

Government Information (Public Access) Act 2009

NOTICE OF DECISION

Applicant:	Dr Tom Lonsdale
File Ref:	2016/5361
Decision-maker:	Mr Alex Maitland, Group Secretary
Date of decision:	3 November 2016

Table of contents

1.	Summary of access application.....	2
2.	Decision.....	2
2.1	Reviewable Decision	2
3.	Information provided to you previously	3
4.	Searches for information	3
5.	The public interest test	3
5.1	Public interest considerations in favour of disclosure.....	4
5.2	Personal factors of the application.....	4
5.3	Public interest considerations against disclosure	4
5.4	Consultation	8
5.5	Balancing the public interest.....	8
6	Access.....	10
7	Disclosure log.....	11
8	Review rights.....	11
9	Further information	12
	Schedule - Information not to be disclosed	13

1. Summary of access application

The University received your access application under the *Government Information (Public Access) Act 2009* ("GIPA Act") on 7 September 2016.

Your application was as follows:

"In regard to my 29 November 2014* (sic) GIPA enquiry into the University of Sydney's dealings with pet-food companies from the inception of the enquiry and for all subsequent internal, external and NCAT proceedings up to today's date please provide:

- Total itemised University payments to Heesom Legal in the provision of advice and conduct of the University's case.
- Total itemised University payments to Ms Brenda Tronson in the provision of advice and the conduct of the University's case.

In respect to any and all instances where any aspect of the GIPA action, its conduct and outcome are mentioned whether directly or indirectly please provide:

- All correspondence, emails, memoranda or similar both from and to the Dean or her office whether involving staff, students, administration or governance of the University.
- All correspondence, emails, memoranda or similar both from and to staff or officers of the University and pet-food companies.
- All correspondence, emails, memoranda or similar between the University and Heesom Legal.
- All correspondence, emails, memoranda or similar between the University and Ms Brenda Tronson."

*Your application was dated 29 September 2014.

2. Decision

I am authorised by the principal officer, for the purposes of section 9(3) of the GIPA Act, to decide your access application.

2.1 Reviewable Decision

I have decided :

- Under section 58(1)(a) to provide access to some of the information sought in your access application
- under section 58(1)(d) to refuse to provide access to some of the information because there is an overriding public interest against its disclosure.

These decisions are reviewable under sections 80(d) and 80(f) of the GIPA Act.

In this Notice of Decision I will explain my reasons. To meet the requirements of section 61 of the GIPA Act, I need to tell you:

- (a) the reasons for my decision and the findings on any important questions of fact underlying those reasons, and
- (b) the general nature and format of the records containing the information you asked for, with reference to the relevant public interest considerations against disclosure (see the attached Schedule of information not disclosed).

3. Information provided to you previously

This application concerns information related to your application dated 29 September 2014 and the reviews of the decisions resulting from that application. The documents disclosed to you following that application and the subsequent reviews have not been dealt with in this decision.

4. Searches for information

Under the GIPA Act, we must conduct reasonable searches for the government information you asked for in your application.

Documents containing the information regarding the costs related to the services of Heesom Legal and Ms Tronson were obtained from the University's Office of General Counsel.

A search was made of the University's records to find any information that fell within the scope of your application. The files related to processing your initial application (2014/7112), the internal review (2014/8813), the review by the Information Commissioner (2015/837) and the NSW Civil and Administrative Tribunal case (2015/3215) were identified and the documents retrieved. Relevant information was also held in the Office of General Counsel file 2015/897.

In addition, a request was made to the Dean of the Faculty of Veterinary Science for any relevant information not already accounted for in the University's response to your access application of 29 September 2014 or the subsequent internal review.

5. The public interest test

Under section 9(1) of the GIPA Act, you have a legally enforceable right to access the information you asked for, unless there is an overriding public interest against its disclosure.

Further, under section 5 of the GIPA Act, there is a presumption in favour of disclosing government information unless there is an overriding public interest against its disclosure.

To decide whether or not there is an overriding public interest against disclosure of the information you asked for, I applied the public interest test, which is set out in section 13 of the GIPA Act.

I applied the public interest test by:

- (a) identifying any public interest considerations in favour of disclosure;
- (b) identifying any relevant public interest considerations against disclosure;
and
- (c) deciding where the balance between them lies.

I did this in the way required by section 15 of the GIPA Act, which is:

- (a) in a way that promotes the objects of the GIPA Act;
- (b) with regard to any relevant guidelines issued by the Information Commissioner.
- (c) without taking into account the fact that disclosure of information may cause embarrassment to, or a loss of confidence in, the Government (as that fact is irrelevant);
- (d) without taking into account the fact that disclosure of information might be misinterpreted or misunderstood by any person (as that fact is irrelevant); and
- (e) with regard to the fact that disclosure cannot be made subject to any conditions on the use or disclosure of information.

5.1 Public interest considerations in favour of disclosure

Under section 12(1) of the GIPA Act, there is a general public interest in favour of disclosing government information. Section 12(2) of the GIPA Act sets out some examples of other public interest considerations in favour of disclosure. However, I am not limited to those considerations in deciding your application.

In my view the following public interest considerations in favour of disclosure apply when considering the documents in issue:

- The general public interest in favour of disclosure of government information.
- The public interest in knowing the about how the University processes applications under the GIPA Act.

5.2 Personal factors of the application

I can also take into account any personal factors of your application, under section 55 of the GIPA Act. I am not aware of any personal factors which are relevant to your request for access to information.

5.3 Public interest considerations against disclosure

When applying the public interest test, the only public interest considerations against disclosure that I can take into account are those set out in the Table to section 14 of the GIPA Act. To show that they are relevant to the information you asked for, I need to consider whether they could reasonably be expected to have the effect outlined in the Table.

I give the words "could reasonably be expected to" their ordinary meaning, that is reasonable, not irrational, absurd or ridiculous. See: *Flack v Commissioner of Police, New South Wales Police* [2011] NSWADT 28, *Attorney General's Department v Cockcroft* (1986) 10 FCR 180 and *McKinnon v Secretary, Department of Treasury* [2006] HCA 45

5.3.1 Conclusive presumption against disclosure – clause 5 of Schedule 1 of the GIPA Act

A number of the documents containing information in the scope of your application are of a kind covered by Schedule 1 of the GIPA Act, either in whole or in part. These documents are listed in the attached Schedule. Section 14(1) of the GIPA Act states:

"It is to be conclusively presumed that there is an overriding public interest against disclosure of any of the government information described in schedule 1."

Clause 5 of Schedule 1 of the GIPA Act is as follows:

"5 Legal professional privilege

(1) It is to be conclusively presumed that there is an overriding public interest against disclosure of information that would be privileged from production in legal proceedings on the ground of client legal privilege (legal professional privilege), unless the person in whose favour the privilege exists has waived the privilege.

(2) An agency in whose favour legal professional privilege exists is required to consider whether it would be appropriate for the agency to waive that privilege before the agency refuses to provide access to government information on the basis of this clause.

(3) A decision that an agency makes under subclause (2) is not a reviewable decision under Part 5."

The information identified in the Schedule as being subject to Schedule 1 clause 5 is contained in confidential communications between University officers, legal staff of the University's Office of General Counsel and external legal practitioners for the sole or dominant purpose of the provision of legal advice and attract a claim of legal professional privilege. Also covered by legal professional privilege are the details of activities set out in the tax invoices from by Heesom Legal to the University as those activities were conducted in the context of providing advice in legal proceedings.

The University's legal staff were Mr Richard Fisher, General Counsel, Ms Olivia Perks, Director, Legal Services, Mr Dominic Stewart, Senior Solicitor, and Ms Megan Wilkinson, Solicitor. In addition Ms Sarah Heesom, Consultant Solicitor of Heesom Legal and Ms Brenda Tronson, Barrister, were engaged by the University. All held NSW solicitor's practicing certificates at the time of providing advice and their duties for the University included the provision of legal advice.

As required by the GIPA Act, I have given consideration as to whether it would be appropriate for the University to waive its privilege. I do not consider that it would be appropriate to do so.

5.3.2 Individual rights, judicial processes and natural justice

Clauses 3(a) and 3(b) of the Table at section 14 of the GIPA Act state:

“There is a public interest consideration against disclosure of information if disclosure of the information could reasonably be expected to have one or more of the following effects:

(a) reveal an individual’s personal information,

(b) contravene an information protection principle under the *Privacy and Personal Information Protection Act 1998 (“PIPA Act”)* or a Health Privacy Principle under the *Health Records and Information Privacy Act 2002*

...”

There is an important distinction between the two considerations stemming from differing definitions of personal information in the GIPA Act and the PIPA Act, as referred to above.

The GIPA Act defines personal information in Schedule 4 as follows:

4 Personal information

“(1) In this Act, personal information means information or an opinion (including information or an opinion forming part of a database and whether or not recorded in a material form) about an individual (whether living or dead) whose identity is apparent or can reasonably be ascertained from the information or opinion.

(2) Personal information includes such things as an individual’s fingerprints, retina prints, body samples or genetic characteristics.

(3) Personal information does not include any of the following:

(a) information about an individual who has been dead for more than 30 years,

(b) information about an individual (comprising the individual’s name and non-personal contact details) that reveals nothing more than the fact that the person was engaged in the exercise of public functions,

(c) information about an individual that is of a class, or is contained in a document of a class, prescribed by the regulations for the purposes of this subclause.”

Sections 18 and 19 of the PIPA Act contain the information protection principles which regulate disclosure of personal information by the University. Section 18 states:

Limits on disclosure of personal information

“(1) A public sector agency that holds personal information must not disclose the information to a person (other than the individual to whom the information

relates) or other body, whether or not such other person or body is a public sector agency, unless:

(a) the disclosure is directly related to the purpose for which the information was collected, and the agency disclosing the information has no reason to believe that the individual concerned would object to the disclosure, or

(b) the individual concerned is reasonably likely to have been aware, or has been made aware in accordance with section 10, that information of that kind is usually disclosed to that other person or body, or

(c) the agency believes on reasonable grounds that the disclosure is necessary to prevent or lessen a serious and imminent threat to the life or health of the individual concerned or another person.

(2) If personal information is disclosed in accordance with subsection (1) to a person or body that is a public sector agency, that agency must not use or disclose the information for a purpose other than the purpose for which the information was given to it.”

Consideration 3(b) in the Table at section 14 of the GIPA Act makes reference to a contravention of an information protection or health privacy principle resulting from the disclosure of the information. For 3(b) to apply the information in question must meet the definition of “personal information” as defined in section 4 of the PPIP Act. While the definition is broadly similar to that in the GIPA Act it includes some specific exemptions, but none are relevant to your application.

Some of the documents covered by your application contain information about individuals who are not exercising public functions as employees of private sector bodies: names, email addresses, bank account details and phone numbers. In addition, many of the documents contain copies of signatures. The information meets the definitions of personal information required by both 3(a) and 3(b) and so both considerations against disclosure are relevant.

5.3.3 Other public interest considerations against disclosure

Business interests of agencies and other persons

Clause 4(d) of the Table at section 14 provides:

“There is a public interest consideration against disclosure of information if disclosure of the information could reasonably be expected to have one or more of the following effects:

...

d) Prejudice any person’s legitimate business, commercial, professional or financial interests.

...”

Some of the documents include the hourly rates of Heesom Legal. Disclosure of that information could reasonably be expected to prejudice Heesom Legal's legitimate business, commercial or financial interests and/or diminish the competitive commercial value of that information to that company.

One email message to the Dean of Veterinary Science contains information regarding potential sponsorship of University activities. Disclosure of that information could reasonably be expected to prejudice the legitimate business commercial or financial interests of the University and its sponsors.

5.4 Consultation

The information that you asked for includes information that is the business and personal information of other organisations. The University was required under section 54 of the GIPA Act to consult with those organisations. Objections were received to the disclosure of some information on the grounds of business interests and the protection of personal information. In response to consultation Ms Brenda Tronson, Barrister, did not object to the disclosure of the details of her charging as the figures were no longer current and she did not have any expectation of a particular effect from disclosure.

5.5 Balancing the public interest

Some of the documents listed in the attached Schedule contain information which is subject, in whole or in part, to the conclusive presumption that its disclosure would be contrary to the public interest under clause 5 of Schedule 1 of the GIPA Act. I have not considered that information in the following balancing of the public interest.

In relation to the information that is not subject to Clause 5 of Schedule 1, I have considered the relevant public interest considerations in favour of and against disclosure of the information covered by your application.

Personal information

My views regarding the disclosure of the personal information contained in the documents which are the subject of your application are guided by the decision of Senior Member McAteer of the NSW Civil and Administrative Tribunal ("the NCAT") in *Lonsdale v University of Sydney* [2016] NSWCATAD 176. In particular, the views set out at [89] to [94] regarding the status of the personal information held by the University concerning employees of Royal Canin and Hills under the GIPA Act. Senior Member McAteer supported the withholding of signatures and direct phone numbers, but held the view that the identities of the individuals should be released, at [92]. I note that the University received objections to the disclosure of the names of the employees from the companies. However, given the relationship between the information covered by your NCAT case and your current application I follow the position put by Senior Member McAteer that on balance the public interest is for the disclosure of the names. See Part 6 of this Notice for the consequence of this decision.

The personal bank account details of Ms Heesom of Heesom Legal appear on the tax invoices to the University and are her private personal information. The bank account details have not been made public in any way and their disclosure would not promote the objects of the GIPA Act as set out in section 3 of that act. I do not see any public interest consideration

in favour of their disclosure, rather the public interest is in the protection of the information. Accordingly I have decided to withhold Ms Heesom's bank account details.

Business interests

The information which relates to business interests is that of Heesom Legal, Brenda Tronson Barrister, a pet food company and the University.

In response to consultation, Heesom Legal stated that to release the itemized costing information would prejudice its legitimate business and commercial interests by placing it at a competitive disadvantage in the market for the provision of legal services. The tax invoices contain a detailed breakdown of charging structures, information not generally available. Release of the information under the GIPA Act is release to the public. Heesom Legal had a legitimate expectation that in dealing with the University such information would not be made public and so available to their competitors, giving those competitors a business and commercial advantage. As a consequence, it is my view that, on balance release of the itemized costing details contained in the tax invoices from Heesom Legal would be contrary to the public interest.

However, I recognise the public interest in the disclosure of information regarding expenditure by public sector agencies including the University, and so I have decided the total amounts should be disclosed. I also note that Heesom Legal did not object to disclosure of the total amounts on each tax invoice or statement.

I find support for my view in *Vincent Neary v State Rail Authority* [1999] NSWADT 107 where the President of the former NSW Administrative Decisions Tribunal ("the ADT") considered whether or not detailed billing information from the Crown Solicitor's Office was exempt from release under the business affairs exemption of the former NSW *Freedom of Information Act 1989* ("the FOI Act"). His Honour said, at [41]:

"That information does, I consider, bear on the contractual relationship between the agency and the Office. It gives an insight into what rate the Office charges for a certain class of work. That information, if known to others with whom the agency deals in relation to the provision of legal services, might give an advantage to those third parties in negotiation of rates..."

However, Neary's case found that there is no overriding public interest against the disclosure of the total amount paid by a public sector agency in legal costs. The President of the former ADT said at [40]:

"As to the information in relation to expenditure on services by the Crown Solicitor's Office, release of the information as total amounts paid does not, I consider, place at risk in any meaningful way the nature of the arrangements that might exist between the agency and that Office."

While that case related to release under the former FOI Act, the principle of the public interest in the disclosure of the expenditure of public money in legal matters is relevant to your application and I have decided the total amounts paid by the University should be provided to you.

In response to consultation Ms Tronson did not object to the disclosure of her business information. The information about her rates was not current and she did not consider that her interests would be particularly affected by the disclosure. Accordingly, I find that the public interest is in the disclosure of this information.

In relation to the information concerning commercial sponsorship of University activities my consideration of the public interest for and against disclosure in response to your application of 29 September 2014 is relevant to this application. In my decision of 11 November 2014 in response to that application I stated:

“The University is funded through many avenues and engages with the wider community, including the commercial sector, on many levels including sponsorship to support its activities.

Fundamental to my consideration of where the public interest lies is a balancing of the public need to be informed of University relationships with commercial organisations with the University’s need for sponsorship, and maintenance of the University as a desirable business partner for the commercial sector.

...

Disclosure of confidential agreements and related correspondence could adversely impact on relationships with sponsors and disadvantage the University in future negotiations for sponsorship, by revealing confidential business arrangements. Release of the information could reasonably be expected to diminish confidence in the University as a business partner and this might lead to loss of sponsorship which would impact on the University’s capacity to carry out some of its activities. For these reasons I find that the public interest lies in not releasing some of the information to you.”

My views in relation to the sponsorship information have not changed. In your recent NCAT case, referred to above, I note that Senior Member McAteer said in relation to his consideration of the relevance of Clause 4(d) of the table at section 14 that release would prejudice business interests:

“... and that as a result of the context in which these arrangements are occurring (Faculty, students, education, sponsorship etc.) significant weight should attach to this consideration so as to override the general presumption in favour of disclosure.” [100]

Accordingly, I have decided that the information identified in the attached Schedule related to business interests should not be disclosed to you.

6 Access

The consulted third parties who objected to disclosure are entitled to seek review of the decision to provide access under section 80(d) of the GIPA Act.

Whilst their review rights are pending, I am not permitted to provide you with access to that information. A copy of the documents with the information that was the subject of the

objection redacted accompanies this Notice. If the third parties do not seek a review, that information will be released to you in the form of another set of the documents when the period for the review rights is concluded.

If the third parties ask for a review of the decision, I will let you know.

7 Disclosure log

If information that would be of interest to other members of the public is released in response to a formal access application, an agency must record certain details about the application in its 'disclosure log' (under sections 25 and 26 of the GIPA Act). I have decided that the information would be of interest to other members of the public and will therefore record the following details in our disclosure log, which is publicly available on our website:

- the date on which your access application was decided (that is, the date of this notice of decision)
- a description of the information that will be released to you
- whether that information is or will be available to other members of the public, and
- if so, how it can be accessed.

This decision is reviewable under section 80(m) of the GIPA Act (see part 8 of this notice for information about your review rights).

8 Review rights

If you disagree with any of the decisions in this notice that are reviewable, you may seek a review under Part 5 of the GIPA Act. Before you do so, I encourage you to contact Mr Tim Robinson to discuss your concerns. His contact details are set out below.

You have three review options:

- internal review by another officer of this agency, who is no less senior than me
- external review by the Information Commissioner, or
- external review by the NSW Civil and Administrative Tribunal (NCAT).

You have 20 working days from the date of this Notice to apply for an internal review. If you would prefer to have the decision reviewed externally, you have 40 working days from the date of this Notice to apply for a review by the Information Commissioner or the NCAT.

To assist you, I have enclosed a fact sheet published by the Information and Privacy Commission (IPC), entitled *Your review rights under the GIPA Act*. You will also find some useful information and frequently asked questions on the IPC's website:

www.ipc.nsw.gov.au.

You can also contact the IPC on freecall 1800 IPC NSW (1800 472 679).

9 Further information

If you have any questions about this notice or would like any further information, please contact Mr Robinson on 9351 4263.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "A Maitland". The letters are cursive and somewhat stylized.

Alex Maitland
Group Secretary

Notice of Decision – Dr Tom Lonsdale

Schedule - Information not to be disclosed

Date	Description of record that contains the information	No of Pages	Document Released	Relevant public interest consideration(s) against disclosure
	File 2016/897			
22 May 2015	Ms S Heesom, Consultant Solicitor, to Mr D Stewart, Senior Solicitor	2	No	Clause 5 of Schedule 1
23 June 2015	Ms S Heesom, Consultant Solicitor, to Mr D Stewart, Senior Solicitor and Ms M Wilkinson, Solicitor.	2	No	Clause 5 of Schedule 1
27 July 2015	Ms S Heesom, Consultant Solicitor, to Ms J Oakeshott.	3	No	Clause 5 of Schedule 1
27 July 2015	Ms S Heesom, Consultant Solicitor, to Dr H White	4	No	Clause 5 of Schedule 1
27 July 2015	Ms S Heesom, Consultant Solicitor, to Ms M Wilkinson, Solicitor	12	No	Clause 5 of Schedule 1
30 July 2015	Ms S Heesom, Consultant Solicitor, to Professor R Taylor and Dr H White.	3	No	Clause 5 of Schedule 1
3 August 2015 12:32	Ms S Heesom, Consultant Solicitor, to Mr R Fisher, General Counsel.	2	No	Clause 5 of Schedule 1
3 August 2015 12:11	Mr R Fisher, General Counsel, to Ms S Heesom, Consultant Solicitor,	2	No	Clause 5 of Schedule 1
6 August 2015	Mr R Fisher, General Counsel, to Ms S Heesom, Consultant Solicitor,	2	No	Clause 5 of Schedule 1
6 October 2015	Ms S Heesom, Consultant Solicitor, to Mr R Fisher, General Counsel	4	No	Clause 5 of Schedule 1

Date	Description of record that contains the information	No of Pages	Document Released	Relevant public interest consideration(s) against disclosure
29 March 2016	Ms S Heesom, Consultant Solicitor, to Mr R Fisher, General Counsel, Mr D Stewart, Senior Solicitor and Ms O Perks, Senior Solicitor.	4	No	Clause 5 of Schedule 1
29 March 2016	Mr R Fisher, General Counsel, to Ms S Heesom, Consultant Solicitor.	2	No	Clause 5 of Schedule 1
21 April 2016	Mr R Fisher, General Counsel, to Ms S Heesom, Consultant Solicitor.	3	No	Clause 5 of Schedule 1
26 April 2016	Mr R Fisher, General Counsel, to Ms S Heesom, Consultant Solicitor.	4	No	Clause 5 of Schedule 1
29 August 2016	Ms S Heesom, Consultant Solicitor, to Mr T Robinson, cc Ms B Tronson, Counsel, and Mr D Stewart, Senior Solicitor	3	No	Clause 5 of Schedule 1
	File 2015/3215			
27 May 2015 9:40	Mr T Robinson, Manager ARMS to Ms S Heesom, Consultant Solicitor	1	No	Clause 5 of Schedule 1
28 May 2015 2:23	Mr T Robinson, Manager ARMS to Ms S Heesom, Consultant Solicitor	9	No	Clause 5 of Schedule 1
1 June 2015 3:38	Mr T Robinson, Manager ARMS to Ms S Heesom Consultant Solicitor	2	No	Clause 5 of Schedule 1

Date	Description of record that contains the information	No of Pages	Document Released	Relevant public interest consideration(s) against disclosure
1 June 2015 3:50	Ms S Heesom, Consultant Solicitor to Mr T Robinson, Manager ARMS	2	No	Clause 5 of Schedule 1
23 June 2015 10:14	Mr T Robinson, Manager ARMS to Ms S Heesom, Consultant Solicitor	26	No	Clause 5 of Schedule 1
23 June 2015 10:07	Mr T Robinson, Manager ARMS to Ms S Heesom, Consultant Solicitor	4	No	Clause 5 of Schedule 1
23 June 2015 9:51	Mr T Robinson, Manager ARMS to Ms S Heesom, Consultant Solicitor	5	No	Clause 5 of Schedule 1
23 June 2015 9:52	Mr T Robinson, Manager ARMS to Ms S Heesom, Consultant Solicitor	4	No	Clause 5 of Schedule 1
29 June 2015 4:58	Mr T Robinson, Manager ARMS to Ms S Heesom, Consultant Solicitor	8	No	Clause 5 of Schedule 1

Date	Description of record that contains the information	No of Pages	Document Released	Relevant public interest consideration(s) against disclosure
	Heesom Legal and Brenda Tronson legal costs			
3 May 2016	Heesom Legal Tax Invoice	2	Part – bank details and item list	Table at s.14 Clauses 3(a) and (b); Clause 5 of Schedule 1
8 April 2016	Heesom Legal Tax Invoice	2	Part – bank details and item list	Table at s.14 Clauses 3(a) and (b); Clause 5 of Schedule 1
2 December 2015	Heesom Legal Tax Invoice	1	Part – bank details	Table at s.14 Clauses 3(a) and (b)
4 November 2015	Heesom Legal Tax Invoice	1	Part – bank details	Table at s.14 Clauses 3(a) and (b)
7 October 2015	Heesom Legal Tax Invoice	1	Part – bank details	Table at s.14 Clauses 3(a) and (b)
8 September 2016	Heesom Legal Tax Invoice	2	Part – bank details and item list	Table at s.14 Clauses 3(a) and (b); Clause 5 of Schedule 1
5 September 2015	Heesom Legal Tax Invoice	1	Part – bank details	Table at s.14 Clauses 3(a) and (b)
5 August 2015	Heesom Legal Tax Invoice	3	Part – bank details and item list	Table at s.14 Clauses 3(a) and (b); Clause 5 of Schedule 1

Date	Description of record that contains the information	No of Pages	Document Released	Relevant public interest consideration(s) against disclosure
5 August 2015	Heesom Legal Tax Invoice Statement	1	Part – bank details	Table at s.14 Clauses 3(a) and (b)
4 July 2015	Heesom Legal Tax Invoice	2	Part – bank details and item list	Table at s.14 Clauses 3(a) and (b); Clause 5 of Schedule 1
6 June 2015	Heesom Legal Tax Invoice	1	Part – bank details	Table at s.14 Clauses 3(a) and (b)
6 June 2015	Heesom Legal Tax Invoice Statement	1	Part – bank details	Table at s.14 Clauses 3(a) and (b)
	Dean of Veterinary Science Correspondence			
8 April 2016	Ms C Oliveira to Professor R Taylor and attachments	6	Part	Table at s.14 Clause 4(d)
28 October 2014 3:11	Mr T Robinson to Professor R Taylor	2	Part (incidental personal information)	Table at s.14 Clauses 3(a) and (b)