

NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR
OFFICE OF THE INFORMATION AND PRIVACY
COMMISSIONER

REPORT 2005-001

College of the North Atlantic

Summary: The Applicant applied under the *Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act (ATIPPA)* for access to records relating to legal costs, travel expenses, an Organizational Climate Survey and all e-mails referencing the Applicant and all e-mails sent to or sent from the Applicant. The Applicant claimed that the College failed to respond in accordance with the legislation and failed to fulfill its duty to assist applicants. The Commissioner found both claims to be well-founded and made several recommendations with respect to the College's obligations to the Applicant. The Commissioner also found that the College failed to provide requested documentation to the Commissioner's Office in accordance with the legislation.

Statutes Cited: *Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act*, SNL 2002, c. A-1.1, as am, ss. 9, 11(1) and (2), 12(1), 16(1)(b), 49(1), 50, 52(3), 67(1), 68(1) and (3).

Authorities Cited: *Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act* Fee Schedule, s. 3(1); Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Coordinating Office, Department of Justice, Policy and Procedures Manual.

I BACKGROUND

[1] The Applicant submitted an access to information request to the College of the North Atlantic (hereinafter referred to as the “College” or “CNA”), wherein he requested the following:

1. *All legal costs incurred by The College of the North Atlantic (CNA) for the period January 01 2002 to January 17 2005. This request includes but is not limited to all invoices and statements submitted by any law firm, or any business doing legal work for the CNA. This request is for all documents whether paid or unpaid and all legal costs whether paid by a third party or paid directly by CNA or agents of CNA. This request includes all legal costs incurred by or at the Qatar campus of CNA.*
2. *All travel claims submitted by or on behalf of [the Chair], Board of Governors, CNA for the period September 01, 2003 to January 14, 2005. This would include all claims submitted whether paid or not paid.*
3. *All travel claims submitted by or on behalf of [an employee], Faculty CNA for the period July 01, 2002 to January 14, 2005. This would include all claims submitted whether paid or not paid.*
4. *All travel claims submitted by or on behalf of [an employee], Faculty CNA for the period July 01, 2002 to January 14, 2005. This would include all claims submitted whether paid or not paid.*
5. *The Organizational Climate Survey conducted at the Qatar campus during or near the Intersession semester, 2003. I am requesting the results and statistical information, whether complete or not complete, collected as a result of this survey.*
6. *All emails that reference [the Applicant] and all emails that are sent from or sent to [the Applicant] whether at the Qatar campus or elsewhere.*

[2] Item 6 was subsequently amended as follows:

6. *All emails that reference [the Applicant] or any part of that name and would originate from or be sent to the following CNA personnel:*

[8 employees of the College]

- 6.2. *The entire file of emails that was contained on the CNA server under [the Applicant]. This would be the file that was already “burned” on to a CD.”*

- [3] The Applicant's original request was sent by registered mail and was received by the College on 17 January 2005. The amended request was sent to the College via facsimile on 18 March 2005.
- [4] On 24 February 2005 the Applicant filed a Request for Review under the *Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act (ATIPPA)*. According to the Applicant the College had failed to respond within the time limit set out in section 11 of the *ATIPPA*. The Applicant asked me to review the College's failure to act and to comment on the College's alleged failure to fulfill their duty to assist as set out in section 9 of the *ATIPPA*.
- [5] On 25 February 2005 an official of this Office contacted the Access and Privacy Coordinator for the College by telephone. The Coordinator indicated that he was not aware of the request. He subsequently confirmed that the request had been received by the College on 17 January 2005, but he had not been notified. The Coordinator further indicated that the College's General Counsel was handling the request. When questioned on this issue, General Counsel indicated that he was not aware that the College had a separate designated contact for access to information issues. Section 67 of the *ATIPPA* requires all public bodies to designate an individual for this purpose and also sets out their duties (see paragraph 22).
- [6] On 25 February 2005 this Office forwarded a letter to the College informing them of the Request for Review and stating, in part:

*Please forward copies of the following documents **within 14 days** of receipt of this letter, as required by sub-section 52(3) of the Act:*

- 1. any correspondence to the Applicant or to any affected third parties regarding the application;*
- 2. a copy of the records in your custody or control relating to the request;*
and
- 3. the College of the North Atlantic's reasons for not disclosing the records with the relevant sections of the Act cited.*

(emphasis in original)

- [7] This letter was received by the College on 3 March 2005, thereby establishing a response date of 17 March 2005. The College forwarded the subject records in three separate parts. The first part

was received at this Office on 21 March 2005 and included those records referenced in paragraph 1 as items 1, 2 and 5. A second part was received on 11 April 2005, and included those records referenced in paragraph 1 as items 3 and 4. A third and final part was received on 18 April 2005 and included a complete set of records as requested in our letter dated 25 February 2005. A severed version of the records referenced in paragraph 1 as items 1 through 5 were forwarded to the Applicant on or about 14 April 2005. An unsevered copy of those records referenced in paragraph 2 as item 6 (as amended) were provided in electronic format to this Office on 18 April 2005, but had not yet been severed and provided to the Applicant. In correspondence to this Office, dated 14 April 2005, the College indicated, in part:

With respect to item 6, I am now including the CD that contains the entire unvetted results of the college's server and the archives search undertaken pursuant to [the Applicant's] amended request. This CD contains in excess of 4,300 e-mails. We are in the process of vetting same. A copy of the vetted CD will be forwarded to [the Applicant] and yourself when it is prepared.

In correspondence dated 13 May 2005, the College sent the Applicant a severed version of these records together with a breakdown of the records that were withheld and the reasons.

- [8] With respect to the amended item 6.2, the College's General Counsel had indicated on 18 March 2005 that all of the Applicant's e-mails had been previously copied onto a disc and stored in his office. General Counsel further indicated that the disc would be provided to the Applicant the following week. On 8 April 2005, however, General Counsel informed this Office by e-mail that this particular disc does not exist. This was confirmed by the College's Manager of Information Technology.
- [9] On 2 March 2005 the Applicant informed this Office that he had received a letter from the College, under the General Counsel's signature. This letter was dated 18 February 2005 and had the words "HAND DELIVERED" written at the top. The letter, however, was not hand delivered but was sent by mail and was received by the Applicant on 2 March 2005.
- [10] This letter was the first piece of correspondence received by the Applicant in response to his request and was sent for the purpose of informing the Applicant that his request was subject to a

fee. The Applicant was asked to pay this fee in advance. The College subsequently waived their requirement for advance payment.

[11] On 17 March 2005 General Counsel forwarded a follow-up letter to the Applicant. This letter indicated in part that in order to thoroughly search for all e-mails as requested by the Applicant, the College would require a minimum of 18 business days. In response, the Applicant narrowed item 6 of his original request to only those e-mails referencing him and sent to and/or sent from eight identified employees of the College. The Applicant's amended request was hand delivered to this Office on 18 March 2005 and forwarded to the College via facsimile on the same day.

II APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION

[12] In his written submission, the Applicant states "CNA has taken every opportunity to work against my request for information. CNA has chosen delay and non-compliance with the Act, creating barriers in an attempt to not supply the information." The Applicant raises several points in support of this claim.

[13] The Applicant claims that the College has shown a pattern of delaying his right of access to information. The Applicant had submitted a request under the *Freedom of Information Act* (now repealed) in September of 2003, which included a request for e-mails referencing the Applicant. The College did not respond until January of 2004. In response to another request, submitted in October of 2004, the Applicant claims that the College responded on day 29 that the money order for the application fee was made payable to the NL Exchequer account and not the CNA. The Applicant was asked to re-submit the request with a money order made payable to CNA.

[14] The Applicant also claims that he had objected to the fee charged for the September 2003 request. He had asked the College to consider providing the information in electronic format in order to reduce the cost and time associated with photocopying. This request was denied.

[15] The Applicant also questions the assertion that the disc with his e-mails does not exist. He makes reference to correspondence received from the College and dated 13 January 2004. In this

correspondence, the College indicates that the e-mails, together with other correspondence, have either been released or withheld pursuant to specific provisions of the *Freedom of Information Act* (now repealed). The Applicant states "...since CNA reviewed this material in January 2004 CNA must have had custody and control of these records at that time." The Applicant also makes reference to General Counsel's statement in March of 2005 that the disc exists somewhere in his office.

III CNA SUBMISSION

[16] In its written submission, the College acknowledged that the response to the Applicant's request from 18 January 2005 to 10 March 2005 was "wholly inadequate," and offered an apology for the delay. Prior to 10 March 2005, the College believed that it was in full compliance with the *ATIPPA* due to the fact that they had written the Applicant asking him to pay the fee in advance. They have acknowledged in their submission that as of 10 March 2005 they understand that this was incorrect.

[17] The College submits that after 10 March 2005 it acted "diligently and reasonably" in dealing with this request. They explain that the records identified as items 1 through 5 were issued within 30 days of the amended request and the records identified as item 6 will be issued within 60 days of the amended request. The College contends that this is "...reasonable and within the spirit and intent of the Act." The College does, however, acknowledge several concerns and commits to specific corrective action:

This being said, the college recognizes that there have been significant systemic problems identified throughout this experience and that these problems need to be remedied. In that context, the college has taken all of the steps necessary to ensure that:

1. *Access to Information requests are immediately directed to the college's designated Access to Information officer. Accordingly, the President's staff have been advised that all future Access to Information requests should be directed to that individual.*

2. *The collection of requested information begins immediately upon receipt of an Access to Information request and that responses including any advance fee requests fully comply with the Regulations and that they are issued well before the expiry of the 30 day period prescribed by the Act.*
3. *Access to Information requests that will or likely will produce vast amounts of information are identified early and that potential delays are appropriately identified and communicated to the applicant.*
4. *Additional human resources are committed as and when necessary to ensure compliance with the Act.*
5. *All communications with an applicant are clear, unambivalent and fully compliant with section 12 of the Act.*

[18] The College also submitted a summary of events and copies of internal correspondence.

IV DISCUSSION

[19] Under authority of section 11(1) of the *ATIPPA*, the College was obligated to make every reasonable effort to respond in writing to the Applicant's request on or before 16 February 2005, unless certain conditions were met as specified in section 11(1). Failure to respond within this time limit is considered a refusal to provide access (section 11(2)). The content of the response is set out in section 12(1).

11. (1) The head of a public body shall make every reasonable effort to respond to a request in writing within 30 days after receiving it, unless

(a) the time limit for responding is extended under section 16;

(b) notice is given to a third party under section 28; or

(c) the request has been transferred under section 17 to another public body.

(2) Where the head of a public body fails to respond within the 30 day period or an extended period, the head is considered to have refused access to the record.

12. (1) *In a response under section 11, the head of a public body shall inform the applicant*

- (a) *whether access to the record or part of the record is granted or refused;*
- (b) *if access to the record or part of the record is granted, where, when and how access will be given; and*
- (c) *if access to the record or part of the record is refused,*
 - (i) *the reasons for the refusal and the provision of this Act on which the refusal is based,*
 - (ii) *the name, title, business address and business telephone number of an officer or employee of the public body who can answer the applicant's questions about the refusal, and*
 - (iii) *that the applicant may appeal the refusal to the Trial Division or ask for a review of the refusal by the commissioner, and advise the applicant of the applicable time limits and how to pursue an appeal or review.*

[20] In addition, section 9 of the *ATIPPA* is relevant to this review:

9. The head of a public body shall make every reasonable effort to assist an applicant in making a request and to respond without delay to an applicant in an open, accurate and complete manner.

[21] Based on the information presented to this Office it is clear that the College failed to act in a manner consistent with section 11, a fact that has been acknowledged by the College. While my recommendations will be straightforward with respect to this point, I have also been asked by the Applicant to comment on the College's exercise of its duty to assist as set out in section 9. After reviewing the facts as put before me I have identified several areas of concern that warrant consideration.

[22] I would like to first address the failure of the College to engage the designated Access and Privacy Coordinator. I consider this an important point and one that had a significant effect on the College's subsequent interactions with the Applicant and with this Office. As indicated in

paragraph 5, the College's designated Access and Privacy Coordinator was contacted by this Office on 25 February 2005, 39 days after the College had received the request, and indicated that he was not aware of the request. Section 67(1) of the *ATIPPA* sets out the duties of the Coordinator:

67. (1) The head of a public body shall designate a person on the staff of the public body to

(a) receive and process requests made under this Act;

(b) co-ordinate responses to requests for approval by the head of the public body;

(c) educate staff of the public body about the applicable provisions of this Act;

(d) track requests made under this Act and the outcome of the request; and

(e) prepare statistical reports on requests for the head of the public body.

[23] Obviously, the Coordinator was not able to honour his obligations under section 67 if he had not been advised of the existence of the request. I believe this to be a significant failure on the part of the College to appropriately assist the Applicant. I do note that in its submission dated 29 April 2005 the College has committed to ensuring that the Coordinator is engaged in all future access to information requests.

[24] I would next like to address the time lines throughout this process. As indicated in paragraph 19, the College was required to respond to the Applicant no later than 16 February 2005. Although the legislation sets out specific circumstances where this response time may be extended, the College did not request an extension. It is interesting to note that the College has referenced the "voluminous nature of the request," yet did not engage section 16(1)(b) of the *ATIPPA*, which provides:

16. (1) The head of a public body may extend the time for responding to a request for up to an additional 30 days where

(b) a large number of records is requested or must be searched, and responding within the time period in section 11 would interfere unreasonably with the operations of the public body;

[25] The Applicant did not receive a response until 2 March 2005, 44 days after the original request was received and 5 days after the College was contacted by this Office. This response informed the Applicant that the College "...has commenced the compilation of materials pursuant to your *Access to Information Act* request..." This response also provided a fee estimate and required the Applicant to pay the full amount of the estimate in advance. Notwithstanding the College's submission that their General Counsel was away from the office from 18 January 2005 to 26 January 2005 and from 3 February 2005 to 16 February 2005, I do not accept that it was reasonable for the College to take 44 days to inform the Applicant that the information was being "compiled" and to provide him with a fee estimate, particularly in light of the fact that the College has a designated individual (the Access and Privacy Coordinator) responsible for these issues.

[26] It is also important to note the delay between the date of this response letter and the date it was sent. The envelope was postmarked 1 March 2005, indicating that the letter was sent 11 days after it was dated. The College has claimed that this delay resulted from a misunderstanding between General Counsel and his assistant. I should also note that in its submission the College indicated that the response letter was sent to this Office via facsimile on 25 February 2005. This Office did not receive a copy of the letter in question until 2 March 2005, from the Applicant. We did not receive a copy from the College until 17 March 2005.

[27] With respect to the College's requirement for advance payment of the entire fee, this is contrary to section 3(1) of the *ATIPPA* Fee Schedule, which provides:

3. (1) If a head gives a person an estimate of an amount payable under the Act, the head may require the person to pay a deposit equal to 50 per cent of the estimate before the head takes any further steps to respond to the request.

[28] This process is also explained in detail in section 3.22 of the *ATIPPA* Policy and Procedures Manual. This Manual is produced by the Access to Information and Protection of Privacy

Coordinating Office with the Provincial Department of Justice, and has been distributed to Access and Privacy Coordinators, including the designated Coordinator for the College. It is also available on the Department of Justice website. The above-noted Fee Schedule, as authorized by section 68(1) of the *ATIPPA*, is also included in this Manual as Appendix 5. It appears likely that the failure of the College to engage their designated Coordinator contributed to the Applicant being misled on this point. I would emphasize, however, that once General Counsel was advised of the fee policy, the College waived its requirement for advance payment. The College advised the Applicant of this by way of correspondence dated 17 March 2005. It is important to note that the amount of the fee is not the subject of this review and will not form part of my recommendations. There is, however, an established procedure under the *ATIPPA* for the Applicant to file a complaint with this Office if he feels a fee is inappropriate.

[29] Continuing with the issue of time lines, this Office forwarded correspondence to the President of the College, dated 25 February 2005 and received by the College on 3 March 2005. This correspondence, as quoted in paragraph 6, required the production of documents within 14 days as per section 52(3) of the *ATIPPA*.

[30] As indicated in paragraph 7, the information responsive to this request was received at this Office in three separate sets of records. The first set was received on 21 March 2005, the second set on 11 April 2005 and the third and final set on 18 April 2005, 4 days, 25 days and 32 days, respectively, after the expiration of the mandatory 14 day period specified in section 52. The full set of records, therefore, was not received at this Office until 46 days after the College had received our specific instructions. I would also note that on 10 March 2005 this Office e-mailed the College reminding them of the 14 day deadline. In a return e-mail General Counsel indicated that he had not seen the letter.

[31] I am greatly concerned that 7 days after the College received correspondence from this Office, the individual handling this request had not even seen that correspondence, and only then became aware of it in response to a reminder from this Office. While I appreciate the volume of records and the difficulties with retrieving the e-mails, I do not accept the extent of the delay in

responding to this Office. In support of my position on this point I would like to discuss several time related issues.

[32] In correspondence sent to this Office via facsimile on 17 March 2005, the College informed this Office that the records responsive to items 1, 2 and 5 of the Applicant's original request were being provided (those records arrived at this Office by courier on 21 March 2005). With respect to the records responsive to items 3 and 4, the College stated, "I am unable to provide the copies of the information requested pursuant to items 3 and 4 of the Applicant's request dated January 14, 2005 since these materials are or were in Qatar and have not yet arrived in Newfoundland" (the College has a campus in Qatar).

[33] On 18 March 2005 a representative of this Office spoke with the College's General Counsel by telephone. At that time, General Counsel indicated that he would have his staff arrange to have the records responsive to items 3 and 4 sent from Qatar. He further indicated that this should only take a day or two and all of the documents would be ready by the following week. In fact, correspondence provided by the College indicates that they did not request the information from Qatar until 28 March 2005, 10 days after the above noted telephone conversation. On 8 April 2005, a further 11 days later, the College again requested the information from Qatar. Our office finally received these records on 11 April 2005, 39 days after it was requested and 24 days after the College informed this Office that these particular records would be available within a few days. The College presented me with two extenuating circumstances in defense of these delays. While I accept that these circumstances were a contributing factor, I do not accept the extent of these delays, particularly in light of other delays throughout this process.

[34] With respect to the College's submission as described in paragraph 17, I fail to see the relevance of connecting items 1 through 5 to the Applicant's revised request. The revised request dealt only with item 6 and should not have had any bearing on the College's response time on the other items. Claiming that items 1 through 5 were issued within 30 days of the revised request is completely irrelevant.

[35] As far as item 6 is concerned, the College's claim that these records will be issued within 60 days of the revised request invites two comments. Firstly, the College did not seek an extension of the 30 day time limit in accordance with section 16 and, therefore, remains obligated to respond within 30 days, not 60 days. Their claim of a 60 day response time only reinforces the fact that they have failed to respond within the appropriate time frames. Secondly, the College's statement, dated 29 April 2005, states that the records **will** be issued, as opposed to **have** been issued, indicating a continued delay. The College did not respond to the Applicant with respect to item 6 until 13 May 2005, 56 days after receipt of the amended request.

[36] With all due respect, I do not accept the College's claim that these timelines are "...reasonable and within the spirit and intent of the Act." In fact, I believe the College's response to the Applicant's request to be patently unreasonable and simply an attempt to deflect from the failure to appropriately respond to the original request.

[37] With respect to item 6.2 of the Applicant's amended request, there has been considerable confusion over this issue. On 18 March 2005 the College informed this Office that the Applicant's e-mails had been stored on a disc which could be easily recovered. Subsequent correspondence from the College's Information Technology (IT) Division, however, indicated that the information was on a server as opposed to a disc. After an extensive search, the IT Division concluded that the information in question had been erased and was not recoverable. In reviewing a series of correspondence between the College's General Counsel and IT staff, as well as a meeting between my staff and the College's Manager of Information Technology, I am satisfied that the College took appropriate steps to recover this information and I accept that it is no longer available.

[38] While paragraph 37 deals with the Applicant's e-mails, there is still the question of all other e-mails referencing the Applicant. Due to the difficulties in searching and recovering archived e-mails the Applicant amended his original request in order to accommodate these difficulties. An electronic copy of the e-mails responsive to this amended request was received at this Office on 18 April 2005, 31 days after the amended request was received by the College. A response was

forwarded to the Applicant on 13 May 2005, 56 days after the amended request was received by the College.

[39] With respect to the fee, the College has made several references to the fact that they are waiting on a response from the Applicant indicating whether or not he accepts the fee estimate. In correspondence to the Applicant dated 17 March 2005 the College stated, in part:

Please note that pursuant to section 68(3) of the Act you are required to indicate your acceptance of the fee estimate referenced in my previous correspondence to you and/or to vary your request within 30 days of receipt of this notice.

[40] The Applicant chose to modify his request and forwarded the appropriate correspondence, through this Office, to the College on 18 March 2005. During a telephone conversation with a representative of this Office on that day, General Counsel indicated that this course of action would significantly reduce the original fee estimate. It is the position of this Office that an amended request would warrant a revised fee estimate. In fact, section 68(3) anticipates a change in the fee in response to an amended request:

*68. (3) The applicant has 30 days from the day the estimate is sent to accept the estimate or **modify the request in order to change the amount of the fees**, after which time the applicant is considered to have abandoned the request.*

(emphasis added)

[41] This point is also clearly referenced in section 3.22 of the *ATIPPA* Policy and Procedure Manual as well as on the approved form (Form 6B – Estimate of Costs) used for the purpose of section 68. This form has been established by the Provincial Minister of Justice and can be found in Appendix 1 of the above noted Manual. Ministerial approval of the form can be found in Appendix 5 of the Manual.

[42] I note that the College did not use Form 6B when responding to the Applicant. In addition, they did not indicate to the Applicant in their original correspondence to him, dated 18 February

2005, that he had to respond within 30 days. Clearly the College cannot expect the Applicant to respond within a time frame without having communicated this time frame to him.

[43] As noted in paragraph 39, the 30 day time limit was not communicated to the Applicant until 17 March 2005. The Applicant, however, chose to modify his request and, in my opinion, was thereby entitled to a revised fee estimate. I have no information to suggest that such an estimate was ever provided to the Applicant. In my opinion, it was the College that was obligated to provide information to the Applicant, in the form of a revised fee estimate. They are not in a position to demand a response from the Applicant with respect to a fee that no longer applies.

V CONCLUSION

[44] I would like to emphasize that the subject of this review is the alleged failure of the College to act in accordance with the time limits set out in the legislation and its alleged failure to fulfill its duty to assist applicants. The content of the records and any severing is not currently before me, nor is the amount of any fee that may be imposed. There are procedures available through the *ATIPPA* if the Applicant wishes to pursue either of these issues. As such, I will not be issuing recommendations in this report respecting the release and severing of records responsive to the request, nor on the amount of any fees.

[45] Based on the information before me it is evident that the College has failed to meet many of its obligations in this situation. They have clearly failed to respond within the time frames as evidenced by the documentation and acknowledged by the College; they failed to engage, and in fact did not even notify, their Access and Privacy Coordinator; they failed to assist the Applicant in an open, accurate and complete manner; and they failed to apply the fee schedule and fee estimate process appropriately.

[46] I also have great concern over the failure of the College to adequately respond to the Commissioner's Office in the course of this review. The College failed to meet its obligations as mandated by section 52. While this Office may be prepared to accept a certain degree of delay where warranted, the extent of the delays in this situation is simply not acceptable. This point is

further emphasized by the fact that the College's General Counsel, the individual handling the request, had not even seen our written correspondence 7 days after it had been received.

[47] I would note, however, that the College has accepted considerable responsibility for its actions on this file. I am very encouraged by the College's self-imposed remedies, quoted in paragraph 17, and fully anticipate that such measures will be implemented and will be reflected in any future requests.

VI RECOMMENDATIONS

[48] I find that the College of the North Atlantic has failed to fulfill its duties under sections 9, 11, 12, 52, 67 and 68 of the *ATIPPA*, with respect to the Applicant's request.

[49] Under authority of section 49(1) of the *ATIPPA*, I hereby make the following recommendations:

1. That the College take steps to ensure that it meets the time limits imposed by the legislation;
2. That the College ensure a timely and complete response to any individual applying for access to information;
3. That the College fully engage the designated Access and Privacy Coordinator in all access to information requests;
4. That the College perform its duties under the *ATIPPA* in a manner that is consistent with the duty to assist an Applicant;
5. That the College provide documents to the Commissioner, when requested, within the statutory time lines set out in the legislation; and
6. That the College apply the Fee Schedule, including the issuance of estimates, in strict accordance with the legislation and established policies and procedures.

[50] Under authority of section 50 of the *ATIPPA*, I direct the head of the College to respond to these recommendations within 15 days after receiving this report.

[51] Dated at St. John's, in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, this 17th day of May, 2005.

Philip Wall
Information and Privacy Commissioner
Newfoundland and Labrador