



Order F25-68

UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA

D. Hans Hwang
Adjudicator

August 27, 2025

CanLII Cite: 2025 BCIPC 79

Quicklaw Cite: [2025] B.C.I.P.C.D. No. 79

Summary: An individual requested access to records, under the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* (FIPPA), from the University of Victoria (University). The University applied for authorization to disregard the request under s. 43 of FIPPA. The University says that responding to the request would unreasonably interfere with its operations because the request is excessively broad under s. 43(c)(i). The adjudicator determined that the request is excessively broad and responding to it would reasonably interfere with the University's operations; therefore, the University was authorized to disregard that request under s. 43. Regarding the University's request for future relief, the adjudicator authorized the University, for a period of one year, to disregard any future access request made by the individual over and above a single access request at a time.

Statutes Considered: *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*, RSBC 1996 c 165, s. 43(c)(i).

INTRODUCTION

[1] The University of Victoria (University) applied to the Office of the Information and Privacy Commissioner (OIPC) for authorization under s. 43 of the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* (FIPPA) to disregard an access request from an individual (respondent).

[2] The University says responding to the respondent's access request would unreasonably interfere with its operations because the request is excessively broad under s. 43(c)(i).

[3] The University also requested future relief under s. 43(c)(i) by asking for authorization to respond to one open request from the respondent at a time and to spend no more than eight hours responding to each request.

Preliminary issues

[4] Based on my review of the parties' submissions, there are a few preliminary matters that I will address below.

Respondent's sur-reply

[5] The submission schedule for the University's s. 43 application allowed the University to make an initial submission, gave the respondent an opportunity to respond to that submission and then allowed the University to reply to the respondent's submission. As part of its reply submission, the University provided two affidavits. After conducting a preliminary review of the parties' submissions, I concluded the University did not provide this affidavit evidence in its initial submission and that the two affidavits were new evidence. As a result, the respondent did not have an opportunity to review and respond to that affidavit evidence.

[6] Usually, if the public body introduces new evidence or arguments in their reply submissions, then it may be fair to allow the other party to respond. Therefore, to ensure procedural fairness, which includes the requirement for parties to have an opportunity to know the opposing party's case and respond to it,¹ I provided the respondent with an opportunity to provide a sur-reply about the University's affidavit evidence.² The respondent provided a sur-reply which I have considered in my determination of the University's s. 43 application.

Additional matter raised in the respondent's submission

[7] The respondent alleges the University is attempting to avoid its statutory obligations under FIPPA by filing this current s. 43 application. To support his position, the respondent refers to four previous OIPC orders in which the University was not authorized to disregard a FIPPA request and was not authorized or required to withhold information. The respondent submits that the University "tends to over-apply FIPPA exemptions" and the current s. 43 application "appears to continue the problematic approach".³

[8] As the Commissioner's delegate, my role is limited to deciding the University's s. 43 application. It is not apparent how the respondent's allegations are relevant to this decision. I also find that the previous OIPC orders the respondent referred to involving the University have no connection to the University's current s. 43 application, the outstanding request or the respondent's rights under FIPPA. Therefore, although I have read the parties' entire

¹ *Rahman v. Windermere Valley Property Management Ltd.*, 2022 BCCA 258 (CanLII), at para 31, citing *Brown v. Brown*, 2020 BCCA 53 at para 30.

² Adjudicator's July 21, 2025 letter.

³ Respondent's response submissions at paras 51-53; Respondent's sur-reply at para 72(b).

submissions, I will only refer to those submissions where they are relevant to the issues that I must decide in this proceeding.

ISSUES AND BURDEN OF PROOF

[9] The issues I must decide for the University's s. 43 application are as follows:

1. Would responding to the respondent's outstanding request unreasonably interfere with the operations of the University because the request is excessively broad under s. 43(c)(i)?
2. If the answer to the above question is yes, what remedy, if any, is appropriate?

[10] The burden of proof is on the University to show that s. 43(c)(i) applies to the respondent's outstanding request.⁴

DISCUSSION

Background

[11] The respondent is a faculty member of the University. On March 10, 2025, the respondent requested the University to provide access to records about workplace investigations involving him for the period of January 1, 2022 to March 10, 2025 (the outstanding request).⁵ This request is summarized as follows:⁶

- All electronic and paper records, about audits and investigations involving the respondent and any companies associated with the respondent;
- All records about prompting, authorizing, recommending or initiating the investigation and documentation of the selection process or justification for the investigation and any communications explaining the rationale for opening the investigation, including any complaints, concerns, or allegations raised;
- All procedural documents related to the investigation;
- All records about reaching preliminary and additional findings of the investigation;
- All communications and records produced during the investigation;

⁴ Order F17-18, 2017 BCIPC 19 (CanLII) at para 4; Order F18-09, 2018 BCIPC 11 (CanLII) at para 2.

⁵ University's s. 43 application dated March 28, 2025.

⁶ Attached as Appendix A to this decision is a full text of the outstanding request.

- All post-investigation documents and pre-investigation documents and communications;
- Records about the investigation, which are associated with email accounts of approximately 41 individuals of six departments; and
- A detailed log of any records withheld and the specific legal basis for withholding each record.

[12] The University did not respond to the request and instead applied to the OIPC for authority to disregard the outstanding request under s. 43(c)(i).

Section 43

[13] Section 43 gives the OIPC the discretion to authorize public bodies to disregard access requests under certain conditions. The provision relevant to the University's s. 43 application reads as follows:

43 If the head of a public body asks, the commissioner may authorize the public body to disregard a request under section 5 or 29, including because

...

(c) responding to the request would unreasonably interfere with the operations of the public body because the request

(i) is excessively broad ...

[14] Section 43 is a remedial tool used to curb abuse of the right of access. It is not punitive in nature.⁷ Section 43 applications require careful consideration because granting this relief curtails or eliminates the rights of access, to records in the custody or control of a public body, granted by the Legislature under FIPPA.⁸

Unreasonable interference, s. 43(c)(i)

[15] Section 43(c)(i) allows the Commissioner to authorize a public body to disregard an access request if responding to the request would unreasonably interfere with the operations of the public body because the request is excessively broad.

[16] As confirmed in previous OIPC orders, s. 43(c)(i) has two parts and the University must prove both. First, it must show that the request is excessively

⁷ *Crocker v. British Columbia (Information and Privacy Commissioner)*, 1997 CanLII 4406 (BC SC) at paras 32-33; Order F19-34, 2019 BCIPC 37 (CanLII) at para 14.

⁸ Decision-Auth (s. 43) 99-01 (December 22, 1999) at 3. Available on the OIPC website at <https://www.oipc.bc.ca/documents/decisions/158>.

broad. Second, the University must show that responding to the request would unreasonably interfere with its operations.⁹

Is the outstanding request excessively broad under s. 43(c)(i)?

[17] The first part of the s. 43(c)(i) test is about whether the request itself is excessively broad. Previous orders have said the key question is whether the request is likely to produce an excessive volume of responsive records.¹⁰ In determining what kind of volume is “excessive,” previous decision-makers have considered the purpose of s. 43, which is to curb abuse of the right of access and to give all access applicants a fair opportunity to have their request processed.¹¹ As a result, they have held that a request is excessively broad when it generates a volume of responsive records that can be fairly characterized as “overwhelming” or “inordinate”.¹²

Parties’ submissions

[18] The University submits that its preliminary search identified approximately 67,761 responsive records consisting of an average of three pages per record, totalling 203,283 pages to be reviewed and processed, and therefore the outstanding request is excessively broad.¹³

[19] The University provides affidavit evidence from its Privacy Officer. He states that in his 13 years experience in the privacy and information area, an average of three pages per records is a conservative estimate.¹⁴ In addition, the University’s Access to Information Officer (Information Officer) says that he has experience in the privacy and information area for approximately 10 years and the total number of pages is broken down as follows:¹⁵

- 41,178 responsive records identified by the School of Business which will require 82,536 minutes to review.
- 12,714 emails and 1,677 documents identified by the School of Business which will require 33,813 minutes to process.¹⁶

⁹ Order F22-59, 2022 BCIPC 67 (CanLII) at para 42 and Order F23-98, 2023 BCIPC 114 (CanLII) at para 32.

¹⁰ Order F23-98, 2023 BCIPC 114 (CanLII) at paras 37 and 39. See also Order F24-15, 2024 BCIPC 21 (CanLII) at paras 30-32.

¹¹ See for example Order F23-98, 2023 BCIPC 114 (CanLII) at paras 37-39.

¹² *Ibid* at paras 37-39 citing *London Health Sciences Centre (Re)* 2021 CanLII 98534 (ON IPC) at para 66, *Carling (Carling) (Re)*, 2018 CanLII 15256 (ON IPC) at para 25, and *Niagara District Airport Commission (Re)*, 2014 CanLII 73018 (ON IPC) at para 23.

¹³ University’s initial submission at para 38 and Information Officer’s affidavit #1 at para 23.

¹⁴ Privacy Officer’s affidavit #1 at para 22.

¹⁵ University’s initial submission at paras 27 and 38. Information Officer’s affidavit #1 at paras 13-18.

¹⁶ Information Officer’s affidavit #1 at para 14.

- 5,472 responsive records comprised of 3,041 emails and 2,431 documents identified by the Internal Audit which will require 27,360 minutes to process.¹⁷
- 144 responsive records identified by the University Secretaries Office which will require 720 minutes to process.¹⁸
- 1,468 emails and 251 documents identified by the Vice President Academic and Provost which will require 8,600 minutes to process.¹⁹
- 4,857 responsive records identified by the Vice President of Finance and Operations that will require 9,714 minutes to process.²⁰

[20] The respondent rejects the University's position that the outstanding request is excessively broad. His position can be summarized as follows:

- The scope of the outstanding request is limited to only one specific issue which is audits or investigations concerning him.²¹
- The period of time of the outstanding request represents 3.2 years that is just 19% of his employment period at the University which is a reasonable time frame.²²
- The University's estimate of the volume of the responsive records is questionable since it did not disclose its search methodology, and it did not consider that duplicated information may have been contained in the responsive records.²³

Analysis and findings

[21] For the reasons that follow, I find that the outstanding request is excessively broad.

[22] I find the scope of the outstanding request encompasses a wide range of different subjects. They include internal or external audits, reviews, examinations, investigations, or similar processes, inquiries, concerns, complaints, including preliminary reviews, formal investigations, follow-up procedures, management responses, corrective action plans, and monitoring activities. Also, the outstanding request is seeking "all records", "all procedural documents" and "all communications" about these subjects. It is also seeking records involving 41 emails accounts and multiple departments and employees of the University. I find this is a broad range of subject matters. In addition, the fact that the scope of the

¹⁷ *Ibid* at para 15.

¹⁸ *Ibid* at para 16.

¹⁹ *Ibid* at para 17.

²⁰ *Ibid* at para 18.

²¹ Respondent's submission at para 29.

²² *Ibid* at paras 4 and 29; Respondent's sur-reply at paras 6-7.

²³ Respondent's submission at para 30; Respondent's sur-reply at paras 32 and 72(c).

request comprises of 19% of the respondent's employment period does not serve to reduce the broad range of subject matters.

[23] I cannot agree with the respondent's position that the outstanding request is not excessively broad since it has clearly defined parameters as required by Order F23-98.²⁴ That Order found the request at issue had defined parameters and was not excessively broad.²⁵ However, the Order also stated that "access requests with more clearly defined parameters may still be excessively broad" and that a request is excessively broad when it generates an excessive volume of responsive records.²⁶

[24] The University estimates the outstanding request will result in approximately 67,761 of responsive records consisting of 203,283 pages of records. I am satisfied that the University has a reasonable basis for its estimate of the volume of records that may be responsive to the outstanding request. The University requested its five program areas conduct a preliminary search and identify potentially responsive records. Also, the University's estimate is supported by affidavit evidence from employees who have direct professional experience in dealing with FIPPA requests for over 10 years. In such a case, I find the University's evidence is sufficient to make my finding, and I do not need the University to provide a search methodology as argued by the respondent. The only requirement is to take a reasonable approach to determine a rough estimate of the volume of records.²⁷ I find the University's approach reasonable.

[25] The respondent argues the University's estimate is questionable because the University did not consider there may be duplicated information in the responsive records. However, the respondent did not specify in his access request that his request did not include a record that contained duplicate information. Therefore, the fact that there may be duplicated information contained in the potentially responsive records does not change the volume of records that may be responsive to the outstanding request. Subject to any applicable FIPPA exceptions, the University would be required to provide the respondent with any responsive records even if those records contain duplicate information.

[26] Based on the above, I find the outstanding request involves a broad range of subject matters and would result in an overwhelming number of responsive records. Therefore, I find the outstanding request is excessively broad under s. 43(c)(i).²⁸

²⁴ Respondent's response submission at paras 5, 14, and 31.

²⁵ Order F23-98, 2023 BCIPC 114 (CanLII) at paras. 44-49.

²⁶ *Ibid* at paras 39 and 41.

²⁷ Order F25-41, 2025 BCIPC 49 (CanLII), at para 16.

²⁸ For similar reasoning, see Order F25-41, 2025 BCIPC 49 (CanLII), at paras 16-20.

[27] I turn now to consider whether responding to the outstanding request would unreasonably interfere with operations of the University.

Would responding to the outstanding request unreasonably interfere with the University's operations?

[28] The second part of the s. 43(c)(i) test is about whether the outstanding request would unreasonably interfere with the University's operations.

[29] Previous orders have found that the amount of time and effort required to search for responsive records goes to whether responding to the request would unreasonably interfere with a public body's operations.²⁹ The BC Supreme Court has also clarified that determining whether there would be an unreasonable interference in a public body's operations under s. 43 involves an objective assessment of the facts, in conjunction with the size and nature of those operations.³⁰ Previous orders have also considered the impact of processing requests on the rights of other applicants.³¹

Parties' submissions

[30] The University submits that responding to the outstanding request would unreasonably interfere with its operations.³² It submits that given the limited capacity of its Privacy and Access to Information Office comprising of three and a quarter full time employees including one information officer, the volume and breadth of the responsive records is unmanageable.³³

[31] To support its position, the University provides affidavit evidence from the Information Officer. The Information Officer states that based on his experience in the privacy and information area for approximately 10 years, he estimates it will take 30,275 hours (broken down as 865 weeks multiplied by 35 hours per week) to organize and review the 203,283 pages of responsive records, perform quality checks and consultation as necessary, and finalize the records. He explains that these tasks require approximately 4,325 staff days (broken down as 30,275 hours divided by seven hours per day).³⁴

[32] The respondent submits that the University has overestimated the amount of time required to respond to the outstanding request. He says that its

²⁹ See for example Order F23-98, 2023 BCIPC 114 (CanLII) at para 42.

³⁰ *Crocker v British Columbia (Information and Privacy Commissioner)*, 1997 CanLII 4406 at para 10.

³¹ Order F17-18, 2018 BCIPC 19 (CanLII) at para 40; Order F13-18, 2013 BCIPC 25 (CanLII) at para 31.

³² University's initial submission at para 37-38. University's reply submission at para 31. Information officer's affidavit #1 at para 24.

³³ University's initial submission at paras 37-38. Information Officer's affidavit #1 at para 26.

³⁴ University's reply submission at para 31. Information Officer's affidavit #1 at para 24.

assumption of three pages per record is speculative and the fact that the University also inconsistently uses terms such as “records”, “item” and “pages” makes it difficult to estimate the actual volume of the records.³⁵ He also says that the University does not look at options to improve its processing time, and does not consider that a duplicate record copy can be processed once.³⁶

[33] The University says that it had canvassed alternatives that may reduce the processing time however it finds the alternatives are not practicable. The University submits that it looked at a computer software that may shorten the labour required to process an access request. However, it found the software is not a feasible option because it costs \$92,000 for the software and \$36,700 for an annual licensing fee.³⁷ The University also submits that it canvassed an option to retain third-party service providers to conduct severing of the records and found the service fee is estimated to be around \$1.2 million. The University says that given it has a fixed budget for its Privacy and Access to Information Office, the alternatives are not viable options.³⁸

Findings and analysis

[34] For the reasons that follow, I find that the University has provided sufficient evidence that responding to the outstanding request would unreasonably interfere with its operations.

[35] I find that the University took a reasonable approach to estimate the time required to process the records and respond to the outstanding request. The University’s estimates come from staff with expertise and experience with processing records for FIPPA requests. I give weight to this evidence because the affiants provided sworn testimony based on their direct experience and knowledge of the University’s processes and they provided calculations to demonstrate the logic of the University’s submissions.

[36] I cannot agree with the respondent’s suggestion that the University’s estimate is questionable because of its inconsistent use of terms such as “records” and “items”.³⁹ While the University used different terms and numbers in its initial submission, it clarified in its reply submission that a preliminary search returned 67,761 records⁴⁰ and this estimation is supported by affidavit evidence.

³⁵ Respondent’s response submission at para 32.

³⁶ *Ibid* at para 44.

³⁷ University’s reply submission at para 40.

³⁸ *Ibid* at para 42. Privacy Officer’s affidavit #1 at para 42. The current budget the University allocates for its Privacy and Information operation is \$381,500, of which 92% is allocated to staff and benefits.

³⁹ University’s initial submission at paras 27-28. It refers to “65,000 items” and “67,761 records”.

⁴⁰ In its reply submission, the University refers to 67,761 records.

[37] Further, I am not persuaded that a duplicate record copy can be processed once as argued by the respondent because the University must review the whole record to identify and process the duplicate information. There is also no basis under Part 2 of FIPPA for a public body to withhold information in a record because it is duplicated elsewhere in the records; therefore, the University would have to process that information as part of its response to the outstanding request.⁴¹

[38] In addition, given it is estimated to take 30,275 hours for the three and a quarter employees of the Privacy and Access to Information Office to process 203,283 pages for one FIPPA request, it is reasonable to conclude that the outstanding request would result in no resources being available to process and respond to other FIPPA requests. This would have a negative impact on the access rights of other FIPPA applicants.

[39] In summary, I find the outstanding request is excessively broad and responding to the outstanding request would unreasonably interfere with the operations of the University in accordance with s. 43(c)(i).

What relief would be appropriate?

[40] The University asks for the following relief:

- Disregard the outstanding request;
- Respond to one open request from the respondent at a time; and
- Spend no more than eight hours responding to each request.⁴²

[41] The respondent says that the relief the University is seeking is not acceptable.⁴³

[42] Section 43(c) gives the Commissioner or their delegate the discretion to authorize a public body to disregard present and future FIPPA requests.⁴⁴

⁴¹ Order F22-16, 2022 BCIPC 18 (CanLII) at para 13.

⁴² University's initial submission at para 43; University's reply submission at para 93.

⁴³ Respondent's submission at para 59. The Respondent requests remedies: (1) denial of s. 43 application, (2) no fees be charged for the processing of the outstanding request, (3) the University processes the outstanding request within expedited timeline, (4) the University provides regular status update, (5) the OIPC maintains oversight for the University's process, (6) the OIPC determines whether the University has failed to fulfill its duty under s. 6(1), and (7) the OIPC directs the University to review its internal policies. I note that other than the first request, the remedies the respondent is requesting are outside the scope of this inquiry. In addition, given that I have found the outstanding request is excessively broad and would unreasonably interfere with the operations of the University, I will not consider the respondent's requests.

⁴⁴ *Crocker v British Columbia (Information and Privacy Commissioner)*, 1997 CanLII 4406 (BC SC) at paras 40-41.

[43] The BC Supreme Court has found that any remedy the Commissioner authorizes under s. 43 must be proportional to the harm inflicted and must bear in mind the objectives of s. 43.⁴⁵ A previous OIPC order has interpreted the Court's statements to mean, when a public body has proven a provision under s. 43 applies, then it is appropriate for the Commissioner to provide a public body with future relief, but that relief must be designed to prevent the harm or abuse specified in that s. 43 provision.⁴⁶

[44] The Court has advised that it is generally not appropriate under s. 43 for the Commissioner to authorize a public body to disregard all future requests for records, even for one year and especially when it comes to a request for the individual's own personal information.⁴⁷ The BC Supreme Court said it would be more appropriate to authorize the public body to disregard future requests "in specified circumstances" such as requiring the public body "to deal with only one request at a time" or "to disregard a request for records if it would take the staff of the public body more than a specified number of hours to comply with the request."⁴⁸

Authority to disregard the outstanding request

[45] The University has requested the authority to disregard the outstanding request. I found the outstanding request is excessively broad and responding to it would unreasonably interfere with the University's operations, therefore, I authorize the University to disregard the outstanding request.

Authority to disregard future requests

[46] The University requests future relief under s. 43 by asking for authorization to respond to one open request from the respondent at a time and to spend no more than eight hours responding to each request. The University did not state a period for which it is asking to respond to one open request from the respondent at a time; therefore, I will assume that the University is asking for future relief for an indefinite time.

[47] As previously noted, the Court has said that any remedy the Commissioner authorizes under s. 43 must be proportional to the harm inflicted

⁴⁵ *Crocker v. British Columbia (Information and Privacy Commissioner)*, 1997 CanLII 4406 (BC SC) at para 45 and *Mazhero v. British Columbia (Information and Privacy Commissioner)*, 1998 CanLII 6010 (BC SC) at para 25.

⁴⁶ Order F25-65, 2025 BCIPC 74 (CanLII) at para 128.

⁴⁷ *Crocker v. British Columbia (Information and Privacy Commissioner)*, 1997 CanLII 4406 (BC SC) at para 45 and *Mazhero v. British Columbia (Information and Privacy Commissioner)*, 1998 CanLII 6010 (BC SC) at para 29.

⁴⁸ *Mazhero v. British Columbia (Information and Privacy Commissioner)*, 1998 CanLII 6010 (BC SC) at para 30.

and must bear in mind the objectives of s. 43.⁴⁹ I do not see, and the University has not sufficiently explained, how indefinitely limiting the respondent's future access request to a single request at a time would be a proportional remedy under s. 43(c)(i). To grant the University's request would indefinitely deprive the respondent of his access rights under FIPPA, including the right to make access requests that are not excessively broad and that would not be an unreasonable interference with the University's operations.

[48] In my view, an appropriate remedy in this case is to authorize the University to disregard all access requests made by the respondent over and above a single access request at a time, for a period of one year. That is because the respondent has demonstrated a practice of making access requests including multiple subject matters of the requested records in quick succession with little regard for the impact of his requests on the University.⁵⁰ Based on what I glean from the parties' submissions, there is no indication that the broad range and volume of the respondent's requests are likely to diminish in the future. This approach is consistent with previous OIPC orders that have considered a public body's request for future relief under s. 43(c)(i).⁵¹

[49] Furthermore, this remedy should not be circumvented by the respondent including multiple categories and subject matters of requested records in a single letter, as he has done in this case, because doing so is, in substance, making multiple access requests at the same time. Therefore, I find that it is also appropriate to give the University the discretion to determine what constitutes a single access request.⁵²

[50] The remedy I have granted is intended to lessen the burden on the University as it carries out its duties under FIPPA, while preserving the respondent's right to access records but cause him to seriously consider the scope of each request before he makes it.

[51] In light of my authorization for the University to respond to a single access request at a time from the respondent for a period of one year and to determine what constitutes a single access request, I do not find it necessary to authorize the University to limit how many hours it spends responding to a request. I am satisfied the authorization I have given the University is a more proportional

⁴⁹ *Crocker v. British Columbia (Information and Privacy Commissioner)*, 1997 CanLII 4406 (BC SC) at para 45 and *Mazhero v. British Columbia (Information and Privacy Commissioner)*, 1998 CanLII 6010 (BC SC) at para 25.

⁵⁰ Prior to the outstanding request, the respondent made a FIPPA request in January 2025 for records about an investigation involving an individual; and the University says that the January 2025 request generated 4,957 pages of responsive records.

⁵¹ See for example Order F17-18, 2017 BCIPC 19 (CanLII), at paras 43-45, Order F25-64, 2025 BCIPC 74 (CanLII) at paras 138-140 and Order F25-47, 2025 BCIPC 55 (CanLII) at para 76.

⁵² See for similar reasoning Order F25-47, 2025 BCIPC 55 (CanLII), at paras 75-77 and Order F25-64, 2025 BCIPC 74 (CanLII) at paras 139-140.

remedy under s. 43(c)(i) that will prevent the unreasonable interference with the University's operations while also preserving the respondent's ability to reasonably exercise his access rights under FIPPA.

CONCLUSION

[52] For the reasons given above, I make the following authorizations under s. 43 of FIPPA:

1. The University is authorized under s. 43(c)(i) to disregard the respondent's outstanding request.
2. The University is authorized, for a period of one year from the date of this authorization, to disregard all access requests that the respondent submits over and above a single access request at a time.
3. The University is authorized to determine what constitutes a single access request for the purposes of the authorization granted under item 2 above.

August 27, 2025

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY

D. Hans Hwang, Adjudicator

OIPC File No.: F25-00583

Appendix A

All records (electronic and paper records), including but not limited to memoranda, emails, calendar entries, meeting notes, notes or summaries of in-person discussions or phone calls, reports, text messages, instant messages, WhatsApp, or other messaging platforms that might contain relevant discussions, handwritten notes, telephone logs, voice recordings, video recordings, presentation materials, spreadsheets, databases, working papers, draft documents, metadata, system logs and access records, authorization forms and approvals, chain of custody documentation, records of who accessed relevant financial or administrative systems during the audit period, any directives authorizing retrieval of [the respondent]'s email and documents from the University-controlled electronic repositories, authentication logs showing who accessed these accounts, delegation of authority documents related to this access, records obtained through this access, preliminary findings, interview transcripts, surveys, questionnaires, checklists, audit programs, risk assessments, planning documents, terms of reference, engagement

letters, approval documents, additional findings, draft and final reports, summaries, analyses, recommendations, and any and all other records and documentation, collectively referred to as “Records”, related to any and all internal or external audits, reviews, examinations, investigations, or similar processes (whether formally designated as ‘Audits’ or not), inquiries, concerns, complaints, including preliminary reviews, formal investigations, follow-up procedures, management responses, corrective action plans, and implementation monitoring activities, collectively referred to as “Investigation”, conducted regarding or involving [the respondent] (whether referenced by first and/or last name, title, employee number, position, or any other identifying information), and any companies associated with [the respondent] including but not limited to: [corporations], and any programs or initiatives associated with [the respondent] including but not limited to [programs], whether these records specifically name the aforementioned individuals/entities/programs/initiatives or refer to them directly, indirectly, implicitly, or by inference, referred to as “Subject”:

1. All Records *prompting, authorizing, recommending or initiating* the Investigation, conducted regarding or involving the Subject, including: initial requests or directives for the Investigation; memoranda, emails, calendar entries, meeting notes, or other communications discussing the need for or purpose of the Investigation; documentation of the selection process or justification for Investigation; meeting minutes where the Investigation was proposed, discussed, or approved; any communications explaining the rationale for opening the Investigation, including any complaints, concerns, or allegations raised.
2. All *procedural documents* related to the Investigation regarding or involving Subject, including: the audit plan, scope, and methodology; risk assessment documents used to justify the audit; timelines and milestone documents; internal protocols or procedures followed.
3. All Records *received, reviewed, referenced, or relied upon* in reaching preliminary and additional findings of the Investigation regarding or involving Subject, including all sources and narratives for such Records.
4. All Records produced *during the* Investigation regarding or involving Subject, including but not limited to notes, interview transcripts, and working papers, preliminary and additional findings or draft reports, summaries, analyses, and recommendations, final reports and any appendices, and all communication records produced.
5. All *post-Investigation* documents, including: Records of actions taken based on audit findings, implementation plans for recommendations, follow-up reviews or assessments, reports to committees or governing bodies, management responses, and any correspondence regarding Subject, findings or outcomes.

6. All pre-Investigation, Investigation, and post-Investigation *related communications* regarding Subject, including any communications where Subject is mentioned directly or indirectly, explicitly or implicitly, or where the Investigation pertaining to Subject is referenced or discussed between, among, from, to, within, across, or including external parties (consultants, advisors, contracted specialists, external auditors, legal counsel, contractors, subcontractors, government agencies, regulatory bodies, professional associations, current or former UVic students), received by, sent to, copied to, blind copied to, forwarded to, originated from, authored by, edited by, reviewed by, commented on by, approved by, or conducted among the individual accounts listed in P.7.

7. Records for P1-6 are requested from the following Individual Accounts: Records are requested to be retrieved from all individuals listed below and their accounts, whether these individuals are currently employed or no longer affiliated with the university, occupying the same or different positions now than during the relevant time period, and regardless of any name changes, title changes, or department transfers.

This request includes records from all university email accounts (including primary, secondary, departmental, role-based, and personal university email addresses), shared drives, document repositories, and communication platforms associated with these individuals. For clarity, this includes but is not limited to personal uvic.ca email accounts [email address], role-based email accounts [email addresses], departmental accounts, and any other university-controlled communication channels utilized by these individuals in any capacity related to the Subject or Investigation. The email list below is non-exhaustive, and records should be retrieved from all university-controlled email accounts and communication platforms used by the listed individuals, regardless of whether specific email addresses are enumerated in this request.

Internal Audit:

- [two individuals' names and email addresses]
- and any other members of the internal audit team or persons supporting the team;

Board of Governors:

- [two individuals' names]
- and any other members involved in the Audit Committee;

VP Finance:

- [two individuals' names and email addresses]
- and relevant staff;

VPAC:

- [12 individuals' names and email addresses]
- and their respective staff; including but not limited to [email addresses]

BUSI:

- [15 individuals' names and email addresses]

BUSI & GSB EE Staff:

- [8 individuals' names and email addresses]

- and any other administrative staff involved.

8. A detailed log of any records withheld and the specific legal basis for withholding each record, including the applicable section of relevant privacy legislation, and confirmation that all reasonably severable portions of withheld documents have been disclosed.