



# ***Analysis of BC's Report on the administration of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act 2019/20 & 2020/21***

**June 2022**

BC Freedom of Information and Privacy Association  
PO Box 8308 Victoria Main  
Victoria, BC V8W 3R9  
Phone: 604-739-9788  
Website: <https://fipa.bc.ca>  
Email: [fipa@fipa.bc.ca](mailto:fipa@fipa.bc.ca)

Prepared by: Alex Li, Jay Artley, and Noah Escandor (Legal Researchers)

## Territorial Acknowledgement

FIPA acknowledges with respect the Indigenous Peoples on whose traditional territory we conduct activities. We acknowledge the insight and knowledge of Elders past, present, and emergent and their relationship to this land and these issues. While striving to increase privacy protection and access to information for everyone, we recognize that colonization and associated attitudes, policies, and institutions have significantly changed Indigenous Peoples' relationship with this land. For many years, those same things served to exclude Indigenous Peoples from the privacy protection and access to information afforded to others. FIPA is committed to redressing those historic and continued barriers.

## Institutional Funders

The BC Freedom of Information and Privacy Association thanks the Law Foundation of BC and all our contributors including donors, funders, and volunteers for their ongoing support of our advocacy, programs, projects, and activities. We also acknowledge the financial support of the Province of British Columbia (Gaming Policy and Enforcement Branch).



## About FIPA

The BC Freedom of Information and Privacy Association (FIPA) is a non-partisan, non-profit society that was established in 1991 to promote and defend freedom of information and privacy rights in Canada. While we are based in BC, our membership extends across Canada and we regularly partner with organizations throughout the country.

Our goal is to empower citizens by increasing their access to information and control over their own personal information. We serve a wide variety of individuals and organizations through programs of public education, public assistance, research, and law reform. We are one of very few public interest groups in Canada devoted solely to the advancement of freedom of information and privacy rights.

## Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	4
Introduction.....	5
Problems and Solutions.....	6
<b>1. Delays in Reporting Undermine Trust.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>2. Report Does Not Address Worrisome Trends.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>3. Gaps in Content.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>4. Report's Analysis is Insufficient.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>5. Report Reveals this Government's Concerning FOI Legacy.....</b>	<b>15</b>
Conclusion.....	17
Summary of Recommendations.....	18
Appendix: Supporting Charts & Tables.....	19
Fees for Access to Information.....	19
Tabling of Annual Reports.....	20
Tabling of Annual Reports Continued.....	21

## Introduction

For the past 30 years, British Columbia's *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (FIPPA)* has provided the public with the right to request access to information held by public bodies. Timely access to this information ensures government accountability and transparency. Government compliance with *FIPPA* is an important aspect of public oversight.

S. 68 of *FIPPA* outlines the Minister's duty to prepare an annual report on the Act's administration and lay it before the Legislative Assembly "as soon as possible". Despite this, ministers have been complacent with a mostly biannual approach. The current Report also includes less analysis, information, and figures than its predecessor. While the data in both reports' tables remained largely consistent, there was noticeably less effort made in the current Report to translate the data into digestible and relevant information. The current Report does not identify negative trends nor does it discuss potential and ongoing challenges under *FIPPA*. This failure is evidenced by the Report's lack of key explanations, definitions, data, and content. Metrics on timeliness of *FIPPA* administration, such as those presented in the previous Administrative Report and the Office of the Information and Privacy Commissioner's (OIPC) *Now is the time: A report card on government's access to information timeliness*,<sup>1</sup> are notably absent.

The lack of a timely, comprehensive, and relevant annual reporting practice discourages public oversight and engagement and could further erode public confidence in *FIPPA*'s administration process.

---

<sup>1</sup>

Office of the Information & Privacy Commissioner for British Columbia, "Now is the time: A report card on government's access to information timeliness." (Sep 2, 2020). <https://www.oipc.bc.ca/special-reports/3459>

## Problems and Solutions

### 1. Delays in Reporting Undermine Trust

#### Problem

- Delays in annual reporting undermine *FIPPA* and reduce the accountability and transparency the report aims to provide.

#### Solution

- Adhere to the Act and institute mechanisms to ensure that the Annual Report is tabled in a timely manner.

Annual reports on the administration of *FIPPA* provide the public with key insights into its administration and help promote government accountability and transparency. The previous report,<sup>2</sup> for the years 2017/18 & 2018/19, was tabled on November 28, 2019. The current Report,<sup>3</sup> for the years 2019/20 & 2020/21, was tabled on May 18, 2022. Delayed reporting such as this undermines government accountability and transparency as the information presented loses currency.

For example, data for the fiscal year ending in 2020 was made available in May 2022, more than 2 years after the Report was created. Within this period, the world was severely altered by the COVID-19 pandemic and *FIPPA* underwent significant amendments in the enactment of Bill 22. Delayed reporting causes information within the Report to lose relevance and

---

<sup>2</sup> British Columbia, Ministry of Citizens' Services, *Report on the administration of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act 2017/18 & 2018/19*. (November, 2019).

[https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/british-columbians-our-governments/initiatives-plans-strategies/open-government/open-information/citz\\_-\\_report\\_on\\_the\\_administration\\_of\\_foippa\\_-\\_2017-2018\\_2018-2019.pdf](https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/british-columbians-our-governments/initiatives-plans-strategies/open-government/open-information/citz_-_report_on_the_administration_of_foippa_-_2017-2018_2018-2019.pdf)

<sup>3</sup> British Columbia, Ministry of Citizens' Services, *Report on the administration of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act 2019/20 & 2020/21*. (March 31, 2021).

[https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/british-columbians-our-governments/initiatives-plans-strategies/open-government/open-information/citz\\_-\\_report\\_on\\_the\\_administration\\_of\\_foippa\\_-\\_2019-20\\_2020-21.pdf](https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/british-columbians-our-governments/initiatives-plans-strategies/open-government/open-information/citz_-_report_on_the_administration_of_foippa_-_2019-20_2020-21.pdf)

undermines the Report’s goal to achieve government accountability and transparency. FIPA has identified the Minister’s inability to comply with *FIPPA* in the past, most recently evidenced in our written submission<sup>4</sup> to the Special Committee to Review *FIPPA*.

The current Report compiled information until the end of March 2021. Despite this, the Minister delayed its reporting to the public, civic society, and legislators until May 18, 2022. These delays undermine transparency in the administration of the act. They also provide the Minister with the political opportunity to control the narrative by restricting access to information. This key information was withheld while the Special Committee to Review *FIPPA* received new terms of reference on June 16, 2021, the Government held public consultations on the Administration of *FIPPA* on June 17, 2021, the Minister introduced legislative changes to amend *FIPPA* on October 18, 2021, and the Special Committee to review *FIPPA* held open consultations on legislative amendments in March of 2022.

The data tables have remained similar between reports. Thus, there seems to be no legitimate reason for the government to delay their reporting. The government is encouraged to institute mechanisms to present the Report in a timely manner. This ensures information that is relevant, actionable, and reflective of ongoing developments.

**Recommendation 1: *Hold Ministers accountable for the timely tabling of reports required under legislation.***

---

<sup>4</sup> BC Freedom of Information and Privacy Association. “Submission to the Special Committee to Review the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.” (March, 2022). <https://www.leg.bc.ca/content/CommitteeDocuments/42nd-parliament/3rd-session/fippa/submissions/1060-13799.pdf>

*Recommendation 2: Introduce mechanisms to ensure that the Annual Report on the Administration of FIPPA adheres to the Act and is tabled in a timely manner.*

## 2. Report Does Not Address Worrisome Trends

### Problem

- The report reflects partial analysis and avoids reviewing particularly troubling trends.
- Metrics such as “No Responsive Records” (NRR), average processing time, and request abandonment have reached their highest points in years, but the report neither identifies nor provides the public with any analysis of the factors that are causing these results.

### Solution

- Objectively analyze issues and challenges relevant to the public interest.

Information presented in the current Report focuses on positive developments, however, several data tables and graphs show troubling negative trends that are not addressed. In contrast, previous reports highlighted both positive and negative trends.

An example of a negative trend is the increase in average processing time. Total FOI requests and average processing time rose from the 2017/18 fiscal year to the 2019/20 fiscal year. However, despite a drop in total requests in 2020/21, the average processing time reached its highest yet at 58 days. Extended timelines may be compliant with requested extensions under s.10 of the Act, but the average processing time is almost double the legislated total timeline of 30 days. The current Report does not identify this concerning trend, despite highlighting progress in FOI modernization efforts. Past reports have attributed an increase in processing time to an increasing number of



broad cross-government requests. However, the percentage of cross-government requests relative to total request volume has been in decline since 2018/19. In addition, during the 2019-21 fiscal years, 600,000 fewer pages were processed than in the 2017/19 reporting years. The current Report fails to address how average processing time has increased despite a decrease in overall request volume, proportion of cross-government requests, and pages processed.

“Disposition” categories also contain worrisome trends. Applicants can fail to obtain records for a variety of reasons, including “No Responsive Records” (NRR), which is when the record does not exist or cannot be located. High NRR rates are a concern because they may speak to the government’s failure to properly document. Concerns regarding the government’s documentation practices had fueled calls to enact a duty to document within *FIPPA*.<sup>5</sup> Despite this, NRR requests continue to increase. The current Report fails to identify and explain this trend. The Information Access Operations Office (IAO) attributed the increase of NRR for general requests in 2018/19/20 to a substantial increase in requests from political party applicants.<sup>6</sup> In the OIPC’s findings,<sup>7</sup> cross-government requests by political party applicants did make a significant portion of the increase in NRR for the stated years however, it is unclear if this remains the case in 2020/21, as this information is not available in the annual report. In addition, the number of “Abandoned” dispositions has increased and makes up a higher percentage of all dispositions. The current Report does not identify this trend.

---

<sup>5</sup> “Submission to the Special Committee to Review the Freedom of Information and Privacy Act,” at p. 10.

<sup>6</sup> “Now is the time: A report card on government’s access to information timeliness,” at p. 21.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, at p. 22.

Recommendation 3: *Departmental staff should provide an objective and comprehensive analysis of the available information, including identifying worrisome trends, challenges, and concerns without politicizing the data.*

### 3. Gaps in Content

#### Problem

- Unreported data reduces relevancy and transparency of the Act's administration.
- Missing definitions create uncertainty around the data and complicate their interpretation and analysis.

#### Solution

- Proactively disclose data useful for measuring timeliness of *FIPPA* administration.
- Provide complete data with respect to *FIPPA* administration.
- Clearly define value categories represented within the data table.

Metrics on timeliness of *FIPPA* administration, such as those presented in the previous Report and the OIPC's *Now is the time: A report card on government's access to information timeliness*<sup>8</sup> are notably absent.

The annual reports do not contain sufficient information for the public to determine the timeliness of government responses. Assessing the government's compliance with the timelines set out in s.7 and s.10 of *FIPPA* is relevant to the public's interest in monitoring the act's administration. To this end, the OIPC has employed several metrics to analyze government's

<sup>8</sup>

Office of the Information & Privacy Commissioner for British Columbia, "Now is the time: A report card on government's access to information timeliness." (Sep 2, 2020).

<https://www.oipc.bc.ca/special-reports/3459>

timeliness.<sup>9</sup> For example, they looked at the percentage of responses completed within 30 and 60 days, average processing time by ministry, percentage of requests “on hold”, time extensions by reason cited, percentage of NRR responses, and detailed non-compliance data. None of these metrics appear in the current Report. Identifying the percentage of responses within 30 and 60 days can illustrate the proportion of requests not completed within legislated timelines and reveal the extent of delays. In addition, the fee payment process, and submissions made to the OIPC to disregard repetitious or systematic requests, may impact timeliness. These “on hold” delays are not captured under “Average Processing Time” and these insights are missing from the current Report. Also missing is data on reasons for first extensions, NRR percentage, and non-compliance.

Bill 22’s amendments to *FIPPA* require the head of a public body to develop a privacy management program. However, privacy management programs were not tracked in the current Report. Similarly, a breakdown of privacy training conducted by ministries is not presented. Missing information allows ministries with large numbers and high rates of training to skew data and mask smaller ministries who have lower levels of training completion.

***Recommendation 4: Proactively disclose data and analysis in the annual report that better speaks to the timeliness of FIPPA administration.***

***Recommendation 5: Identify additional data relevant to the public interest and disclose this information in a comprehensive manner.***

---

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, at p. 11.

Key terms are left undefined in the current Report. For example, the Report does not define “complexity” beyond describing requests that are broad in scope, despite citing complexity as a factor behind longer FOI response time.

The current Report fails to provide definitions and scope for data values. An example is the lack of clarity regarding the ‘Open Information Disclosures’ (OID) figure on page 7. First, it is unclear what an OID is; whether it is synonymous with proactive disclosures, and, if so, why the figure is titled OID rather than proactive disclosures. Second, it is also unclear what is included in the “Other Directives” category. The lack of clarity renders the OID figure ineffectual. This is problematic because issues around public bodies’ adherence to s. 71’s proactive disclosure requirements are well documented.<sup>10</sup> With the introduction of application fees and economic incentives for public bodies to avoid proactive disclosure,<sup>11</sup> reports must clarify ongoing confusion regarding proactive disclosures and open information requests.

In addition, the government does not define or explain why “Abandoned” dispositions have been steadily increasing. In 2020/21, the category reached its highest percentage under “Disposition Other”. It is unclear what the implications of the increase are, or if it should be a cause for concern because there is no definition in the data table about what causes “Abandoned” dispositions. Are applicants giving up on the request due to longer wait times or due to being faced with fees to complete the request? The current Report also excludes data related to Engagement with the OIPC, which was included in the previous report.

---

<sup>10</sup> Office of the Information & Privacy Commissioner for British Columbia, “Section 71: Categories of records available without a request,” Investigation Report 20-01 (OIPC, 11 June 2020). <https://www.oipc.bc.ca/investigation-reports/3432>

<sup>11</sup> “Submission to the Special Committee to Review the Freedom of Information and Privacy Act,” at p. 20.

Similar to “Abandoned” dispositions, the “Partial Disclosures” section under the “Disposition Releases” table is ambiguous due to a lack of definition and scope. It is unclear to what extent these disclosures are partial; they could be disclosing only a small number of the requested files. Specific to “Partial Disclosures”, it would be helpful to have data on the extent “Partial Disclosures” are being fulfilled, most likely as a percentage value. In addition, similar to “No Response Records”, the Report should explain why these disclosures were only partially fulfilled.

The privacy breach tiers are an example of missing definitions that render a table ineffectual. Without a definition of what constitutes a “Tier 1” or a “Tier 5” privacy breach, for example, it is impossible to determine whether privacy breaches are increasing in severity each year and should be a cause for concern. Without definitions, it is also unclear whether the criteria for privacy breaches have been consistent from year to year. This lack of clarity renders data on page 17 of the current Report less informative as it is unclear whether the low percentage of privacy breach notifications matches the severity of breaches.

***Recommendation 6: Use plain language, avoid jargon, and define key terms in both the text and the data tables.***

The report fails to align data and information to new legislative requirements or gaps identified by the OIPC.

Bill 22 amendments to *FIPPA* require the head of a public body to develop a privacy management program. However, Privacy Management Programs were not tracked in the annual report. Similarly, a breakdown of privacy training conducted by ministries is not presented.

The OIPC report *Now is the time: A report card on government's access to information timeliness*.

#### 4. Report's Analysis is Insufficient

##### Problem

- There is a noticeable decline in efforts made to visualize information and identify trends in a manner that facilitates public understanding.

##### Solution

- Better present trends and information within data tables to help public understanding of the data.
- Implement these changes in the next report.

There are documented examples where governments avoid putting analysis in writing to prevent public disclosure, possible reputational harm, and in the process reduce accountability<sup>12</sup>. The current Report, in comparison to past reports, exhibits a noticeable shift away from written analysis and discussion of the data presented. On data visualization, the previous report contained upwards of 15 illustrative figures and charts to highlight existing or potential trends. Only five figures were included in the body of the current Report. Furthermore, figures in the previous annual report were often accompanied by analysis and discussion of the information presented. This level of analysis is not repeated in the current Report. The shift is problematic as it signifies fewer efforts to translate the data into easily digestible and relevant information for the public. The burden is transferred to the public to make sense of the current Report's raw data.

---

<sup>12</sup> Charles Rusnell and Jennie Russell, "Inside the Kenney Government's System of Secrecy," (9 May 2022), online (article): *The Tyee* <https://thetyee.ca/News/2022/05/09/Inside-Kenney-Government-System-Secrecy>

Some key information is present but not analyzed in the current Report. For example, on-time FOI request response rate is displayed once and not highlighted, despite being a key indicator of non-compliance. As the OIPC’s report showed, this metric is indicative of the percentage of cases in which the government delayed their response *without legal authority*.<sup>13</sup> On-time response rate of 85% in 2020/21 indicates that the government delayed 15 percent of all cases *without legal authority to do so*. Interestingly, this statistic is only briefly shown on the first page of the “FOIPPA Overview.”

**Recommendation 7:** *Illustrate and visualize more information from the data tables to aid public understanding. Implement these changes in the next report.*

## 5. Report Reveals this Government’s Concerning FOI Legacy

### Problem

- The introduction of the BC Government’s FOI General Request application fee will double the average fee for all FOI requests.
- As trust in public bodies decreases due to a perceived lack of transparency, government has introduced new barriers to access to information with fees.
- The government has framed the public application fee as an incentive.

### Solution

- Recognize the application fee as a deterrent to accessing information and remove it.
- If the application fee is kept, quantify and disclose its effectiveness and impacts in a future report.

---

<sup>13</sup> “Now is the time: A report card on government’s access to information timeliness,” at p. 13.

With the introduction of fees for general FOI requests, the BC Government is levying a ‘Transparency Tax’ on FOI requests and shifting the blame to the public for increasing delays. Although downplayed by the Premier and Minister, the revenue stream from their ‘Transparency Tax’ will more than double the average fee for all FOI <sup>14</sup>, <sup>15</sup> for more thoughtful requests without effectively exploring its impact on accessibility.

It is a leap of logic to justify implementing an application fee to improve timeliness without appropriately measuring the impact of fees on timeliness. The government claims that the main reason for introducing the fee was to alleviate processing times due to the volume and complexity of requests. But it also admits that the current timeliness metrics are not optimal. During its presentation to the Special Committee to Review *FIPPA*,<sup>16</sup> the government admitted that timeliness metrics “...are exceptionally complicated” and that there is definite “room for improvement”. Within the current Report, there is a noticeable decline in effort to address timeliness. Without an informative set of metrics to measure timeliness, and a conscious effort to address this gap, how will the government review its main justification for application fees moving forward? The government also mentioned a decrease in NRR records. It remains to be seen if the decrease matches a general decline in FOI requests. Additionally, it is unclear how the additional fee collection processes will cause further delays to applicant requests. As discussed, applications awaiting payment processes can be put ‘on hold’, which is not taken into

---

<sup>14</sup> See Appendix: Support Charts and Tables 1 & 2.

<sup>15</sup> British Columbia, *Report of Proceedings: Special Committee to Review the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*, 42nd Parl, 2nd Sess, issue no. 3 (3 February 2022) at p. 16 (Matt Reed). <https://www.leg.bc.ca/parliamentary-business/committees-calendar/20220203-FOI-1200>

<sup>16</sup> *Report of Proceedings: Special Committee to Review the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*, at p. 15.



account when calculating average processing times. Application fees whose effectiveness is backed by presumptions continue to erode public trust.

***Recommendation 8: Hold government accountable and recognize the application fee as a deterrent to accessing information that should be removed. Quantify and disclose the effectiveness and impacts of the fee in a future report.***

## Conclusion

The Annual Report on the Administration of *FIPPA* helps monitor public body compliance and maintain government accountability through improved transparency. However, to achieve these effects, the Report must be delivered in a timely manner with current information. It also must contain comprehensive and insightful data and metrics. Information should be clear and defined to aid public understanding. The Report should present information objectively and identify both challenges and progress. Without meaningful data and analysis, the simplified Report complicates efforts by public watchdogs and citizens to maintain government accountability. Such efforts are further frustrated by the Minister's biannual reporting practices. These changes undermine the current Report's ability to promote accountability and transparency. The government and Minister can rectify this situation by addressing the recommendations outlined in this analysis.

## Summary of Recommendations

**Recommendation 1:** *Hold Ministers accountable for the timely tabling of reports required under legislation.*

**Recommendation 2:** *Introduce mechanisms to ensure that the Annual Report on the Administration of FIPPA adheres to the Act and is tabled in a timely manner.*

**Recommendation 3:** *Departmental staff should provide an objective and comprehensive analysis of the available information, including identifying worrisome trends, challenges, and concerns without politicizing the data.*

**Recommendation 4:** *Proactively disclose data and analysis in the annual report that better speaks to the timeliness of FIPPA administration.*

**Recommendation 5:** *Identify additional data relevant to the public interest and disclose this information in a comprehensive manner.*

**Recommendation 6:** *Use plain language, avoid jargon, and define key terms in both the text and the data tables.*

**Recommendation 7:** *Illustrate and visualize more information from the data tables to aid public understanding. Implement these changes in the next report.*

**Recommendation 8:** *Hold government accountable and recognize the application fee as a deterrent to accessing information that should be removed. Quantify and disclose the effectiveness and impacts of the fee in a future report.*

## Appendix: Supporting Charts & Tables

### Fees for Access to Information

Table 1: WITHOUT new application fees

	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
<b>Total FOI Requests</b>	9,310	10,471	12,255	13,055	10,265
<b>General Requests</b>	4,905	5,501	7,622	8,147	6,467
<b>Number of Requests Where Fees Paid</b>	188	157	151	145	144
<b>Sum of Fees Paid (nearest thousand)</b>	\$62,000	\$60,000	\$63,000	\$44,000	\$51,000
<b>Percent of General Requests Where Fees Paid</b>	3.49%	3.49%	2.08%	1.74%	2.01%
<b>Average Fee for all FOI Requests</b>	\$6	\$6	\$5	\$3	\$5

Table 2: WITH new application fees

	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
<b>Total FOI Requests</b>	9,310	10,471	12,255	13,055	10,265
<b>General Requests</b>	4,905	5,501	7,622	8,147	6,467
<b>PROJECTED Sum of Application Fees</b>	\$49,050	\$55,010	\$76,220	\$81,470	\$64,670
<b>Number of Requests Where Additional Fees Paid</b>	188	157	151	145	144
<b>PROJECTED Sum of Additional Fees Paid (nearest thousand)</b>	\$62,000	\$60,000	\$63,000	\$44,000	\$51,000
<b>PROJECTED Total Revenue from FOI Fees</b>	\$111,050	\$115,010	\$139,220	\$125,470	\$115,670
<b>PROJECTED Percent of General Requests Where Fees Paid</b>	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
<b>Average Fee for all FOI Requests</b>	\$12	\$11	\$11	\$10	\$11

Sourced from: [Report on the administration of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act 2019/20 & 2020/21](#) p.16

## Tabling of Annual Reports

Journal Sessions	Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act Annual Reports	Date / Method of tabling the report
1992	FOIPPA Introduced	
1993	FOIPPA Passed	
1994	No Annual Report Tabled	
1995	Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Annual Report for the period of October 4, 1993, to December 31, 1994	Wednesday, July 5, 1995
1996	No Annual Report Tabled	
1997	No Annual Report Tabled	
1998	No Annual Report Tabled	
1999	No Annual Report Tabled	
2000	No Annual Report Tabled	
2001	No Annual Report Tabled	
2002	No Annual Report Tabled	
2003	No Annual Report Tabled	
2004	No Annual Report Tabled	
2005	No Annual Report Tabled	
2006	No Annual Report Tabled	
2007	No Annual Report Tabled	
2008	No Annual Report Tabled	
2009	No Annual Report Tabled	
2009	No Annual Report Tabled	
2010	No Annual Report Tabled	
2011	No Annual Report Tabled	

## Tabling of Annual Reports Continued

2012	<a href="#">Administration of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act Annual Report, 2011/2012</a>	received by the Office of the Clerk during adjournment:
2013	No Annual Report Tabled	
2013 2014	No Annual Report Tabled	
2014	<a href="#">Administration of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act Annual Report, 2012/2013.</a>	Thursday, February 27, 2014
2014 2015	No Annual Report Tabled	
2015 2016	<a href="#">Report on the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (FOIPPA), 2014/15</a>	Thursday, October 8, 2015
2016 2017	No Annual Report Tabled	
2017	No Annual Report Tabled	
2017	<a href="#">Report on the Administration of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, 2015/2016 &amp; 2016/2017</a>	Tuesday, June 27, 2017
2017	No Annual Report Tabled	
2018	No Annual Report Tabled	
2019	<a href="#">Report on the Administration of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, 2017/18 &amp; 2018/19</a>	Thursday, November 28, 2019
2020	No Annual Report Tabled	
2020 2021	No Annual Report Tabled	
2021	No Annual Report Tabled	
2022	<a href="#">Report on the administration of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act 2019/20 &amp; 2020/21</a>	Wednesday, May 18, 2022