

**REPORT WITH RESPECT TO THE APPLICATION
FOR REVIEW OF ██████████ IN RELATION TO INFORMATION
REQUESTED FROM THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE
REGINA SCHOOL DIVISION NO. 4 OF SASKATCHEWAN**

[1] On August 20, 2001, ██████████ (the "Applicant") submitted to The Board of Education of the Regina School Division No. 4 of Saskatchewan (the "Respondent") an Access to Information Request Form. The words chosen by the Applicant to describe the information requested as set out in the form are as follows:

"I would like to know the following information about the room I taught in 96-99. ██████████ (1996-98) changed number on door to room ██████████ in Sept 98 at ██████████. What tests were taken? Why they were taken. When they were taken? All documentation & results of tests. Work that was done. What work was done? When it was done? Why was it done? Where it was done? Where is the documentation? Construction information requested."

[2] On October 4, 2001, the Applicant filed with me a Request for Review. In the form of Request for Review is a series of reasons for the making of the Request with an implied invitation to check the appropriate box that describes the reason for the specific Request for Review. The Applicant checked the box that reads "I have not received a reply to my application, which I submitted [45] days ago."

[3] A few days following the receipt of the Request for Review, I received a communication from the Applicant indicating that she had "received a portion of the materials she had requested" from the Respondent. The Applicant was invited to outline to me in writing a description of the information that was not provided to her in response to her Access to Information Request and to provide to me copies of the materials that had been forwarded to her by the Respondent. Copies of the material provided to the Applicant by the Respondent were forwarded to me by the Applicant by letter received by me on October 15, 2001.

[4] A portion of the letter of the Applicant reads as follows:

“The information I received is spars [sic] and incomplete. Much of the information is missing. When I requested results and documentation for all tests I expected that the results would include graphs and lab. reports. Documentation for the co2 tests should be in the form of graphs. Documentation for the mold [sic] testing should be in the form of laboratory reports.

I requested the name of the builder who constructed the portable unit in which I worked. I was told in the response letter that ...”they are unable to determine the identity of the firm that was contracted for the project.” (Number 4 of cover letter).

I don’t understand why or how records of who was billed for constructing this portable unit are not on record and available.”

[5] I have communicated with the Respondent respecting the concerns articulated by the Applicant. I am satisfied that the Respondent has provided to the Applicant the information requested of the Respondent which is in the possession of the Applicant. No information has been brought to my attention that would lead me to believe that the Respondent has failed to comply with its obligations set forth in Section 10 of *The Local Authority Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* (the “Act”). Although the response that was provided was not given within the time limited in Section 7 of the *Act* (30 days), it was in fact provided prior to my determining whether or not to conduct a Review.

[6] In the circumstances, I have concluded that there is no basis established for me to conduct a Review and I therefore decline to do so.

[7] Dated at Regina, in the Province of Saskatchewan, this 9th day of November, 2001.

GERALD L. GERRAND, Q.C.
Commissioner of Information
and Privacy for Saskatchewan