

2009 ANNUAL REPORT

Honourable Charlie Parker, Speaker of the House of Assembly

In accordance with Section 33(7) of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act and Section 4(3) of the Privacy Review Officer Act, I am pleased to present my third Annual Report to you and the Members of the House of Assembly. This Annual Report is filed in my capacity as both the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Review Officer and the newly appointed Privacy Review Officer, to be tabled with the House of Assembly. Mr. Speaker, by this letter, I am also advising you and the Members that beginning next year, the Annual Report will be largely distributed electronically and the Report will be available in printable format on the Review Office website. This is in keeping with the Review Office's commitments to readily accessible information at no cost to the public and to environmental sustainability.

Respectfully,



Dulcie McCallum,
Freedom of Information and
Protection of Privacy Review Officer,
Province of Nova Scotia

The number of Review files informally resolved in 2009 increased 135 percent over 2008.

To provide independent non-partisan oversight of decisions made by public bodies by receiving Requests for Review under the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*, Part XX of the *Municipal Government Act* and of privacy matters under the *Privacy Review Officer Act* ["Acts"]. Thereafter, the Review Officer investigates the requests/complaints from individuals and/or groups who feel their access to information rights or their privacy rights, as provided for in the governing Acts, have not been respected. The Review Officer issues public Reports that include findings and recommendations to provincial, municipal and local public bodies to reaffirm, alter or modify their decisions and to rectify their processes and practices with respect to access to information requests and/or protection of privacy.

Message from the Review Officer



It has been another eventful year in the area of privacy and access. Nova Scotians now have privacy oversight protection because the *Privacy Review Officer Act* was proclaimed into law in September 2009. Citizens who feel that provincial public bodies have breached their privacy can now complain by making a Request for Review to the Privacy Review Officer as the designated oversight body.

In 2009, I issued 13 formal Review Reports related to access to information requests. The most recent Review Reports are available to the public online at www.foipop.ns.ca. A sampling of the 2009 Review Reports can be found in the Summaries section of this Annual Report. Over 50% of the recommendations made by the Review Officer were accepted by the public bodies, in full or in part. The Review Office closed a total of 123 Reviews in 2009, in comparison to 59 in 2008. In addition to the 13 public Review Reports issued after a formal Review, the Office resolved 66 Reviews through informal resolution and 2 through formal Mediation. The number of files informally resolved in 2009 represents a 135% increase over 2008. This comes as a result of the introduction of an internal Office policy that encourages informal resolution at all stages of the Review process, which means sharing relevant information with applicants and public bodies to assist all parties to reach a mutually satisfactory resolution and avoid a formal Review.

There were 110 Requests for Review received during 2009 involving access decisions of both provincial and municipal public bodies. After proclamation of the new *Privacy Review Officer Act* on September 25, 2009, the Review Office received four Privacy Requests for Review in addition to four Privacy Requests for Review received prior to proclamation. The Review Office also has a very active Intake component that received 1,163 inquiries in 2009 about every aspect of access and privacy. That number increased 57% from 2008.

In this Annual Report, I highlight two areas that continue to be problematic: public bodies failing to meet their duty to assist citizens and failing to provide reasons for their decisions, contrary to the governing legislation. These substandard approaches to responding to access to information requests from the public must be addressed at the most senior levels. Access requests to government are often viewed as a sidebar or a chore rather than as an opportunity for a public body to demonstrate its commitment to openness, transparency and accountability.

But this is not true in all cases. On many occasions public bodies make a real effort to assist the public in obtaining the records to which they are entitled. Again this year we are awarding the Gold Star Award to a public body. This year it is Community Services whose conduct in one Review best exemplified the purposes of the legislation. The Public Body approached the file with demonstrable professionalism despite the fact that it was subjected to repeated demeaning and condescending language from the Applicant directed specifically at the public body's competence with respect to processing an access to information request. I relied on Nova Scotia's Respectful Workplace Policy to advise public bodies how to proceed with respect to its duty to assist where an applicant is in breach of the policy.



Commissioners' Annual Meeting

St. John's, NL, September 9-11, 2009

Every year the independent oversight bodies in access and privacy convene for one formal meeting. Among the issues discussed at the 2009 meeting were:

- engaging civil society on access to information
- privacy issues with respect to personal health information and electronic health records
- how to conduct systemic investigations
- plans for Right to Know Week and International Data Protection [Privacy] Day

MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS

NEW Privacy Review Officer Act – Oversight Law Proclaimed

On September 25, 2009, the *Privacy Review Officer Act* – introduced as a private member's bill – was proclaimed. I was appointed by Order-in-Council as the first Privacy Review Officer. Fulfilling this mandate will be in addition to my present role as the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Review Officer. Highlights of the new law are:

- the privacy provisions are laid out in Sections 24-31 of the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*, which are referentially incorporated into the new Act, and include rules for:
 - collection of personal information by public bodies
 - correction of personal information held by a public body
 - when a public body can use personal information
 - when a public body can disclose personal information
 - disclosure for research, by public archives, and in the public interest
- a person who believes that his or her own personal information has been collected, used or disclosed in contravention of these privacy provisions can file a complaint under the *Privacy Review Officer Act*
- the Review Officer has the authority to investigate complaints received from the public and make recommendations to the public body
- the new powers in the *Privacy Review Officer Act* give the Review Officer authority to:
 - initiate, on reasonable grounds, an investigation of privacy compliance
 - undertake research matters and inform the public about privacy legislation
 - on request of a public body, provide advice and comments on privacy.

Province Reduces Application Fee

On August 14, 2009, the government announced the reduction of the Application for Access to a Record fee from \$25 to \$5. The Minister responsible indicated that government did so because it is committed to being open and accountable to Nova Scotians. This fee reduction will assist those people who may have found the fee too costly and a barrier to access to information. The fee to file a Request for Review with the Review Office was completely removed in 2007. The Review Officer applauds the government's decision to reduce the fees as doing so makes access to information more affordable for everyone.


CARTER FITZGERALD PHOTOGRAPHY

INFORMAL RESOLUTION SUMMARIES

Adequate Search


The Applicant was unsatisfied, since s/he believed the Public Body's search for records failed to include records that should have been contained in the file. At the Review Office's request, the Public Body conducted a second, expanded search for records, and provided the Applicant with further information. The Applicant remained unsatisfied with the expanded access, still claiming that the search was incomplete. The Review Office then requested the Public Body to explain its search process to the Applicant. The explanation satisfied the Applicant that the search was complete, and the file was closed.

Resolution of Files Closed in the Year



The Review Office closed 123 files in 2009. 11 files opened in 2007 and 65 files opened in 2008 were resolved in 2009 and included in the total. (21 files opened in 2008 and 60 files opened in 2009 have been carried over into 2010).

General Inquiries



Complainant Name and Answering Questions

The Applicant requested access to information relating to an event that involved him/her and a third party complainant. The Applicant also posed numerous questions to the Public Body. The Public Body released the information in part, but withheld the information of a third party. The Applicant requested a Review of the Public Body's decision, asking the Review Officer to recommend that the Public Body grant him/her access to the third party's information and that the Public Body answer his/her questions. The Review Office explained to the Applicant that the personal information exemption is mandatory, meaning that if the information contains personal information and its release would be an unreasonable invasion of a third party's privacy, a public body must not disclose it. The Review Office shared several past Review Reports with the Applicant in which the Review Officer has held that complainants' identities are personal information and should not be released because to do so would be an unreasonable invasion of third parties' privacy.

The Review Office also explained to the Applicant that the Acts do not contemplate answers to questions – only access to records. Although a public body may choose to answer an applicant's questions, it is not required to do so under the Acts and the answers to those questions or lack thereof are not reviewable. Information has to be in recorded form to fall within the scope of the Acts. The Applicant was satisfied with the research provided and the file was closed.

The Review Office then requested the Public Body to explain its search process to the Applicant. The explanation satisfied the Applicant that the search was complete, and the file was closed.

Duty to Provide Reasons

The Applicant was unsatisfied with a complex access decision s/he received, and alleged a variety of wrongdoings by the Public Body. The Public Body made considerable efforts to clarify the scope of the access request, and provided the Applicant with a substantial amount of information. The Public Body informed the Applicant in its decision letter of the nature of the records being considered and the reasons why the exemptions were operative. The Public Body provided the Review Officer with a detailed explanation for each step undertaken in its decision-making process. At the request of the Review Office, the Public Body provided a Representation, which was shared with the Applicant, outlining how the Public Body reached its decision. It included a thorough description of how the Public Body exercised its discretion in the pages it chose to sever, which satisfied the Applicant. As a result, the file was closed.

Records Index

During the Review process, it became known that the Applicant may have already received all of the responsive Records through the discovery process for a court case in which s/he was involved. The Applicant was concerned that all of the documents were not provided during the discovery process. By comparing the Index of Records that was provided to the Applicant during the Review process to the discovery documents, the Applicant was satisfied that s/he had previously received all of the documents requested and therefore there was no need to receive those same documents under the Act. As a result, the file was closed. Although an applicant has the right to request the same documents through the access to information process and any other process, the amount of information that is received under the discovery process is usually greater, so an applicant may choose not to pursue the records through the access to information process.

Legislative Purposes Review Report Summaries

Four Review Reports have been chosen for Summary, each highlighting one of the governing purposes of the Acts.

- Full Accountability
- Public Participation
- Fairness
- Airing Divergent Views

Full Accountability

FI-07-54(M) Town of Parrsboro

The Applicant filed a Request for Review of the Town's decision to refuse to provide copies of financial updates given to the mayor and council for a particular fiscal year, which preceded the final budget approval. The Town provided some information to the Applicant but claimed it was unable to provide financial information from the previous years' budget processes as it had been destroyed and the Town's software was not able to recreate the Record. The Review Officer recommended that for the Town to become more transparent and open to its citizens, it should explore how to retain budget information for a longer period of time. In pursuit of the purpose of being fully accountable, the Town was advised to review its Document Destruction By-law to be more in line with local government guidelines. The Town did not accept the Review Officer's recommendations.

Public Participation

FI-08-06 Transportation and Infrastructure Renewal ["TIR"]

The Applicant requested access to a letter written by a solicitor to an employee at the Department. TIR refused access to the letter claiming it fell under the solicitor-client privilege exemption. TIR did not provide the Applicant or the Review Officer with any explanation as to how it exercised its discretion.

The Applicant felt the public had a right to know TIR's justification for changing a local road's status from public to private.

The solicitor-client exemption is discretionary and a public body therefore must consider what harm would result from the release of the letter and thus whether the exemption applies. The Review Officer recommended that TIR reconsider its decision and exercise its discretion to release the letter cognizant of the local public interest and that to do so would be consistent with the purposes of the statute. TIR did not accept the Review Officer's recommendations.

Fairness

FI-08-35/FI-08-54 Community Services



The access statutes impose a duty on public bodies to assist the public in their pursuit of information. Those responsible for administering the legislation are to make every reasonable effort to assist the applicant and to respond without delay, openly, accurately and completely. In this case, Community Services was subjected to repeated, demeaning and condescending language from the Applicant directed specifically at the FOIPOP Administrator's abilities in processing an Application for Access to a Record. One of the key findings in the Review Report is that such behavior is inappropriate and in contravention of the Nova Scotia government's Respectful Workplace Policy. The Review Officer recommended that additional information be released to the Applicant and Community Services accepted the Review Officer's recommendations.

Notwithstanding the inappropriate way in which the Applicant communicated with Community Services, the Report found that Community Services was fair throughout and more than met its duty to assist the Applicant. For this reason, Community Services is the recipient of the 2009 Annual Access Award.

Airing Divergent Views

FI-08-66 Energy

The Applicants requested a fee waiver from the Department on the basis that it was in the public interest to have the information made public. Energy exercised its discretion to refuse the fee waiver.

In this case, the Applicants' access request was broad and general in its wording and it was therefore impossible to see a link to an issue of public interest, such as an environmental, health or safety issue. The request was for information about companies for an eight year period, making it impossible to ascertain how it was about a topical issue. Had the access request been reconfigured in its wording to show that the Applicants had the intention to disseminate the information, that it was the subject of recent public debate and was for information related to the environment, it could have affected the outcome of the Review. The Review Officer agreed with Energy's decision and recommended procedural changes for future access decisions. Energy did not accept the Review Officer's recommendations.

Budget History 2007–2009

Category	Expenditures*		
	2009	2008	2007
Salaries and Benefits	232,235	216,732	197,139
Travel	2,570	2,704	10,725
Professional/Special Services	11,800	5,908	3,561
Supplies and Services	7,115	5,160	6,307
Other	22,772	26,029	27,947
Total Budget Spent	275,493	256,533	245,679
Total Budget	400,000	427,000	383,000
Percent of Budget Spent*	69	60	64

* Budget reporting is on a fiscal year basis from April 01 to March 31, while the above-noted expenditures are reported on a part of the calendar year from April to December.

COURT CASES OF INTEREST

Review Officer's statutory power to obtain documents

In 2009, the Review Office faced a court challenge of its right under Nova Scotia's *FOIPOP Act* to inspect and review records for which the solicitor-client exemption has been claimed.

An Applicant requested access to information held by the Nova Scotia Legal Aid Commission. The Commission denied access to the records, claiming release would disclose information protected by solicitor-client privilege. The Applicant filed a Request for Review, but when the Review Officer attempted to act on it, the Commission refused to provide copies of the record to the Review Officer on the basis of the Supreme Court of Canada's 2008 *Blood Tribe* decision. As a result, the Review Officer was forced to apply to the Nova Scotia Supreme Court to order the Commission to produce the record.

The Commission argued that *Blood Tribe* prevented access-to-information commissioners from viewing records for which solicitor-client privilege has been claimed. The Review Office's position was that *Blood Tribe* was specific to the federal commissioner, and that Nova Scotia's *FOIPOP Act* was "deliberately more generous" than its federal counterpart.

The Nova Scotia Barristers' Society requested to be allowed to intervene in the proceedings in support of the Commission's position on *FOIPOP*. In addition, they were arguing that solicitor-client privilege is protected by the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*.

In April 2009, the Applicant withdrew his/her Request for Review, which effectively ended the court case.

When is information provided in confidence? What do we mean by employment history?

A.B. v. Griffiths, 2009 NSCA 48 – Appeal of Supreme Court decision Griffiths v. Nova Scotia (Education), 2007 NSCC 178

The Chambers Judge found that the list of electricians who held certificates could be released. The Appellants, who were on that list, appealed the decision as they felt the Judge erred in holding that the personal information was not supplied in confidence, that Mr. Griffiths had satisfied the burden of proving the disclosure would not be an unreasonable invasion of privacy and in determining that the information relates to employment or education history. The appeal was dismissed. This case provides useful information on how to determine if information was "supplied in confidence" and how to define "employment or educational history." There is also valuable information on the balancing of all the relevant considerations when deciding if disclosure is an unreasonable invasion of privacy or not under Section 20(2) of the *Act*.

JANUARY

Dalhousie Data Protection Day – Halifax, NS
Leading a Respectful Workplace, Nova Scotia Public Service Commission (NSPSC) – Halifax, NS
Respectful Workplace for Employees, NSPSC – Halifax, NS

FEBRUARY

Atlantic Canada Web Accessibility Best Practices Forum – Halifax, NS
Canadian Federal/Provincial/Territorial Commissioners' Mid-winter Meeting – Ottawa, ON
Canadian Bar Association Privacy and Access Law Section Meeting – Halifax, NS
National Privacy Investigators' Workshop – Ottawa, ON

MARCH

Atlantic Canada Web Accessibility Best Practices Forum – Halifax, NS
Canadian Federal/Provincial/Territorial Commissioners' Mid-winter Meeting – Ottawa, ON
GoverNext Annual General Meeting – Halifax, NS
First Aid/CPR Staff training – Halifax, NS

APRIL

Atlantic Regional Training Centre Atlantic Symposium on Privacy in Health Services and Policy Research – St. John's, NL
Diversity and Employment Equity, NSPSC – Halifax, NS
Crime Prevention Society of Nova Scotia and Office of the Privacy Commissioner of Canada Identity Theft Awareness Certificate ceremony – Halifax, NS
Information Access Applications: Issues and Practices, UAB – online

MAY

Chief Justice Thane A. Campbell Lectureship in Law, University of Prince Edward Island (UPEI) – Charlottetown, PE

JUNE

Annual Access and Privacy Conference – Edmonton, AB
Canada Health Infoway Oversight Body Representatives' Meeting – Halifax, NS
Maritime Access and Privacy Conference – Halifax, NS

JULY

NSPSC Recognition Event – Halifax, NS

SEPTEMBER

Presentation by the Review Office team to the FOIPOP Administrators' Forum – Halifax, NS
Opening of Legislative Assembly – Halifax, NS
Attend Legislative Assembly Introduction of the Privacy Review Officer Act – Halifax, NS
Right to Know Week – Halifax, NS

- Premier proclaimed Right to Know Week
- The Review Officer appeared on Breakfast Television to promote Right to Know Week
- Hosted a Right to Know quiz contest and awarded a prize to the winner

Information and Privacy Commissioners'/Ombudspersons' Summit – St. John's, NL

OCTOBER

Canadian Bar Association Women in the Law Workshop – Halifax, NS

NOVEMBER

Canada Health Infoway Oversight Body Representatives' Meeting – Mississauga, ON

Committee Membership – GoverNEXT

MAJOR ISSUES

Duty to Assist

The *Acts* impose a duty on public bodies to assist applicants applying for information under the *Acts*. That duty to assist has several components – to respond without delay and to respond openly, accurately and completely. Written timelines in the statutes make it clear what was intended by "without delay".

There is less definition as to what constitutes "openly, accurately and completely" so these terms have been largely defined in jurisprudence. There are some public body responses that appear inconsistent with these imperatives and could

THERE ARE SOME PUBLIC BODY RESPONSES THAT...COULD BEST BE DESCRIBED AS CLOSED, OBTUSE AND MINIMALIST.

best be described as closed, obtuse and minimalist. To change this tendency requires leadership at the top levels — a clear and visible commitment to transparency and accountability by senior officials.

Duty to Provide Reasons

The *Acts* impose a duty on public bodies to provide reasons for the refusal of information and not just the section of the *Act* on which the refusal is based.

The Review Officer has raised the issue of the duty to provide reasons on numerous occasions. In the majority of Review files it is clear that public bodies simply provide applicants with the exemption relied upon referred to by number but do not provide any explanation or reasons for the refusal. The sections of the *Acts* that impose the duty to provide reasons

are conjunctive — in other words, they impose a duty on public bodies to cite the provision **and** provide reasons why it applies.

Public bodies can meet the duty to provide reasons in a number of ways. One way is to prepare an Index of the Record with columns citing the statutory exemption

section and an explanation for the severances. If it is a discretionary exemption, then the public body should explain what factors it took into account in denying access. Public bodies could also aid applicants' understanding by inserting blank pages to indicate where a record was withheld in full. The ways to communicate with applicants and give an explanation could be by phone, in an e-mail, or, preferably, in the decision letter.

Public bodies do have their reasons because these are often provided to the Review Officer when Representations are provided as part of the Review process. Public bodies should have this information readily available for an applicant at the outset of the access process as it is required in order to make their access decision. If this approach is more widely adopted, there may be fewer appeals to the Review Office because applicants will know at the outset why they are being refused access to information and they will have a greater understanding of the decision-making process.

Mediation Summary

Scope and Fee Reduction

The Public Body and Applicant worked together to resolve the issue of fee waiver to the satisfaction of both parties during the Mediation stage. The Applicant narrowed the vast scope of the initial access request to focus on only internal documents and agreed to pursue other documents through other organizations. The Applicant provided the Public Body with letters of support to show that the issue was one of public interest and the release of the documents would benefit more people than just the Applicant. This resulted in the Public Body being willing to exercise its discretion to waive the fees for the remainder of the Record.

2009 STATISTICS

Time Extension Complaints		
	Within the first 60 days	After 60 days
2009	2	0
2008	4	0
2007	3	0

Privacy Complaints				
	Primary Issue Disclosure	Primary Issue Use	Primary Issue Collection	Total Received
2009	6 (75%)	1 (12.5%)	1 (12.5%)	8
2008	0	0	2 (100%)	2
2007	4 (80%)	1 (20%)	0	5

Access Request by Primary Issue										
		Refusal to Disclose/ Severing	Search	Fee/Waiver	Response	Jurisdiction	Third Party	Deemed Refusal	Time Extension	Other
2009	Provincial	51 (60.0%)	7 (8.2%)	2 (2.4%)	7 (8.2%)	1 (1.2%)	5 (5.9%)	3 (3.5%)	1 (1.2%)	8 (9.4%)
	Municipal	14 (58.3%)	2 (8.3%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (8.3%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (12.5%)	3 (12.5%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
	TOTAL	65 (59.1%)	6 (8.2%)	2 (1.8%)	9 (8.2%)	1 (0.9%)	8 (7.3%)	6 (5.4%)	1 (0.9%)	8 (7.3%)
Other (prior to 2009)										
2008	Provincial	52 (57.1%)	8 (8.8%)	3 (3.3%)	8 (8.8%)	1 (1.1%)	9 (9.9%)		8 (8.8%)	
	Municipal	16 (66.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (16.7%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (4.2%)		3 (12.5%)	
	TOTAL	67 (58.8%)	8 (7.0%)	3 (2.6%)	12 (10.5%)	1 (0.9%)	10 (8.8%)		11 (9.6%)	
2007	Provincial	35	7	5	7	1	3		2	
	Municipal	9	1	3	2	1	0		1	
	TOTAL	44 (57%)	8 (10%)	8 (10%)	9 (12%)	2 (3%)	3 (4%)		3 (4%)	

Reviews Opened by Applicant Group					
	Media	General Public	Political	Organizations	Other Public Bodies
2009	7 (6.4%)	82 (74.5%)	6 (5.5%)	15 (13.6%)	0 (0.0%)
2008	8 (7.0%)	90 (78.3%)	3 (2.6%)	13 (11.3%)	0 (0.0%)
2007	6 (8%)	53 (69%)	2 (2.5%)	15 (19.5%)	1 (1%)

Privacy Investigations Closed					
	Public Report	Private Report	Resolved through Informal Resolution	Withdrawn or Abandoned	Screened Out
2009	0	0	0	0	5 (100%)
2008	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	0	3 (60%)	0
2007	0	0	0	1 (50%)	1 (50%)

Conclusions of the Review Officer Where a Report Was Issued			
	Agree with Public Body	Agree In-part with Public Body	Disagree with Public Body
2009	3 (23.1%)	6 (46.2%)	4 (30.8%)
2008	1 (11.1%)	2 (22.2%)	6 (66.7%)
2007	3 (50%)	2 (33.3%)	4 (66.6%)

Public Body Responses to the Review Officer's Recommendations				
	Recommendations Accepted	Partial Acceptance	Recommendations Rejected	Response Outstanding
2009	6 (46.2%)	3 (23%)	4 (30.8%)	0
2008	4 (44.4%)	2 (22.2%)	2 (22.2%)	0
2007	3 (50%)	2 (33.3%)	1 (16.6%)	0

Time Extension Requests	
Public Body	Number Requested
Property Valuation Services Corporation	1
Tourism, Culture and Heritage	2
Department of Health	4
Economic and Rural Development	1
Natural Resources	3
World Trade Centre Limited	1
TOTAL	12

Reviews by Type of Information Requested <i>percentages represent portion of total provincial or municipal Reviews</i>					
	Act	General	Personal	Personal/ General	Correction
2009	Provincial	38 (44.7%)	31 (36.5%)	15 (17.6%)	1 (1.2%)
	Municipal	14 (58.3%)	5 (20.8%)	5 (20.8%)	0 (0.0%)
2008	Provincial	31 (34.1%)	47 (51.6%)	9 (9.9%)	3 (3.3%)
	Municipal	12 (50.0%)	6 (25.0%)	5 (20.8%)	0 (0.0%)
2007	Provincial	35 (58.3%)	20 (33.3%)	5 (8.3%)	0
	Municipal	13 (76%)	2 (12%)	2 (12%)	0


Deemed Refusals	
Public Body	Reviews Requested
Cape Breton Regional Police	3 (50.0%)
Halifax Regional Police	1 (16.7%)
Public Prosecution Service	1 (16.7%)
Southwest Shore Development Authority	1 (16.7%)
TOTAL	6

Reviews Opened Between January 1 and December 31			
	2007	2008	2009
Provincial	60 (70%)	91 (79.1%)	85 (78.4%)
Municipal	17 (22%)	24 (20.9%)	24 (21.6%)
TOTAL*	77	115	110

* One Review file received in 2009 and screened at Intake did not make clear whether the public body was a provincial or municipal body.



www.foipop.ns.ca
 PO Box 181
 Halifax, NS B3J 2M4
 Phone (902) 424-4684
 No Charge-Dial 1-866-243-1564
 TTD/TTY 1-800-855-0511
 Fax (902) 424-8303



The FOIPOP publication *Respecting Your Access and Privacy Rights: a Citizen's Guide for Nova Scotians* is available at all MLA constituency offices, public libraries, Access Nova Scotia offices, as well as online at www.foipop.ns.ca.