



Decision and Reasons for Decision

Citation:	<i>M69 and Queensland Ombudsman; U15 (Third Party) [2025] QICmr 16 (26 March 2025)</i>
Application Number:	317908
Applicant:	M69
Respondent:	Queensland Ombudsman
Third Party:	U15
Decision Date:	26 March 2025
Catchwords:	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW - RIGHT TO INFORMATION - REFUSAL OF ACCESS - CONTRARY TO PUBLIC INTEREST INFORMATION – recruitment information – personal information – accountability and transparency – inquiry into possible deficiencies in conduct – fair treatment – whether disclosure would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest – section 47(3)(b) and section 49 of the <i>Right to Information Act 2009</i> (Qld)

REASONS FOR DECISION

Summary

1. The applicant applied¹ to the Queensland Ombudsman (**Ombudsman**) under the *Right to Information Act 2009* (Qld) (**RTI Act**) for access to documents concerning the selection process and recruitment by the Ombudsman of a named individual (**the third party**). The applicant was an unsuccessful candidate in the recruitment process. The information sought included the selection report, the written application and curriculum vitae (**CV**) submitted by the successful candidate, selection panel records, the shortlisting assessment, interview questions and referee reports.
2. In its initial decision,² the Ombudsman located various documents, and it decided to release some of these (in whole or part), and to refuse access to others, on the ground their disclosure would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest.³
3. The applicant applied⁴ to the Ombudsman for internal review on the basis that some of the information should not have been refused and contested the adequacy of the Ombudsman's searches for documents relevant to the request. The Ombudsman informed the applicant that considerable further documents had been located. The Ombudsman however did not make a decision within the statutory timeframe and therefore a deemed decision affirming the original decision was made.⁵

¹ Application dated 27 October 2023, made compliant on 2 November 2023.

² Decision dated 2 January 2024.

³ Section 47(3)(b) of the RTI Act.

⁴ Application dated 30 January 2024.

⁵ On 28 February 2024.

4. The applicant applied⁶ to the Office of the Information Commissioner (**OIC**) for external review of the Ombudsman's decision. Significant further documents were released to the applicant during the external review process.
5. In terms of the remaining information in issue, for the reasons set out below, I affirm the Ombudsman's decision to refuse access to this information on the ground that its disclosure would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest.

Background

6. During the review, OIC sought the views of a third party as to possible disclosure of information, and the third party was joined as a participant.
7. Substantial procedural steps relating to the external review are set out in the Appendix.
8. In making my decision in this external review, I have considered the applicant's submissions to the extent they are relevant to the issues for determination in the context of this external review.

Reviewable decision

9. The decision under review is the deemed internal review decision the Ombudsman is taken to have made⁷ affirming the original decision of 2 January 2024.⁸

Evidence considered

10. Evidence, submissions, legislation and other material considered in reaching this decision are included in this decision (including footnotes and Appendix).
11. In making this decision I have had regard to the *Human Rights Act 2019* (Qld) (**HR Act**), particularly the applicant's right to seek and receive information.⁹ I consider a decision-maker will be '*respecting and acting compatibly with*' that right, and others prescribed in the HR Act, when applying the law prescribed in the RTI Act.¹⁰ I have acted in this way in making this decision, in accordance with section 58(1) of the HR Act.

Information in Issue

12. A significant amount of further documents were released to the applicant during the external review process¹¹ and additional information, initially refused in the Ombudsman's decision, was also released. The applicant agreed to narrow the issues for determination in the external review to the refusal of the successful candidate's selection criteria responses and CV.¹²
13. The third party was consulted and initially objected to the release of their personal information but then, in an effort to informally resolve this matter, ultimately agreed to the

⁶ Application dated 24 March 2024.

⁷ On 28 February 2024.

⁸ Section 83(2) of the RTI Act.

⁹ Section 21 of the HR Act.

¹⁰ *XYZ v Victoria Police (General)* [2010] VCAT 255 (16 March 2010) (**XYZ**) at [573]; *Horrocks v Department of Justice (General)* [2012] VCAT 241 (2 March 2012) at [111]. I further note that OIC's approach to the HR Act set out in this paragraph was considered and endorsed by the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal in *Lawrence v Queensland Police Service* [2022] QCATA 134 at [23] (where Judicial Member McGill saw 'no reason to differ' from our position).

¹¹ In excess of 2450 pages of documents were located by the Ombudsman and were released to the applicant on 11 June 2024.

¹² Via email correspondence dated 22 August 2024.

release of *some* information. The applicant was given the opportunity to access this further information *via inspection*.¹³ Given the availability of this particular information to the applicant¹⁴, it is no longer in issue for the purpose of this decision.

14. The applicant contests the refusal of the remaining information. This remaining **information in issue** comprises:

- the successful candidate's selection criteria responses; and
- segments of the successful candidate's (CV) that remain undisclosed.

Issue for determination

15. The sole issue for determination on external review is whether access to the information in issue would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest.

Relevant law

16. Under section 23 of the RTI Act, a person has a right to be given access to government held documents. However, this right is subject to a number of exclusions and limitations including grounds for refusal of access. These grounds are contained in section 47 of the RTI Act.
17. The RTI Act identifies many factors that may be relevant to deciding the balance of the public interest and explains the steps a decision maker must take in deciding the public interest as follows:
- identify any irrelevant factors and disregard them
 - identify relevant public interest factors favouring disclosure and nondisclosure
 - balance the relevant factors favouring disclosure and nondisclosure; and
 - decide whether disclosing the information would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest.

Findings

Irrelevant factors

18. The applicant submitted¹⁵ that the Ombudsman took into consideration irrelevant factors to reach its decision instead of disregarding them in accordance with section 49(3) of the RTI Act – specifically, that disclosure of the information could reasonably be expected to cause embarrassment to the government or loss of confidence in the Government¹⁶ and that the person who created the document containing the information was or is of high seniority within the agency.¹⁷
19. External review by the Information Commissioner is a merits review process of government decisions about access to, and amendment of, documents. In conducting this review and reaching this decision I have disregarded the irrelevant factors stated in schedule 4, part 1 of the RTI Act. I have followed the steps prescribed in section 49 of the RTI Act, and also adhered to both the RTI Act's pro-disclosure bias¹⁸ and

¹³ In accordance with section 68(4) of the RTI Act. The third party claimed copyright over their job application material and consequently, access to a redacted copy of the CV was made available via inspection.

¹⁴ Letter dated 18 November 2024 and email correspondence sent on 12 and 13 March 2025.

¹⁵ Application for external review dated 24 March 2024.

¹⁶ Schedule 4, part 1, item 1 of the RTI Act.

¹⁷ Schedule 4, part 1, item 4 of the RTI Act.

¹⁸ Section 44 of the RTI Act.

Parliament's intention that grounds for refusing access to information be interpreted narrowly.¹⁹

Factors favouring disclosure

20. There is a general public interest in promoting access to government-held information.²⁰ Disclosure of material relied on by a candidate for a senior public sector position could reasonably be expected to:
 - promote open discussion of public affairs and enhance the Government's accountability;²¹ and
 - reveal the reason for a government decision and any background or contextual information that informed the decision.²²
21. The public interest in accountability and transparency²³ arises given the recruitment was for a publicly funded position to provide services to the public. In these circumstances, the public is entitled to background and contextual information about recruitment decisions.
22. In this case, a considerable amount of information has already been released to the applicant which includes²⁴:
 - background information regarding the requirements and need for the advertised position, services to be provided by the position and the type and level of knowledge necessary to perform in the position
 - a copy of the selection report comprising:
 - background information
 - comparative merit assessment findings
 - overview of the training experience, work test, interview answers, technical proficiency and overall assessment of the successful applicant
 - comments from referees for the successful applicant
 - the outcome of the assessment
 - a summary of the successful candidate's work test results and interview responses, job experience, qualifications, merits and selection criteria responses; and
 - panel member individual shortlisting feedback for the successful candidate and the applicant.
23. Amongst the released information, the applicant has been given access to the panel's shortlisting assessment document which included an assessment and evaluation of the applicant and successful candidate's job applications.²⁵ Comments regarding work experience, training, education and management experience were included by the panel members and such information has been released to the applicant. Further, as part of this external review, having conducted an assessment of the information in issue, it was the OIC's view that *some* information contained in the successful candidate's CV, particularly work titles, dates, employment, training and education history, was suitable

¹⁹ Section 47(2)(a) of the RTI Act.

²⁰ Implicit in the object of the RTI Act.

²¹ Schedule 4, part 2, item 1 of the RTI Act. The Information Commissioner and predecessors have previously recognised the existence of public interest considerations favouring disclosure of information that will, as here, 'enhance the accountability of ...[agencies] for adherence to merit and equity principles in job selection processes' (Antony at [47].)

²² Schedule 4, part 2, item 11 of the RTI Act.

²³ Schedule 4, part 2, Item 1 of the RTI Act.

²⁴ Relevantly the applicant excluded from the scope of the application information about unsuccessful applicants. This was confirmed on correspondence from applicant to Ombudsman on 06 November 2023 as part of processing the initial access application.

²⁵ Document titled "Panel member feedback" released by the Ombudsman with the initial decision dated 02 January 2024.

for release. As noted at paragraph 13 above, the applicant was given the opportunity to access this further information via inspection.

24. The applicant, however, asserts²⁶ that the information already released by the Ombudsman is insufficient to enable a proper understanding of the shortlisting assessment. In this regard the applicant submits:

The documents released provide limited information about the successful candidate's application and resume. Without access to the application and resume it is impossible to understand what information was available to the panel, and to assess how my qualifications, experience and performance compared to the successful candidate.

25. I recognise the importance of providing disclosure of information in circumstances which would allow unsuccessful candidates in government recruitment processes to assess how their qualifications, experience and performance compared with successful candidates, and therefore, information relevant to the qualifications, experience and performance of the successful candidate has been released in this external review to allow such comparison. Contrary to the applicant's assertions, I consider that a substantial amount of information about the successful candidate's application and resume has been released. The selection report provided a summary of the successful candidate's training, work history, experience, interview outcomes, merit assessment, work tests responses and referee comments. Further, additional employment, training and working history information included in the successful candidate's CV has been released through this external review.
26. I am not satisfied that disclosure of the information in issue would provide the applicant with any significant further insight into the background or contextual information informing Ombudsman's shortlisting process and recruitment decision or assist them to assess their qualifications, experience and performance compared with the successful candidate. In these circumstances, disclosing the information in issue would contribute only marginally to the advancement of these two public interests in favour of disclosure, and I have therefore afforded them low weight.
27. The applicant has submitted²⁷ that the following additional factors favouring disclosure of the information apply in the circumstances:
- disclosure could reasonably allow or assist inquiry into possible deficiencies in the conduct or administration of an agency or official²⁸
 - disclosure could reasonably reveal or substantiate that an agency or official has engaged in misconduct or negligent, improper or unlawful conduct;²⁹ and
 - disclosure could reasonably advance the fair treatment of individuals and other entities in accordance with the law in their dealings with agencies.³⁰
28. The phrase '*could reasonably be expected to*', as contained in each of the factors, means that the relevant expectation must be reasonably based: that is, there must be real and substantial grounds for expecting the relevant occurrence, which can be supported by evidence or reasoning. An assumption or allegation that the occurrence will take place, or an expectation of an occurrence that is merely a possibility or that is speculative,

²⁶ External review application dated 24 March 2024.

²⁷ External review application dated 24 March 2024.

²⁸ Schedule 4, part 2, item 5 of the RTI Act.

²⁹ Schedule 4, part 2, item 6 of the RTI Act.

³⁰ Schedule 4, part 2, item 10 of the RTI Act.

conjectural, hypothetical or remote, is insufficient.³¹ Importantly, the expectation must arise as a result of disclosure of the specific information in issue, rather than from other circumstances.³²

29. It is evident that the applicant believes that the shortlisting process was not performed in a manner consistent with general standards of professionalism and integrity. The applicant's submissions outline why they consider the shortlisting assessment was flawed and states³³:

...the panel's assessment failed to properly assess whether the successful applicant's statement complied with the application instructions and if it did, it failed to exclude irrelevant information from its consideration. Again, the application instructions required applicants to provide a two-page statement solely addressing 'experience in delivering training programs'.

30. In this particular case, a considerable number of applications were received as part of the recruitment process. The panel members were responsible for assessing such applications against the requirements of the role and conducting a shortlisting assessment as part of the recruitment process. Reasons for the advertised position, services to be provided by the position and the type and level of knowledge necessary to perform in the position comprise information already disclosed to the applicant. Applicants were encouraged to apply for the position online and submit a two page statement outlining their suitability for the role. The applicant submits that *the instructions advised applicants to provide a two-page statement solely addressing 'experience in delivering training programs'*.³⁴
31. I consider the applicant's interpretation of the advertised position instructions to be misconceived. Relevantly twelve key responsibilities were included in the role description. In addition, the job description's paragraph about "*Are you the right person for the job?*" indicated that the ideal applicant will be someone that demonstrated vision, results, accountability and technical expertise in a variety of skills.
32. I accept that disclosing the information in issue would give the applicant a more complete picture of the information that was available to the panel members, however, due to the very personal nature of the information³⁵ and given the extent of the information already released to the applicant (which includes work history, experience, skills, training history and a summary of the successful candidate's responses to interview and work tests), I do not consider this carries significant weight.
33. While the comments included by the panel members in the document called "Panel assessment feedback" are short and descriptive, there is nothing before me to give rise to an expectation that disclosing this information could reasonably *reveal or substantiate* any possible deficiencies of conduct. I therefore find that this factor³⁶ does not apply. I consider that the comments could reasonably *allow or assist inquiry* into possible misconduct, in the sense that they would not disclose any information consistent with the applicant's expectations of misconduct – and therefore find that this factor³⁷ is relevant. However, given the limited extent to which the comments would assist, relative to the

³¹ *Murphy and Treasury Department* (1995) 2 QAR 744 at [44] (**Murphy**), citing *Re B and Brisbane North Regional Health Authority* (1994) 1 QAR 279 at [160]. See also *Attorney-General's Department and Australian Iron and Steel Pty Ltd v Cockcroft* (1986) 10 FCR 180.

³² *Murphy* at [54].

³³ Letter dated 26 November 2024.

³⁴ Letter dated 26 November 2024.

³⁵ Which comprises the successful candidate's recollections of experiences, learnings, personal accounts of work situations and challenges, including statements of self-reflection in relation to the values required for the role.

³⁶ Schedule 4, part 2, item 6 of the RTI Act.

³⁷ Schedule 4, part 2, item 5 of the RTI Act.

assistance afforded by the information already released to the applicant, I consider that this factor should also be assigned low weight.

34. As noted at paragraph 27 above, the applicant also raised the factor regarding advancing the fair treatment of individuals.³⁸ I have considered this factor, and also the factor regarding whether disclosure of the information in issue could reasonably be expected to contribute to the administration of justice for the applicant.³⁹ For the administration of justice factor to apply, it must be established that an applicant has suffered a wrong in which a remedy is, or may be available under the law; that there is a basis for seeking any such remedy; and that disclosure of the information held by the Ombudsman would assist the applicant to pursue the remedy, or evaluate whether a remedy is available or worth pursuing.⁴⁰ While I note the applicant was an unsuccessful applicant, there is no information before me to indicate that disclosure of the information in issue is required to enable the applicant to pursue or evaluate any legal remedy, particularly given the information already released to the applicant.⁴¹ In these circumstances, I am satisfied that this public interest factor favouring disclosure does not apply. Similarly, in terms of the fair treatment factor, given the significant amount of information that has been released to the applicant regarding the recruitment process, and also taking into account the nature of the information in issue, I consider that this factor warrants low to no weight.
35. I have carefully considered the remaining factors favouring disclosure listed in schedule 4, part 2, of the RTI, and factors favouring disclosure more generally, given the factors listed in schedule 4 are not exhaustive. I can identify no other public interest considerations in favour of disclosure of the information in issue.

Factors favouring non disclosure

36. The RTI Act recognises that there is a public interest harm⁴² in disclosing an individual's personal information and also that the public interest favours nondisclosure of information which could reasonably be expected to prejudice the protection of an individual's right to privacy.⁴³ As noted above, the information in issue comprises the personal information of the successful candidate, including statements of self-reflection in relation to the values required for the advertised role. There is a strong public interest in protecting a person's right to privacy and avoiding public interest harm that would arise if information were to be disclosed.⁴⁴
37. The applicant submits that the successful candidate's documents could be redacted to remove name or contact detail type information.⁴⁵ However, the personal information in the information in issue extends beyond a name or contact details. The entirety of the information in issue inherently comprises the successful candidate's personal information,⁴⁶ and therefore redacting the names or contact detail information would not render the factors favouring non-disclosure irrelevant. This is particularly so in this specific case, given the sensitive information included in the selection criteria responses.

³⁸ Schedule 4, part 2, item 10 of the RTI Act.

³⁹ Schedule 4, part 2, item 17 of the RTI Act.

⁴⁰ *Willsford and Brisbane City Council* (1996) 3 QAR 368 at [17] and confirmed in *1OS3KF and Department of Community Safety* (Unreported, Queensland Information Commissioner, 16 December 2011) at [16] and *C98 and Cairns and Hinterland Hospital and Health Service* [2021] QICmr 46 (9 September 2021) at [26].

⁴¹ Schedule 4, part 2, item 17 of the RTI Act.

⁴² Schedule 4, part 4, section 6 of the RTI Act.

⁴³ Schedule 4, part 3, item 3 of the RTI Act. The concept of 'privacy' is not defined in the IP Act. It can, however, be viewed as the right of an individual to preserve their 'personal sphere' free from interference from others (as discussed in 'For your information: Australian Privacy Law and Practice' Australian Law Reform Commission Report No. 108, 12 August 2008, at 1.56).

⁴⁴ Schedule 4, part 4, section 6 of the RTI Act.

⁴⁵ External review submission of 24 March 2024.

⁴⁶ Defined in section 12 of the *Information Privacy Act 2009* (Qld).

The extent of the harm that would be expected to cause if this information were released is significant.

38. The applicant contests this position:⁴⁷

The right to privacy of the successful candidate is diminished upon appointment to a senior role in the Ombudsman's Office because the fact of their application and their success is a matter of public record.

39. The Australian Information Commissioner in *BA and Merit Protection Commissioner*⁴⁸ recognised there are a range of factors that need to be taken into account in deciding whether it would be unreasonable to release information of a successful candidate in a government recruitment process. These include:

- the nature of the personal information
- the circumstances in which that information was collected
- the expectations that the applicant may reasonably have had at the time of collection about confidentiality or disclosure
- whether the information is already in the public arena
- the submissions made by the third party as to why the information should not be released
- the public interest in upholding transparency and integrity in personnel selection processes; and
- the public interest in protecting an individual's privacy.

40. I have a responsibility to consider each matter on its own particular facts and the public interest factors that arise in relation to those facts. In this case, the information in issue comprises information in documents that were authored by the successful candidate in applying for the position and making a submission to the Ombudsman. The information is distinctly personal about the third party's career and how the third party perceives their own strengths. The information that remains undisclosed was prepared by the third party for a specific purpose, with a particular audience in mind. It is of a kind that persons ordinarily share only with a selected few or for a specific purpose. The author has not consented to wider dissemination, and the information is not already publicly available. Whilst generally, information submitted by an applicant for a government vacancy is subject to both the RTI and the IP Act and if requested, may be subject to release – this disclosure is not absolute and factors listed in paragraph 39 must be considered when determining if disclosure of specific information is suitable in the circumstances, particularly noting the expectation that applications will be treated with a certain level of confidentiality.

41. As to the individual interest of the applicant – as an unsuccessful candidate – in learning more about why another candidate was shortlisted, I do not place great weight upon granting access to the personal information of another individual as the preferred or necessary means of achieving this objective. In this regard, I note that, not only has the applicant been given access to their own assessment results and the evaluation of the selection panel, they have additionally been offered a feedback session with one of the members of the selection panel.

42. In *BA*, the Australian Information Commissioner analysed the case law and legislative developments since earlier leading authorities and reflected on whether the correct balance had been maintained between public disclosure of employee information and

⁴⁷ External review application 24 March 2024.

⁴⁸ [2014] AICmr 9 (*BA*).

the protection of personal privacy. Having done so, the Australian Information Commissioner decided to refuse access to personal information of a successful candidate in similar recruitment circumstances to this matter.

43. In light of changes in privacy law and heightened community concern about privacy protection and the potential for misuse of personal information that enters the public domain, greater weight should be given to the public interest in protecting a person's right to privacy, and the earlier leading authorities favouring disclosure of personal information of public servants in the interests of government accountability should no longer hold '*decisive sway*'.⁴⁹
44. I acknowledge that the applicant does not have the benefit of seeing the information in issue and therefore has made assumptions about that information. The applicant's assumptions appear to be based on a view that public sector employees cannot express any personal information in a work context. In my view, that assumption is incorrect. The information in issue in this particular case is materially different to the information that discloses the work experience, skills and training history. The nature of the information in issue is particularly personal to the author and disclosure of this information would be an intrusion into the privacy of the author and a public interest harm could be anticipated from disclosure. Thus, I consider in this case that significant weight is to be given to the public interest in the protection of an individual's right to privacy. I am also of the view that the public interest harm in disclosing personal information is significant.
45. Additionally, as information touching on matters such as workplace performance and the operation of agency personnel in sensitive regulatory contexts, I am also of the view that unconditional disclosure of these limited segments of information could reasonably be expected to lead to a level of disquiet among staff of various agencies, given its underlying reference to sensitive workplace procedures, methodologies, practices and behaviours from the personal perspective of the author with reference to those agencies, and to that extent could reasonably be expected to prejudice the agencies' management functions.⁵⁰

Balancing the public interest

46. Protecting personal information and avoiding prejudice to agency management functions are important public interests, deserving of considerable weight.
47. On balance, I am satisfied that the information that has already been released to the applicant addresses and advances the public interest factors favouring accountability, examining the reasons and background for the Ombudsman decision, assisting with inquiry into possible conduct deficiencies, and fair treatment. I am of the view that further disclosure will not materially advance these factors. In turn, the factors favouring non-disclosure carry significant weight.
48. I am satisfied that factors favouring nondisclosure are sufficient to displace those in favour. Disclosure of the information in issue would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest, and access may therefore be refused to this information, under section 47(3)(b) of the RTI Act.

⁴⁹ BA at paragraph 87.

⁵⁰ Schedule 4, part 3, item 19 of the RTI Act.

DECISION

49. I affirm the Ombudsman's decision to refuse access to the information in issue on the ground that its disclosure would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest.
50. I have made this decision as a delegate of the Information Commissioner, under section 145 of the RTI Act.

K Zaidiza
A/Principal Officer

Date: 26 March 2025

APPENDIX

Significant procedural steps

Date	Event
24 March 2024	OIC received the application for external review and requested the preliminary information from the Ombudsman.
26 March 2024	OIC received the preliminary information from the Ombudsman.
10 April 2024	OIC advised the applicant and the Ombudsman that the application for external review had been accepted. OIC requested further information, search records and submissions from the Ombudsman.
23 April 2024	OIC received the information, search records and submissions from the Ombudsman.
1 May 2024	OIC received additional documents from the Ombudsman located on external review.
31 May 2024	OIC updated the applicant that additional documents had been located by the Ombudsman.
11 June 2024	OIC advised the applicant that additional documents had been located by the Ombudsman and these documents would be released to the applicant. OIC requested the Ombudsman to release additional documents to the applicant. OIC received confirmation that the Ombudsman had released the additional documents to the applicant.
17 June 2024	OIC received submissions from the applicant in response to the release of additional documents.
2 July 2024	OIC sought submissions from the Ombudsman to address the submissions made by the applicant.
19 July 2024	OIC received further submissions from the Ombudsman.
19 August 2024	OIC provided further information about the Ombudsman's searches to the applicant. OIC also advised the applicant that in an effort to informally resolve this matter, the Ombudsman agreed to release further information. OIC requested the Ombudsman to release additional information to the applicant.
20 August 2024	OIC received confirmation that the Ombudsman had released the additional documents to the applicant.
22 August 2024	OIC received further submissions from the applicant in response to the release of additional documents.
9 October 2024	OIC commenced consultation process with the third party, conveyed a preliminary view to the applicant and proposed an informal resolution.
15 October 2024	OIC received a request from the third party to be joined as a participant to the external review.

Date	Event
18 October 2024	OIC accepted the third party request to be joined as a participant to the external review.
28 October 2024	OIC received agreement from the third party to a proposed informal resolution.
18 November 2024	OIC conveyed this proposal and a preliminary view to the applicant. OIC provided an update to the Ombudsman.
26 November 2024	OIC received further submissions from the applicant in response to the preliminary view and non-acceptance of the proposed information resolution.
30 January 2025	OIC updated the applicant, Ombudsman and third party on progress of the external review and likely next step to be issuing a decision.
12 March 2025	OIC received submissions from the Ombudsman. OIC reiterated to the applicant that access to some information was available via inspection.
13 March 2025	OIC liaised with the Ombudsman about the inspection access and confirmed to the applicant that OIC could be contacted to arrange inspection access on the Ombudsman's behalf.