NUNAVUT
INFORMATION AND PRIVACY COMMISSIONER

Review Decision 03-07
March 4, 2003
Review File: 02-228-5

A. BACKGROUND

By letter dated May 14, 2002 the Applicant, through their counsel, requested copies of :

> "all documents concerning the referenced RFP, all standards for rating responders, and any changes made therein at any time after the initial publication of the RFP, any rating, preliminary or otherwise (and any change therein) of all entities who responded to any portion of the RFP, and any decision, preliminary or otherwise, to award, or of any intent to award, any contract for which the RFP was published, including but not limited to:
>
> 1. The proposed rating schedule, and the standards therefor, and any changes therein,
>
> 2. All documents relating to the rating of all entities who responded to the RFP;
>
> 3. The final rating schedule, and the various components of the final rating of all entities who responded to the RFP;
>
> 4. All documents concerning the TeleLearning rating of all entities who responded to the RFP, the TeleConsulting rating of all entities who responded to the RFP and the TeleRadiology Proof of Concept rating of all entities who responded to the RFP

The RFP in question was a Request for Proposals issued by the Department of Public Works and Services on behalf of the Department of Health and Social Services in late 2001 requesting proposals for the provision of Telehealth Products and Services.

After some initial difficulties meeting the request, a letter of response to the Request for Information was written by the Department of Health and Social Services (DHSS) on July 22nd, 2002, and some of the requested records were provided to the Applicant.

However, the Department declined to provide the Applicant with documentation relating to the Third Party entities who responded to the Request for Proposals, citing sections 14, 18, 22 and 24 of the *Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act* as the grounds for such refusal.

By letter to my office dated August 15th, 2002, the Applicant requested that I review the refusal of the Government of Nunavut to provide the Third Party information. In so doing, they also narrowed the focus of their request to information relating to the successful proponent but expanded the request to include the actual proposal submitted by the successful Third Party.

The DHSS was asked for their position with respect to the Request for Review by letter of August 19th, 2002 and a response was requested by September 20th. The Department's response was not received until October 8th, 2002. The response was extremely brief and not helpful to the review process. By letter dated October 9th, the Department was asked to provide a more detailed explanation by October 31st. Although the letter was faxed to the Department on October 10th and mailed from Yellowknife to Iqaluit on the same day, the Department claimed that they did not receive this correspondence until November 13th, and an extension of time to reply was requested. An extension was granted to December 13th, 2002. The Department's submissions were finally received on January 9th, 2003. On January 31st, 2003, the Applicant provided its response to the Department's position.

On January 23rd, I also received correspondence from the affected Third Party's counsel who indicated that the Third Party objected to the release of any confidential information and relied on sections 24(1)(a)(b) and (c) of the *Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act*.

B. ISSUES

The records in question include proposals received by the Government of Nunavut in response to a Request for Proposals, as well as certain evaluations made by the

Government or its agents with respect to the proposals received. The project involved is a significant one which, quite obviously, involved a potentially lucrative contract worth a considerable amount of money to the successful proponent over the course of time.

Although the Department cited several sections of the *Access to Information and Protection of Privacy* (ATIPP) Act in its initial response to the Applicant, in its detailed response to this office it relied only on section 24 of the Act and, in particular, sections 24(1)(a), 24(1)(b)(i), section 24(1)(c)(i) and 24(2)(a). The Third Party relies on section 24(a), (b) and (c) in their entirety. In particular, the Third Party claims that the disclosure of the records in question would reveal its trade secrets, that they contain financial, commercial, scientific, technical and labour information which was supplied in confidence and that there is a substantial risk that the disclosure of the information would cause undue financial loss to the Third Party and undue financial gain to the Applicant and that it would prejudice the Third Party's competitive position.

C. THE LEGISLATION

Section 24 of the Act reads as follows:

> 24.(1) Subject to subsection (2), the head of a public body shall refuse to disclose to an applicant
>
> (a) information that would reveal trade secrets of a third party;
>
> (b) financial, commercial, scientific, technical or labour relations information
>
> (i) obtained in confidence, explicitly or implicitly, from a third party, or
>
> (ii) that is of a confidential nature and was supplied by a third party in compliance with a lawful requirement;
>
> (c) information the disclosure of which could reasonably be expected to
>
> (i) result in undue financial loss or gain to any person,

(ii) prejudice the competitive position of a third party,

(iii) interfere with contractual or other negotiations of a third party, or

(iv) result in similar information not being supplied to a public body;

(d) information about a third party obtained on a tax return or gathered for the purpose of determining tax liability or collecting a tax;

(e) a statement of a financial account relating to a third party with respect to the provision of routine services by a public body;

(f) a statement of financial assistance provided to a third party by a prescribed corporation or board; or

(g) information supplied by a third party to support an application for financial assistance mentioned in paragraph (f).

(2) A head of a public body may disclose information described in subsection (1)

(a) with the written consent of the third party to whom the information relates; or

(b) if an Act or regulation of the Northwest Territories or Canada authorizes or requires the disclosure.

Also relevant to my review of this matter are sections 1 and 33

1. The purposes of this Act are to make public bodies more accountable to the public and to protect personal privacy by

(a) giving the public a right of access to records held by public bodies;

(b) giving individuals a right of access to, and a right to request correction of, personal information about themselves held by public bodies;

(c) specifying limited exceptions to the rights of access;

(d) preventing the unauthorized collection, use or disclosure of personal information by public bodies; and

(e) providing for an independent review of decisions made under this Act.

33.(1) On a review of a decision to refuse an applicant access to all or part of a record, the onus is on the head of the public body to establish that the applicant has no right of access to the record or part.

(2) On a review of a decision to refuse an applicant access to all or part of a record that contains personal information about a third party, the onus is on the applicant to establish that disclosure of the information would not be contrary to this Act or the regulations.

(3) On a review of a decision to give an applicant access to all or part of a record containing information that relates to a third party,

(a) in the case of personal information, the onus is on the applicant to establish that disclosure of the information would not be contrary to this Act or the regulations; and

(b) in any other case, the onus is on the third party to establish that the applicant has no right of access under this Act to the record or the part of the record.

D. THE RECORDS

The records in question in this review fall into two categories:

1. information provided to the DHSS by Third Parties, and, in particular, the successful Third Party proponent, in response to a public Request for Proposals ("the Proposal");

2. documents relating to the evaluation of each of the proposals received by the DHSS which records were created by the Department or its agent ("the Evaluations").

The Applicant is aware of the kind of information contained in the Evaluations as it did receive some of these records in response to its Request for Information. However, it did not receive any of the specific evaluation information relating to the Third Party.

As Information and Privacy Commissioner, I have the ability to review all records at issue. I have had the opportunity to review all of the records in question with one exception, that being the Third Party's actual proposal. I am satisfied, however, that I am able to deal with this Request for Review without having seen the actual proposal document.

E. DISCUSSION

Before going into the merits of whether or not the Department's decision to refuse access to some of the records requested by the Applicant, it is important to remind ourselves of the purpose of the ATIPP Act as set out in section one which is reproduced above. One of the objects of the Act is to make the government more accountable and ensure that the public has access to government records. Section 1 also provides, however, that that right of access is to be subject to the limited exceptions set out in the Act. Similar stated purposes appear in access to information legislation in several Canadian jurisdictions and these provisions have been the subject of comment by my counterparts in those jurisdictions and by the courts. A general interpretative rule has emerged which suggests that those exceptions are to be narrowly construed. As the Federal Court of Appeal states in *Rubin v. Canada (Minister of Transport)* [1998] 2 F.C. 430 (C.A.) at para. 23.

> ... where there are two interpretations open to the Court, it must, given Parliament's stated intention, choose the one that infringes on the public's right to access the least. It is only in this way that the purpose of the Act can be achieved. It follows that an interpretation of an exemption that allows the government to withhold information from public scrutiny weakens the stated purpose of the Act.

Furthermore, in a case such as this where the Department is refusing to disclose the records requested, the onus is on the Department to establish that one of the exemptions to disclosure applies.

Every jurisdiction in Canada which has access to information legislation has a provision which provides an exemption for the disclosure for third party information. The exemption, in almost every jurisdiction, including Nunavut, is mandatory in that, if the exemption is found to apply, the Department must refuse access to the record in question. The question then becomes, what constitutes Third Party information and to what extent is it exempted from disclosure pursuant to section 24 of the Act?

Section 24(1)(a)

This section precludes a public body from disclosing information relating to a Third Party where the information would reveal trade secrets of the Third Party. Trade secrets are defined in section 2 of the Act to include :

> information, including a formula, pattern, compilation, program, device, product, method, technique or process:
>
> 1. that is used or may be used, in business or for any commercial advantage;
>
> 2. that derives independent economic value, actual or potential, from not being generally known to the public or to other persons who can obtain economic value from its disclosure or use;
>
> 3. that is the subject of reasonable efforts to prevent it from becoming generally known; and
>
> 4. the disclosure of which would result in harm or improper benefit.

The Department and the affected Third Party both claim that the disclosure of the information in question will reveal trade secrets of the Third Party and cannot, therefore, be disclosed. The Applicant takes the position that the Evaluations are documents

which were prepared by the DHSS or its agents and that they do not contain anything that might be considered “trade secrets” as that term is defined in the Act.

How do these sections apply to the records at issue? The first category of documents includes information provided to the DHSS by the various proponents who responded to the Department’s Request for Proposals. The Applicant has indicated in correspondence addressing this issue that it is seeking a copy of the successful proponent’s proposal.

As noted above, I have not had the opportunity to review the proposal itself. However, I am satisfied that there is enough information before me in the form of the Evaluations and supporting documents for me to conclude that all of the proposals received were highly technical in nature and that the product involved is highly dependent on computer hardware, software and applications which have been developed, adapted or perfected by the individual companies which responded to the Request for Proposals.

Furthermore, it appears evident from the correspondence and documentation which I have had the opportunity to review that the telehealth supply industry is a highly competitive one.

In these circumstances, I am satisfied that the proposals contain information about programs, devices, products, methods, techniques and process that are used in the Third Party’s business and the services they provide. As such, the information in the Third Party’s proposal consists of “trade secrets” as that term is defined in the *Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act*, and it is exempt from disclosure pursuant to section 24(1)(a) of the Act.

The Evaluations, however, are a different story. The evaluative material must be reviewed on a document by document basis to determine whether the disclosure of those records might reveal “trade secrets” of the individual proponents.

Record #1 - “Assessment of the IIU Proposals - Evaluation Scores”.

This record consists of one page document which shows a list of evaluation criteria such as “technical merits”, “costs”, and” knowledge and expertise” among others, and an indication of the scores given to each of the proposals. There is nothing of a technical nature in this document and it is not, therefore, exempt from disclosure pursuant to section 24(1)(a).

Record #2 - Untitled

This record is a two page document similar to Document #1 in that it shows a list of evaluation criteria and an indication of the scores given to each proponent. This record, however, also contains comments and observations made by the evaluator. Some of those comments are with respect to the technical aspects of the individual proposals. However, there is nothing so specific, in my opinion, that it constitutes a “trade secret”. It is not, therefore, exempt from disclosure pursuant to section 24(1)(a).

Record #3 - “Proposal Rating Schedule - Services/Goods”

This is a three page record. Each page of the record relates to the evaluation of one of the proponents. This record is, again, similar to the first two records and there is nothing of a technical nature contained in it. There is nothing in this record that could be considered to be a “trade secret”.

Record #4 - “RFP Evaluation Form”

This is a three page record. Again each page relates to the evaluation of one of the proposals. Each page also contains some comments and observations of the evaluator. Again, however, there is nothing of a technical nature which might be considered a “trade secret”.

Record #5 - Untitled

This appears to be a summary of the evaluations provided in records 1-4. Once again, there is no technical information or anything that might be considered a “trade secret” in this record.

Record #6 - “Telehealth Workstation Evaluation Feedback”

This is a three page record which outlines on the first page a narrative of what appears to have been a practical demonstration of the products of three of the tendering companies. The evaluation is continued on the second page which contains, once again, a set of criteria and the scores awarded to each proponent. Following the scores are some further comments from the evaluator. In the first paragraph on the third page is a description of specific devices used by each of the proposers. I am prepared to concede that reference to the specific devices constitutes a “trade secret” for each of the proponents and is, therefore, subject to an exemption pursuant to section 24(1)(a) of the Act. This information, however, can be easily severed from the record so that the balance of the document remains subject to disclosure.

Record #7 - “Telehealth Workstation - Clinical Evaluation”

This is a six page record which includes a rather detailed description of a practical demonstration of the products of the three “short listed” proponents. It is similar to Record #6. Much of the narrative is highly technical in nature, although the technical aspects describe factors which were common to all three of the demonstrations and are not unique to any of the proponents. The only thing that might be considered to be a “trade secret” in any of this evaluation form is a reference to the name of the software used by each of the three proponents. It may be that each company is well aware of the software program used by the others, but I have no way of knowing that. I am prepared, however, to accept that it might be a “trade secret” and therefore subject to an exclusion under section 24(1)(a). Once again, however, these pieces of information

can be easily severed from the record and the balance of the document remains subject to disclosure under the Act.

Record #8 - “Software Usability Evaluation”

This is a 22 page document which constitutes an evaluation of the software used by each of the three short listed proponents. Except for references to the name of the software used by the proponents, there is nothing in the evaluation which might be considered to be a “trade secret” as that term is defined in the Act. All references to the name of the software should be severed to comply with section 24(1)(a), but the balance of the record is not exempt from disclosure under that provision.

Record #9 - “Comparison of Workstation Design and Layout”

This is a 17 page document which constitutes a description and evaluation of the workstation design and layout of each of the three short listed proponents. This document does contain information which is specific to each of the proponent’s systems which may well be considered “trade secrets” when read as a whole. It outlines the specific dimensions and qualities of the work stations. To the extent that these specifics are provided on the bottom of page two and the top of page three, the bottom of page 4, the whole of page 5 and the top of page 6, the bottom of page 7 and the top of page 8, all of page 9 and the top of page 10, the bottom of page 11 and the top of page 12, the bottom of page 13 and all of page 14, and the bottom of page 15 and the top of page 16, I am satisfied that the details might be considered trade secrets and are protected from disclosure under section 24(1)(a) of the Act. As with other records, however, these items can be severed from the remainder of the record. The rest constitutes evaluative material and is not subject to an exemption from disclosure pursuant to section 24(1)(a).

Record #10 - “Summary of POC Testing Results”

This record is a three page document which is clearly marked “Confidential”. No

explanation was provided, however, as to why it was so marked. It is to be noted, once again, that the onus is on the Department to establish that an exemption exists and without any explanation provided as to why it is so marked, or to whom the confidentiality applies, little can be deduced from this fact. It is certainly not clear from the document itself where the confidentiality is intended to apply. However, as this document was prepared by the Department or its agent and the Department did not plan on sharing the document with the Applicant or any of the proponents, it does not appear that the confidentiality contemplated was intended to protect the confidentiality of the proponents.

There is nothing in this document which might be considered a “trade secret” and none of the document can be considered as exempt from disclosure pursuant to section 24(1)(a).

Record # 11 - “Summary of POC Testing Scores”

This is a one page record which is also marked “Confidential”. Again, no explanation was provided. Once again, the document contains no “trade secrets” as that term is defined in the Act and it is not, therefore, exempt from disclosure pursuant to section 24(1)(a).

Records #12, 13 and 14 - “POC Testing Scores”

These are three separate records, all 7 pages in length. Each document relates to the evaluation of one of the three short listed proponents. Each of the documents is marked as “Confidential”, but once again, no further explanation was provided by the Department.

The first page of each of these documents contains only a summary of the points awarded to each of the proponents for stated criteria. As such, there is no information on the first page that might be considered to be a “trade secret” and thereby protected

from disclosure pursuant to section 24(1)(a). However, the remaining pages each have a column entitled “Comments” under which there are detailed technical comments made as to each of the proponent’s systems. Some of this might be considered merely evaluative in nature, but it is, at least to my mind, impossible to differentiate between the opinion of the evaluator and the technical specifics of the proposal. One reading the comments might well be able to gather valuable trade secrets from the comments. For this reason, it is my opinion that all of the remarks in the “Comments” column of each of these records do constitute “trade secrets” and are subject to the mandatory exception to disclosure provided for in section 24(1)(a). As with other records, however, these comments can be severed from the remainder of the records.

Document #15 - “Results of Teleradiography Systems Testing”

This is a 29 page document which relates to one of the three proposals. In fact, it relates to the proposal submitted by the Applicant. For this reason, it does not constitute “third party” information. It cannot, therefore, contain trade secrets of a third party and is not, therefore, subject to the exemption from disclosure provided by section 24(1)(a).

I was provided with three separate copies of this document and I suspect, therefore, that this was an error and, in fact, there is one such record which relates to each of the three short listed proponents. If this is the case, it is to be noted that this particular record appears to contain a good deal of very specific information respecting hardware and software. It is extremely technical and provides detailed lists of “Pros” and “Cons” of the system proposed. As with Records 11, 12 and 13, it would be difficult, if not impossible, to separate the evaluation and opinion of the evaluator from the technical specifics and I am satisfied that the disclosure of such a document relating to a Third Party’s proposal would be likely to reveal trade secrets and the documents, as a whole, would be subject to the exemption provided for in section 24(1)(a).

Section 24(1)(b)(i)

Section 24(1)(b)(i) prohibits a public body from disclosing information to an Applicant about a Third Party where that information is financial, commercial, scientific, technical or labour relations information which was obtained in confidence, either explicitly or implicitly from a Third Party. There are three conditions which have to be met in order for this exemption to apply:

1. the information must have been obtained from a Third Party;
2. the information must have been obtained in confidence; and
3. the information must be financial, commercial, scientific, technical or labour relations information

If any one of these conditions is not met, the information is not protected from disclosure pursuant to section 24(1)(b)(i).

The first thing to note in this case is that most of the records at issue in this Review do not contain any information that was "obtained" from the Third Party. Unless the information in question was obtained from the Third Party, it does not fall under the exemption provide by section 24(1)(b)(i). In some cases, the information in the records makes no reference to any information obtained from the Third Party. In other cases, there is clear reference to specific and detailed information which has been taken from documents provided by the Third Parties. For those records in the former category, the exemption provided by section 24(1)(b)(i) does not apply.

For those records that do contain information that was obtained from the Third Party, the next thing that must be done is to determine whether that information constitutes "financial, commercial, scientific, technical or labour relations" information about the Third Party.

There has been much discussion in recommendations and orders issued by my counterparts in other jurisdictions as to how these terms should be defined. Without

going through a detailed analysis, having reviewed the records in question, I am prepared to accept that some of the information contained in the records in question is very technical and, perhaps, scientific, in nature and, in light of the fact that the proposals were submitted for the purpose of selling a product to the Department, clearly commercial in nature.

The third condition for the application of the exemption is that the information in question must have been provided either explicitly or implicitly, in confidence. This is often the most difficult condition to assess. The Third Party in this case has submitted to me that they considered their proposal, and the contents of their proposal, to have been submitted in confidence. The test, however, is an objective one and it is not sufficient for the Third Party to simply say, "I thought I was providing the information in confidence". In *Montana Band of Indians v. Canada (Minister of Indian & Northern Affairs*) 51 D.L.R. (4th) 306, Jerome, A.C.J. of the Federal Court, Trial Division made the following observation:

> the objective test for confidentiality must have more to do with the content of the information, its purpose, and the conditions under which it was prepared and communicated.

Would the reasonable person regard the information as confidential? Was the information prepared for a purpose that would not be expected to be made public? Was the information developed and communicated in such a way as to project a concern for its confidentiality? Was there an assertion of a claim of confidentiality at the time the information was provided?

In this case, there is nothing which suggests that there was an explicit expectation on the part of the Third Party for confidentiality. Some of the records indicate that the Department considers them to be confidential, but that does not answer the question as to whether the information in those records was supplied in confidence. It is clear from the information before me, however, that the telehealth industry is a highly competitive one and that even small differences in technology and product might well have a

considerable impact on whether one company is chosen for a contract over another. The proposals were prepared with the express purpose of "selling" the government a highly technical product in the context of that competitive market. In the specific circumstances of this case, it is my opinion that each of the proponents who responded to the RFP did so with an expectation of confidentiality with respect to their technical and proprietary information and that there was an implicit agreement with the public body that it would be kept confidential.

Applying these principals to the 15 records at issue, therefore, in my opinion, section 24(1)(b)(i) applies to the following records to exempt them from disclosure:

Record #6 - that portion of the record in the first paragraph on page three in brackets following the words "all different products"

Record #7 - the name of the specific software used by each of the three proponents.

Record #8 - the name of the specific software used by each of the three proponents

Record #9 - all information which is exempt pursuant to section 24(1)(a) is also exempt pursuant to section 24(1)(b)(i).

Record #10 - all information which is exempt pursuant to section 24(1)(a) is also exempt pursuant to section 24(1)(b)(i).

Records #12, 13 and 14 - all information which is exempt pursuant to section 24(1)(a) is also exempt pursuant to section 24(1)(b)(i).

Record #15 - all information which is exempt pursuant to section 24(1)(a) is also exempt pursuant to section 24(1)(b)(i).

Section 24(1)(c)(i) and (ii)

These provisions provide that the public body must refuse to disclose a record where the disclosure of the information could be reasonably expected to result in an undue financial loss or gain to any person or prejudice the competitive position of a Third Party. In *Saint John Shipbuilding Ltd.* v. *Canada (Minister of Supply & Services)* (1990) 107 N.R. 89 (Fed. C.A.), the Federal Court of Appeal considered a similar section in the Federal Access to Information Act. The Court concluded that a party seeking to prevent disclosure pursuant to these provisions must establish the probability of harmful consequences. In that case, the Court noted that the affidavits provided only general statements which, in the opinion of the Court, amounted merely to bald assertions unsupported by any evidence as to the likelihood of financial loss. In another case, *Merck Frosst Canada Inc.* v. *Canada (Minister of Health and Welfare)* (1988) 20 F.T.R. 73 (Fed. TD), where the Applicant sought records relating to the evaluation and approval of the Third Party's new drug, the Third Party objected to the release of the records on the grounds that the disclosure would cause the Third Party financial loss and would negatively affect its competitive position. The Court in that case held that the Third Party had not provided sufficient information upon which it could come to that conclusion. The Third Party had presented no evidence as to the way in which this information would cause harm, no indication of the degree of harm it would cause, and no facts to support the assertions made.

In this case, both the public body and the Third Party have asserted that the release of the records in question would result in financial loss to the Third Party and would negatively impact on the Third Party's competitive position. They have, however, provided nothing more than mere assertions to that effect. There is nothing before me, other than what I can draw from the records themselves and the correspondence received in this matter from all parties, upon which I can assess the allegation of harm contended, nor any indication as to how the disclosure of the evaluations (which for the most part contain no technical information) might impact on the Third Party.

Furthermore, it is my understanding that in this case the contract has already been awarded to the Third Party. The disclosure of the evaluations done on this particular Request for Proposals, therefore, cannot affect the awarding of this particular contract. To the extent that the disclosure of the evaluative material might point out some of the weaknesses of the Third Party's product to the competition, it might be argued that there might be a negative impact on the Third Party's competitive position. However, I have not been provided with sufficient information upon which that conclusion can be reached. My own uneducated view of the matter is that those portions of the evaluations which are not protected from disclosure under section 24(1) as discussed above are fairly generic and likely contain nothing that each of the proponents don't already know about their competition. Even if I am wrong in this, I cannot conclude, based on what I have before me, that there is a reasonable expectation of financial loss to the Third Party or gain to the Applicant, nor any significant effect on the competitive position of the Third Party by the disclosure of the records once they are edited in accordance with the discussion set out in this recommendation.

F. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In view of the above discussions, it is my recommendation that the following records, to which the Applicant was previously denied access, be provided to the Applicant:

a) Record #1
b) Record #2
c) Record #3
d) Record #4
e) Record #5
f) Record #6 except for that portion of the first paragraph of page three which appears in brackets following the words ""all different products";
g) Record #7 except for any reference to the name of the software used by each of the three proponents being evaluated;
h) Record #8 except for any reference to the name of the software used by

each of the three proponents being evaluated;

i) Record #9 with the exception of:
    i) the chart at the bottom of page 4
    ii) the whole of page 5
    iii) the chart at the top of page 6
    iv) the chart at the bottom of page 7
    v) the chart at the top of page 8
    vi) the whole of page 9
    vii) the chart at the top of page 10
    viii) the chart at the bottom of page 11
    ix) the chart at the top of page 12
    x) the chart at the bottom of page 13
    xi) the whole of page 14
    xii) the chart at the bottom of page 15
    xiii) the chart at the top of page 16
j) Record #10
k) Record #11
l) Records #12, 13 and 14 except for the portions of those documents which appear under the columns entitled “Comments”

Elaine Keenan Bengts
Nunavut Information and Privacy Commissioner