

**OFFICE OF THE INFORMATION
COMMISSIONER (W.A.)**

**File Refs: F0742000
Decision Ref: D0022001**

Participants: **Avon Valley Environmental Society
Inc.**
Complainant

- and -

Agriculture Western Australia
First Respondent

and

“J” & “K”
Second Respondents

DECISION AND REASONS FOR DECISION

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION - refusal of access – documents relating to appeal to Minister by land-owner in respect of a Soil Conservation Notice – clause 3(1) – whether personal information – disclosure of personal information where third party’s identity can be reasonably ascertained – clause 3(6) – public interest factors for and against disclosure – whether practicable to delete exempt matter.

Freedom of Information Act 1992 (WA) s. 102; Schedule 1 clauses 3(1), 3(6); Schedule 2 Glossary
Soil and Land Conservation Act 1945 (WA) ss.33, 38(2), 39A.

DECISION

The decision of the agency is varied. I decide that:

- the matter identified in the schedule attached to my reasons for this decision is exempt under clause 3(1) of Schedule 1 to the *Freedom of Information Act 1992*; and
- the documents are otherwise not exempt.

B. KEIGHLEY-GERARDY
INFORMATION COMMISSIONER

4 January 2001

REASONS FOR DECISION

1. This is an application for external review by the Information Commissioner arising out of a decision made by Agriculture Western Australia ('the agency') to refuse the Avon Valley Environmental Society Inc ('the complainant') access to documents requested under the *Freedom of Information Act 1992* ('the FOI Act').
2. In 1993, the Commissioner for Soil and Land Conservation ('the Commissioner') issued a Soil Conservation Notice in respect of certain land. The notice was registered on the certificate of title of the land concerned and it had the effect of preventing the land-owner from clearing his land. In 1997, the land-owner submitted to the Commissioner a notice of his intention to clear his land which was, effectively, a request under s.38(2) of the *Soil and Land Conservation Act 1945* to discharge the Soil Conservation Notice.
3. After assessing the proposal to clear the land concerned, the Commissioner decided not to discharge the Soil Conservation Notice. Following that refusal, in November 1997, the land-owner appealed to the Minister for Primary Industry ('the Minister'). The Minister referred the matter to an advisory committee on appeals appointed under s.39A of the *Soil and Land Conservation Act 1945* for its examination and advice. Subsequently, the advisory committee provided its advice to the Minister. In July 1998, the Minister informed the land-owner that he had decided to uphold the appeal and quash the Soil Conservation Notice, subject to certain conditions.
4. On 6 January 2000, the complainant made an application to the agency under the FOI Act for access to documents relating to the appeal made by the land-owner to the Minister. The agency identified 3 documents and refused the complainant access to those documents on the ground that they are exempt under clause 3(1) of Schedule 1 to the FOI Act. The agency's decision was confirmed following an internal review. On 13 April 2000, the complainant made a complaint to the Information Commissioner seeking external review of the agency's decision.

REVIEW BY THE INFORMATION COMMISSIONER

5. I obtained the disputed documents from the agency. Various discussions were held with the parties to determine whether this complaint could be resolved by conciliation. In the course of my dealing with this complaint, the complainant claimed that more than the 3 documents identified by the agency should exist in relation to this matter. The agency's files were examined and additional documents were found that came within the scope of the complainant's access application. Subsequently, the agency made a decision with respect to the additional documents and granted the complainant access to 22 documents, but refused access to others on the ground that they are exempt under clause 3(1).

6. The land-owner was contacted by my office and advised of his rights to make submissions and to be joined as a party to this complaint. Initially, he did not seek to be joined as a party and did not make any submissions to me other than to indicate his objection to the disclosure of the documents.
7. On 22 September 2000, after examining the disputed documents and considering the material before me, I informed the parties in writing of my preliminary view of this complaint, including my reasons. It was my preliminary view that each of the disputed documents contains personal information about third parties and that that information is, on its face, exempt matter under clause 3(1).
8. However, I was also of the preliminary view that it would be practicable to delete exempt matter from all but one of the disputed documents and to provide the complainant with access to edited copies of those documents. The agency responded and maintained its claims for exemption for the disputed documents, but did not make any further submissions to me.
9. The land-owner was provided with a copy of my preliminary view and was once again invited to be joined as a party to this complaint. On 6 November 2000, following a meeting between the land-owner and his wife and my Senior Investigations Officer, the land-owner and his wife sought to be joined as parties to this complaint and were so joined. Hereafter I shall refer to the land-owner as “the first third party” and to the land-owner and his wife as “the third parties”. The third parties made oral submissions to my Senior Investigations Officer and objected to the disclosure of the disputed documents on the grounds that their disclosure would reveal personal information about them.
10. I received further submissions in writing from the complainant’s solicitor seeking full access to each of the disputed documents.

THE DISPUTED DOCUMENTS

11. There are 8 documents in dispute. I shall refer to those documents by the numbers assigned to them in the schedule prepared by my office. The disputed documents are:

Number.	Folios	Description
	5-7	Letter dated 12 November 1997, from third party to the Minister containing the grounds for the appeal.
1	41-45	Letter dated 12 January 1998, from the third party to the Minister containing amended grounds of appeal.
5	51	Letter dated 5 March 1998 from the Minister to the third party accepting amended grounds of appeal.

8	54-55	Letter dated 13 October 1997 from Commissioner informing the third party of his decision.
28	77	Letter dated 19 January 1998 from the third party to the Minister.
32	81-90	Report to the Minister from the Advisory Committee, undated.
33	91	Letter dated 24 July 1998 from the Minister to the third party containing the Minister's decision on the appeal.
34	93	Letter dated 24 July 1998 from the Minister to the third party containing the Minister's decision on the appeal. This document includes a handwritten annotation.

THE EXEMPTION

12. Both the agency and the third parties claim that the disputed documents are exempt under clause 3(1). Clause 3, so far as is relevant, provides:

“3. *Personal information*

Exemption

- (1) *Matter is exempt matter if its disclosure would reveal personal information about an individual (whether living or dead).*

Limits on exemption

...

- (3) *Matter is not exempt matter under subclause (1) merely because its disclosure would reveal, in relation to a person who is or has been an officer of an agency, prescribed details relating to –*

- (a) *the person;*
 (b) *the person's position or functions as an officer; or*
 (c) *things done by the person in the course of performing functions as an officer.*

...

- (6) *Matter is not exempt matter under subclause (1) if its disclosure would, on balance, be in the public interest.”*

13. In the Glossary in Schedule 2 to the FOI Act the term “personal information” is defined to mean:

“... information or an opinion, whether true or not, and whether recorded in a material form or not, about an individual, whether living or dead -

- (a) *whose identity is apparent or can reasonably be ascertained from the information or opinion; or*
- (b) *who can be identified by reference to an identification number or other identifying particular such as a fingerprint, retina print or body sample”.*
14. The definition of “personal information” in the Glossary makes it clear that any information or opinion about a person, from which that person can be identified, is, on the face of it, exempt under clause 3(1). In my view, the purpose of the exemption in clause 3(1) is to protect the privacy of individuals about whom private, and often sensitive, information is recorded in the documents held by government agencies.
15. I have examined the disputed documents. Each of those documents contains information including the name of the first third party, the third parties’ private postal address and the address of their property, as well as other information from which the identities of the third parties could reasonably be ascertained. I consider that disclosure of the disputed documents would reveal information about the third parties including information about their dealings with the Commissioner, the Minister and the Ministerial Appeals Committee; their concerns relating to the management of their own property; and their private plans for their business and financial future. Information of that kind is clearly personal information, as defined, about the third parties and is, *prima facie*, exempt matter under clause 3(1).
16. The names of twelve other individuals also appear in the documents. One of those is the Minister for Primary Industry and Fisheries, whose name appears as either the addressee or the author of several of the documents (folios 5-7 and Documents 1, 5, 28, 32, 33 and 34) and another is the Commissioner of Soil and Land Conservation, whose name appears as the author of Document 8. Having inspected the documents, I am satisfied that any information about those two individuals which would be revealed by disclosure of those documents is merely information relating to things done or purported to have been done by them in the course of their official duties. Accordingly, by virtue of the limit on exemption contained in clause 3(3) of Schedule 1 to the FOI Act, that information is not exempt under clause 3(1).
17. Clause 3(3) provides that matter is not exempt under subclause (1) merely because its disclosure would reveal, in relation to a person who is or has been an officer of an agency, prescribed details relating to the person; the person’s position or functions as an officer; or things done by the person in the course of performing functions as an officer. A Minister is an agency, as defined in clause 1 of the Glossary in Schedule 2 to the FOI Act. A Minister is also, by virtue of paragraph (e) of the definition of “principal officer” in clause 1 of the Glossary, also the principal officer of that agency. Therefore, I consider the Minister to be “an officer of an agency” for the purposes of clause 3(3) of Schedule 1. The Commissioner of Soil and Land Conservation is clearly an officer of an agency. Regulation 9 of the *Freedom of Information Regulations 1993* prescribes, for

the purposes of clause 3(3), details in respect of an officer of agency including the person's name; the position held by the person in the agency; the functions and duties of the person; and anything done by the person in the course of performing or purporting to perform the person's functions or duties as an officer.

18. Three of the other individuals named were the members of the relevant Ministerial Appeals Committee. One of those was an officer of the agency, and another was an officer of another agency. It also appears to me that the Appeals Committee may itself be an agency for the purposes of the FOI Act in accordance with the definition of "agency" and paragraph (e) or (f) of the definition of "public body or office" in the Glossary. As I understand it, either from information given by the agency or from the documents themselves, all of the other individuals named in the documents are, or were at the relevant time, officers of the agency or another agency. All of the information concerning those individuals, in my opinion, relates to things done by those persons in the course of performing functions as officers of an agency.
19. In usual circumstances, I would consider that information to be subject to the limit in clause 3(3) and, therefore, not exempt under clause 3(1). However, in the circumstances of this matter, I consider that the disclosure of those names, being the names of the particular officers involved in various capacities in dealing with the first third party's appeal, or at an earlier stage of the process, would reveal information from which the third parties' identities would be apparent or could be reasonably ascertained. In those circumstances, therefore, I consider that disclosure of those officers' names would not reveal merely information of the kind described in clause 3(3) but would reveal personal information about the third parties. Therefore, I find that matter to be, *prima facie*, exempt under clause 3(1) of Schedule 1 to the FOI Act.
20. Information about the third parties is clearly not affected by the limit in clause 3(3). In the circumstances of this complaint, the only limit on exemption that, in my opinion, may apply in respect of personal information about the third parties is the limit in clause 3(6) which provides that matter is not exempt under clause 3(1) if its disclosure would, on balance, be in the public interest. Pursuant to s.102(3) of the FOI Act, the onus is on the complainant to persuade me that, on balance, the public interest favours the disclosure of personal information about the third parties.

The complainant's submission

21. The complainant's application to me for external review included submissions concerning the "public interest test" in clause 3(6). The earlier submissions made by the complainant were supplemented by a further submission in response to my preliminary view. The complainant initially submitted:
 - It is in the public interest that documents which have been paid for by the public purse, concern matters that directly or indirectly affect a significant part of the public, or relate to matters in which a significant part of the public has an interest, are made available to the public unless

there is a very good reason not to, and no reason has been provided by the agency why this principle should not apply in this application.

- The activities of the Commissioner, the Minister, and the appeals committee are all paid for by the public purse to monitor and minimise the overall effect of individual land clearing proposals, and there is a public interest in people being fully informed of the basis on which decisions directly affecting their interests have been made by the government.
- The Minister has the power to vary or quash a Soil Conservation Notice under s.33 of the *Soil and Land Conversation Act 1945*. There is no requirement for the Minister to disclose his reasons nor does the section provide any guidelines for the Minister in making such a decision. The public interest includes being informed of the basis for decision-making including the matters taken into account, the weight given to those matters and the kinds of matters considered irrelevant. This aspect of the public interest has considerable weight where a Minister is not required to give or publish reasons for his decision.
- The clearing occurred in the context of the Commissioner imposing a notice against the clearing and the Minister varying the notice and there is great public interest in the reasons for this decision being released because the complainant and the wider community have been affected by the Minister's decision.
- In the circumstances of this particular clearing there should be no private matters between the Minister and the third party because undisclosed personal information that may have influenced the Minister's decision will be seen to reflect on the integrity of the Minister's decision and it is not in the public interest that the Minister's integrity is doubted by the community.
- In circumstances where there is speculation in the media about a Ministerial decision, disclosure will enable proper scrutiny of the decision-making process, and fully inform the public of the facts which tends to be in the public interest and, in the circumstances of this complaint, there is community speculation about the clearing following the successful appeal by the respondent and public confusion about the reasons for the decision made by the Minister.

22. The supplementary submission of the complainant is as follows:

“It is in the public interest that the complainant is able to satisfy itself that the regulatory framework for the lifting of a Soil Conservation Notice ... has been complied with by the landowner and the Minister, especially in circumstances where that land and surrounding land is degraded and at risk of further degradation.

If the documents...will inform the complainant of the nature of the material that was before the Minister, the grounds of the landowner's appeal and the decision of the Minister; the complainant will still not know of the reasons (which presumably includes the report and recommendation of the Appeals Committee) for the Minister's decision. This is the essence of the complaint and the subject of the pressing public interest in the Minister's decision.

There is no requirement in the Soil and Land Conservation Act 1945 for the Minister to give his reasons for his decision. However, in some cases it may be legitimate to infer from the absence of stated reasons the presence of illegitimate reasons...It is not in the public interest for such inferences to be drawn.

The complainant is concerned that personal reasons might have unlawfully influenced the decision making process. It is submitted that "any just cause" in section 38(1) of the Soil and Land Conservation Act 1945, cannot include the personal reasons of third parties... The Soil and Land Conservation Act 1945 is an Act relating to the conservation of soil and land resources, and to the mitigation of the effects of erosion, salinity and flooding. The Act is not concerned with the effect of the conservation measures on individual landowners or third parties.

It is arguable the personal reasons should have been an irrelevant consideration in this decision, and that it is reasonable for the complainant to infer that personal reasons influenced the decision making process because:

- (i) the decision is inconsistent with the policy and objects of the Soil and Land Conservation Act 1945;*
- (ii) the persistent refusal of the Minister to release the documents sought;*
- (iii) the personal information exemption is relied on;*
- (iv) there appears no other reason why the notice should have been lifted; and*
- (v) "personal information" about third parties is scattered throughout the document (32).*

Accordingly, it is arguable that the Minister's decision might have been ultra vires. It is in the public interest that a decision, by the Minister made ultra vires the Minister's powers, is disclosed."

The third parties' submission

23. The third parties object to the disclosure of any of the information in the documents on the basis that they have proceeded to conduct their affairs in accordance with the law in order to deal with their land which they lawfully purchased and have lawfully attempted to develop, and they should not be

subjected to harassment by other parties. They consider it inappropriate that their private affairs be made available to any other person.

24. The third parties submit that, if anyone has a problem with decisions of the Minister of the Government, then that ought to be dealt with without dragging innocent members of the public into it, and disclosing their private affairs. Were they confident that the information were to be disclosed only to a limited number of people in order to explain the Minister's decision-making, then, the third parties submit, they may not object to disclosure. However, they submit that, given their experiences to date, they do not have such confidence.
25. The third parties contend that merely deleting names and other identifying material such as the location of the property would not protect their privacy as, firstly, the complainant clearly knows which property is involved and the identities of the owners. Further, disclosure of any of the material would clearly identify them because the Minister's decision is the only one of that kind made in their region. It is well known to people in their region, they submit, that the decision relates to them and their land and, therefore, it would be well known that the information contained in the documents related to them, even if their names and other identifying matter were to be deleted.

Public interest

26. In the context of the FOI Act, I recognise that there is a strong public interest in maintaining personal privacy and consider that that public interest may only be displaced by some stronger countervailing public interest that requires the disclosure of personal information about another individual. I also recognise a public interest in people being able to live and go about their lawful business on their own property without undue interference by others.
27. Favours disclosure, I recognise a public interest in people being informed of the basis on which appeal decisions are made by the Minister, including the Minister's reasons for such decisions and the matters taken into account by the Minister in making such a decision. I consider that this is an aspect of the wider public interest in the accountability of Government and its agencies.
28. I also recognise that there is a public interest in ensuring that the statutory provisions of the *Soil and Land Conservation Act 1945* have been complied with and that the appeal processes have been fair to all parties concerned. Further, in the circumstances of this complaint, I accept that there have been concerns expressed by some sections of the community about land clearing in the general region in which the third parties' property is situated, as evidenced by a number of press articles and published letters to the editor of a local community newspaper provided to me by the complainant. I also recognise a public interest in the maintenance and protection of native flora and fauna species and in ensuring that private land use does not impact adversely on the wider environment. That public interest is reflected in the *Soil and Land Conservation Act 1945*.

29. I note that, in a letter to the complainant dated 20 December 1999, the agency informed the complainant of the basis for the initial decision made by the Commissioner and of the substance of the decision made by the Minister following the first third party's appeal. However, in my view, that letter does not disclose the reasons for the Minister's decision, nor does it reveal the matters taken into account by the Minister in reaching that decision.
30. There does not appear to be any other means of ensuring accountability by the Minister for a decision to override a decision of the Commissioner made under the *Soil and Land Conservation Act 1945*. There is no requirement under the legislation for the Minister to give reasons for such decisions and, in these circumstances, I consider the FOI Act to be an important means of making the persons and bodies that are responsible for State and local government more accountable to the public. To that end, I consider, on balance, that the public interest favours disclosure of the material before the Minister when the decision was made, so far as that can be done without unduly impinging upon the privacy of the third parties.

Folios 5-7 and Document 1

31. Folios 5-7 and Document 1 contain the grounds of the appeal to the Minister and submissions in support of those grounds. I have considered the contents of those documents carefully and I am of the view that the name, postal address and personal signature of their author is information personal to that person and that, on balance, there is no public interest in its disclosure. The public interests identified above as favouring disclosure do not, in my view, outweigh the public interest in the protection of personal privacy in respect of that information, or in respect of the location of the third parties' property, from which their identities could be easily ascertained. Nor do those public interests require, in my view, the disclosure of the name of the officer who prepared a report on the matter for the Commissioner or the two other officers referred to, from which information it appears to me the identities of the third parties may be apparent or could be reasonably ascertained.
32. I understand that the first third party has complied with the conditions imposed by the Minister and that the land in question has been cleared. The public interest in the accountability of the Minister for his decisions would not be furthered, in my view, by disclosure of the identities of the particular individuals concerned in this case or by information particularly personal to them. It seems to me, therefore, that there would be no benefits ensuing to the public from the disclosure of that particular personal information about the third parties, and in particular the first third party, and no practical benefits are likely to be gained by the complainant from having access to that kind of personal information, which identifies the individual concerned.
33. Even with that information deleted, however, I accept that disclosure of those documents could be said to reveal personal information, as that term is defined in the FOI Act, about the third parties. The complainant requested access to documents relating to the first third party's appeal concerning the third parties'

property specifically and named the first third party in its access application. In its notice of decision, the agency identified the first third party by name and the relevant property and that the documents it had identified as within the scope of the access application related to that person's appeal concerning that property. Clearly, therefore, disclosure of any information concerning the appeal made by that person and his dealings with the Minister will reveal information about that person.

34. However, I do not consider that the information contained in those documents, subject to deletion of the information referred to in paragraph 31 above, is of the particular personal and private nature that, in my view, the clause 3 exemption is designed to protect. The grounds of appeal and submissions focus primarily on the actions of the Commissioner and the reasons why the Minister should exercise his discretion and overturn the Commissioner's decision. As I have said, I consider there to be a considerable public interest in the accountability of the Minister for the exercise of such a power and, to that end, the process should be as open and transparent as possible. Where there is no requirement to give reasons for the exercise of such power and, as in this case, no reasons are given, then I consider that the public interest favours disclosure of at least the material that was before the Minister when the decision was made.
35. Accordingly, I find the material specified in paragraph 31 above exempt under clause 3(1) of Schedule 1 to the FOI Act. I also find that the disclosure of folios 5-7 and Document 1, subject to the deletion of the material which I have found to be exempt, would, on balance, be in the public interest and they are, therefore, not exempt. In order to assist the agency to give effect to my decision, I have identified the material I have found to be exempt in a schedule attached to these reasons.

Documents 5, 8, 28, 33 and 34

36. Documents 5, 8 and 28 are correspondence between the Minister and the first third party, the Commissioner and the first third party, and the first third party and the Minister, respectively. Document 33 is a letter from the Minister to the first third party conveying the Minister's decision on the appeal. Document 34 is a copy of that letter bearing a handwritten instruction.
37. For similar reasons to those given above, I do not consider there to be any public interest in the disclosure of the first third party's name or private address, or the specific location of his property, where that information appears in those documents, and I find that matter to be exempt under clause 3(1). For the reasons given, I also consider that, on balance, it would not be in the public interest to disclose other information in those documents from which the third parties' identities might be apparent or reasonably ascertained, being correspondence reference numbers and names and telephone numbers of particular officers involved in the matter, and I find that information to be exempt under clause 3(1). Further, consistently with my previous decisions, I consider the personal signatures appearing in those documents, including those of public officials, to be personal information about those individuals. In the

circumstances of this matter, I do not consider there to be any public interest in their disclosure and I find them to be exempt under clause 3(1).

38. Subject to the deletion of that matter, however, I consider that, on balance, the disclosure of those documents would be in the public interest. The documents reveal the steps in the process of the Ministerial appeal and I am of the view that the public interests I have identified above, relating to the accountability of Government for such processes, weigh strongly in favour of their disclosure and outweigh any public interest in non-disclosure. Therefore, subject to the deletion of the peculiarly personal information about particular individuals contained in them, I find that those documents are not exempt.

Document 32

39. Document 32 is the report to the Minister prepared by the advisory committee. Document 32 contains a considerable amount of personal information about the third party and his family, including their names and other private business information. The document also contains other information from which the identities of the third parties could reasonably be ascertained in my view. I consider much of that information to be particularly private information concerning the third parties and their business, and that its disclosure would not serve the public interests I have identified relating to government accountability to such an extent that those public interests outweigh the public interest in maintaining the third parties' personal privacy. Therefore, I find that information to be exempt under clause 3(1).
40. Having examined Document 32, I do not consider that it would be practicable to delete all of the exempt matter from it and to provide access to the balance of that document. That course of action would result in a disjointed and, therefore, somewhat meaningless document the disclosure of which would not serve any public interest.
41. However, as I have said, I consider there to be a strong public interest in disclosure of the material that was before the Minister when making the decision, so far as that can be done without unreasonably infringing the third parties' privacy. Having considered the document carefully, I am of the view that those parts of Document 32 consisting of the cover sheet (subject to minor editing to delete matter that may reveal the identities of the third parties); points 1, 2 and 3 under the heading "Recommendations" on page 2 and also on page 8; the "Terms of Reference" on page 7; points 1, 2 and 3 under the heading "Considerations" on page 2 and also on page 8 (subject to minor editing to delete exempt personal information); and all of the section under the heading "Conclusions" on pages 8 and 9, subject to minor editing of exempt matter, could be disclosed to the complainant without any detriment or loss of personal privacy to the third parties. In my view, the public interest in the accountability of agencies would be served if the committee's terms of reference, recommendations and conclusions were to be disclosed.

42. Accordingly, I find that the disclosure of those parts of Document 32 specified above would, on balance, be in the public interest. Therefore, I find that, subject to the deletion of a small amount of exempt matter, which is described in the schedule to these reasons for decision, those parts of Document 32, being the cover sheet, points 1, 2 and 3 under the heading “Recommendations” on pages 2 and 8; points 1, 2 and 3 under the heading “Considerations” on pages 2 and 8; the terms of reference on page 7; and all of the section under the heading “Conclusions” on pages 8 and 9 is not exempt, but the document is otherwise exempt under clause 3 of Schedule 1 to the FOI Act.

SCHEDULE OF EXEMPT MATTER

DOCUMENT NO.	FOLIO NO.	DESCRIPTION OF MATTER TO BE DELETED
Folios 5-7	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> all of the first address block, including the name. the land description appearing in the subject heading. the land description appearing in the last line.
	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the name appearing in line 2 of paragraph 1. the last 5 words in line 6 of paragraph 3. the 3rd, 4th and 5th words in line 8 of paragraph 3. all of line 10 of paragraph 3. the name appearing in line 1 of paragraph 4. the name appearing in line 3 of paragraph 4. the names where they appear in line 2 of paragraph 7. the 2nd-6th words in line 2 of the last paragraph.
	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the signature and the name.
1	45	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> all of the first address block, including the name. the land description appearing in the subject heading. the land description in line 5 of the first paragraph.
	44	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the land description appearing in line 9 of the first paragraph. the name appearing in line 11 of the first paragraph. the 4th-8th words in line 7 of paragraph 3. the name appearing in line 8 of paragraph 3. the name appearing in line 9 of paragraph 3. all of line 13 in paragraph 3. the name appearing in line 1 of paragraph 4. the name appearing in line 3 of paragraph 4.
	43	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the name appearing twice in line 2 of paragraph 2. the name appearing in line 9 of the last paragraph.
	42	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the name appearing in line 1 of the first paragraph. the name appearing in lines 12, 15 and 18 of paragraph 2.

	41	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the 2nd-6th words in line 2 of the last paragraph. the signature and the name.
5	51	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the reference number at the top left of the page. all of the address block, including the name. the name appearing in the salutation. the name appearing in line 1 of the first paragraph. the land description appearing in lines 3/4 of the first paragraph. the land description appearing in line 5 of the first paragraph. the name appearing in line 2 of the second paragraph. the signature of the author. the name of the person to whom the letter was copied and that person's telephone number.
8	55	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the reference number and the name and telephone number appearing below the letterhead at the top left of the page. all of the address block, including the name. the name appearing in the salutation. the land description appearing in the subject heading. the land description appearing in line 1 of the first paragraph.
	54	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the name and telephone number appearing in the last paragraph. the signature.
28	77	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> all of the first address block, including the name. the land description appearing in the subject heading. the land description appearing in lines 2/3 of item 2. the land description appearing in line 3 of item 4. the name appearing in line 1 of item 5. the name appearing in line 2 of item 5. the name appearing in line 2 of item 6. the name appearing in line 3 of item 6. the name appearing in line 2 of item 8. the name appearing in line 3 of item 9. the signature and name of the author.
32	90	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the name in the "header". the name in line 2 of the report title. all of line 3 of the report title. the names and locations of the Appeal Committee Members.
	89	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the header. the first heading and all of paragraphs 1-6. the name appearing in lines 1 and 2 of the third last paragraph and in line 1 of the second last paragraph and in lines 1 and 2 of the last paragraph. all of the last 2 lines of the last paragraph.

	88-85	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • all.
	84	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • all matter before the heading “Terms of Reference”. • the last 5 words in line 2 under the heading “Terms of Reference”. • the number appearing in line 3 under the heading “Terms of Reference”. • the name appearing in Item 2 under the heading “Terms of Reference”.
	83	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the name appearing in the “header”. • the name appearing in lines 1 and 2 of paragraph 4. • the name appearing in line 1 of paragraph 5. • the name appearing in lines 1 and 2/3 of paragraph 6. • the 4th word to the last word of line 3 of paragraph 6. • all of lines 4 and 5 of paragraph 6. • the name appearing in line 2 of the 2nd last paragraph.
	82	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the name in the “header” • the name appearing in line 1 of the first paragraph. • the last two words in line 1 of paragraph 2. • the first word in line 2 of paragraph 2. • all, except the first word, of line 3 in paragraph 2. • the name appearing in line 1 of paragraph 3. • the name appearing in line 2 of paragraph 3. • everything after the heading below paragraph 4.
	81	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • all.
33	91	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the reference number at the top left of the page. • all of the address block, including the name. • the name appearing in the salutation. • the signature of the author.
34	93	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the reference number at the top left of the page. • all of the address block, including the name. • the name appearing in the salutation. • the signature of the author of the letter. • the name of the person to whom the handwritten note is addressed. • the signature of the author of the handwritten note.