for most transfers, and that most transfers were agency-initiated.

Figure 55: Number of applications that were transferred, by sector and by whether agency or applicant initiated, 2015/16

	Agency initiated transfers	Applicant initiated transfers	Total
Government	563	33	596
Councils	5	0	5
Universities	0	0	0
Ministers	0	0	0
Grand total	568	33	601

In 2015/16, Service NSW accounted for 397, or 66%, of transferred applications. This may be attributable to the increasing recognition and usage by the community of Service NSW as a 'one stop shop' for government services. The second and third highest numbers of transfers were attributed to the Department of Justice, with 35 transferred applications (6%), and the Department of Premier and Cabinet, with 27 transferred applications (5%) (Figure 56).

Figure 56: Distribution of applications transferred, by agency, 2015/16



The inclusion of this reporting requirement and data provides a means of examining the assistance provided by agencies to applicants in upholding their information access obligations. More importantly, it provides a mechanism to facilitate a whole of government citizen-centric approach to information access.

ISSUE HIGHLIGHT: IPC GUIDANCE – Appropriate transfers at the first instance assist in providing information in a timely and efficient manner

An access applicant lodged a complaint with the IPC after difficulties gaining access to information:

- The applicant initially sent their application to a hospital, and it was 'returned to sender'.
- The application was re-submitted and the hospital transferred the application to Justice Health.
- Justice Health in turn forwarded the application to the Local Health District which operates the hospital.
- The applicant did not receive a response from the Local Health District, and so contacted the Information Commissioner.

The Local Health District informed the IPC that the application was intended to be transferred to another agency as the agency that is likely to hold the information requested, but due to an administrative oversight this did not occur.

Section 45(2) of the GIPA Act requires agencies to transfer applications within 10 working days after the application is received. As this had not occurred, the Local Health District was then required to deal with the access application. As it had not done so within the statutory time frame, the Local Health District was deemed to have refused to deal with the application.

Following involvement by the IPC, the Local Health District advised that it would be prepared to make a late decision on the application, and while it did not hold the information, it would provide assistance to the applicant so that an application for access could be directed to the correct agency.

The GIPA Act provides a streamlined process for the transfer of applications and agencies are encouraged to ensure that training and awareness of this statutory provision is elevated to achieve efficiencies in the use of time and resources.

Appendices

Appendix 1

Financial Year 2015 – 2016

Total aggregation of all sectors

Clause 7(a): details of the review carried out by the agency under section 7(3) of the Act during the reporting year and the details of any information made publicly available by the agency as a result of the review

	Reviews carried out by agency	Information made publicly available by the agency
7(a)	155	114

Table A: number of applications by type of applicant and outcome

Type of applicant	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held
Media	159	107	43	74
Members of Parliament	164	105	24	64
Private sector business	723	493	241	122
Not for profit organisations or community groups	94	96	54	70
Members of the public (legal representative)	1252	3153	790	897
Members of the public (other)	1697	1961	543	518
Grand total	4089	5915	1695	1745

Clause 7(b): the total number of access applications received by the agency during the reporting year (including withdrawn applications but not including invalid applications)

	Total number of applications received
7(b)	14,761

Clause 7(c): the total number of access applications received by the agency during the reporting year that the agency refused, either wholly or partly, because the application was for the disclosure of information referred to in Schedule 1 to the Act (information for which there is conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure)

	Total number of applications received
Partly	554
Wholly	275
Grand total	829

	Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm or deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn	Grand total
	5	20	2	51	461
	16	25	0	16	414
	28	28	1	79	1715
	26	19	1	16	376
	172	55	14	191	6524
	102	84	16	240	5161
	349	231	34	593	14,651

Table B: number of applications by type of application and outcome

Type of application	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held
Personal information applications	1597	3791	947	905
Access application (other than personal information applications)	2309	1437	662	652
Access applications that are partly personal information applications and partly other	201	700	73	177
Grand total	4,107	5,928	1,682	1,734

Table C: invalid applications

Reason for invalidity	Number of Applications
Application does not comply with formal requirements (section 41)	1,408
Application is for excluded information of the agency (section 43)	59
Application contravenes restraint order (section 110)	3
Total number of invalid applications received	1451
Invalid applications that subsequently become valid applications	629

Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm or deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn	Grand total
203	42	22	135	7,642
136	162	9	362	5,729
19	24	2	84	1,280
358	228	33	581	14,651

Table D: conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure – matters listed in Schedule 1 to Act

Schedule 1 reasons	Number of times consideration used
Overriding secrecy laws	21
Cabinet information	107
Executive council information	6
Contempt	20
Legal professional privilege	293
Excluded information	171
Documents affecting law enforcement and public safety	34
Transport safety	1
Adoption	2
Care and protection of children	164
Ministerial code of conduct	1
Aboriginal and environmental heritage	0
Grand total	820

Table E: other public interest considerations against disclosure – matters listed in table to section 14 of Act

Other public interest reasons	Number of occasions when application not successful
Responsible and effective government	1,503
Law enforcement and security	641
Individual rights, judicial processes and natural justice	6,318
Business interests of agencies and other persons	577
Environment, culture, economy and general matters	11
Secrecy provisions	25
Exempt documents under interstate Freedom of Information legislation	12
Grand total	9,087

Table F: timeliness

Timeliness	Number of applications
Decided within the statutory time frame (20 days plus any extensions)	12,678
Decided after 35 days (by agreement with applicant)	535
Not decided within time (deemed refusal)	477
Grand total	13,690

Table G: number of applications reviewed under Part 5 of the Act (by type of review and outcome)

Review type	Decision varied	Decision upheld	Grand total
Internal review	118	96	214
Review by Information Commissioner	88	131	219
Internal review following recommendation under section 93 of Act	25	41	66
Review by NCAT	30	40	70
Grand total	261	308	569

Table H: applications for review under Part 5 of the Act (by type of applicant)

Review requested by	Number of applications
Applications by access applicants	56
Applications by persons to whom information the subject of access application relates (see section 54 of the Act)	22
Grand total	78

Table I: applications transferred to other agencies under Division 2, Part 4 of the Act (by type of transfer)

Applications transferred	Number of applications
Agency initiated transfers	568
Applicant initiated transfers	33
Grand total	601

Appendix 2

Financial Year 2015 – 2016 Total aggregation of Government sector

Clause 7(a): details of the review carried out by the agency under section 7(3) of the Act during the reporting year and the details of any information made publicly available by the agency as a result of the review

	Reviews carried out by agency	Information made publicly available by the agency
7(a)	71	51

Table A: number of applications by type of applicant and outcome

Type of applicant	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held
Media	140	84	37	62
Members of Parliament	157	90	24	56
Private sector business	581	431	230	100
Not for profit organisations or community groups	60	86	44	57
Members of the public (legal representative)	956	3,006	780	822
Members of the public (other)	1,229	1,674	452	453
Grand total	3,123	5,371	1,567	1,550

Clause 7(b): the total number of access applications received by the agency during the reporting year (including withdrawn applications but not including invalid applications)

	Total number of applications received
7(b)	12,599

Clause 7(c): the total number of access applications received by the agency during the reporting year that the agency refused, either wholly or partly, because the application was for the disclosure of information referred to in Schedule 1 to the Act (information for which there is conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure)

	Total number of applications received
Partly	448
Wholly	218
Grand total	666

	Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm or deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn	Grand total
	4	18	1	47	393
	13	23	0	13	376
	20	18	0	40	1,420
	21	15	1	14	298
	166	38	13	110	5,891
	78	45	14	131	4,076
	302	157	29	355	12,454

Table B: number of applications by type of application and outcome

Type of application	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held
Personal information applications	1,480	3,733	930	896
Access application (other than personal information applications)	1,548	1043	568	490
Access applications that are partly personal information applications and partly other	101	607	54	162
Grand total	3,129	5,383	1,552	1,548

Table C: invalid applications

Reason for invalidity	Number of Applications
Application does not comply with formal requirements (section 41)	1,305
Application is for excluded information of the agency (section 43)	58
Application contravenes restraint order (section 110)	3
Total number of invalid applications received	1,350
Invalid applications that subsequently become valid applications	565

Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm or deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn	Grand total
200	42	22	122	7,425
95	103	6	177	4,030
10	9	1	55	999
305	154	29	354	12,454

Table D: conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure – matters listed in Schedule 1 to Act

Schedule 1 reasons	Number of times consideration used
Overriding secrecy laws	20
Cabinet information	99
Executive council information	4
Contempt	18
Legal professional privilege	232
Excluded information	165
Documents affecting law enforcement and public safety	15
Transport safety	0
Adoption	2
Care and protection of children	164
Ministerial code of conduct	1
Aboriginal and environmental heritage	0
Grand total	720

Table E: other public interest considerations against disclosure – matters listed in table to section 14 of Act

Other public interest reasons	Number of occasions when application not successful
Responsible and effective government	1,362
Law enforcement and security	607
Individual rights, judicial processes and natural justice	5,921
Business interests of agencies and other persons	474
Environment, culture, economy and general matters	4
Secrecy provisions	20
Exempt documents under interstate Freedom of Information legislation	8
Grand total	8,396

Table F: timeliness

Timeliness	Number of applications
Decided within the statutory time frame (20 days plus any extensions)	10,987
Decided after 35 days (by agreement with applicant)	418
Not decided within time (deemed refusal)	392
Grand total	11,797

Table G: number of applications reviewed under Part 5 of the Act (by type of review and outcome)

Review type	Decision varied	Decision upheld	Grand total
Internal review	104	76	180
Review by Information Commissioner	44	94	138
Internal review following recommendation under section 93 of Act	14	18	32
Review by NCAT	23	30	53
Grand total	185	218	403

Table H: applications for review under Part 5 of the Act (by type of applicant)

Review requested by	Number of applications
Applications by access applicants	2,337
Applications by persons to whom information the subject of access application relates (see section 54 of the Act)	170
Grand total	2,507

Table I: applications transferred to other agencies under Division 2, Part 4 of the Act (by type of transfer)

Applications transferred	Number of applications
Agency initiated transfers	563
Applicant initiated transfers	33
Grand total	596

Appendix 3

Financial Year 2015 – 2016 Total aggregation of Council sector

Clause 7(a): details of the review carried out by the agency under section 7(3) of the Act during the reporting year and the details of any information made publicly available by the agency as a result of the review

	Reviews carried out by agency	Information made publicly available by the agency
7(a)	76	58

Table A: number of applications by type of applicant and outcome

Type of applicant	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held
Media	9	13	2	5
Members of Parliament	2	4	0	0
Private sector business	140	62	11	21
Not for profit organisations or community groups	28	8	5	1
Members of the public (legal representative)	292	146	10	71
Members of the public (other)	446	266	81	55
Grand total	917	499	109	153

Clause 7(b): the total number of access applications received by the agency during the reporting year (including withdrawn applications but not including invalid applications)

	Total number of applications received
7(b)	2,009

Clause 7(c): the total number of access applications received by the agency during the reporting year that the agency refused, either wholly or partly, because the application was for the disclosure of information referred to in Schedule 1 to the Act (information for which there is conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure)

	Total number of applications received
Partly	92
Wholly	56
Grand total	148

	Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm or deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn	Grand total
	1	2	1	3	36
	0	2	0	2	10
	8	10	1	39	292
	1	4	0	1	48
	5	16	1	81	622
	19	36	2	105	1,010
	34	70	5	231	2,018

Table B: number of applications by type of application and outcome

Type of application	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held
Personal information applications	106	50	17	7
Access application (other than personal information applications)	722	367	79	127
Access applications that are partly personal information applications and partly other	98	82	15	13
Grand total	926	499	111	147

Table C: invalid applications

Reason for invalidity	Number of Applications
Application does not comply with formal requirements (section 41)	95
Application is for excluded information of the agency (section 43)	0
Application contravenes restraint order (section 110)	0
Total number of invalid applications received	93
Invalid applications that subsequently become valid applications	60

Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm or deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn	Grand total
2	0	0	12	194
30	58	3	180	1,566
9	12	1	28	258
41	70	4	220	2,018

Table D: conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure – matters listed in Schedule 1 to Act

Schedule 1 reasons	Number of times consideration used
Overriding secrecy laws	1
Cabinet information	0
Executive council information	0
Contempt	1
Legal professional privilege	53
Excluded information	5
Documents affecting law enforcement and public safety	19
Transport safety	1
Adoption	0
Care and protection of children	0
Ministerial code of conduct	0
Aboriginal and environmental heritage	0
Grand total	80

Table E: other public interest considerations against disclosure – matters listed in table to section 14 of Act

Other public interest reasons	Number of occasions when application not successful
Responsible and effective government	106
Law enforcement and security	31
Individual rights, judicial processes and natural justice	364
Business interests of agencies and other persons	87
Environment, culture, economy and general matters	6
Secrecy provisions	5
Exempt documents under interstate Freedom of Information legislation	3
Grand total	602

Table F: timeliness

Timeliness	Number of applications
Decided within the statutory time frame (20 days plus any extensions)	1,588
Decided after 35 days (by agreement with applicant)	89
Not decided within time (deemed refusal)	80
Grand total	1,757

Table G: number of applications reviewed under Part 5 of the Act (by type of review and outcome)

Review type	Decision varied	Decision upheld	Grand total
Internal review	9	16	25
Review by Information Commissioner	31	28	59
Internal review following recommendation under section 93 of Act	8	13	21
Review by NCAT	5	5	10
Grand total	53	62	115

Table H: applications for review under Part 5 of the Act (by type of applicant)

Review requested by	Number of applications
Applications by access applicants	263
Applications by persons to whom information the subject of access application relates (see section 54 of the Act)	37
Grand total	300

Table I: applications transferred to other agencies under Division 2, Part 4 of the Act (by type of transfer)

Applications transferred	Number of applications
Agency initiated transfers	5
Applicant initiated transfers	0
Grand total	5

Appendix 4

Financial Year 2015 – 2016 Total aggregation of Ministerial sector

Clause 7(a): details of the review carried out by the agency under section 7(3) of the Act during the reporting year and the details of any information made publicly available by the agency as a result of the review

	Reviews carried out by agency	Information made publicly available by the agency
7(a)	N/A	N/A

Table A: number of applications by type of applicant and outcome

Type of applicant	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held
Media	2	3	1	2
Members of Parliament	3	7	0	7
Private sector business	2	0	0	1
Not for profit organisations or community groups	1	1	0	0
Members of the public (legal representative)	3	0	0	4
Members of the public (other)	1	2	0	1
Grand total	12	13	1	15

Clause 7(b): the total number of access applications received by the agency during the reporting year (including withdrawn applications but not including invalid applications)

	Total number of applications received
7(b)	42

Clause 7(c): the total number of access applications received by the agency during the reporting year that the agency refused, either wholly or partly, because the application was for the disclosure of information referred to in Schedule 1 to the Act (information for which there is conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure)

	Total number of applications received
Partly	8
Wholly	1
Grand total	9

* Ministers only reported on the total number of wholly or partly refused applications received.

	Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm or deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn	Grand total
	0	0	0	0	8
	3	0	0	1	21
	0	0	0	0	3
	0	0	0	0	2
	1	0	0	0	8
	0	0	0	0	4
	4	0	0	1	46

Table B: number of applications by type of application and outcome

Type of application	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held
Personal information applications	0	1	0	1
Access application (other than personal information applications)	13	12	1	11
Access applications that are partly personal information applications and partly other	2	1	0	0
Grand total	15	14	1	12

Table C: invalid applications

Reason for invalidity	Number of Applications
Application does not comply with formal requirements (section 41)	2
Application is for excluded information of the agency (section 43)	0
Application contravenes restraint order (section 110)	0
Total number of invalid applications received	1
Invalid applications that subsequently become valid applications	0

Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm or deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn	Grand total
0	0	0	0	2
3	0	0	1	41
0	0	0	0	3
3	0	0	1	46

Table D: conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure – matters listed in Schedule 1 to Act

Schedule 1 reasons	Number of times consideration used
Overriding secrecy laws	0
Cabinet information	7
Executive council information	2
Contempt	1
Legal professional privilege	1
Excluded information	1
Documents affecting law enforcement and public safety	0
Transport safety	0
Adoption	0
Care and protection of children	0
Ministerial code of conduct	0
Aboriginal and environmental heritage	0
Grand total	12

Table E: other public interest considerations against disclosure – matters listed in table to section 14 of Act

Other public interest reasons	Number of occasions when application not successful
Responsible and effective government	8
Law enforcement and security	0
Individual rights, judicial processes and natural justice	4
Business interests of agencies and other persons	3
Environment, culture, economy and general matters	1
Secrecy provisions	0
Exempt documents under interstate Freedom of Information legislation	0
Grand total	16

Table F: timeliness

Timeliness	Number of applications
Decided within the statutory time frame (20 days plus any extensions)	30
Decided after 35 days (by agreement with applicant)	8
Not decided within time (deemed refusal)	0
Grand total	38

Table G: number of applications reviewed under Part 5 of the Act (by type of review and outcome)

Review type	Decision varied	Decision upheld	Grand total
Internal review	0	0	0
Review by Information Commissioner	9	1	10
Internal review following recommendation under section 93 of Act	0	9	9
Review by NCAT	0	1	1
Grand total	9	11	20

Table H: applications for review under Part 5 of the Act (by type of applicant)

Review requested by	Number of applications
Applications by access applicants	12
Applications by persons to whom information the subject of access application relates (see section 54 of the Act)	9
Grand total	21

Table I: applications transferred to other agencies under Division 2, Part 4 of the Act (by type of transfer)

Applications transferred	Number of applications
Agency initiated transfers	0
Applicant initiated transfers	0
Grand total	0

Appendix 5

Financial Year 2015 – 2016 Total aggregation of University sector

Clause 7(a): details of the review carried out by the agency under section 7(3) of the Act during the reporting year and the details of any information made publicly available by the agency as a result of the review

	Reviews carried out by agency	Information made publicly available by the agency
7(a)	8	5

Table A: number of applications by type of applicant and outcome

Type of applicant	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held
Media	8	7	3	5
Members of Parliament	2	4	0	1
Private sector business	0	0	0	0
Not for profit organisations or community groups	5	1	5	12
Members of the public (legal representative)	1	1	0	0
Members of the public (other)	21	19	10	9
Grand total	37	32	18	27

Clause 7(b): the total number of access applications received by the agency during the reporting year (including withdrawn applications but not including invalid applications)

	Total number of applications received
7(b)	111

Clause 7(c): the total number of access applications received by the agency during the reporting year that the agency refused, either wholly or partly, because the application was for the disclosure of information referred to in Schedule 1 to the Act (information for which there is conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure)

	Total number of applications received
Partly	6
Wholly	0
Grand total	6

	Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm or deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn	Grand total
	0	0	0	1	24
	0	0	0	0	7
	0	0	0	0	0
	4	0	0	1	28
	0	1	0	0	3
	5	3	0	4	71
	9	4	0	6	133

Table B: number of applications by type of application and outcome

Type of application	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held
Personal information applications	11	7	0	1
Access application (other than personal information applications)	26	15	14	24
Access applications that are partly personal information applications and partly other	0	10	4	2
Grand total	37	32	18	27

Table C: invalid applications

Reason for invalidity	Number of Applications
Application does not comply with formal requirements (section 41)	6
Application is for excluded information of the agency (section 43)	1
Application contravenes restraint order (section 110)	0
Total number of invalid applications received	7
Invalid applications that subsequently become valid applications	4

Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm or deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn	Grand total
1	0	0	1	21
8	1	0	4	92
0	3	0	1	20
9	4	0	6	133

Table D: conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure – matters listed in Schedule 1 to Act

Schedule 1 reasons	Number of times consideration used
Overriding secrecy laws	0
Cabinet information	1
Executive council information	0
Contempt	0
Legal professional privilege	7
Excluded information	0
Documents affecting law enforcement and public safety	0
Transport safety	0
Adoption	0
Care and protection of children	0
Ministerial code of conduct	0
Aboriginal and environmental heritage	0
Grand total	8

Table E: other public interest considerations against disclosure – matters listed in table to section 14 of Act

Other public interest reasons	Number of occasions when application not successful
Responsible and effective government	27
Law enforcement and security	3
Individual rights, judicial processes and natural justice	29
Business interests of agencies and other persons	13
Environment, culture, economy and general matters	0
Secrecy provisions	0
Exempt documents under interstate Freedom of Information legislation	1
Grand total	73

Table F: timeliness

Timeliness	Number of applications
Decided within the statutory time frame (20 days plus any extensions)	73
Decided after 35 days (by agreement with applicant)	20
Not decided within time (deemed refusal)	5
Grand total	98

Table G: number of applications reviewed under Part 5 of the Act (by type of review and outcome)

Review type	Decision varied	Decision upheld	Grand total
Internal review	5	4	9
Review by Information Commissioner	4	8	12
Internal review following recommendation under section 93 of Act	3	1	4
Review by NCAT	2	4	6
Grand total	14	17	31

Table H: applications for review under Part 5 of the Act (by type of applicant)

Review requested by	Number of applications
Applications by access applicants	56
Applications by persons to whom information the subject of access application relates (see section 54 of the Act)	22
Grand total	78

Table I: applications transferred to other agencies under Division 2, Part 4 of the Act (by type of transfer)

Applications transferred	Number of applications
Agency initiated transfers	0
Applicant initiated transfers	0
Grand total	0

Appendix 6

Note on data sources and previous reports

The IPC's annual report on the Operation of the Government Information (Public Access) Act 2009 is based on information submitted by NSW public sector agencies and analysed within the IPC. Data has now been collected for six years, beginning in 2010/11.

For the first four years data was submitted by agencies in a variety of formats and then manually entered into a database within the IPC.

In mid-2015, the IPC introduced a new online GIPA Tool as a way for agencies to manage their applications, provide their annual reports to the IPC and directly upload data.

The data analysed for this report should be considered a snapshot of agencies' compliance as at 25 November 2016 (this is the date when agencies' reported data was downloaded by the IPC from the GIPA Tool). It should be noted that not all agencies had submitted their annual reports to the IPC by this time.

The table on page 101 records any significant changes to previous years' data. A significant change is where the data as at 25 November 2016 varies by more than 5% from previously reported data.

Data updates by agencies may affect historical data and future reports. For example, a number of transferred applications were not reported as applications received when agencies' reported data was downloaded on 25 November 2016. This is being rectified and updated numbers will be reflected in future reports. The IPC will continue to work with agencies to improve data quality.

The annual reporting period for universities is a calendar year. For this report, universities' data is included in the relevant financial year to assist with cross-sector comparability. For example, GIPA data from universities' 2015 annual reporting has been treated as for the 2015/16 financial year.

In this report, data that has been reported aligned with the following sectors:

- government, including state-owned corporations
- councils
- universities
- ministers.

A set of appendices containing all revised data for previous years is available on the IPC's [website](#).

Table: Effect of changes made to previous years' data

Report section	Changes made to previous years' data
Mandatory proactive release of information	No significant changes.
Authorised proactive release of information	No significant changes.
Informal release of information	No significant changes.
How many applications were lodged?	No significant changes.
Invalid applications	No significant changes.
Who applied?	No significant changes.
What information was asked for?	No significant changes.
Did applicants get what they asked for?	No significant changes.
How quickly were decisions made?	No significant changes.
How was the public interest test applied?	No significant changes.
How were decisions reviewed?	Additional data supplied by agencies after the submission date for last year's report resulted in a slight increase in the number of reviews reported in 2014/15.
Were applications transferred between agencies?	<p>There was an increase in the number of applications reported by agencies as transferred from 75 to 93.</p> <p>This is the result of a reported increase of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • agency-initiated transfers from 67 to 76 • applicant-initiated transfers from 8 to 17.

Appendix 7

The Legislative Framework

Government Information (Public Access) Act 2009 (GIPA Act)


The object of the GIPA Act is to maintain and advance a system of responsible and representative government that is open, accountable, fair and effective by:

- authorising and encouraging the proactive public release of government information by agencies
- giving members of the public an enforceable right to access government information
- ensuring that access to government information is restricted only when there is an overriding public interest against disclosure.

The GIPA Act applies to government departments and agencies, state-owned corporations, local councils, ministers and their staff, and universities.

The guiding principle of the GIPA Act is to make information more accessible to the public and the GIPA Act embodies the general presumption that the disclosure of information is in the public interest unless there is a strong case to the contrary.

The GIPA Act outlines four information release pathways:



1. Mandatory proactive release

The mandatory proactive release of information is one of the GIPA Act's four pathways for information release and access. Through this pathway, the GIPA Act requires NSW public sector agencies to release a prescribed set of information to the public, known as open access information. This information must be made publicly available online and free of charge. Open access information of minister may be made available on the website of the relevant department.

The benefit of mandatory proactive release is that the pathway ensures that a minimum, consistent set of information is freely available to the public, which is regularly reviewed and updated to maintain relevance and currency. Mandatory proactive release is an important vehicle to achieve better service delivery through information access, transparency and increased citizen input to government policy and service delivery.

2. Authorised proactive release

The GIPA Act authorises and encourages agencies to make information available unless there is an overriding public interest against disclosure.

Agencies (except ministers) are required under the GIPA Act to, at least annually, review their program for the proactive release of information and identify additional kinds of information that should be made publicly available. These agency reviews are not merely a reporting obligation. They provide the tool to drive the continuous release of information under this pathway. This information can be made publicly available in any manner that the agency considers appropriate either free or at the lowest reasonable cost.

Through this pathway, agencies have a responsibility to promote policies and practices that ensure as much information as possible is made publicly available.

The aim of proactive release is to maximise the amount of information that is released by agencies. This requires creating a culture where information release is a matter of course. The proactive release of information has many benefits, including a more informed community that is better able to engage and influence the development and delivery of services, agency operations and broader policy and community debates.

3. Informal release

The GIPA Act enables agencies to release government information in response to an informal request for information, unless there is an overriding public interest against disclosure.

This pathway promotes the transition to a system which will result in the general release of government information.

4. Formal access applications

The GIPA Act provides citizens with a right to apply for and access most government information, unless there is an overriding public interest against disclosure (section 9). The GIPA Act outlines a formal process that must be followed by applicants and agencies. The steps for applicants include:

- putting an application in writing
- stating that the application is seeking information under the GIPA Act
- including a postal address in Australia
- explaining clearly the information that is being requested
- paying an application fee of \$30.

Agencies must assess each application that is received. For valid access applications, agencies must apply the public interest balancing test and consider the factors for and against the disclosure of the information that is being requested.

The main benefits of the formal access pathway are that:

- the right to seek access is legally enforceable
- agencies are not subject to the direction or control of any minister in the exercise of the agency's functions when dealing with an access application
- agencies must apply the public interest balancing test and consult with third parties to whom the information relates
- applicants have a right to seek review of an agency's decision about the application through an internal review by the agency, an external review by the Information Commissioner or an external review by NCAT.

Section 125 of the Act requires agencies to report to Parliament annually on their obligations under the GIPA Act, including reporting on GIPA data. This mandated information is set out in clause 7 (a), (b), (c) and (d) of the *Government Information (Public Access) Regulation 2009* (the Regulation). Schedule 2 of the Regulation sets out the prescribed form for Clause 7(d) reporting through Tables A – I.

Government Information (Public Access) Regulation 2009

The GIPA Regulation:

- prescribes additional open access information that local authorities, Ministers, departments and statutory bodies must make publicly available
- sets out the statistical information regarding formal applications that agencies must include in their annual reports
- in the case of an access application relating to a school, extends the period in which the application must be decided if the usual 20-day period for deciding the application occurs during the school holidays
- specifies the corresponding access to information laws of other Australian jurisdictions under which information may be exempt (this is a relevant public interest consideration against disclosure under section 14)
- declares certain bodies to be public authorities for the purpose of the GIPA Act
- declares certain entities to be sub-agencies and parent agencies for the purpose of access applications
- provides that records held by the Audit Office or the Ombudsman's Office that were originally created or received by another agency are taken to be held by the original agency.

Government Information (Information Commissioner) Act 2009

The system of public access to information is overseen by the Information Commissioner, established under the *Government Information (Information Commissioner) Act 2009*.

Under the GIIC Act the Information Commissioner's role includes:

- promoting public awareness and understanding of the Act
- providing information, advice, assistance and training to agencies and the public
- dealing with complaints about agencies
- investigating agencies' systems, policies and practices
- reporting on compliance with the Act.

Under section 37 of the GIIC Act, the Information Commissioner is required to provide an annual report to Parliament on "the operation of the *Government Information (Public Access) Act 2009*, generally, across all agencies".

This report fulfils the Information Commissioner's obligation in this regard.



information and
privacy commission

new south wales

www.ipc.nsw.gov.au

Level 17, 201 Elizabeth Street, Sydney 2000

GPO Box 7011, Sydney NSW 2001

1800 IPC NSW (1800 472 679)

Fax: (02) 8114 3756

ipcinfo@ipc.nsw.gov.au

www.ipc.nsw.gov.au

Our business hours are 9am to 5pm
Monday to Friday (excluding public holidays)



information
and privacy
commission
new south wales