



REVIEW REPORT 214-2025 (Part II)¹

Ministry of Social Services

February 5, 2026

Summary: This office issued Review Report 343-2025, Part I, on December 17, 2025. That report considered a preliminary matter of jurisdiction raised by the Ministry of Social Services (Ministry) regarding a notice of abandonment (notice) issued to the Applicant. That report concluded that the Ministry's notice was a nullity, and the Applicant's request to for a review of the Ministry's fee estimate would proceed.

Upon review, the Office of the Saskatchewan Information and Privacy Commissioner (OIPC) found that the Ministry's fee estimate was reasonable except that it should be reduced by \$3,700 to account for the electronic provision of records. The Commissioner recommended that the Ministry reduce its fee estimate of \$14,890 by the \$3,700 amount to \$11,190 if the Applicant still agrees to accept an electronic transfer of documents and upon payment of the 50% deposit. If the Applicant fulfills these two conditions, the processing of the Applicant's request should proceed.

OIPC also advised that the Ministry should, under its duty to assist, work with the Applicant to determine if the Applicant would be satisfied with certain types of records, which may further reduce costs. OIPC also advised that, since the request goes back 30+ years, many records may have been destroyed in accordance with existing retention and destruction policies. If this is the case, the Ministry's final fee quote may be less.

I BACKGROUND

- [1] On December 17, 2025, this office issued Review Report 343-2025, Part I. That report considered a preliminary matter of jurisdiction raised by the Ministry of Social Services

¹ This report is issued following [Review Report 343-2025 Part I](#), which considered a preliminary matter raised by the Ministry.

(Ministry) over a notice of abandonment. In Part I, this office concluded that the Ministry did not meet the threshold requirements to issue a notice of abandonment to the Applicant pursuant to section 7.1(1) of *The Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* (*FOIP*).² Since the notice of abandonment was considered a nullity, the Applicant's request for a review of the Ministry's fee estimate must continue.

[2] The Applicant submitted a three-part access request to the Ministry, which the Ministry received on July 17, 2025. The access request read as follows:

...we request copies of the following records from the Saskatchewan Ministry of Social Services (the "MSS") for the period from January 1, 1993 to present:

1. financial records of the total amount of special allowances paid to the MSS each month pursuant to sections 3 and 4 of the *Children's Special Allowances Act*, SC 1992, c 48 (the "CSA Act"), whether paid directly by the Canada Revenue Agency to the MSS or remitted from another agency or institution to the MSS;
2. financial records of how the MSS treated these special allowances in its accounting once received, including but not limited to accounting policies, budgets, and financial reporting;
3. correspondence, policies, procedures, and memoranda with respect to how the MSS was to, and did, apply these special allowances toward each child in respect of whom it was paid pursuant to section 3 of the *CSA Act*;

To the extent that the above requests for records may be addressed sufficiently with only a single record or a few records rather than a broader set of documents which contain the same information, please defer to providing fewer records where possible.

[3] By letter dated July 25, 2025, the Ministry provided the Applicant with a fee estimate in the amount of \$14,890. The Ministry advised it would begin processing the Applicant's request if the Applicant paid the required 50% deposit of \$7,445. The Ministry also offered to work with the Applicant to modify the request to reduce the fee.

² *The Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*, SS 1990-91, c. F-22.01, as amended.

[4] The Applicant emailed the Ministry on August 18, 2025, signaled their intent to narrow their request, and provided the Ministry with a written confirmation clarifying the request on August 19, 2025. According to the Applicant, their revised request removed “entire classes of documents and records” as follows for the same period January 1, 1993 to present:

1. financial records of the total amount of special allowances paid to the MSS each month pursuant to sections 3 and 4 of the *Children’s Special Allowances Act*, SC 1992, c 48 (the “**CSA Act**”), whether paid directly by the Canada Revenue Agency to the MSS or remitted from another agency or institution to the MSS;
2. financial records of how the MSS treated these special allowances in its accounting once received; and
3. financial records demonstrating that the MCFS applied these special allowances exclusively toward the care, maintenance, education, training or advancement of each child in respect of whom it was paid, if at all, pursuant to section 3 of the *CSA Act*.

I further wish to clarify the portion of my request which stated: “to the extent that the above requests for records may be addressed sufficiently with only a single record or a few records rather than a broader set of documents which contain the same information, please defer to providing fewer records where possible”. In doing so, I did not intend to request that any record be created that does not currently exist. Rather, I desired only to indicate that, as a courtesy, if a single record exists that provides a full answer to one of my requests, then I am content to receive only that single record and I do not require additional responsive records to be provided which are duplicative of the information contained in that record or which must be taken together with other records to fully answer the request.

[5] The Ministry advised the Applicant by letter dated August 20, 2025, that the change in wording didn’t affect the parameters of their request, and upfront payment of 50% of the estimate of \$14,890 was still required prior to proceeding with the processing of the access request.

[6] The Applicant considered this matter until September 2, 2025, at which point they contacted the Office of the Saskatchewan Information and Privacy Commissioner (OIPC) and asked for a review the fee estimate issued by the Ministry.

- [7] Having concluded that an early resolution may be possible, the OIPC Intake Officer contacted the Ministry on October 7, 2025 to engage on the fee estimate issue and perhaps seek early resolution. The OIPC Intake Officer requested further documentation from the Ministry and attempted to initiate discussions with respect to a reconsideration of the fee estimate. The Ministry was unwilling to discuss the fee estimate with the OIPC Intake Officer.
- [8] On October 17, 2025, the Applicant was advised by this office that the Ministry would not budge on the fee estimate and the Applicant requested OIPC proceed with a formal review of the fee estimate.
- [9] On October 24, 2025, the full scope of the fee estimate review was confirmed with the Applicant and conveyed to the Ministry. Further documentation was requested once again from the Ministry. At this time, OIPC advised the Ministry that if the matter was not resolved informally, OIPC may issue a public report.
- [10] On October 31, 2025, this office completed its initial review of the matter with both sides of the fee dispute and all relevant documentation was obtained. This office issued a formal notice of review of the fee estimate to the Applicant and the Ministry.
- [11] By email on November 6, 2025, the Ministry advised this office that as the result of the fact that it had previously issued a notice of abandonment to the Applicant on September 22, 2025, the matter was now one of a “threshold issue” that had to be determined prior to any consideration of the fee estimate issue. On November 10, 2025, the Ministry confirmed with this office that the notice of abandonment should be reviewed as a “threshold issue”.
- [12] As noted, this office determined in Review Report 343-2025, Part I, which was issued December 17, 2025, that the Ministry’s notice of abandonment was a nullity and that a review of the Ministry’s fee estimate would proceed. The Ministry was given until January 14, 2025, to provide its submission on the fee estimate, which was originally due December 1, 2025.

- [13] The Applicant provided a submission on December 1, 2025, and supplemental information on January 12, 2026.
- [14] The Ministry provided a submission on January 15, 2026, and did not agree to share the submission with the Applicant.

II RECORDS AT ISSUE

- [15] As this is a review of the Ministry's fee estimate, there are no records in issue.

III DISCUSSION OF THE ISSUES

1. Jurisdiction

- [16] The Ministry is a “government institution” under section 2(1)(d)(i) of *FOIP*. *FOIP* is engaged and OIPC has jurisdiction under PART VII of *FOIP* to undertake this review.

2. Supplemental Reasons to Review Report 343-2025, Part I

- [17] The Ministry addressed the issue of the notice of abandonment once again in its January 16, 2025, submission to this office. We thank the Ministry for its submission, but we must respond because perhaps we were not as clear as we could have been in Review Report 343-2025. We take this opportunity now and this addition is meant to be viewed as supplemental reasons to Review Report 343-2025.
- [18] In its January 16, 2025, submission, the Ministry wrote the following after quoting section 9(1) to (4) of *FOIP* in full:

These provisions demonstrate that subsection 7(2)(a) is a statutory trigger for the fee process. Subsection 9(1) links the applicant's entitlement to access directly to the giving of notice under subsection 7(2)(a). That entitlement arises when the notice is issued, not when the deposit is paid.

Subsections 9(2), (3) and (4) cannot operate independently of subsection 7(2)(a). Subsection 9(2) prescribes when a fee estimate is required. Subsection 9(3) of *FOIP* suspends the timeline to give written notice to the applicant. Subsection 9(4) provides a discretionary mechanism that allows the head to require a deposit be paid before the search for the records begins. None of these provisions can be meaningfully applied unless subsection 7(2)(a) has already been engaged. It is true that once the request is processed another subsection 7(2)(a) notice may be provided requesting the remaining amount of the fee estimate, but that does not mean that the initial notice was not also provided pursuant to subsection 7(2)(a).

- [19] OIPC interprets section 7(2)(a) as only a statutory trigger for section 9(1) of *FOIP* which mandates that upon payment of the prescribed fee and upon notice pursuant to section 7(2)(a) of *FOIP*, an applicant is entitled to obtain access to the records. However, sections 9(2) to (4) of *FOIP* are to be read separate and apart from section 9(1) because these sections deal with fee estimates and a fee estimate is not a prescribed fee unless and until an applicant agrees that it is so.
- [20] In this matter the Ministry did not give section 7(2)(a) *FOIP* notice in this case because it only provided a fee estimate to the Applicant. The Ministry sent a letter with a fee estimate to the Applicant and, most notably, that letter did not state that it was notice pursuant to section 7(2)(a) of *FOIP*. Unfortunately, the Ministry continues to conflate a fee estimate with a prescribed fee which is incorrect because the two are separate concepts. A fee estimate is issued by a government institution after it has estimated the fees to process an access request and determined that the fees will exceed the \$100 prescribed fee threshold. A prescribed fee is the fee to provide access to records that have already been processed by the government institution and involve a fee upon which the applicant has previously agreed to pay. The Applicant did not provide its consent to the fee estimate in this matter and instead, sought a review from this office pursuant to the framework as outlined in sections 9(2) to (3) of *FOIP*.
- [21] Section 7(2)(a) of *FOIP* mandates that notice must be given to an applicant within 30 days stating that access to the record ...will be given on payment of the *prescribed fee*. The difference between a prescribed fee and a fee estimate is found in *The Freedom of*

*Information and Protection of Privacy Regulations (FOIP Regulations).*³ Section 6 of the *FOIP Regulations* lays out a number of fees that a government institution may charge an applicant for the reproduction of a record such as \$0.25 per page of a photocopy or \$0.25 per page of a computer printout, and so forth. But section 7(1) of the *Regulations* provides that the prescribed fee is either \$100 or another fee which is an estimate:

Estimate

7(1) For the purpose of subsection 9(2) of the Act, \$100 is prescribed as the amount of fees beyond which an *estimate* must be given by the head.

[Emphasis added]

- [22] The Ministry urges this office to apply statutory construction, and in so doing, it is clear by the simple language of section 7(1) of the *FOIP Regulations* when read in conjunction with section 7(2)(a) of *FOIP*, that a prescribed fee is either the prescribed amount of \$100 or a fee that has been otherwise determined to be a prescribed fee upon consensus. How is a fee determined to be a prescribed fee if it is greater than \$100? It could be that an Applicant has agreed that the fee estimate as quoted is satisfactory – then that may be the prescribed fee. Alternately, a prescribed fee may be the fee amount after a review has been conducted by this office at the request of the Applicant and the government institution agrees on that quoted sum.
- [23] Therefore, the prescribed fee that is referred to in section 7(2)(a) of *FOIP* can *never* be the same thing as a fee estimate. This is why we stated in Review Report 343-2025 that section 7(2)(a) of *FOIP* was never meaningfully triggered in any way by the Ministry in the first place because the Ministry did not quote a prescribed fee to the Applicant in the fee estimate letter. The Ministry believed this fee estimate was the prescribed fee, but the Applicant did not agree to pay that sum. The Ministry gave a fee estimate and therefore the Applicant was entitled to the option offered by subsections 9(2) and (3) of *FOIP* to bring the matter to this office for a review, during which the 30-day time period for the issuance of the section 7(2)(a) notice was suspended. Until the Ministry had the firm agreement of

³ [The Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Regulations](#), c.F-22.01 Reg 1 (April 1, 1992), as amended.

the Applicant to pay the fee estimate, a section 7 *FOIP* notice could not have been issued and a notice of abandonment could not follow.

[24] The Ministry gave the Applicant a fee estimate and not a true section 7(2)(a) *FOIP* notice and therefore the Ministry's deeming of the matter to be abandoned pursuant to section 7.1 of *FOIP* was a nullity.

3. Was the Ministry's fee estimate reasonable?

[25] The Ministry issued a fee estimate to the Applicant, and thereby engaged section 9(2) of *FOIP*. Section 9(2) of *FOIP* says that if the cost for providing access to records exceeds the prescribed amount of \$100.00, which is found at section 7(1) of the *FOIP Regulations*,⁴ then a fee estimate must be given.⁵ Section 9(2) of *FOIP* states as follows:

9(2) Where the amount of fees to be paid by an applicant for access to records is greater than a prescribed amount, the head shall give the applicant a reasonable estimate of the amount, and the applicant shall not be required to pay an amount greater than the estimated amount.

[26] *FOIP* provides for reasonable cost recovery. There are three general types of fees to consider in a fee estimate: (1) fees for searching for records; (2) fees for preparing the records for disclosure; and (3) fees for reproducing the records. A reasonable fee estimate is one that is proportionate to the work required on the part of the government institution to respond efficiently and effectively to an access request. A fee is equitable when it is fair and even-handed, meaning applicants should bear a reasonable cost of producing records. Applicants should not, however, bear costs arising from administrative inefficiencies.⁶ The Ministry provided the following estimate of costs to the Applicant for each:⁷

⁴ *Ibid* at section 7(1).

⁵ OIPC [Review Report 109-2025](#) at paragraph [11].

⁶ *Ibid*, at paragraph [12].

⁷ As summarized by OIPC from the Ministry's letter to the Applicant dated July 25, 2025.

Description	Cost
Searching: 15 hours at \$15 per half hour	\$450.00
Preparing: based on estimated 530 records and 14,800 pages found, 360 hours at \$15 per half hour	\$10,800.00
Copying: 14,800 pages at \$0.25/page	\$3,700.00
Subtotal Estimate	\$14,950.00
Less 2 hours at \$15 per half hour	(\$60.00)
Total Estimate	\$14,890.00
Deposit of 50%	\$7,445.00

[27] If search or preparation exceeds two hours, a government institution can charge \$15 for every half hour of search and/or preparation, which is described at section 6(2) of *FOIP Regulations* as follows:

6(2) Where time in excess of two hours is spent in searching for a record requested by an applicant or in preparing it for disclosure, a fee of \$15 for each half-hour or portion of a half-hour of that excess time is payable at the time when access is given.

[28] This review considers each type of fee separately.

a. Estimated fees for searching

[29] Search time consists of every half hour manual search time required to locate and identify responsive records. It can include search time involving physical search for records, examining file indices or paper/electronic records, pulling paper files, and reading through files to determine responsiveness. As a rule, search time does not include time spent copying records, going from office to office or to off-site storage, or having someone review the results of a search.⁸

[30] OIPC recommends the following general standards to estimate search:⁹

⁸ *Supra*, footnote 5 at paragraph [18].

⁹ *Ibid.*

- It should take an experienced employee one minute to visually scan 12 pages of paper or electronic records to determine responsiveness.
- It should take an experienced employee five minutes to search one regular file drawer for responsive records.
- It should take three minutes to search one active email count and transfer the results to a separate folder or drive.

[31] If the above test does not accurately reflect the circumstances, a government institution should design a search strategy and test a representative sample for time and apply it to the record in whole.¹⁰

[32] In its submission to OIPC, the Ministry estimated the number of records as follows:

Electronic Records Estimate

Record Type	Estimated Number of Records	Estimated Average Number of Pages	Estimated Total Pages
Annual Reports 1993 to 2011	18	26	468
Annual Reports 2012 to 2025	0 (Publicly available)	0	0
Monthly Remittance Slips	72	50	3,600
Quarterly Reports	24	1	24
Total Electronic Records	114		4,092

Paper Records Estimate

Record Type	Estimated Number of Records	Estimated Average Number of Pages	Estimated Total Pages
Monthly Remittance Slips	312	50	15,600
Quarterly Reports	104	1	104
Total Paper Records	416		15,704

¹⁰ *Supra*, footnote 5 at paragraph [20].

[33] The Ministry acknowledged that records span approximately 390 months (30+ years). Some of the Ministry's assumptions in estimating the total number of records included that:¹¹

- annual reports contain financial information including CSA revenue and average 26 pages each;
- CSA remittance slips show monthly payments by child and total amount remitted;
- remittance slips for 1993 to 2019 are in paper format and electronically after that;
- the Ministry stated there were an average of 70 remittance slips per month, but the Ministry rounded down to 50; and
- quarterly reports average one page per quarter.

[34] The Ministry added that all records respond to the first part of the Applicant's request, and that there are no records responsive to parts two and three.¹² The Ministry also stated that it anticipated 530 records totaling 19,796 pages, but reduced its estimated page count by 25% to account for older records that may have been destroyed or that may no longer exist because of "historical record-keeping practices." This is how the Ministry arrived at 14,800 pages of records. The Ministry added that using OIPC's formula of one minute to review 12 pages it could have charged 21 hours for search but chose to reduce this amount to 15 hours.

[35] As outlined in the *Background* to this Report, the Applicant modified their access request on August 19, 2025. In their submission, the Applicant agreed to eliminate what they described as classes of records. This included narrowing part two of the request to "only financial records" and no "accounting policies, budgets and financial reporting." It also included narrowing part three to "only financial records" and no "correspondence, policies,

¹¹ As summarized by OIPC and not directly quoted from the submission provided by the Ministry.

¹² This is something the Ministry would advise the Applicant after the fee estimate issue is resolved and it is able to complete its search and issue its section 7 decision.

procedures, and memoranda.” Since the Ministry states that it does not have records responsive to parts two and three of the access request, the focus can only be on the first part of the Applicant’s request.

- [36] The Applicant also provided details of the same or substantially similar access requests they made to Alberta (AB) and British Columbia (BC) to shed light on the reasonableness of the response from Saskatchewan.
- [37] The AB request involved no charge to the Applicant. The Applicant stated that AB opted to provide a single document that summarized the information rather than provide a series of records. The legislation in Saskatchewan does not require government institutions to create a record or even summarize data to meet an access request. Government institutions are obligated to either provide access to a full set of records or to claim the non-existence of records. For this reason, the response from AB is not helpful and will not be considered.
- [38] The estimate from BC was \$2,910. This figure was based on 60 hours to produce the requested records and an additional 40 hours to locate other documentation, some stored offsite. There is no information on the exact number of records involved, but BC stipulated that electronic records were available from 2008 onward. Records are only available in Saskatchewan from 2019 onward. BC’s ability to access older electronic records *may* give it a bit of an advantage in terms of searching, and possibly allow it to reduce associated fees, but this would be speculation and nothing more. BC also may create a record or summarize data under its duty to assist but chose not to in this case.¹³ Given these circumstances, the BC option is also not helpful as a comparison for the purposes of this review.
- [39] This review will focus on the types of records the Ministry stated would be responsive as outlined at paragraph [32] of this Report – annual reports, remittance slips and quarterly reports.

¹³ This ability is described under section 6(2) of the BC *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*, RSBC 1996, c 165, as amended.

[40] According to the Ministry, the annual reports for 2012 to 2025 are available online, meaning they are published records.¹⁴ Annual reports prior to 2012 are not online but may have been “transferred to Archives (if they exist).”¹⁵ Regardless, they are still published records. *FOIP* does not apply to published materials by way of section 3(1)(a) of *FOIP*, which provides:

3(1) This Act does not apply to:

- (a) published material or material that is available for purchase by the public;

[41] When materials are published, a government institution is required to give written notice to an applicant under section 7(2)(b) of *FOIP*, directing them to the record. The Ministry has agreed to consult the provincial Archives office and to direct the Applicant accordingly. If this is the case, the fee estimate associated with the annual reports may be removed from the estimate.

[42] This leaves remittance slips and quarterly reports. The Ministry stated there may be some overlap in information between the two types of records, but based on the Applicant’s request, it assumes that both types of records would be responsive.

[43] If the annual reports are removed from the Ministry’s calculation, the total of the electronic records comes to 3,624, leaving the total of paper records at 15,704. This brings the total pages count of the records to 19,328. Using the OIPC search parameters of one minute to visually scan 12 pages, this amounts to a total of 1,610 minutes or 27 hours. Since the Ministry has already reduced its search time to 14,800 pages and 15 hours, we easily find the Ministry’s search estimate of \$450 to be reasonable.

¹⁴ See [*Business Plans and Annual Reports*](#) on the Government of Saskatchewan Publications webpage.

¹⁵ “Archives” is taken to mean [*The Provincial Archives of Saskatchewan*](#).

b. Estimated fees for preparing records for disclosure

[44] This office has stated in the past that preparation includes time spent preparing the records for disclosure. This includes the anticipated amount of time spent physically severing exempt information from the record. It should in general take an experienced employee two minutes per page to sever. Preparation time does not include:¹⁶

- Deciding whether to claim an exemption.
- Identifying records requiring severing.
- Identifying and preparing records requiring third party notice.
- Packaging records to ship, transporting them to the mailroom, or arranging for a courier.
- Time spent compiling and printing.
- Assembling information and proofing data.
- Photocopying.
- Preparing an index of records.

[45] In this case, the Ministry estimated 14,800 pages. The Ministry added that the type of severing required for these records *may* involve personal information as well as discretionary exemptions, and that some exemptions may fall within the ambit of *The Child and Family Services Act*.¹⁷ None of this is certain at the moment, but the Ministry has estimated that approximately 75% of the records would require some severing and so calculated its preparation time based on 11,100 pages.¹⁸

[46] The Ministry reduced the time to sever from 370 to 360 hours. At \$15 per half hour, it arrived at its estimate of \$10,800. This office agrees this is reasonable based on the

¹⁶ *Supra*, footnote 5 at paragraph [28].

¹⁷ *The Child and Family Services Act*, SS 1989-90 c. C-7.2, as amended.

¹⁸ 75% of 14,800 pages.

circumstances and the reductions on the part of the Ministry. Indeed, a good portion of the estimated fee for severing likely owes to the volume of remittance slips going back 30+ years. These will likely require severance in some way. Factors such as this add to the reasonableness of the Ministry's estimate for severing, which is considerable.

c. Estimated fees for providing copies

[47] The cost for photocopying a record or for providing a computer printout of record is a straight calculation of \$0.25 per page times the number of estimated pages. These amounts are found at sections 6(1)(a) and (b) of *FOIP Regulations* as follows:

6(1) Where access to a record or part of a record is given by providing the applicant with a copy of the record, the following fees are payable at the time when access is given:

- (a) for a photocopy, \$0.25 per page;
- (b) for a computer printout, \$0.25 per page;

[48] In this case, the Ministry's calculation based on photocopying 14,800 pages at \$0.25/page would be \$3,700. This aligns with the fees set out in section 6(2)(a) of *FOIP Regulations* and so is reasonable.

[49] The Applicant confirmed that they would be satisfied receiving the records electronically, and they suggested a secure file transfer. If this is the case, that recommended method would involve no cost.¹⁹ In this way the estimated fee may be reduced by \$3,700 from \$14,890 to \$11,190.

¹⁹ OIPC [Review Report 062-2023](#) considered at paragraph [40] in a review of a fee estimate under [The Local Authority Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act](#), SS 1990-91, c L-27.1, as amended, that if applicants want records electronically, they should be given that way at no charge.

Conclusion

[50] There is a finding that the Ministry's fee estimate of \$14,890 is reasonable and that it may be reduced by \$3,700 to account for the electronic provision of records. The total deposit payable would then be \$5,595. The recommendation will be that the Ministry revise its fee estimate accordingly and if the Applicant pays the deposit, then the Ministry is to continue processing the Applicant's request.

[51] It should be noted that if there is overlap between the remittance slips and quarterly reports, the Applicant may not want both. Under section 5.1 of *FOIP*, a government institution has a duty to assist by responding *accurately*, which means providing applicants with information on the types of records in the possession or control of the government institution that may be responsive.²⁰ At this stage, the Ministry knows what type of information is contained on a remittance slip as well as in a quarterly report, and so the Applicant may be consulted on this point. Taking either type of record off the table at this stage could reduce costs, but this would be at the Applicant's discretion.

[52] There is also a possibility that records beyond a certain age may have been destroyed in accordance with the Ministry's (or government's) record retention and destruction policies. If this is the case, the volume of records may be significantly reduced, thus reducing the associated fees. Section 7(2) of *FOIP Regulations* provides that if the amount of an estimate exceeds the actual amount of fees determined pursuant to section 6 of *FOIP Regulations*, then the applicant pays the lesser amount. This means that if the Applicant pays the deposit and the Ministry's final calculated fee turns out to be less than its total estimated fee, the Applicant pays the lesser amount. For example, if the final fee is calculated by the Ministry to be less than the deposit paid by the Applicant, then the Ministry would be required to refund the Applicant the difference.

²⁰ OIPC [Review Report 056-2022](#) at paragraph [24].

IV FINDINGS

- [53] OIPC has jurisdiction under PART VII of *FOIP* to undertake this review.
- [54] The fee estimate of \$14,890 issued by the Ministry is reasonable except that it may be reduced by the reproduction fee of \$3,700 to \$11,190 if the Applicant is still agreeable to accept the electronic transfer of records.

V RECOMMENDATION

- [55] I recommend that the Ministry reduce its fee estimate of \$14,890 by the amount of the reproduction fee of \$3,700 to \$11,190 if the Applicant still agrees to the electronic transfer of documents. If the Applicant pays the 50% deposit of \$5,595, then the Ministry is required to continue processing the Applicant's request.

Dated at Regina, in the Province of Saskatchewan, this 5th day of February 2026.

Grace Hession David
Saskatchewan Information and Privacy Commissioner