



18 December 2018

[Redacted]

In reply please quote:

FOI Request: FA 17/10/00234

File Number: ADF2017/104888

Dear [Redacted]

Freedom of Information (FOI) request - Access Revised Decision

The purpose of this letter is to provide you with a revised decision on your request for access to documents under the *Freedom of Information Act 1982* (the FOI Act).

The former Department of Immigration and Border Protection (DIBP) received your request for access to documents on 4 October 2017 and made a decision to refuse access within the scope of the request on 3 November 2017. On 3 November 2017 you requested an Information Commissioner review of the former DIBP's decision under section 54L of the FOI Act.

On 20 December 2017 the Home Affairs Portfolio, including the Department of Home Affairs, was formally established. The Department of Home Affairs includes the entirety of the Department of Immigration and Border Protection, the Australian Border Force and the Office of Transport Security from within the Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development. It also includes specific functions from the Attorney-General's Department, the Department of Social Services and the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet.

As such a decision has now been made on your request by the Department of Home Affairs (the Department).

1 Scope of request

You have requested access to the following document:

'All correspondence between the former chief surgeon of the ABF John Brayley and the secretary of the department Michael Pezzullo in August and September 2017.'

2 Authority to make decision

I am an officer authorised under section 23 of the FOI Act to make decisions in respect of requests to access document or to amend or annotate records.

3 Relevant material

In reaching my decision I referred to the following:

- the terms of your request
- the document relevant to the request
- the FOI Act
- Guidelines published by the Office of the Information Commissioner under section 93A of the FOI Act (the FOI Guidelines)
- the Department's guidance material on the FOI Act
- the preliminary view issued by the Office of the Australian Information Commissioner on 9 November 2018
- your submissions made to the Office of the Australian Information Commissioner during the course of the Information Commissioner review
- advice from Departmental officers with responsibility for matters relating to the document to which you sought access

4 Document in scope of request

The Department has identified one document as falling within the scope of your request. This document was in the possession of the Department on 4 October 2017 when your request was received.

5 Decision

Section 55G of the FOI Act allows for a revocation or variation of an access refusal decision during a review by the Information Commissioner:

55G Procedure in IC review—revocation or variation of access refusal decision

*(1) An agency or Minister may vary (or set aside and substitute) an access refusal decision (the **original** decision) in relation to a request or an application under section 48 at any time during an IC review of the access refusal decision if the variation or substitution (the **revised** decision) would have an effect of:*

- (a) giving access to a document in accordance with the request; or*
- (b) relieving the IC review applicant from liability to pay a charge; or*
- (c) requiring a record of personal information to be amended or annotated in accordance with the application.*

Note: When making the revised decision, a consultation requirement under section 26A (documents affecting Commonwealth-State relations etc.), 26AA (documents affecting Norfolk Island intergovernmental relations), 27 (business documents) or 27A (documents affecting personal privacy) may apply.

(2) If an agency or Minister varies (or sets aside and substitutes) an access refusal decision under subsection (1):

- (a) the agency or Minister must, in writing, notify the Information Commissioner as soon as practicable after the agency or Minister makes the variation or substitution; and*
- (b) the Information Commissioner must deal with the IC review application for review of the original decision as if it were an IC review application for the review of the varied or substituted decision, subject otherwise to this Part.*

I have reviewed the document that falls within the scope of this request and I have considered the submissions made by you in relation to your reasons for requesting Information Commissioner Review.

I have now made a revised decision under section 55G(1)(a).

The decision in relation to the document in the possession of the Department which fall within the scope of your request is as follows:

- Release one document in part with exempt and irrelevant material deleted.

6 Reasons for Decision

Detailed reasons for my decision are set out below.

6.1 Section 22 of the FOI Act – irrelevant to request

Section 22 of the FOI Act provides that if giving access to a document would disclose information that would reasonably be regarded as irrelevant to the request, it is possible for the Department to prepare an edited copy of the document, modified by deletions, ensuring that the edited copy would not disclose any information that would reasonably be regarded as irrelevant to the request.

On 6 October 2017, the Department advised you that its policy is to exclude the personal details of officers not in the Senior Executive Service (SES), as well as the mobile and work telephone numbers of SES staff, contained in documents that fall within scope of an FOI request.

I have therefore decided that parts of document marked 's22(1)(a)(ii)' would disclose information that could reasonably be regarded as irrelevant to your request, and have therefore prepared an edited copy of the document, with the irrelevant material deleted pursuant to section 22(1)(a)(ii) of the FOI Act.

The remainder of the document has been considered for release to you as it is relevant to your request.

6.2 Section 47C of the FOI Act – Deliberative Processes

Section 47C of the FOI Act provides that a document is conditionally exempt if its disclosure would disclose 'deliberative matter'. Deliberative matter includes opinion, advice or recommendation obtained, prepared or recorded, or consultation or deliberation that has taken place, in the deliberative processes of an agency. 'Deliberative processes' have previously been described as 'the process of reflection, for example, upon the wisdom and expediency of a proposal, a particular decision or a course of action.'¹

¹ See *JE Waterford and Department of Treasury (No 2)* [1984] AATA 67.

Part of the document marked 's47C' contains Dr Brayley's personal opinion of a matter relating to the functions of the Department that was subject to deliberation in a form of verbal discussions. The opinion of Dr Brayley does not form part of a decision or conclusion that was reached at the end of any deliberative process undertaken by the Department. Additionally, the information does not fall within any of the exclusions in subsections 47C(2) and (3) of the FOI Act.

I have decided that the information is conditionally exempt under section 47C of the FOI Act. Access to a conditionally exempt document must generally be given unless it would be contrary to the public interest to do so. I have turned my mind to whether disclosure of the information would be contrary to the public interest, and have included my reasoning in that regard below.

6.3 Section 47F of the FOI Act – Personal Privacy

Section 47F of the FOI Act provides that a document is conditionally exempt if its disclosure under the FOI Act would involve the unreasonable disclosure of personal information of any person. 'Personal information' means information or an opinion about an identified individual, or an individual who is reasonably identifiable, whether the information or opinion is true or not, and whether the information or opinion is recorded in a material form or not (see s 4 of the FOI Act and s 6 of the *Privacy Act 1988*).

I consider that disclosure of the information marked 's47F' in the document would disclose personal information relating to third parties. The material in question contains personal information about individual transferees and refugees subject to offshore processing. The information either directly identifies the individuals in question or is of such a specific nature that it would enable the person to be identified, particularly by other transferees or refugees in the country in question.

Additionally, some of the information marked with 's47F' contains Dr John Brayley's personal mobile number.

The FOI Act states that, when deciding whether the disclosure of the personal information would be 'unreasonable', I must have regard to four factors set out in s.47F(2) of the FOI Act. I have therefore considered each of these factors below:

- *the extent to which the information is well known;*
- *whether the person to whom the information relates is known to be (or to have been) associated with the matters dealt with in the document;*
- *the availability of the information from publicly available resources;*
- *any other matters that I consider relevant.*

The information relating to the third parties is not well known and would only be known to a limited group of people in the Department with a business need to know. As this information is only known to a limited group of people, the individuals concerned are not generally known to be associated with the matters discussed in the document.

In addition, I have taken into account the sensitivity of the information, in the case of transferees and refugees the disclosure of the information would further disclose that:

- the people in question were subject to regional processing
- they are likely to have made claims for protection
- the information relates to their health conditions and medical treatment.

I am satisfied that the release of this information would involve an unreasonable disclosure of personal information about these individuals.

I have decided that the information referred to above is conditionally exempt under section 47F of the FOI Act. Access to a conditionally exempt document must generally be given unless it would be contrary to the public interest to do so. I have turned my mind to whether disclosure of the information would be contrary to the public interest, and have included my reasoning in that regard below.

6.4 The public interest – section 11A of the FOI Act

As I have decided that parts of the document are conditionally exempt, I am now required to consider whether access to the conditionally exempt information would be contrary to the public interest (section 11A of the FOI Act).

A part of a document which is conditionally exempt must also meet the public interest test in section 11A(5) before an exemption may be claimed in respect of that part.

In summary, the test is whether access to the conditionally exempt part of the document would be, on balance, contrary to the public interest.

In applying this test, I have noted the objects of the FOI Act and the importance of the other factors listed in section 11B(3) of the FOI Act, being whether access to the document would do any of the following:

- (a) promote the objects of this Act (including all the matters set out in sections 3 and 3A);*
- (b) inform debate on a matter of public importance;*
- (c) promote effective oversight of public expenditure;*
- (d) allow a person to access his or her own personal information.*

Having regard to the above:

- I am satisfied that access to the document would promote the objects of the FOI Act.
- I consider that the subject matter of the document does have the character of public importance and that there may be broad public interest in the document.
- I consider that no insights into public expenditure will be provided through examination of the exempt material.
- I am satisfied that you do not require access to the document in order to access your own personal information.

Disclosure of the exempt material would not provide a person with sufficient information to assess the rigour or efficiencies of internal decision making processes within the Department, promote scrutiny of government decision making or reveal the reasoning for a government decision. I consider these considerations as neutral.

I have also considered the following factors that weigh against the release of the conditionally exempt information in the document:

- Disclosure of the conditionally exempt information under **section 47C** could reasonably be expected to prejudice the management functions of the Department, specifically the capacity of senior departmental officers to share their opinion and develop high level advice in the course of formulating policy and making decisions.
- Disclosure of the personal information which is conditionally exempt under **section 47F** of the FOI Act could reasonably be expected to prejudice the protection of those individuals' right to privacy.
- The Department is committed to complying with its obligations under the *Privacy Act 1988*, which sets out standards and obligations that regulate how the Department must handle and manage personal information. It is firmly in the public interest that the Department uphold the rights of individuals to their own privacy and meets its obligations under the Privacy Act. I consider that this factor weighs heavily against disclosure of the personal information contained within the document.

I have also had regard to section 11B(4) which sets out the factors which are irrelevant to my decision, which are:

- a) access to the document could result in embarrassment to the Commonwealth Government, or cause a loss of confidence in the Commonwealth Government;*
- b) access to the document could result in any person misinterpreting or misunderstanding the document;*
- c) the author of the document was (or is) of high seniority in the agency to which the request for access to the document was made;*
- d) access to the document could result in confusion or unnecessary debate.*

I have not taken into account any of those factors in this decision.

Upon balancing all of the above relevant public interest considerations, I have concluded that the disclosure of the conditionally exempt information in the documents is not in the public interest and therefore exempt from disclosure under the FOI Act.

7 Legislation

A copy of the FOI Act is available at <https://www.legislation.gov.au/Details/C2017C00251>. If you are unable to access the legislation through this website, please contact our office for a copy.

8 Your Review Rights

Internal Review

If you disagree with this decision, you have the right to apply for an internal review by the Department of this decision. Any request for internal review must be provided to the Department within 30 days of you being notified of the decision. Where possible please attach reasons why you believe a review of the decision is necessary. The internal review will be carried out by an officer other than the original decision maker and the Department must make a review decision within 30 days.

Applications for review should be sent to:

By email to: foi.reviews@homeaffairs.gov.au

OR

By mail to:
Freedom of Information Section

PO Box 25
BELCONNEN ACT 2617

Review by the Office of the Australian Information Commissioner

You may apply directly to the Office of the Australian Information Commissioner (OAIC) for a review of this decision. You must apply in writing within 60 days of this notice. For further information about review rights and how to submit a request for a review to the OAIC, please see Fact Sheet 12 "Freedom of information – Your review rights", available online at <http://www.oaic.gov.au/freedom-of-information/foi-reviews>.

9 Making a Complaint

You may complain to the Australian Information Commissioner about action taken by the Department in relation to your request.

Your enquiries to the Australian Information Commissioner can be directed to:

Phone 1300 363 992 (local call charge)

Email enquiries@oaic.gov.au

There is no particular form required to make a complaint to the Australian Information Commissioner. The request should be in writing and should set out the grounds on which it is considered that the action taken in relation to the request should be investigated and identify the as the relevant agency.

10 Contacting the FOI Section

Should you wish to discuss this decision, please do not hesitate to contact the FOI Section at foi.reviews@homeaffairs.gov.au.



**Authorised Decision Maker
Department of Home Affairs**