



Decision and Reasons for Decision

Citation:	<i>G83 and Queensland Police Service [2019] QICmr 47 (5 November 2019)</i>
Application Number:	314339
Applicant:	G83
Respondent:	Queensland Police Service
Decision Date:	5 November 2019
Catchwords:	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW - RIGHT TO INFORMATION - REFUSAL OF ACCESS - CONTRARY TO PUBLIC INTEREST INFORMATION - information about police officer recruitment - recruitment process not finalised - applicant's personal information - enhancing accountability and transparency - inquiry into possible deficiencies - fair treatment and procedural fairness - prejudice to testing and examination methods and procedures - prejudice to deliberative process and management function - whether disclosure, would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest - section 67(1) of the <i>Information Privacy Act 2009</i> (Qld) - sections 47(3)(b) and 49 of the <i>Right to Information Act 2009</i> (Qld)

REASONS FOR DECISION

Summary

1. The applicant, a former police officer, applied to the Queensland Police Service (**QPS**) under the *Information Privacy Act 2009* (Qld) (**IP Act**) for access to '*All documents regarding my current application to join the Queensland Police Service*'.¹
2. QPS located 221 pages in response to the application and released 10 of those pages to the applicant. QPS decided² to refuse access to the remaining 211 pages on the basis that disclosure of the information would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest, citing prejudice to the testing and examination procedures involved in a QPS recruitment process.³
3. The applicant applied to the Office of the Information Commissioner (**OIC**) for external review of QPS' refusal of access decision.⁴ The applicant submitted that he had been

¹ Access application dated 24 October 2018.

² Decision dated 12 December 2018.

³ Section 67(1) of the IP Act, section 47(3)(b) of the *Right to Information Act 2009* (Qld) (**RTI Act**) and schedule 4, part 4, section 3 of the RTI Act.

⁴ External review application dated 12 December 2018.

waiting over two years for a decision to be made on his current recruitment application and had concerns about the lack of transparency in the application process.

4. During the external review, QPS agreed to disclose some further information to the applicant, including communications involving the applicant, the applicant's medical records, and some internal QPS documents regarding the recruitment process.⁵ However, QPS maintained the position that disclosure of certain internal QPS documents, would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest.
5. For the reasons set out below, I affirm QPS' decision to refuse access to the information remaining in issue, under section 67(1) of the IP Act and section 47(3)(b) of the RTI Act, as its disclosure would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest.

Background

6. The applicant was medically discharged from QPS in 2008, having worked with QPS since 1991. He unsuccessfully applied for readmission to the police force in 2011 and in late 2016, he made a further application to re-join QPS. As at the date of this decision, that recruitment application remains undecided. The applicant has expressed to OIC his frustration with the time it has taken QPS to make a decision on his recruitment application. In his view, the *'RTI process is the only way that I will be able to view what information is being used'* to make the recruitment decision.⁶
7. The decision under review is QPS' refusal of access decision dated 12 December 2018.
8. Significant procedural steps taken during the external review are set out in the Appendix.
9. Evidence, submissions, legislation and other material I have considered in reaching this decision are disclosed in these reasons (including footnotes and Appendix).

Information in issue

10. The information which is the subject of this decision includes correspondence sent/received by QPS in relation to the recruitment application, testing/assessment forms and responses, interview questions and panel member notes, and QPS deliberations on the applicant's recruitment application (**Recruitment Documents**).⁷

Issue for determination

11. The issue for determination is whether access to the Recruitment Documents may be refused on the basis that disclosure would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest.⁸

Relevant law

12. The IP Act provides an individual with the right to access documents of an agency to the extent they contain the individual's personal information.⁹ This right of access is however,

⁵ 96 full pages.

⁶ Submission to OIC dated 8 July 2019.

⁷ 63 full pages and parts of 2 pages. I note these figures are significantly lower than the 211 pages to which access was originally refused by QPS. This is the result of QPS' agreement to disclose certain information to the applicant during the review (see footnote 5), and the applicant's election not to pursue access to the personal information of third parties (eg. other recruitment candidates) and documents to which other access is available, eg. his traffic history, which appeared within the located documents. The issue of access to that information is therefore, not considered in these reasons.

⁸ Under section 67(1) of the IP Act and section 47(3)(b) of the RTI Act. Section 67(1) of the IP Act sets out that an agency may refuse access to information in the same way and to the same extent that the agency could refuse access to the document under section 47 of RTI Act.

⁹ Section 40 of the IP Act.

subject to certain limitations, including grounds for refusing access. One such ground is where disclosure would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest.¹⁰

13. The term 'public interest' refers to considerations affecting the good order and functioning of the community and government affairs for the well-being of citizens.¹¹ This means that in general, a public interest consideration is one which is common to all members of, or a substantial segment of, the community, as distinct from matters that concern purely private or personal interests.¹²
14. In deciding where the balance of the public interest lies, various factors may be relevant¹³ and a decision-maker must take specific steps in reaching a decision on disclosure.¹⁴
15. The factors listed in schedule 4 to the RTI Act generally require that the particular outcome that the factor is intended to promote or protect against '*could reasonably be expected*' to result from disclosure. In assessing whether an outcome '*could reasonably be expected*', the Information Commissioner has found that a decision maker must distinguish '*between what is merely possible ... and expectations that are reasonably based*' and for which '*real and substantial grounds exist*'.¹⁵ Other jurisdictions have similarly interpreted the phrase '*as distinct from something that is irrational, absurd or ridiculous*'.¹⁶
16. Taking the above into account, my assessment of, and findings in relation to, the public interest factors relevant in this case, are set out below.

Findings

17. No irrelevant factors arise in the circumstances of this case, and I have not taken any, including those set out in schedule 4, part 1 of the RTI Act, into account.
18. In making this decision, I have adopted a pro-disclosure bias, as required by section 64 of the IP Act.

Factors favouring disclosure

19. The applicant's personal information appears throughout the Recruitment Documents, giving rise to a public interest factor favouring disclosure.¹⁷ This factor is routinely afforded very high weight given the fundamental importance of individuals being able to access their personal information held by government agencies.
20. The applicant has been given access to some information through the IP Act application process, including a significant number of pages to which QPS originally refused access and subsequently agreed to disclose following negotiations with OIC. However, I accept, as the applicant has argued, that much of the released information was already known to him, eg. it comprises copies of correspondence involving him, and his medical

¹⁰ Sections 47(3)(b) and 49 of the RTI Act.

¹¹ Chris Wheeler, 'The Public Interest: We know it's important, but do we know what it means' (2006) 48 AIAL Forum 12, 14.

¹² Some factors, are however, expressed to apply for the benefit of a particular individual, eg. Schedule 4, part 2, items 7 and 17 of the RTI Act.

¹³ Including the non-exhaustive list of factors in schedule 4 of the RTI Act.

¹⁴ Section 49 of the RTI Act. The steps include: disregarding any irrelevant factors, identifying relevant factors favouring disclosure and nondisclosure and balancing the relevant factors.

¹⁵ *B and Brisbane North Regional Health Authority* (1994) 1 QAR 279 at [154]-[160].

¹⁶ See *Smolenski v Commissioner of Police, NSW Police* [2015] NSWCATAD 21 at [34], citing *Commissioner of Police, NSW Police Force v Camilleri (GD)* [2012] NSWADTAP 19 at [28], *McKinnon v Secretary, Department of Treasury* [2006] HCA 45 at [61] and *Attorney-General's Department v Cockcroft* (1986) 10 FCR 180 at 190.

¹⁷ Schedule 4, part 2, item 7 of the RTI Act.

reports.¹⁸ In the circumstances, I do not consider the released information serves to reduce the weight of this factor to any degree, and therefore, I afford this factor significant weight in favour of disclosure of the Recruitment Documents.

21. The applicant submits that there has been a lack of transparency in the processing of his recruitment application.¹⁹ I am satisfied that there is a public interest in QPS being accountable and transparent in relation to the decisions it makes, and processes undertaken in relation to police officer recruitment.²⁰ In the circumstances of this case, I also consider the public interest in informing the community of the government's operations²¹ and revealing the reason for a government decision and any background or contextual information that informed the decision²² are relevant to consider.
22. As I have noted above, the applicant has been granted access to some information regarding his recruitment application through the IP Act process. While I accept that some of that information was already known to him, I consider that certain released documents do serve, to an extent, to discharge the public interest factors identified in the preceding paragraph. For example, the document titled File Action Notes records the chronology of actions taken by QPS recruitment officers in dealing with the applicant's recruitment application,²³ subject only to the deletion of information revealing particular deliberations/considerations. I consider the disclosure of this internal chronology has served to enhance QPS accountability and transparency, to a moderate degree.
23. Also, a number of emails released to the applicant demonstrate that inquiries were made by QPS Recruiting Section to obtain information from within QPS units, and from external sources, to assist in QPS' deliberations on the application. Notably, those emails demonstrate that the QPS recruitment officers asked the various sources to provide a response outlining any objections or concerns regarding the applicant's recruitment application. I consider that the disclosure of these documents has served to provide a level of transparency in terms of revealing some of the steps taken in the recruitment application process, and that this serves to reduce the weight of the relevant public interest factors to moderate.
24. The applicant is very concerned about the length of time it has taken QPS to decide his recruitment application.²⁴ He believes he has been treated unfairly and has been denied natural justice.²⁵ He is also concerned that information may have been '*fabricated*' and wants an opportunity to '*check the factual accuracy*' of the information provided and rectify any inaccuracies.²⁶ The applicant is understandably frustrated that he has been waiting approximately three years for an outcome on his current application (lodged in 2016) to be re-admitted to the police force. On its face, this does seem like a long time for a recruitment application to remain undecided. Therefore, I consider that disclosure could reasonably be expected to allow inquiry into possible deficiencies in QPS recruitment application handling process.²⁷
25. QPS has explained that the applicant '*has a unique and complex medical and QPS history and as such his application has taken longer to process*' and this has been further complicated by the fact that during QPS' consideration of the recruitment application, the

¹⁸ Applicant's submission to OIC dated 27 August 2019.

¹⁹ Applicant's submissions to OIC dated 27 August and 9 September 2019.

²⁰ Schedule 4, part 2, item 1 of the RTI Act.

²¹ Schedule 4, part 2, item 3 of the RTI Act.

²² Schedule 3, part 2, item 11 of the RTI Act.

²³ Since October 2016.

²⁴ Submissions to OIC dated 8 July and 9 September 2019.

²⁵ Submission to OIC dated 8 July 2019, telephone submissions provided 9 August 2019.

²⁶ Submissions to OIC dated 8 July and 27 August 2019.

²⁷ Schedule 4, part 2, item 5 of the RTI Act.

applicant's treating psychiatrist passed away, requiring QPS to *'explore other options to adequately assess [the applicant's] suitability to be offered a place as a recruit'*.²⁸ I am satisfied that the particular complexities of this case appear to have legitimately extended the time taken to process the recruitment application. Also, the information available to me, both in the released documents (eg. the File Action Notes) and Recruitment Documents demonstrates that QPS recruitment officers have been actively progressing the matter since its receipt. QPS also submits that the applicant is *'fully aware of the status of his application'*.²⁹ In the circumstances, I afford this factor moderate weight.

26. I am also satisfied that disclosing the Recruitment Documents could reasonably be expected to advance the applicant's fair treatment³⁰ and contribute to procedural fairness for him.³¹ Disclosure would allow the applicant to view the entirety of the information that QPS has before it in relation to the recruitment application, and critique/respond to any information of concern to him. I am also satisfied that disclosure of the Recruitment Documents would provide the applicant with a more comprehensive understanding of why QPS has taken the length of time it has to process the recruitment application. However, in attributing weight to these disclosure factors, I have also taken into account QPS submission³² that *'When each applicant enters into the recruitment process, they sign an acknowledgement that specific feedback will not be provided prior to the finalisation of the application.'* I also note that the content of the released documents, particularly the File Action Notes, do disclose a relatively detailed chronology about the steps/actions taken on the recruitment application, which serves to reduce the weight of these factors, to some extent. In the circumstances, I afford these factors low weight.
27. As set out above, the applicant is concerned that there may be inaccuracies in the Recruitment Documents.³³ The applicant has not, however, advanced any evidence to demonstrate to me that this expectation is reasonably based. I accept that the applicant is at a disadvantage in not being able to see the Recruitment Documents. However, for the relevant public interest factor to apply, I must be satisfied that disclosure of the refused information could reasonably be expected to reveal that the Recruitment Documents contain incorrect, out of date, or misleading information, as distinct from a mere possibility that such information may appear within the documents. In the circumstances of this case, I am unable to find that this factor applies.
28. Based on the information available to me, I am satisfied that no further public interest factors arise to favour disclosure of the Recruitment Documents.³⁴

Factors favouring nondisclosure

QPS submissions

29. QPS submitted that, while the applicant's recruitment application remains active, disclosure of the Recruitment Documents would prejudice its decision-making processes.³⁵ Further, QPS argued that disclosure would place the applicant in a position to *'subvert the internal workings and deliberations'* of the agency and that this would

²⁸ Submission to OIC received 25 July 2019 (dated 25 May 2019 due to typographical error).

²⁹ Submission to OIC received 25 July 2019.

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

³¹ Schedule 4, part 2, items 16 and 17 of the RTI Act.

³² Submission to OIC received 25 July 2019.

³³ Thereby, raising the public interest factor in schedule 4, part 2, item 12 of the RTI Act.

³⁴ I have considered all of the factors listed in schedule 2, part 2 of the RTI Act and find that no further factors apply, other than those discussed above.

³⁵ Submission to OIC received 25 July 2019.

'thwart the Service's ability to manage the recruitment process' and 'give the applicant an unfair advantage over other applicants, in a competitive environment'.³⁶

30. QPS outlined that its recruitment process for police officers involves a number of tests and examinations which are designed to ensure that people selected to the role will be able to provide the service that the community expects, and to handle the rigorous demands of policing.³⁷ QPS submitted that disclosure of the tests, results, questionnaires and examinations, which appear throughout the Recruitment Documents, would enable applicants to frame their responses, giving them an unfair advantage over other applicants.³⁸
31. QPS made specific submissions in relation to psychological testing that occurs during a recruitment process. QPS argued that disclosure would prejudice the effectiveness of the methods and procedures that are used to determine an applicant's psychological suitability to perform the duties of a police officer.³⁹ Further, QPS submitted that disclosure of the psychological assessment documents and feedback could reasonably be expected to prejudice the effectiveness of those tests, the objects of which is to ensure appropriate candidates are selected to become police officers.⁴⁰ QPS submitted that the recruitment of suitable candidates is also a critical component of QPS' management function. In particular, the selection of suitable candidates for a role that can be very demanding both physically and mentally forms part of QPS' duty to ensure the welfare of employees.⁴¹
32. QPS also submitted that its management function would be detrimentally affected if QPS Recruiting was required to respond to requests from recruitment applicants prior to the finalisation of the process, noting that QPS Recruiting receives over 10,000 applications each year.⁴² QPS considers that not only would disclosure subvert the process by allowing applicants to tailor/frame their responses (as outlined above), it would also divert QPS Recruiting from deciding the applications, thereby further prejudicing its management function.⁴³

Analysis

33. The public interest will favour nondisclosure of information that could reasonably be expected to prejudice (i) the management function of an agency,⁴⁴ (ii) a deliberative process of government;⁴⁵ and/or (iii) the effectiveness of testing procedures.⁴⁶ The RTI Act also recognises that disclosure could reasonably be expected to cause a public interest *harm* if disclosure could:
- prejudice the effectiveness of a method or procedure for the conduct to tests or examinations by an agency⁴⁷
 - prejudice achieving the objects of a test or examination conducted by an agency;⁴⁸ and

³⁶ Submission to OIC received 25 July 2019. QPS submitted that its Recruitment Unit receives in excess of 10,000 applications to join the police force each year.

³⁷ QPS decision dated 12 December 2018.

³⁸ QPS submissions dated 17 May 2019.

³⁹ QPS decision dated 12 December 2018.

⁴⁰ QPS decision dated 12 December 2018.

⁴¹ QPS submissions dated 17 May 2019 and submissions received 25 July 2019.

⁴² QPS submissions received 25 July 2019.

⁴³ QPS submissions received 25 July 2019.

⁴⁴ Schedule 4, part 3, item 19 of the RTI Act.

⁴⁵ Schedule 4, part 3, item 20 of the RTI Act.

⁴⁶ Schedule 4, part 3, item 21 of the RTI Act.

⁴⁷ Schedule 4, part 4, section 3(a) of the RTI Act. See *Lucas and The University of Queensland* [2017] QICmr 14 (7 April 2017) for a discussion of this factor, and the related nondisclosure factor in schedule 4, part 3, item 21 of the RTI Act.

⁴⁸ Schedule 4, part 4, section 3(b) of the RTI Act.

- reveal an opinion, advice or recommendation that has been obtained, prepared or recorded, or a consultation or deliberation that has taken place.⁴⁹
34. As noted in paragraph 10 above, the Recruitment Documents include copies of the questions the applicant was asked at a face to face interview, which formed part of the recruitment process. The interview panel members' notes which record their observations and assessments of the applicant's responses are also present. It is not uncommon for job applicants to be asked to return interview questions at the conclusion of an interview—this serves to preserve their confidentiality for the current process (as against competing applicants who are yet to be interviewed), and also in future recruitment processes (should they be re-used). I am satisfied that the effectiveness of testing/examination processes used in QPS recruitment is likely to be compromised by disclosure of these (and other testing/evaluation) documents as it could reasonably be expected to allow future applicants to tailor their responses to gain a more beneficial outcome, thereby undermining the recruitment process.⁵⁰
35. Similarly, I am satisfied that disclosure of the psychological testing questionnaire, responses and associated evaluation information could reasonably be expected to prejudice the recruitment process. As set out above, QPS has emphasised that selecting suitable candidates for recruitment to the police force is a critical component of its management function and psychological testing is one of the key methods used in the selection process. I accept that disclosure of this testing/evaluation information would reveal the particular areas on which applicants are assessed, and the methods that are used by QPS to evaluate an applicant's responses/performance. I am satisfied that disclosure of such information could reasonably be expected to subvert the purpose of those testing methods as it would enable future candidates to respond in a way that could give them an unfair advantage in a highly competitive environment.⁵¹
36. For the reasons set out in paragraphs 34 and 35 above, I am satisfied that disclosure of the Recruitment Documents would prejudice the effectiveness and objects of testing/examination methods used by QPS in its recruitment process. I also find that this would have a corresponding prejudicial impact on QPS' management function⁵² as it may lead to unsuitable candidates being selected due to the presence of skewed/misleading testing results. In the circumstances, I afford the relevant factors⁵³ significant weight in favour of nondisclosure.
37. Observations about, and assessment/evaluation of the applicant's suitability to join the police force appear throughout the Recruitment Documents, particularly within correspondence, and the refused portions of the File Action Notes. I am satisfied that the information reveals QPS' deliberations on issues associated with the applicant's recruitment application, and constitute QPS' pre-decisional thinking, thereby raising a public interest factor in favour of nondisclosure.⁵⁴
38. Given the unfinalised status of the recruitment process, I am satisfied that disclosure of this information could reasonably be expected to prejudice a deliberative process of government, namely, the process QPS is undertaking to decide whether or not to recruit

⁴⁹ Schedule 4, part 4, section 4 of the RTI Act.

⁵⁰ There can be no restriction on the use, dissemination or republication of information once it is released under the IP Act.

⁵¹ Once the recruitment process is finalised, there may be an opportunity for QPS to consider granting the applicant inspection access to some of the testing/examination information, psychological questionnaire/responses and interview panel member notes. Inspection access to test results routinely occurs in a university context when students seek copies/feedback on their past examinations. However, this would be a matter for QPS to consider, based on the particular circumstances of the case.

⁵² See *W7SV7G and Department of Education* [2018] QICmr 24 (22 May 2018) at paragraph [28].

⁵³ Schedule 4, part 3, items 19 and 21 and schedule 4, part 4, section 3(a) and (b) of the RTI Act.

⁵⁴ Schedule 4, part 3, item 20 of the RTI Act. See *Straker and Sunshine Coast Regional Council; NBN Co Limited (Third Party)* [2016] QICmr 44 (28 October 2016) at paragraphs [148]-[155].

the applicant into the police force.⁵⁵ I am also satisfied that a public interest harm arises in respect of particular documents that constitute opinions/advice/recommendations that have been obtained/prepared in relation to that deliberative process.⁵⁶ I am satisfied that the recruitment of suitable candidates to QPS is a process that involves input from various sources both internally within QPS, and externally (as relevant to a particular case). Given the potential ramifications of selecting a candidate that is not suitable for the demanding role of a police officer, I am satisfied that those involved in the recruitment process should be afforded a level of discretion to allow them to express their views openly and honestly. Therefore, I accept QPS's submission that revealing internal conversations about a particular recruitment candidate before a decision has been made could reasonably be expected to prejudice that process. I afford the relevant factors⁵⁷ significant weight in favour of nondisclosure.

Conclusion

39. As demonstrated by the discussion above, there are multiple public interest factors which favour of disclosure of the Recruitment Documents. Primarily, the applicant's entitlement to access his own personal information weighs heavily in favour of disclosure. I have also afforded moderate weight to the public interest in enhancing the accountability and transparency of the QPS recruitment process, and allowing inquiry into possible deficiencies in the conduct of that process, particularly given the length of time the applicant has been waiting for a decision to be made. I have also afforded weight, while low, to advancing the applicant's fair treatment and affording him procedural fairness.
40. There are also several relevant nondisclosure factors which must be balanced against the disclosure factors. Of key significance in this case is the reasonable likelihood of prejudice to effectiveness, and purpose of, the testing and examination procedures that form part of the recruitment process, the fact that the recruitment application remains the subject of deliberations and the negative impact on QPS' management function. For the reasons set out above, I am satisfied that the collective weight of those nondisclosure factors and the level of public interest harm that could reasonably be expect to arise through disclosure of the Recruitment Documents, tip the scales in favour of nondisclosure.
41. On balance, I find that disclosure of the Recruitment Documents would be contrary to the public interest and therefore, access to the information remaining in issue may be refused.

DECISION

42. On the basis of the above, I affirm QPS' decision to refuse access to the Recruitment Documents under section 67(1) of the IP Act and section 47(3)(b) of the RTI Act.
43. I have made this decision as a delegate of the Information Commissioner, under section 139 of the IP Act.

K Shepherd
Assistant Information Commissioner
5 November 2019

⁵⁵ Noting that, once the recruitment process has been finalised, the relevance and weight of this nondisclosure factor would need to be reconsidered, subject to whether or not the recruitment application is accepted.

⁵⁶ Schedule 4, part 4, section 4 of the RTI Act. I am unable to describe the exact nature of those documents, due to the limitations placed on me by section 120 and 121 of the IP Act. However, they can broadly be described as suitability reports.

⁵⁷ Schedule 4, part 3, item 20 and part 4, section 4 of the RTI Act.

APPENDIX

Significant procedural steps

Date	Event
12 December 2018	OIC received the application for external review.
21 December 2018	OIC notified the applicant and QPS that it had accepted the external review application and asked QPS to provide relevant information.
8 January 2019	OIC received the requested information from QPS.
12 April 2019	OIC conveyed a preliminary view to QPS.
17 May 2019	QPS provided submissions in response to OIC's preliminary view, agreeing to release certain documents to the applicant.
11 June 2019	QPS released documents to applicant as part of the informal resolution process.
13 June 2019	OIC conveyed a further preliminary view to QPS.
8 July 2019	OIC received written submissions from the applicant.
25 July 2019	QPS provided further submissions to OIC confirming its position that access to certain documents should be refused on the basis that their disclosure would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest.
9 August 2019	OIC received telephone submissions from the applicant.
15 August 2019	OIC conveyed a further written preliminary view to QPS that there was no basis on which to refuse access to certain information. OIC also conveyed a written preliminary view to applicant and invited him to provide submissions if he wished to contest the view.
27 August 2019	OIC received further written submissions from the applicant, disagreeing with OIC's preliminary view.
5 September 2019	QPS advised OIC that it had reconsidered its position and agreed to release certain documents to the applicant.
9 September 2019	OIC wrote to the applicant to address his concerns about the review process. The applicant provided OIC with additional written submissions. OIC wrote to QPS to confirm its agreement to release certain documents to the applicant, and to confirm OIC's preliminary view in relation to nondisclosure of the remaining documents. OIC also requested QPS to advise OIC, as a matter of urgency, if the status of the applicant's recruitment process changed.
10 September 2019	OIC wrote to the applicant to clarify certain procedural issues, and to confirm that the next step in the review would be for OIC to issue a formal written decision.
12 September 2019	QPS advised OIC that the further documents had been released to the applicant, in accordance with OIC's preliminary view.
24 September 2019	QPS confirmed to OIC that a decision was yet to be made on the applicant's recruitment application.
23 October 2019	OIC wrote to the applicant to confirm the information remaining in issue.
30 October 2019	The applicant telephoned OIC and confirmed that he was willing to exclude the personal information of other individuals, and information to which access is otherwise available, from consideration in the review.
5 November 2019	QPS confirmed the ongoing status of the recruitment process.