

Australian Government

Department of Home Affairs

18 September 2019

In reply please quote:

 FOI Request:
 FA 19/08/01430

 File Number:
 OBJ2019/47646

Freedom of Information (FOI) request - Access Decision

On 22 August 2019, the Department of Home Affairs (the Department) received a request for access to documents under the *Freedom of Information Act 1982* (the FOI Act).

The purpose of this letter is to provide you with a decision on your request for access under the FOI Act.

1 Scope of request

You have requested access to the following documents:

File ADF2018/224879 STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT AND GOVERNANCE - Policy Framework - 2018 September - update to labour agreement policy and processing framework.

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 documents or to amend or annotate records.

3 Relevant material

In reaching my decision I referred to the following:

- the terms of your request
- the FOI Act
- Guidelines published by the Office of the Information Commissioner under section 93A of the FOI Act (the FOI Guidelines)

4 Documents in scope of request

The Department identified two document relevant to your request. The documents existed in the possession of the Department on 22 August 2019 when your FOI request was received.

Document 2 consists of a draft of Labour Agreements - Procedural Instruction. The final copy of this document is available on the <u>LEGENDcom</u> online database.

Attachment A is a schedule which describes the relevant documents and sets out my decision in relation to each of them.

5 Decision

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

- Release one document in full
- Release one document in part with deletions

6 Reasons for Decision

Detailed reasons for my decision are set out below.

Where the schedule of documents indicates an exemption claim has been applied to a document or part of document, my findings of fact and reasons for deciding that the exemption provision applies to that information 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 23 August 2019, 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 22 of the FOI Act – deletion of exempt material

I have decided to prepare an edited copy of the document. The grounds upon which the edited copy of this document has been prepared is set out in the Schedule of Documents.

6.3 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 relating to the deliberative processes involved in the functions of the Department.

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' generally involves "the process of weighing up or evaluating competing arguments or considerations"¹ and the 'thinking processes –the process of reflection, for example, upon the wisdom and expediency of a proposal, a particular decision or a course of action.'²

The document contains deliberative material relating to the deliberative processes involved in the functions of Department, being Designated Area Migration Agreement (DAMA) negotiations, which did not come into effect. I am satisfied that this deliberative matter relates to a process that was undertaken within government to consider whether and how to make or implement a decision, revise or prepare a policy, administer or review a program, or some similar activity.³

Section 47C(2) provides that "deliberative matter" does not include purely factual material. I have had regard to the fact that "purely factual material" does not extend to factual material that is an integral part of the deliberative content and purpose of a document, or is embedded in or intertwined with the deliberative content such that it is impractical to excise it.⁴ A factual summary prepared to aid a complex issue may be classed as purely factual material, but may also be of a character as to disclose a process of section involving opinion, advice or recommendation. As such, a conclusion which involves a deliberative process may well prevent material from being purely factual⁵.

I am further satisfied that the factors set out in subsection (3) do not apply in this instance.

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

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

As I have decided that parts of the documents 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).

¹ Dreyfus and Secretary Attorney-General's Department (Freedom of information) [2015] AATA 962 [18]

² JE Waterford and Department of Treasury (No 2) [1984] AATA 67

 ³ Dreyfus and Secretary Attorney-General's Department (Freedom of information) [2015] AATA 962
 ⁴ Dreyfus and Secretary Attorney General's Department (Freedom of information) [2015] AATA 962

Dreyfus and Secretary Attorney-General's Department (Freedom of information) [2015] AATA 962 [18]

⁵ Harris v Australian Broadcasting Corporation and Others (1984) 1 FCR 150

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 documents would promote the objects of the FOI Act.
- I consider that the subject matter of the documents does not seem to have the character of public importance. The matter has a very limited scope and, in my view, would be of interest to a very narrow section of the public.
- I consider that no insights into public expenditure will be provided through examination of the documents.
- I am satisfied that you do not require access to the documents in order to access your own personal information.

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

 disclosure of the conditionally exempt information under section 47C could reasonably be expected to prejudice the ability of the Department to manage future deliberations in relation to the Designated Area Migration Agreement (DAMA) negotiations. I consider that this would be contrary to the public interest and that this factor weighs strongly against disclosure.

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 would be contrary to the public interest and it is therefore exempt from disclosure under the FOI Act.

7 Legislation

A copy of the FOI Act is available at <u>https://www.legislation.gov.au/Series/C2004A02562</u>. 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 Department of Home Affairs 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 <u>https://www.oaic.gov.au/freedom-of-information/foi-review-process</u>.

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 <u>enquiries@oaic.gov.au</u>

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 Department of Home Affairs 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@homeaffairs.gov.au.

Authorised Decision Maker Department of Home Affairs

ATTACHMENT A

SCHEDULE OF DOCUMENTS REQUEST UNDER FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 1982

FOI request: FA 19/08/01430 **File Number**: OBJ2019/47646

No	Date of document		Description	Decision on release	
1.	28/09/2019	19	Ministerial submission and attachments	Release in part	22(1)(a)(ii)
2.	X/09/2019	47	Draft Labour Agreement Procedural Instruction	Release in full	