

Decision Notice



Decision 061/2010 Mrs Jacqueline Moffat and Ayrshire and Arran NHS Board

Job Matching and Evaluation Procedure

Reference No: 200901244
Decision Date: 30 April 2010

www.itspublicknowledge.info

Kevin Dunion
Scottish Information Commissioner

Kinburn Castle
Doubledykes Road
St Andrews KY16 9DS
Tel: 01334 464610



Summary

This decision is concerned with the handling by Ayrshire and Arran NHS Board (the Board), of two separate information requests made by Mrs Moffat. Both sought information relating to a job evaluation process regarding a specific post. In response to the first request, the Board provided information, subject to the redaction of certain information considered to be exempt from disclosure. Ms Moffat sought a review of that decision, and was subsequently provided with some of the information previously withheld.

Consideration of the information disclosed in response to her first request alerted Mrs Moffat to the existence of additional relevant information which had not been disclosed. She made a further information request for a number of items. The Board responded by stating that as it had previously responded to her earlier request and had provided her with all the information, it was not treating her second request as a request for information. No response was provided in terms of FOISA, and instead Mrs Moffat's concerns were passed to the team dealing with the job evaluation process for consideration. Mrs Moffat requested a review of this failure to respond, following which she remained dissatisfied and applied to the Commissioner for a decision. After she had submitted that application, the Board and Mrs Moffat engaged in further communications and the Board disclosed further information to Mrs Moffat.

Following an investigation, the Commissioner found that the Board had failed to deal with Mrs Moffat's requests for information in accordance with Part 1 of FOISA. In each case, the Board breached the requirements section 1(1) of FOSIA by failing to identify and supply all relevant (and non-exempt) information that fell within the scope of Mrs Moffat's request. With respect to the second request, the Board failed to recognise that this was a distinct and valid information request in terms of FOISA and the Commissioner found that the Board failed to respond to this request within the timeframe specified by section 10(1) of FOISA. Since the Board had taken steps to provide all remaining relevant information to Mrs Moffat, the Commissioner did not require the Board to take any action in respect of these failings.

Relevant statutory provisions and other sources

Freedom of Information (Scotland) Act 2002 (FOISA) sections 1(1) and 1(6) (General entitlement); 10(1) (Time for compliance) and 14(2) (Vexatious or repeated requests)

The full text of each of the statutory provisions cited above is reproduced in Appendix 1 to this decision. (Both Appendices 1 and 2 form part of this decision.)



Background

1. This decision is concerned with the Board's handling of two separate but related requests for information.

Request one

2. On 9 February 2009, Mrs Moffat wrote to the Board requesting all recorded information relating to the Job Matching and Evaluation procedure and the Job Matching and Evaluation review procedure relating to her role (a full copy of this request is contained within Appendix 2 to this decision notice).
3. On 5 March 2009, the Board responded providing copies of the job audit reports but indicating that the names of individuals had been redacted as they were considered exempt in terms of section 30(c) of FOISA (Prejudice to effective conduct of public affairs). The job audit review report was also supplied to Mrs Moffat subject to similar redactions under the same exemption. These reports were supplied alongside a range of other information relating to the matching and evaluation process. Mrs Moffat was also informed that there was no consistency checking form or quality assurance note related to the relevant job number and therefore that information was not held in terms of section 17 of FOISA. The Board stated that this was all the information held for her post by its Agenda for Change team.
4. On 7 March 2009, Mrs Moffat submitted a request for review highlighting that she was not satisfied with the redactions made to the documents supplied. She noted in particular that the redactions were not limited to just names and initials of individuals but included security codes that she understood were used to identify these individuals internally.
5. On 3 April 2009, the Board advised Mrs Moffat that it was upholding its decision to withhold individuals' names and initials under section 30(c) of FOISA. However, the Board acknowledged that it had incorrectly withheld security codes on the same basis and therefore supplied Mrs Moffat with a list of the security codes for the individuals who made up the panels at the initial and review stages in the matching and evaluation process.

Request two

6. On 20 April 2009, having reviewed the information received in response to the request detailed above, Mrs Moffat wrote to the Board noting that certain relevant information appeared not to have been made available to her. She made another request for information seeking a range of information referred to within the job audit reports previously released to her. A full copy of Mrs Moffat's second request is also contained within Appendix 2 to this decision notice.
7. On 24 April 2009, the Board advised Mrs Moffat that as it considered that she had already requested this information, it would not treat her request as a new request under FOISA. Instead, Mrs Moffat was advised that the Agenda for Change team had been asked to investigate the points made in her letter, specifically that certain information referred to in the documents disclosed was not released to her.



8. No formal response to this request was provided by the Board.
9. On 22 May 2009 Mrs Moffat wrote to the Board advising that she was dissatisfied that she had not yet received a response. Ms Moffat noted that, following a meeting with the Board, she had received one of the items she had requested. However, she pointed out that the other parts of her request remained outstanding. She reiterated her request for this information. A further reminder regarding the outstanding parts of her request was sent to the Board by Ms Moffat on 15 June 2009.
10. On 16 June 2009 the Board responded to Mrs Moffat, advising her again that it had not treated her request of 20 April 2009 as an information request under the terms of FOISA. However, the Board advised her that no further recorded information was held in addition to that already supplied to her. The Commissioner considers this letter to specify the Board's response to Ms Moffat's information request and her subsequent request for review.
11. On 18 June 2009 Mrs Moffat wrote to the Board highlighting that she considered her request of 20 April 2009 to be a new request for information and highlighting the differences between her two requests. She also advised the Board that she would be making an application to the Commissioner.
12. On 6 July 2009, Mrs Moffat wrote to the Commissioner, stating that she was dissatisfied with the outcome of the Board's review in respect of both requests and applying to the Commissioner for a decision in terms of section 47(1) of FOISA.
13. Mrs Moffat's application was validated by establishing that she had made valid requests for information to a Scottish public authority and had applied to the Commissioner for a decision only after asking the authority to review its response to those requests. The case was then allocated to an investigating officer.

Investigation

14. On 14 August 2009, the Board was notified in writing that an application had been received from Mrs Moffat and was asked to provide the Commissioner with any information withheld from her. The Board responded and the case was then allocated to an investigating officer.
15. The investigating officer subsequently contacted the Board, giving it an opportunity to provide comments on the application (as required by section 49(3)(a) of FOISA) and asking it to respond to specific questions. In particular, the Board was asked to justify its reliance on any provisions of FOISA it considered applicable to the information requested. The Board's response was provided on 9 September 2009.
16. Further comments were received from both the Board and Mrs Moffat during the investigation.



Mrs Moffat's further correspondence with the Board during the course of the investigation

17. During the investigation, Mrs Moffat and the Board corresponded further about her information request of 20 April 2009, enabling the resolution of some of Mrs Moffat's concerns.
18. On 10 July 2009, the Board wrote to Mrs Moffat explaining that it takes its duty to comply with FOISA very seriously and that to ensure that it fulfilled its obligations, its Freedom of Information Officer and a member of the Agenda for Change team agreed to meet again to go through her letter of 20 April 2009 to ensure that all points had been covered and all recorded information released to her in accordance with FOISA. The Board's letter also supplied an anonymised copy of the job audit review report which showed the security numbers of each panel member, but with panellists' names redacted. The Board also apologised for not disclosing this information sooner to Mrs Moffat.
19. Mrs Moffat wrote to the investigating officer on 24 July 2009 explaining that she had been supplied with additional information by the Board but that some of the information she had requested remained outstanding.
20. On 30 July 2009, the Board wrote to Mrs Moffat confirming that the meeting had taken place between the Board's Freedom of Information Officer a member of the Agenda for Change team and, in order for the Board to be satisfied that it had supplied her with all the documentation, it again supplied copies of all the information that had been released along with some new documentation. The Board acknowledged at this stage that it had not provided Mrs Moffat with all the recorded information that she had originally requested and apologised for any inconvenience this delay may have caused.
21. On 13 August 2009, Mrs Moffat wrote to the investigating officer explaining that she had received this letter from the Board enclosing many of the items she had requested which had not previously been supplied.
22. In this letter, Mrs Moffat also explained that she had submitted a written report in support of her Job Matching and Evaluation Review. The Agenda for Change Team had requested that she submit this in digital form in order that it was available to the Review panel. Mrs Moffat believed that sections of material were removed from the digital version of her report prior to it being made available to the Review Panel. Mrs Moffat clarified that it was the version of the digital report that was made available to the Review Panel that constituted the information that she sought.
23. On 14 August 2009, Mrs Moffat wrote directly to the Board explaining that, although additional information that had been provided that she felt that there were two pieces of information which remained outstanding:
 - A copy of the digital file containing her submissions – 'Request for formal review and rematch of Agenda for Change banding' and



- A hard copy of the same submissions.
24. On 9 September 2009, the Board wrote again to Mrs Moffat. Within this letter the Board acknowledged that it was remiss in not finding the digital file and hard copy of the documentation sought at an earlier stage, but explained that it had assumed that her request encompassed the information generated under the Agenda for Change process, i.e. produced by the Board as opposed to information that had been supplied by Mrs Moffat. With this letter, the Board enclosed a hard copy of the file 'Request for formal review and rematch of Agenda for Change banding'. The Board further advised that it held a digital version of Mrs Moffat's submission, but advised that the file was corrupt and it was unable to open it, but that she was welcome to come and view it.

Commissioner's analysis and findings

25. In coming to a decision on this matter, the Commissioner has considered all of the submissions made to him by both Mrs Moffat and the Board and is satisfied that no matter of relevance has been overlooked.

Background information

26. Mrs Moffat's requests relate to her experience with the Agenda for Change system. Agenda for Change is a single job evaluation scheme to cover all jobs in the health service to support a review of pay and all other terms and conditions for health service employees. It applies to all directly employed NHS staff with the exception of doctors, dentists and some very senior managers.
27. Mrs Moffat sought the information relating to the job evaluation process relating to her own post to ensure that the correct procedure was followed.

Grounds for dissatisfaction

28. Mrs Moffat's application for decision raised concerns relating to the Board's handling of both of her requests for information. Firstly, Mrs Moffat was dissatisfied that the Board had failed to supply all the information that fell within the scope of her requests. Secondly, she was dissatisfied with the manner in which her requests were dealt with.
29. Mrs Moffat also raised general concerns relating to the Agenda for Change process which fall outwith the remit of the Commissioner; he is therefore unable to comment upon these concerns.



30. As noted above, dialogue between the Board and Mrs Moffat during the investigation process led to the disclosure of much of the information that had previously been omitted within the Board's responses to Mrs Moffat. By the end of the investigation, Mrs Moffat identified that the remaining information which she believed was held by the Board and which had still not been supplied was the copy of her submission (either in electronic or hard copy) that was supplied to review panel members.
31. In what follows, the Commissioner has considered the handling of the two requests in turn.

Request 1

32. The Commissioner is satisfied that Mrs Moffat's first request was clearly intended to capture all recorded information held by the Board relating to the Job Matching and Evaluation Process and the subsequent Job Matching and Evaluation Review Process in relation to her post.
33. The Board's disclosure of further information after it had reviewed its handling of this request provides clear evidence that the Board failed to identify and provide Mrs Moffat with all the information which fell within the scope of her request. The Commissioner considers that all of the information supplied to Mrs Moffat following the submission of request 2 also fell within the scope of request 1.
34. The Commissioner therefore concludes that the Board failed to comply with section 1(1) of FOISA in its failure to identify and provide Mrs Moffat with the information which fell within the scope of her request and which was identified and provided to Mrs Moffat after its review of this request.

Request 2

35. It appears from the correspondence between the Board and Mrs Moffat that the Board had effectively treated Mrs Moffat's second request of 20 April 2009 as a repeated request, stating that "[A]s you have already requested the information, we will not treat your letter as a new freedom of information request" in its letter to her of 24 April 2009.
36. Section 14(2) of FOISA states that "where a Scottish public authority has complied with a request from a person for information, it is not obliged to comply with a subsequent request from that person which is identical or substantially similar unless there has been a reasonable period of time between the making of the request complied with and the making of the subsequent request".
37. Although it is unclear whether the Board did intend to rely on the provision in section 14(2), the Commissioner would note that he is satisfied that Mrs Moffat's second request (although seeking information that should have been identified as falling within the scope of the first request) was not a repeated request.



38. Mrs Moffat's request of 20 April 2009 clearly requested recorded information which had not been previously supplied to her. The Commissioner is satisfied that this was a valid request for information and so should have been dealt with in line with the requirements of Part 1 of FOISA by the Board.
39. As noted above, a number of the items requested by Mrs Moffat on 20 April 2009 were provided during the investigation. The Commissioner therefore concludes that the Board failed to comply with section 1(1) of FOISA in failing to identify and provide Mrs Moffat with this information.

Outstanding information

40. However, one item sought by request 2, which would also (if held) fall within the scope of request 1 has not been supplied to Mrs Moffat. This is a copy of the digital file containing her submissions – 'Request for formal review and rematch of Agenda for Change banding'.
41. The Commissioner has therefore gone on to consider whether this item is held by the Board, and, if so, whether it should have been supplied in response to Mrs Moffat's information requests.

Submissions from the Board

42. The Board explained that all information in relation to matching, evaluation and reviews is held in its Computer Aided Job Evaluation system (CAJE) which is used by the matching, evaluation and review panels to document their deliberations and to enter the banding results.
43. The searches carried out by the Agenda for Change operational team were therefore based on the interrogation of this system. The Board submitted that some of the information referenced within the material supplied was not produced because it had been overwritten as part of the updating of review process information by the CAJE administrator (i.e. it ceased to exist as a separate entity within the system). For example, request 2 makes reference to documents mentioned in the job audit report, 'Copy of the file Review Panel 004-282.doc referred to by Panel 4 about 11:52 on 1 October 2008'. The Board explained that this was overwritten and renamed by the CAJE administrator and it became file 004-282 Deputy Superintendent Radiographer.Doc. referred to by panel 2 about 12:51 on 8 October 2008. The second file, the Board explained, is an updated version of the first file. The Board emphasised that this is not suppression of information, but part of the normal updating procedures built into the review process.
44. Following receipt of Mrs Moffat's second request, one of the CAJE administrators was asked to provide the information and was able to do so apart from items that had been superseded in the system (as explained above) and the digital file input sent in by Mrs Moffat which had not been uploaded into the CAJE system. The Board submitted that no further searches were carried out at this point, since it is the CAJE administrator who maintains all relevant information on the CAJE system and since, normally, all requested information would be on the system.



45. The Board explained that, during the Agenda for Change process, post holders were asked to submit a digital version of supporting evidence in respect of their request for review. The rationale behind requesting a digital version was to allow uploading of the post holders' submission directly on the CAJE system and to allow panel members to easily access this information as well as incorporating it with the CAJE system in perpetuity.
46. The Board further explained that there is no record kept of who did or did not supply digital copies. The Board highlighted that there are 2,500 reviews so it is difficult for staff to remember the details of each of them. As a result of Mrs Moffat's explicit request for a copy of this file, the CAJE administrator checked the system and, finding no upload of the digital file on the CAJE system, assumed that no digital file had been submitted.
47. However, following further meetings and correspondence with Mrs Moffat, the Agenda for Change team extended their investigation to all staff working in the Agenda for Change process to see if any of them could recollect receiving the file. A member of the team's administration team recalled the file because of problems encountered in trying to open it. Mrs Moffat's input document had not been uploaded onto the CAJE system because it could not be opened due to it being corrupt or incompatible with the Board's systems, or too large.
48. Another member of the Board's staff recalled email correspondence with Mrs Moffat with regard to the file and having discussions with the IT department to try and overcome the problem of loading the disc into the CAJE system. The Board had requested that Mrs Moffat try and submit the documentation by a different method. The Board suggested that she had supplied a pen drive, but that this also could not be opened.
49. The Board advised that due to a security directive by its Information Governance team all pen drives were to be handed into eHealth Services under an amnesty and only encrypted pen drives issued by Information Governance were to be used within NHS Ayrshire and Arran. The Board explained that this is why it no longer has this pen drive as it was destroyed as part of the security measures. The Board attached with its submission a copy of its internal 'Information security update' which was issued to all staff informing them of the new policy and amnesty.
50. The Commissioner notes, however, that Ms Moffat disputes this version of events and submitted that she personally never submitted a personal pen drive or memory stick and that it was in fact downloaded onto such a device internally.
51. The Board explained that the Review Panel were able to go ahead with the review using the hard copy of the report and that an explanation of the above misunderstanding along with a hard copy of the report was provided to Mrs Moffat on 9 September 2009.
52. The Board advised that it still held a copy of the digital version of Mrs Moffat's submissions, but that its eHealth Support officer who was assigned with the task of trying to open the file concluded that the file is corrupt. The Support Officer was able to convert the digital file which was created in Microsoft works to Microsoft Word 2003 and retrieve some text. However, the Board explained that it is unable to open the file without the necessary skills and technology employed by its IT department.



53. The Board maintained that the suggestion that the Agenda for Change team altered Mrs Moffat's submission prior to it going to the Review Panel was untrue and the operational team at Agenda for Change had no input and no influence on the review result.
54. The Board acknowledged that it was remiss in not finding Mrs Moffat's digital file and hard copy documentation at an earlier stage, but in defence stated that it had assumed that Mrs Moffat sought all documentation generated under the Agenda for Change process i.e. documentation produce by the Board rather than documentation Mrs Moffat had supplied.

Submissions from Mrs Moffat

55. Mrs Moffat asserted that her written submissions ' Request for Formal Review and Rematch of Agenda for Change Banding' would not have been made available to any of the Review Panel in its original form, without undergoing alterations, removal of material, deletions or redactions.
56. To back this assertion, Mrs Moffat stated that there was information contained within her written submission that would not have been suitable for consideration by the Review Panel. Mrs Moffat felt that the digital version of her report was amended as considered necessary by the Agenda for Change Team and then a memory stick containing the amended version of her written report was made available to the Review panel.
57. However, Mrs Moffat acknowledges, following extended correspondence relating to her requests, that the Board cannot provide her with a copy of the actual material considered by the Review Panels.

Conclusion

58. The Commissioner has considered carefully the submissions made by both parties and is satisfied, having considered the explanations, the searches undertaken and the additional information supplied by the Board during the course of the investigation, that it does not hold, and did not hold at the time of Mrs Moffat's request, the *remaining* information (the digital version of the report submitted by Mrs Moffat which was considered by the review panel) which would fully satisfy the terms of that request. The Commissioner therefore concludes on the balance of probabilities that the Board holds no further information falling within the terms of Mrs Moffat's requests.

The handling of Mrs Moffat's second request

59. Within her application and later correspondence with the Commissioner, Mrs Moffat stated that she was dissatisfied with the manner in which her request had been handled. Specifically, Mrs Moffat was concerned by the manner in which her request was originally interpreted and the time taken by the Board to respond to her requests.



60. The Board has acknowledged that it was originally incorrect in its interpretation of Mrs Moffat's request. The Board had originally assumed that Mrs Moffat sought all the information generated by the Agenda for Change process rather than information submitted by Mrs Moffat to that process. It is also clear from the correspondence provided that the Board had failed to recognise and treat Mrs Moffat's second request as a distinct and valid information request.
61. Section 10(1) of FOISA gives Scottish public authorities a maximum of 20 working days after receipt of the request to comply with a request for information, subject to certain exceptions which are not relevant in this case.
62. The Board acknowledged Mrs Moffat's second request, but did not provide a formal response to her request within the 20 working day timeframe prescribed by section 10(1) of FOISA.
63. The Commissioner therefore finds that the Board failed to respond to Mrs Moffat's request within the 20 working days allowed under section 10(1) of FOISA. In failing to comply with this timescale, the Board failed to comply with Part 1 of FOISA.

DECISION

The Commissioner finds that the Board failed to comply with Part 1 of the Freedom of Information (Scotland) Act 2002 (FOISA) in responding to the information requests made by Mrs Moffat.

By failing to identify and provide all information falling within the scope of her two requests, the Board failed in each case to comply fully with section 1(1) of FOISA. The Commissioner also found that the Board failed to respond to Mrs Moffat's second request within the timeframe set out in section 10(1) of FOISA.

Given that further information was supplied to Mrs Moffat during the course of the investigation, the Commissioner does not require the Board to take any action in response to these failures.

The Commissioner also finds that the Board holds no further information, following the information provided during the course of this investigation, which would satisfy the terms of Mrs Moffat's requests.



Appeal

Should either Mrs Moffat or the Board wish to appeal against this decision, there is an appeal to the Court of Session on a point of law only. Any such appeal must be made within 42 days after the date of intimation of this decision notice.

Margaret Keyse
Head of Enforcement
30 April 2010



Appendix 1

Relevant statutory provisions

Freedom of Information (Scotland) Act 2002

1 General entitlement

- (1) A person who requests information from a Scottish public authority which holds it is entitled to be given it by the authority.

...

- (6) This section is subject to sections 2, 9, 12 and 14.

10 Time for compliance

- (1) Subject to subsections (2) and (3), a Scottish public authority receiving a request which requires it to comply with section 1(1) must comply promptly; and in any event by not later than the twentieth working day after-

(a) in a case other than that mentioned in paragraph (b), the receipt by the authority of the request; or

(b) in a case where section 1(3) applies, the receipt by it of the further information.

14 Vexatious or repeated requests

...

- (2) Where a Scottish public authority has complied with a request from a person for information, it is not obliged to comply with a subsequent request from that person which is identical or substantially similar unless there has been a reasonable period of time between the making of the request complied with and the making of the subsequent request.



Appendix 2

Request 1 – 9 February 2009

“ I require you to produce to me, in permanent form, a copy of the following information:

(i)

All information, whether held on computer or paper records, relating to the Job Matching & Evaluation procedure carried out regarding my role as [post specified]

Job ID Number: Sco11/004-282e/cc

The information should include *inter alia* details of any consistency checking outcomes and procedures, Consistency Checking panel notes, rationale behind awarding the factor levels, and original panel member initials and job titles.

In addition, I require to know whether or not any job advisors or representatives were contacted. If any such job advisors were contacted, I require their details and details of any questions asked of them.

(ii)

All information, whether held on computer or paper records, relating to the Job Matching and Evaluation Review procedure carried out regarding my role as [post specified]

Job ID Number: Sco11/Review/004-282

For the period between the date of submission of my Form 2 Factor Review Form ON 1 March 2008 and receipt of Agenda for Change – Outcome of Review Panel letter which I received on 4 February 2009.

The information should include *inter alia* CAJE records, Review Panel notes, Local Consistency Checking Panel notes, national Job Evaluation Monitoring Group (JEMG) notes and review panel member initials and job titles.

In addition, I require to know whether or not any job advisors or representatives were contacted. If any job advisors were contacted, I require their details and details of any questions asked of them”



Request 2 - 20 April 2009

Mrs Moffat requested the following information:

Job Audit Report Sco11/004-282e/cc

- Full copy Job Audit Report Sco11/004-282e/cc which clearly shows the 'security code numbers' of each evaluation or review panel member, for each of the 20 occasions in which the constitution of an evaluation or review panel is set or changed. The only item of information which should be redacted or blacked out is the name of an individual panel member
- A copy of file jobdescription01.doc referred to by Panel 2 about 09:44 on 6 January 2006. (page3/12)
- Full copy of Panel Notes referred to by Panel 3 about 10:30 ON 23 January 2006. Only part of these notes appear on the Job Audit Report and a copy of the full Panel Notes are required. (page 7/12)
- Full copy of the amended Panel Notes referred to by Admin 3 about 12:21 on 2 February 2005. Only part of these notes appear on the Job Audit Report and a copy of the full Panel Notes are required. (page8/12)
- Full copy of the amended Panel Notes referred to by Panel 1 about 14:49 on 13 July 2006. Only part of these notes appear on the Job Audit Report and a copy of the full Panel notes are required. (page 9/12)
- Full explanation of change to Factor 9, referred to by Panel; 2 about 15:19 on 13 July 2006. Only part of these notes appear on the Job Audit Report and a full copy of these notes are required. (page 10/12)
- Full explanation of change to Factor , referred to by Panel 1 about 15:30 on 13 July 2006. Only part of these notes appear on the Job Audit Report and a full copy of these notes are required. (page 10/12)

JEMG – Monitoring Template

- Copy of Job Audit Report Sco11/004-283 referred to in comments relating to Factor 'ME'
- Copy of Job Audit Report Sco11/004-283E Superintendent III(?) referred to in 'Comments/Actions'
- Date that this JEMG – Monitoring Template was compiled and/or forwarded to evaluation/review panel.

Job Audit Report Sco11/Review/004-282



- Full copy of Job Audit Report Sco11/Review/004-282 which clearly shows the 'security code numbers' of each evaluation or review panel member, for each of the 16 occasions in which the constitution of an evaluation or review panel is set or changed. The only item of information which should be redacted or blacked out is the name of an individual panel member.
- Copy of file [job title].doc referred to by Panel 3 about 15:32 on 29 September 2008. (page 3/18)
- Copy of file Review Panel 004-282.doc referred to by Panel 4 about 11:52 on 01 October 2008. (page 8/18)
- Copy of file 004-282 [job title].doc referred to by Panel 2 about 12:51 on 08 October 2008. (page 9/18)

Job Audit Report Sco11/Review/004-282

- Copy of file [job title].doc referred to by Panel 1 about 14:56 on 12 January 2009. (page 17/18)
- Copy of file 004-282 [job title].doc referred to by Panel 3 about 09:39 on 22 January 2009. (page 17/18)
- Copy of Panel Notes 004-282 referred to by Admin 3 about 09:49 on 17 February 2009. (page 18/18)