



Decision and Reasons for Decision

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| Citation: | Queensland Nurses and Midwives Union and Gold Coast Hospital and Health Service [2026] QICmr 4 (20 January 2026) |
| Application Number: | 318189 |
| Applicant: | Queensland Nurses and Midwives Union |
| Respondent: | Gold Coast Hospital and Health Service |
| Decision Date: | 20 January 2026 |
| Catchwords: | ADMINISTRATIVE LAW - RIGHT TO INFORMATION - REFUSAL OF ACCESS - CONTRARY TO THE PUBLIC INTEREST - request for information concerning a report about workforce optimisation - whether disclosure would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest - sections 47(3)(b) and 49 of the <i>Right to Information Act 2009</i> (Qld) |

REASONS FOR DECISION

Summary

1. The applicant applied to the Gold Coast Hospital and Health Service (**Health Service**) under the *Right to Information Act 2009* (Qld) (**RTI Act**) to access a particular report about workforce optimisation and associated documentation.¹
2. The Health Service did not make a decision within the required statutory timeframe and was therefore taken to have made a deemed decision refusing access to the requested information (**Deemed Decision**).²
3. The applicant applied to the Office of the Information Commissioner (**OIC**) for an external review of the Deemed Decision.³
4. On external review, the Health Service located 531 pages of documents relevant to the access application and submitted that disclosure of those located documents would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest and access to them may be refused on that basis.⁴ The applicant maintains their request to access the requested documents and

¹ The access application is dated 27 May 2024 and nominated a timeframe for the request as '*December 2023 to the current date*'. On 1 July 2025 key parts of the *Information Privacy and Other Legislation Act 2023* (Qld) (**IPOLA Act**) came into force, effecting changes to the RTI Act and *Information Privacy Act 2009* (Qld) (**IP Act**). As the applicant's application was made before this change, the RTI Act and IP Act **as in force prior to 1 July 2025** remain applicable to it. This is in accordance with transitional provisions in Chapter 7, Part 9 of the RTI Act, which require that applications on foot before 1 July 2025 are to be dealt with as if the IPOLA Act had not been enacted. Accordingly, references to the RTI Act and IP Act in this decision are to those Acts **as in force prior to 1 July 2025**.

² Under section 46(1) of the RTI Act. The Health Service confirmed this in its letter to the applicant dated 21 August 2024.

³ On 22 August 2024 (**External Review Application**).

⁴ Under section 47(3)(b) of the RTI Act.

does not accept that disclosure of the located documents would be contrary to the public interest.

5. For the reasons set out below, I set aside the Deemed Decision and, in substitution for that decision, I find that access may be refused to the requested documents on the basis that disclosure would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest.

Reviewable decision

6. The decision under review is the Deemed Decision, which the Health Service is taken to have made under section 46(1) of the RTI Act.

Evidence considered

7. The evidence, submissions, legislation and other material I have considered in reaching this decision are disclosed in these reasons (including the footnotes).
8. Generally, it is necessary that decision-makers have regard to the *Human Rights Act 2019* (Qld) (**HR Act**), as section 11(1) of the HR Act provides that '[a]ll individuals in Queensland have human rights'. Here, the applicant is an organisation, not an individual. However, to the extent that it is necessary to observe relevant rights under section 58(1) of the HR Act,⁵ I am satisfied that I have done so. This is because in observing and applying the law prescribed in the RTI Act, as I have done in this case, an RTI decision-maker will be '*respecting and acting compatibly with*' applicable human rights as stated in the HR Act.⁶

Information in issue

9. As mentioned in paragraph 4 above, the Health Service located 531 pages as responsive to the access application (**Information in Issue**). While the RTI Act limits the extent to which I can describe the Information in Issue in this decision,⁷ I can confirm that the Information in Issue falls into the following broad categories:
 - a report about the nursing and midwifery workforce at the Health Service; and
 - documents related to the '*commissioning and provision*' of that report.

Issue for determination

10. The issue for determination is whether access to the Information in Issue may be refused on the basis its disclosure would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest.⁸

Relevant law

11. The RTI Act creates a right to access documents of an agency.⁹ However, this access right is subject to some limitations, including the grounds on which access to information may be refused.¹⁰

⁵ Noting that Kingham J in *Waratah Coal Pty Ltd v Youth Verdict Ltd & Ors* [2020] QLC 33 at [90] indicated that where section 58(1) of the HR Act applies, there need be no mover to raise human rights issues because that section requires the relevant public entity to properly consider engaged human rights and to not act or make a decision that is not compatible with human rights.

⁶ Refer to *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].) In this regard, I note Bell J's observations at [573] of XYZ on the interaction between the Victorian analogues of Queensland's RTI Act and HR Act: '*it is perfectly compatible with the scope of that positive right in the Charter for it to be observed by reference to the scheme of, and principles in, the Freedom of Information Act*'.

⁷ Section 108(3) of the RTI Act.

⁸ Sections 47(3)(b) and 49 of the RTI Act.

⁹ Section 23 of the RTI Act.

¹⁰ The grounds on which access can be refused are set out in section 47 of the RTI Act.

12. One ground of refusal is where disclosing information would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest.¹¹ 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. 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
13. In deciding whether disclosure of information would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest, a decision-maker is required to:¹³
- 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 disclosure of the information in issue would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest.
14. Schedule 4 of the RTI Act contains non-exhaustive lists of factors that may be relevant in determining where the balance of public interest lies in a particular case. I have considered these lists, together with all other relevant information, in reaching my decision. I have also kept in mind the RTI Act's pro-disclosure bias.¹⁴

Findings

15. I do not consider that any irrelevant factors arise in the circumstances of this case, and I have taken none into account.¹⁵

Factors favouring disclosure

16. The applicant submitted that disclosure of the Information in Issue is in the public interest, as the requested information relates to the structuring of health care services provided to the public within the Gold Coast.¹⁶ Public interest factors favouring disclosure arise under the RTI Act where disclosing information could reasonably be expected to:
- promote open discussion of public affairs and enhance the Government's accountability¹⁷
 - contribute to positive and informed debate on important issues or matters of serious interest¹⁸
 - inform the community of the Government's operations, including, in particular, the policies, guidelines and codes of conduct followed by the Government in its dealings with members of the community;¹⁹ and
 - reveal the reason for a government decision and any background or contextual information that informed the decision.²⁰

¹¹ Sections 47(3)(b) and 49 of the RTI Act.

¹² However, there are some recognised public interest considerations that may apply for the benefit of an individual.

¹³ Section 49(3) of the RTI Act.

¹⁴ Section 44(1) of the RTI Act. I have also noted Parliament's requirement that grounds for refusing access to information be interpreted narrowly (section 47(2)(a) of the RTI Act).

¹⁵ I specifically confirm that I have not taken the irrelevant factors listed in schedule 4, part 1 of the RTI Act into account.

¹⁶ External Review Application. In this submission, the applicant generally referenced schedule 4, part 2 of the RTI Act. The applicant made a similar submission on 4 September 2025, stating: '*it is within the public interest to provide the details of how a public hospital is choosing to structure the health service*'.

¹⁷ Schedule 4, part 2, item 1 of the RTI Act.

¹⁸ Schedule 4, part 2, item 2 of the RTI Act.

¹⁹ Schedule 4, part 2, item 3 of the RTI Act.

²⁰ Schedule 4, part 2, item 11 of the RTI Act.

17. I acknowledge that matters associated with the workforce of Queensland's health systems are of serious interest to the community. I also consider that disclosing the requested information would allow scrutiny of the workforce advice obtained by the Health Service and may provide contextual information to certain decisions made by the Health Service. For these reasons and taking the nature of the Information in Issue into account, I consider these public interest factors apply and are deserving of high weight.
18. A public interest factor will also arise where disclosure of information could reasonably be expected to reveal environmental or health risks or measures relating to public health and safety.²¹ Having carefully reviewed the Information in Issue, I do not consider this factor applies to favour disclosure, given the particular nature of that information.
19. I have carefully considered all the other factors listed in schedule 4, part 2 of the RTI Act. Having done so, and given the nature of the Information in Issue, I cannot identify any other public interest considerations favouring its disclosure.²²

Factors favouring nondisclosure

20. The Health Service submitted²³ that a number of public interest factors apply to strongly favour nondisclosure of the Information in Issue, namely, where disclosure of information could reasonably be expected to prejudice the management function of an agency or the conduct of industrial relations by an agency,²⁴ prejudice an agency's ability to obtain confidential information²⁵ and prejudice an agency's commercial and financial affairs.²⁶ Additionally, the Health Service submitted²⁷ that the public interest factors relating to personal information and privacy²⁸ also arise to favour nondisclosure of some components of the Information in Issue, as those components identify a large number of individuals and include certain personal information of those individuals.
21. When considering the public interest factors in schedule 4, parts 3 and 4 of the RTI Act, I have taken into account that the RTI Act places no restriction on the use, dissemination or republication of information which has been disclosed in response to an access application. I have also noted that the term '*could reasonably be expected to*' requires that the expectation be reasonably based; that the expectation is neither irrational,

²¹ Schedule 4, part 2, item 14 of the RTI Act.

²² While the Information in Issue includes some financial information about the Health Service's operations, its nature is such that I do not consider disclosure of that information could reasonably be expected to ensure effective oversight of expenditure of public funds (schedule 4, part 2, item 4 of the RTI Act). On the information before me, and noting the particular nature of the Information in Issue, I also cannot see how disclosing that information (or any part of it) could reasonably be expected to allow or assist inquiry into possible deficiencies in the conduct or administration of an agency or official; or reveal or substantiate that an agency or official has engaged in misconduct or negligent, improper or unlawful conduct (schedule 4, part 2, items 5 and 6 of the RTI Act); advance the fair treatment of individuals and other entities in accordance with the law in their dealings with agencies (schedule 4, part 2, item 10 of the RTI Act); reveal the information was incorrect, out of date, misleading, gratuitous, unfairly subjective or irrelevant (schedule 4, part 2, item 12 of the RTI Act); contribute to the administration of justice generally or for a person (schedule 4, part 2, items 16 and 17 of the RTI Act); or contribute to the maintenance of peace and order or the enforcement of the criminal law (schedule 4, part 2, items 15 and 18 of the RTI Act). In the event that further relevant factors exist in favour of disclosure, I am satisfied that there is no evidence before me to suggest that any would carry sufficient weight to outweigh the weight that I have afforded to the public interest factors that favour the nondisclosure of the Information in Issue.

²³ Submission dated 27 September 2024. The Health Service made similar submissions on 21 February 2025.

²⁴ Schedule 4, part 3, item 19 of the RTI Act.

²⁵ Schedule 4, part 3, item 16 of the RTI Act.

²⁶ In this regard, the Health Service relies upon the public interest factor in schedule 4, part 3, item 2 of the RTI Act, which relates to prejudice to the private, business, professional, commercial or financial affairs of entities. As an associated factor in schedule 4, part 3, item 15 of the RTI Act arises where disclosure could reasonably be expected to prejudice trade secrets, business affairs or research of an agency or person, I have also given consideration that public interest factor.

²⁷ Submission dated 27 September 2024.

²⁸ Schedule 4, part 3, item 3 and schedule 4, part 4, section 6 of the RTI Act.

absurd or ridiculous, nor merely a possibility; and that the expectation must arise as a result of disclosure, rather than from other circumstances.²⁹

Management function

22. The Health Service explained that the requested documents *'arose out of a process undertaken to inform the health service's workforce planning activities'*³⁰ and that the report which is the subject of the access application was obtained as *'one step in an ongoing process to assess and optimise the workforce within the health service'*.³¹ In this context, the Health Service submitted that disclosure of the requested information could compromise the Health Service's ongoing management strategies and decision-making processes relating to its workforce.³²
23. The public interest factor in schedule 4, part 3, item 19 of the RTI Act is usually directed towards prejudice to an agency's function of managing its staff.³³ Health Services must be able to address raised workforce issues on a confidential basis. They must also, from time to time, be able to assess the structure and deployment of their workforce resources in a manner which does not unduly impact their ongoing employment relationship with staff. The subject matter of the access application generally concerns matters relating to the Health Service's management functions (including management of the Health Service's workforce).³⁴ Given the nature of the Information in Issue and the Health Service's explanation referenced in the preceding paragraph, I am satisfied that there is a reasonable expectation that disclosure of the Information in Issue, at a time when there are ongoing processes associated with a workforce review, could prejudice the Health Service's management functions. This, in turn, has the potential to impact the delivery of health services to the community. In these circumstances, I am satisfied this public interest factor applies and is deserving of significant weight.
24. The RTI Act also recognises that public interest harms will arise where disclosing information could reasonably be expected to have a substantial adverse effect on the management, or assessment, by an agency of the agency's staff³⁵ or have a substantial adverse effect on the conduct of industrial relations by an agency.³⁶ Noting the nature of the Information in Issue, I consider it reasonable to expect that its disclosure could adversely effect the Health Service's assessment of its workforce. This, in turn, could also adversely effect the ability of the Health Service to conduct cooperative industrial relations with its workforce. I also consider that disclosure of the Information in Issue may impact the way in which staff involved in implementing the Health Service's workforce strategy may interact, potentially impeding the exchange of full and frank input to those processes. In the circumstances of this matter, I am satisfied that the reasonably expected adverse effect on the Health Service's assessment and management of its workforce would be substantial and the resulting public interest harm would be

²⁹ Whether the expected consequence is reasonable requires an objective examination of the relevant evidence. It is not necessary for a decision-maker to be satisfied upon a balance of probabilities that disclosing the document will produce the anticipated prejudice. Refer, for example, to *Tol and The University of Queensland* [2015] QICmr 4 (18 February 2015) at footnote [8], citing with approval *Nine Network Australia Pty Ltd and Department of Justice and Attorney-General* (Unreported, Queensland Information Commissioner, 14 February 2012) at [31].

³⁰ Submission dated 27 September 2024.

³¹ Submission dated 21 February 2025.

³² Submission dated 27 September 2024.

³³ The application of this public interest factor was discussed in *Stella v Griffith University* [2025] QCA 203 at [41]-[49]. In particular, I note that Court of Appeal in that matter decided, at [47], that: *'although Item 19 will capture the management of an agency's staff, the term "management function" is not limited to that activity and might, in the circumstances of a particular case, extend to another form of activity which can properly be described as a management function'*.

³⁴ I consider it is reasonable to expect that the Information in Issue (or parts of it) would form part of the information being considered in the Health Service's ongoing processes related to the Health Service's published 2024-2028 Workforce Strategy (which may be accessed via the Queensland Government website www.publications.qld.gov.au).

³⁵ Schedule 4, part 4, section 3(c) of the RTI Act.

³⁶ Schedule 4, part 4, section 3(d) of the RTI Act.

significant. Based on the information before me, while I am also satisfied the expected adverse effect on the Health Service's conduct of industrial relations would be substantial, I consider the resulting harm would be slightly lower. Accordingly, I find these public interest factors apply and I afford them significant and moderate weight respectively, noting again that such adverse effects would impact the delivery of health services to the community.

Confidential information

25. Where disclosing information could reasonably be expected to prejudice an agency's ability to obtain confidential information, a public interest factor favouring nondisclosure arises.³⁷
26. Most of the Information in Issue includes, references and reflects information which was obtained from individual Health Service staff and others (for instance, as part of the inputs to the report which is the subject of the access application). It is reasonable to expect that these individuals provided information on the understanding it could be reproduced or referenced in such a report and may also be considered by the Health Service as part of its overall workforce strategy. However, I do not consider that these individuals would have contemplated that their provided input would be disclosed publicly or to other third parties. Accordingly, it is reasonable to expect that disclosure of the Information in Issue under the RTI Act may result in Health Service staff being reluctant to provide further information to, or be involved in, the Health Service's ongoing workforce strategy processes. This would negatively impact those processes, particularly as the Health Service relies on staff engagement and the free flow of information to executive management in those processes. In this context, I consider the public interest factor referenced in the preceding paragraph applies to favour nondisclosure of this type of information. Given the manner in which such information appears within the Information in Issue, I afford the factor referenced in the preceding paragraph moderate weight.

Business affairs

27. Public interest factors arise where disclosing information could reasonably be expected to prejudice the private, business, professional, commercial or financial affairs of entities³⁸ or the trade secrets, business affairs or research of an agency or person.³⁹
28. The requested information, by virtue of its nature, traverses the structure/configuration of the Health Service's workforce at a point (or points) in time; the varied nature and availability of its workforce resources; and particular financial information about the Health Service's operations. A significant portion of the Information in Issue is not publicly accessible and its disclosure could, on that basis, be expected to impact the Health Service's ability to competitively negotiate commercial arrangements for its current, and future, workforce resources.⁴⁰ Given the nature of this type of information, particularly noting the areas of focus in the Health Service's published workforce strategy, I consider there is a reasonable expectation that disclosure of the Information in Issue would give rise to a high level of prejudice to the Health Service's business, professional, commercial and financial affairs. For this type of information, I afford the

³⁷ Schedule 4, part 3, item 16 of the RTI Act. The RTI Act also recognises that a public interest harm arises where disclosure of information, which is of a confidential nature that was communicated in confidence, could reasonably be expected to prejudice the future supply of information of that type (schedule 4, part 4, section 8(1) of the RTI Act), however, an exception to this public interest factor is set out in schedule 4, part 4, section 8(2) of the RTI Act.

³⁸ Schedule 4, part 3, item 2 of the RTI Act.

³⁹ Schedule 4, part 3, item 15 of the RTI Act.

⁴⁰ As a result of the workforce challenges being faced by all Health Services in Queensland, the market for workforce resources is highly competitive (which is recognised in the Health Service's published 2024-2028 Workforce Strategy).

public interest factors listed in paragraph 27 above significant weight in favour of nondisclosure.⁴¹

29. The Information in Issue also includes the business affairs information of the entity which authored the report that is the subject of the access application.⁴² While I consider the public interest factors referenced in paragraph 27 above apply to that type of information, I consider those factors are deserving of only low weight, given the nature of this component of the Information in Issue.⁴³
30. The RTI Act also recognises that public interest harms will arise where disclosing information:
- that has a commercial value to an agency or another person could reasonably be expected to diminish the commercial value of the information;⁴⁴ and
 - concerning the business, professional, commercial or financial affairs of an agency or another person could reasonably be expected to have an adverse effect on those affairs or prejudice the future supply of information of this type to government.⁴⁵
31. Having reviewed all the information before me, I am not satisfied these public interest factors apply to favour nondisclosure of the Information in Issue.

Personal information and privacy

32. The RTI Act recognises that disclosing an individual's personal information to someone else can reasonably be expected to cause a public interest harm⁴⁶ and that disclosing information which could reasonably be expected to prejudice the protection of an individual's right to privacy gives rise to a public interest factor favouring nondisclosure.⁴⁷
33. I can confirm that the Information in Issue identifies a large number of individuals and includes other personal information of many of those individuals, such as their views and opinions.⁴⁸ Accordingly, I am satisfied that the nondisclosure factor in schedule 4, part 4, section 6 of the RTI Act applies to all of this personal information.⁴⁹ Most of this information was obtained, or provided, on a confidential basis and with the expectation it would be used in the preparation of the report referenced in the access application and in the Health Service's ongoing workforce assessment. I do not consider these individuals would have held any expectation that their personal information would

⁴¹ In this regard, I note that the applicant submitted (on 4 September 2025) that 'confidential or private information concerning names or sensitive information' could be redacted so as to facilitate disclosure. To the extent this submission applies to the information referenced in paragraph 28, I do not consider that it would be reasonably practicable to redact the Health Service's business, professional, commercial and financial affairs information within the Information in Issue, given the intertwined manner in which it appears. For completeness, I also consider that the applicant's redaction proposal does not negate the weight which I have afforded to the public interest factors in paragraph 28.

⁴² Such as the entity's project methodologies, project plan and project team.

⁴³ In this regard, I have taken into account that a wide range of external consultants offer services which include workforce optimisation assessments.

⁴⁴ Schedule 4, part 4, section 7(1)(b) of the RTI Act.

⁴⁵ Schedule 4, part 4, section 7(1)(c) of the RTI Act.

⁴⁶ Schedule 4, part 4, section 6 of the RTI Act. 'Personal information' is defined in section 12 of the IP Act as 'information or an opinion, including information or an opinion forming part of a database, whether true or not, and whether recorded in a material form or not, about an individual whose identity is apparent, or can reasonably be ascertained, from the information or opinion'.

⁴⁷ Schedule 4, part 3, item 3 of the RTI Act. The concept of 'privacy' is not defined in the IP Act or the RTI Act. It can, however, essentially be viewed as the right of an individual to preserve their 'personal sphere' free from interference from others (paraphrasing the Australian Law Reform Commission's definition of the concept in 'For your information: Australian Privacy Law and Practice' Australian Law Reform Commission Report No. 108 released 12 August 2008, at paragraph 1.56).

⁴⁸ Noting the restrictions placed upon me under section 108(3) of the RTI Act, I cannot provide further details about this personal information.

⁴⁹ As confirmed in *Deemal-Hall v Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions* [2024] QCATA 131 at [27], if information meets the definition of personal information in the IP Act, the public interest harm factor in schedule 4, part 4, section 6 of the RTI Act applies.

otherwise be disclosed. In these circumstances, I afford this factor significant weight in favour of nondisclosure of this type of information within the requested documents.

34. I am also satisfied that disclosure of this personal information would intrude into the privacy of the individuals about whom it relates. In the circumstances of this matter, I consider that intrusion would be significant, and I therefore afford significant weight to the public interest factor in schedule 4, part 3, item 3 of the RTI Act for that information.
35. The applicant submitted that '*confidential or private information concerning names or sensitive information this can be redacted*'.⁵⁰ Given the manner in which this personal information appears, I consider that it is not practicable to remove some of it, given the intertwined manner in which it appears. I also consider that, notwithstanding any redaction of this personal information, the identities of many of the relevant individuals may remain ascertainable. Accordingly, I do not consider the applicant's suggested redaction is reasonably practicable and it does not negate the weight I have afforded to the personal information and privacy considerations referenced above.

Balancing the public interest

36. After carefully reviewing the Information in Issue, I have identified and considered above the public interest factors which are relevant to that information.
37. For the reasons set out above, I have afforded high weight to the public interest factors relating to government accountability and transparency.⁵¹
38. On the other hand, I have identified a number of factors favouring nondisclosure of the Information in Issue. For the reasons addressed above, I afford significant weight to two nondisclosure factors relating to an agency's management function and its ability to conduct industrial relations⁵² and moderate weight to a further nondisclosure factor concerning an agency's conduct of industrial relations.⁵³ I have also afforded significant weight to the nondisclosure factors concerning personal information and privacy⁵⁴ for some of the Information in Issue. It is also my view that a nondisclosure factor concerning the ability to obtain confidential information⁵⁵ is deserving of moderate weight and that considerations relating to business, professional, commercial and financial affairs⁵⁶ are deserving of significant weight for most of the Information in Issue and low weight in respect of other parts of the Information in Issue.
39. On balance, I am satisfied that the public interest factors favouring nondisclosure outweigh the factors favouring disclosure.
40. Accordingly, I find that disclosing the Information in Issue would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest and access to it may be refused on that basis.⁵⁷

⁵⁰ Submission dated 4 September 2025.

⁵¹ Schedule 4, part 2, items 1, 2, 3 and 11 of the RTI Act.

⁵² Schedule 4, part 3, item 19 and schedule 4, part 4, section 3(c) of the RTI Act.

⁵³ Schedule 4, part 4, section 3(d) of the RTI Act.

⁵⁴ Schedule 4, part 3, item 3 and schedule 4, part 4, section 6 of the RTI Act.

⁵⁵ Schedule 4, part 3, item 16 of the RTI Act.

⁵⁶ Schedule 4, part 3, items 2 and 15 of the RTI Act.

⁵⁷ Under section 47(3)(b) of the RTI Act.

DECISION

41. For the reasons set out above, I set aside the Deemed Decision⁵⁸ and, in substitution for that decision, I find that disclosure of the Information in Issue would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest and access to it may be refused on that basis.⁵⁹
42. I have made this decision under section 110 of the RTI Act as a delegate of the Information Commissioner, under section 145 of the RTI Act.



T Lake
Principal Review Officer

Date: 20 January 2026

⁵⁸ Under section 110(1)(c) of the RTI Act.

⁵⁹ Under sections 47(3)(b) and 49 of the RTI Act.