

Theme	Idea	Purpose (why)	Unique ID
Accountability	Publicly release CE performance measures	Hold CEs accountable for performance and increase transparency	AUPI1
	Increased transparency of recruitment process for senior public service roles such as CE, board appointments	Perception of nepotism and cronyism	AUPI2
		Need for independent panel?	
	Greater use of pilots and trials to increase innovation	Will help move away from fear of failure or blame. Encourage greater innovation	AUPI3
	Independent bodies for specific functions. For example, a body to study the relationship between Protected Disclosure and OIA. Independent body to provide oversight of protected disclosures	Increase transparency and remove possibility of interference, actual or implied	AUPI4
	Disclosure of official's names on emails and documents	Increase accountability and transparency	AUPI5
Enabling Participation	Better access to public information for all. Includes all various groups including gender, ethnicity, disability, digital ability etc. Some specific other examples include having select committee public sessions televised,	People are move informed and can access public information easily. Good examples cited were COVID19 site, Christchurch City Council site. Also IR work with Citizens Advice Bureau to improve access for those with limited or no electronic access	AUPI6
	Extend commitment 11 from previous plan (NAP3) – an authoritative dataset of government organisations as open data for greater transparency	Increase transparency and access to data	AUPI7
	Release of 'marked up' up versions of complex legislative change	Increase transparency and reduce potential duplication of effort	AUPI8
	Increased collaboration with the public	Increased participation by citizens. Greater and broader analysis and capture of ideas. Increased innovation and engagement	AUPI9
	Addressing mis- and disinformation as impacts on trust, for example vaccines	Increase trust in government, decision making and advice	AUPI10
Improved access	Central information repository. Better advocacy tools and portals	Make it easier for people to find information. Provide support for people when they have an issue or problem	AUPI11
	Free access to case law	Judgments are a very important source of understanding what is going on in our Courts and how people are being treated in the justice system. Increases accountability of the judiciary	AUPI12
	Increased visibility and sharing of information. Publish Hansard and Select Committees public sessions	Potential for all of government website. Increase proactive release	AUPI13
	Reform OIA and LGOIMA legislation	Legislation possibly not fit for purpose. Not leading to desired outcomes	AUPI14
	Make OIA and LGOIMA information more accessible	Increase transparency and trust and confidence	AUPI15

Unique ID	Idea	Why
AUPI 1	<p>Publicly release CE performance measures: Performance evaluations Measures to assess open government to the performance contracts for all public service departmental chief executives. We need to make outcomes, goals, targets, KPI's, what's achievable transparent. What are the key indicators of your success at each level of government, make that transparent. Say if you're trying to improve an initiative, when you completed it, and was it improved? Make it all visible to public. Start internally and open up government.</p>	<p>Chief Executives need to be appraised and accountable. Including Peter Hughes. Why are people doing a bad job being praised. It starts with the culture, CEOs, SLTs. Don't protect, don't hide. This would enforce his statement that "New Zealanders expect government agencies to be open and transparent".</p>
AUPI 2	<p>Increased transparency in recruitment processes for senior public service roles such as CE, board appointments</p>	<p>Succession plans for CEs are not transparent. They don't have to apply or interview normally. They can also be shoulder tapped. Equal opportunities for other people are not there. Some people appointed to certain positions make decisions that seem to defy logic irrespective of good process. In these cases that has happened through undeclared conflicts of interest based upon nepotism and cronyism. People who do a public duty should be open to being questioned about previous employment, friendships or any potential conflict of interest that could have a bearing on their decision-making in certain cases as an when required. If someone is unwilling to be put to that level of scrutiny, they should be considered unfit from holding such a position. To claim their right of privacy trumps any decision I've made is not transparent and to the detriment of accountability. At times people are appointed based upon whom they know to get them there and in return protect them from public scrutiny by hiding information that could be embarrassing. When heads of agencies are appointed some do not make sense, meet standards or the public don't know about changes. The public should be able to say that person appointed doesn't meet the requirements or match the role in regards to their skill set. An independent body to make or vet appointments could help enhance trust,</p>

		<p>as it does in other countries.</p> <p>Use the new code of conduct to reinforce the culture we want to see. Need to be employing the right people and that people are recruited for having the right values and principles that are in the act. Involve HR.</p>
AUPI 3	Greater use of pilots and trials to increase innovation	<p>Allows for innovation.</p> <p>Move away from blame culture. Allow trials of stuff to happen like safe at schools. Push back on inaccuracies in a reasoned way.</p>
AUPI 4	<p>Establish independent bodies for specific functions:</p> <p>Independent body to analyse policies etc as to what is happening. Study the relationship between the Protected Disclosures Act (whistleblowing), Privacy Act and Official Information Act. Update the Protected Disclosures Act to include the establishment of an independent oversight body.</p>	<p>Politicians currently have discretion over a wide range of appointments to posts on public bodies, agencies, boards, etc. These appointments lack transparency and accountability, and the large number of former politicians appointed to such posts has led to plausible arguments that political affiliation, rather than merit, often determines such appointments. This situation feeds public distrust of the democratic system and a (potentially correct) belief that the system involves an unduly large element of politicians looking out for their associates and contacts. Other countries, such as the UK, have created independent bodies to improve the transparency and oversight of public appointments. While such bodies may not have the final say on appointments, they can – for instance – be in charge of drawing up shortlists, enhancing the likelihood of appointments based on merit and diminishing undue political influence.</p>
AUPI 5	<p>Disclosure of Government employee names:</p> <p>People need to know who to contact if needed</p> <p>Supply names and numbers of Government officials on information/emails.</p> <p>Put faces to names</p>	<p>It's hard for the public to find who to talk to about something in local and central government. How do you find the right person?</p> <p>Line of communication need to be clear and specific.</p> <p>Need numbers to call that have people on the other end who know what you're talking about or how to connect you always but especially when online forms break e.g.: for consultation.</p> <p>Many citizens don't see government apart from things like IRD, the next level of interaction is local government.</p> <p>People need to know who they are dealing with - e.g. a person rather than a team.</p> <p>Clarity of process is sought so the buck stops somewhere.</p> <p>Greater accountability by civil servants</p>
AUPI 6	<p>Better access to public information for all:</p> <p>Radio or TV channel run by young people for young people.</p> <p>Increase use of social media for information.</p> <p>Could have a New Zealand owned social media platform use digital</p>	<p>Key into what is relevant to me.</p> <p>Media is far too influential – creates adversarial headlines which affect govt</p> <p>Increase engagement and spread information further. Go where the young people are.</p>

identity to register for it.
Share information in bite-sized posts on Instagram and other youth-heavy mediums, like @washingtonpost on Insta.
Have an on-demand Government streaming service.
Mid term debates and progress reports shown to public on TV/Media, utilise Parliament TV more.
Have TV documentaries, like a 'day in the life' not just Parliament TV.
Strengthen high-quality public media reporting of local government.
Social media posting needs to be short and engaging (eg graphics, humour), especially for young people, and need to use Instagram and TikTok as well.
Formal space for Select Committee proceedings, outside social media (eg. Parliament TV).
Honest and informative short news segment on local and national projects/decisions explaining pros and cons and why certain decisions have been made and accept submissions afterwards.
Replace shallow TV slots with important informative shows.
More documentaries on prominent issues like Seaspiracy shown on main TV channels. So older generations are exposed to them.
Have summary reports – simplifying complex issues on a website
Plain, accessible language in documentation, in English and other languages.
I want government research institutes to be "CCBY" by default, closed by exception.
Different languages and tools, and increased visuals for sharing information.
Greater use of Te Reo and commitment to te Tiriti o Waitangi in documents.
Make sure that there are different channels of communication, such as over the phone or online for the people who are not comfortable with face to face connections.
Maybe the hub idea comes in here but learn because attempts in the past haven't done very well. Look at which ones have worked and where.
Videos translated into different languages with subtitles on how the system works, increased use of subtitles and interpreters.

It's not right that videos of Select Committee proceedings are posted on Facebook rather than Parliamentary TV - need a formal space owned by Parliament as well as sharing on social media. Not everyone uses social media. It's hard to distinguish between what local and central government is doing. Each have their own challenges, but democracy gets tangled up.
Government websites are all very unique and different and it is really difficult to find the information you want. A standardised approach.
Government websites are structures in an opaque, camouflaged way. Make key terms easier to search for, [see Christchurch City Council website].
Disability is an afterthought! Strengthen the commitment to 100% accessible websites and offices.
Better enforcement and evaluation of government's standards by putting them into an easily accessible and executable format.
Need to break down what's happening for average member of public in the city, have different levels of explanations.
Content/research paid by New Zealanders should be available for reuse by New Zealanders
Improve access for people with language barriers for non-English speakers, people with learning difficulties, people who don't have/use the internet.
The language used matters as it can effectively EXCLUDE large groups like marginalised people.
Not everyone has digital access (eg TV or internet) so government needs to support engagement through other channels or government needs to ensure everyone has digital access.
DIA service designers are designing for the invisible customer. People are required to have a government accepted ID, this can actively push them out. People are also digitally excluded. If you need to be using a government service to be involved some people are already excluded because they don't have the pre requisite. For refugees its harder to be involved.
Look at report by Citizen's Advice Bureau on digital exclusion and how increasingly, government services are more accessible online, but there is a whole cohort of people who are struggling to engage with government in a way which is primarily digital. They are struggling to get any face-to-face person to talk through something, or understand something, or access support.
Accessibility a big issue -> a lot of those who move to NZ (e.g., deaf refugees) have real issues with accessing information - Not enough information or deaf

	<p>Sign language translations.</p> <p>Accessibility - translations, translators, face to face with people from the community.</p> <p>Setting standards, such as using internationally comparable data classifications, and keeping raw data consistent over future years.</p>	<p>individuals coming from overseas to be able to move through the citizenship process. Govt needs to be aware of lack of information available for the deaf community and the limited accessibility options available.</p> <p>If a city becomes a refugee resettlement city there must be interpreters available, for example they were needed for Afghan former refugees being resettled in Dunedin. - Refugees have 6 weeks to learn about what and where they're coming to. They need to engage with own community in new place but you don't want segregated ghettos. Need inclusive engagement. Ask the people what they need, for example the former refugees in Mosgiel.</p> <p>Further consider the midterm recommendations for improving access to budget information.</p>
AUPI 7	<p>Extend commitment 11 from previous plan (NAP3):</p> <p>Extend the scope of current Commitment 11 [Authoritative dataset of government organisations as open data for greater transparency] to include the structure that organisations use, white spaces and overlaps. Actions required include actually funding public servants to work on this, and explicitly mandating agency Chief Executives to (a) cooperate and support this work and (b) begin work to scope what adaptations will need to be made to their business systems to make use of the dataset.</p>	<p>Greater transparency and access to data</p>
AUPI 8	<p>Release 'marked up' version of complex legislative change:</p> <p>Any complex legislative proposal amending existing law results in the release of a marked-up version of the legislation containing the proposed amending provisions to assist potential submitters.</p>	<p>The provision of such marked-up material greatly assists submission preparation, allowing submitters' time to be focused on identifying areas for legislative improvement, thereby also improving productivity by no longer requiring multiple parties considering making submissions to complete similar work marking up legislation.</p> <p>The Financial Services Legislation Amendment Bill is an example where the failure of officials to provide a marked-up version of the Financial Markets Conduct Act led to duplicate work having to be completed by multiple parties that I believe likely impacted upon the submission process to the detriment of obtaining better legislation.</p> <p>Further, following the passage of the Financial Services Legislation Bill, there is still no easy way of seeing what it will eventually look like, because the Financial Markets Conduct Act will not be updated on the NZ Legislation website until the amended legislation actually comes into force in June 2020, again making it difficult to understand and plan for the change. In this circumstance, I submit that consideration should also be given to providing a version of the legislation containing the new provisions ahead of the</p>

		<p>provisions actually coming into force, appropriately marked up to ensure that there is no misunderstanding as to what applies when.</p>
<p>AUPI 9</p>	<p>Increased collaboration with the public: Get input from demographics about what information they want/need The better rules approach to policy should include interested citizens or experts outside government and collaborate with them to take policy. Improve awareness of initiatives for public feedback on draft legislation. Have Q&A sessions with the public. Once government has got info, say what you're going to do with it. Acknowledge the gift they gave you. When the government commissions a report seeking proposals which may impact on the constitution this should be made public and include public consultation in support of active citizenship and partnership of all New Zealanders. Create a panel with an even number of representatives from civil society and the government to inquire into how the jurisdiction of the Inspector General of Intelligence and Security can best be extended to ensure intelligence activities of all government agencies and the armed services are subject to its oversight, and how this extended jurisdiction should work in practice. The panel will produce and publish a report on the results of its inquiry, complete with draft legislative provisions for any amendments to the law necessary. Review confidentiality terms imposed on external experts who serve on expert advisory groups across government. Convene a joint working party of civil society and government officials to undertake a stocktake and review of agreements and terms non-officials are asked to agree to when they serve on advisory committees. The working group should develop principles upon which such agreements should be based in future and draft a model agreement. These principles should reflect the principles in section 12 and the values in section 16 of the Public Service Act 2020. A report of the joint working party should be published, along with the model agreement.</p>	<p>Better targeting for information, greater engagement, and results that are what the public wants. Transparency – what is missing in departmental report is how they sorted through all the submissions to select committee and came up with themes. - analysis tools - How do they sort through everyone's ideas – transparency around whole approach. The constitution is the basis of our country and democracy. Any perceived review of this or how our constitution works lies at the heart of open government. This also applies if the government seeks to interpret or apply The Treaty in a new way. Decreased misrepresentation of feelings and values on things that impact the public. We don't know about consultations and then find out that the people who got involved are really not considered in the industry as spokespeople for the industry. They are good at fostering personal connections.</p>

	<p>Support community led initiatives that provide everyday service without stigma.</p>	
<p>AUPI 10</p>	<p>Addressing mis- and disinformation: Talk to schools about cyber/digital bullying and being more engaged with the community. Media shouldn't be leading the government. Government communications departments should work differently with the media. Government censorship of information. Twitter pop ups questioning validity of content, so you're prompted to think about whether its fake news. There is an opportunity for other systems to take on learnings and the impact of it. Utilise new ways to regulate social media. Remove some of the commercial imperative, bias of media like RNZ. Have a TVNZ channel where any organisation can send true information. Could subscribe it for genuine updates. Youtube could be better. Parliament TV could be used for other purposes. The Local Democracy Reporter (LDR) concept works really well, continue and strengthen it. The LDR scheme does give a higher level of openness and encourages engagement because it covers issues that otherwise wouldn't be reported. I would like to see them having slots allocated on TV and radio for accessibility reason particularly given a lot of where they are published often requires payment or subscription. There doesn't seem to be the range of free community newspapers there once was. Even availing themselves of You-tube or podcast might be a more cost-effective and efficient way to reach the masses beyond print for those reporters willing to avail themselves of other media formats. People who are deemed to be stirrers or a problem for authority should have their privacy protected and not be at a greater risk of attack from those funded by the taxpayer's purse strings. Education about keeping yourself safe online. Need to develop a code with the media with values that are kept to. Need manner and respect, let people speak and be gracious. We will have to call out bad media like we're asked to call out bullying in the community. Use the broadcasting complaints better.</p>	<p>Media are not for the state they are more trying to find scandal. Traditionally media held the government accountable, but is now more interested in the celebrity stature and confrontations. There's a distrust in government but also in scientific and media bodies, corporations. People need good "crap detectors" to spot misinformation. Need to fight the bias towards click bait. Our headlines are awful. If you read the Otago Daily Times and TV1 News they are completely different stories. It's really hard for the public when they're relying on that as their information. Or you have social media where people put on whatever they like. The cannabis referendum failed partially due to hundreds of millions of dollars worth of misinformation being pumped into New Zealanders at the expense of overseas groups who were decidedly not neutral parties. This is bloody cooked in my opinion and shouldn't be permitted. When the media are so aggressive it makes it hard for agencies to keep that social capital and be innovative. There's only focus on mistakes, which happen sometimes or one side of the story, there's little celebration of the good stuff. It's simple stuff like how your word a headline especially when there are vulnerable members of the public involved in the story. We are going backward in terms of sifting through fake news to get reliable info. It's getting worse and social media is pushing people into echo chambers. Now truth is non existent which I despair over in terms of the COVID vaccine. One can't participate if they don't know what's going on to partaken and the LDR are a vital tool whereby they in part information for people to potentially engage with. A lot of things are still hidden or at the very least not reveal when sought. Secrecy doesn't promote openness and transparency and is most certainly to the detriment of accountability and trust in our public or state services. Private citizens seeking information on themselves or for others to see how a decision was made or what was said about them. That shouldn't result in the advocate being targeted by those who also equally hold personal information on them as well.</p>

		Government needs to be able to tell the public what has gone wrong or whats happening without being attacked
AUPI 11	<p>Central information repository. Better advocacy tools and portals: Create a central Government site for sending/receiving information Regular updates on what agencies are doing. Explain why or why don't things get implemented. Explain our position on cameras on boats, bodycams, 1080, surveillance. Show weighing up of threatening privacy and freedom. centralise proactive cabinet paper releases – make them searchable and indexed Create a centralised repository for all OIA requests and responses. Could there be a website of New Zealand's current agreements with involvement with countries around the world. MFAT? Service like the CAB but narrowly focused on the government. Can be a central point for all questions from young people for all thing's government. Consultations should be in a central location and well promoted, press releases etc. Require sources to be referenced in government advice, especially so that submitters and the public can see if and how their ideas are being used, and that reasons for key decisions are communicated to the public. Require all public institutions tasked with implementing government services to provide public reference implementations of their interpretation of the law that governs them. When published, such reference implementations should allow for and encourage drafts, feedback, "bug reports", versioning and public discussion. Create a one door into government culture, where a department will point people in the right direction, even connect them. Build better advocacy tools and portals into other areas of government. Promote awareness of existing tools and supports through a multi-media campaign, such as an app that represents a 'pool' of resources which better connect people to the corner of government they require. Persistent repository of bugs and features.</p>	<p>Have one place for information that can be trusted. E.g. For COVID-19, you could rely on Ashley Bloomfield. You did not have to go through 7 websites or 7 links to access information. Earlier this year the government announced that it would do a consultation into pharma procurement processes, regarding changing to multiple sources for medicines. I have resorted to setting up a Google search for pharmacological consultation. Nothing so far but may missed it. The pharma consultation didn't give any indication where you could follow-up just that it was going to happen at some point. This will encourage participation, aid academics and civil society organisations and demonstrate impact. Allows "Open Interpretation", it represents a fundamental shift away from the gate keeping that can happen around legal interpretation within government departments which is often couched in a concern of getting things wrong and then not admitting fault. "no wrong door" for info provision or requests. Minimise the points of contact. Too many ministries to go through is confusing. The public experiences government through a web of services made up of seemingly endless councils, departments, corporations, and contracted organisations. The business of the civil service must be to aid a diverse public, with diverse needs, to find points of access within these complicated structures. Those working in government know a plethora of supports already exist, however, the vast majority of New Zealanders have no idea how to begin accessing them. A great many government websites already function as portals for FAQs, providing broad overviews of government processes however, the public lean most heavily on front line staff and typical big names like EAP, tenancy services, citizens advice bureau, or health line, to name a few. New Zealand's COVID-19 response presents us with a powerful example of when government access points work well. During the pandemic, a range of multi-media tools have been used to provide education, issue government edicts, manage misinformation, and coordinate health screening or testing. Through these various access points, the public are kept engaged and aware — leading to high levels of active citizenship and accountability for each other's health and wellbeing. Simply put, we all knew what was happening</p>

		<p>and where to go if we needed help. By making each sector's tools and supports more visible, we encourage more active and informed engagement with government. To demystify the public's experience of government, I envision the following action plan. Identify sector leading access points across the spectrum of government. Are any sectors lacking approachable access points?</p> <p>CAB is constantly finding bugs and refreshing their website. They should be resourced better to pass this information on as it's a universal service.</p>
AUI 12	Free access to case law	<p>The accountability of judges is achieved through requiring them to give reasons for their decisions. The public has to be able to examine these reasons. Adopting this as a goal of the open gov partnership would serve as an important means of sending a message to other branches of government that this issue is important. Taking control of the system for publishing judgments will ensure that the publication of judgments serves the interests of justice, the administration of justice, and meets the needs of the New Zealand legal system. Judgments are a very important source of understanding what is going on in our Courts and how people are being treated in the justice system.</p> <p>Provide free access to judgments of New Zealand courts and tribunals, through publication by using a system co-designed with civil society and the legal profession to facilitate innovation as well as access to information. A joint working group of civil society organisations, technologists, officials from the Ministry of Justice, Parliamentary Counsel Office, Crown Law, and the judiciary is created to develop principles, standards and practical procedural guidance to achieve this and cost the proposals. A report of the joint working group should be published, along with the costing and minutes and papers of the working group.</p>
AUI 13	<p>Increased visibility and sharing of information. Publish Hansard and Select Committees public sessions:</p> <p>Have a long-term view of policies and the impacts of investment.</p> <p>Register of Government's innovation activities.</p> <p>The Government's decision to release Ministerial diaries each month should become accepted and codified within the plan for all future governments, such that this monthly diary release going forward becomes the norm.</p> <p>Expand diary disclosures from ministers to include all MPs senior</p>	<p>Enhances openness.</p> <p>The all of government website has a place for consultation and it is something like get involved, www.gov.nz but for the lower level of consultation, not the legislative consultation, very little of it actually makes its way to that location and the downside of that is that the NGO, non-government organisation sector and other civil society professional organisations have to spend an inordinate amount of time finding out what government is doing and it would be the simplest matter in the world to make the use of that consultation site.</p> <p>A huge criticism from NGOs is always the silo-ing of Government agencies, but</p>

	<p>public servants.</p> <p>It would be good to have a dashboard of political commitments that are tracked through from election promise to action.</p> <p>Make publication mandatory for all consultations.</p> <p>Report on who is attending engagement processes run by government, include numbers and demographics. Stats NZ could do this.</p> <p>More publicly available information on cross-agency governance/working groups.</p> <p>List what functions/regulations etc central government has delegated to local government and its impact (i.e. documenting the current Localism work). Comment was made that the delegated work has not been resourced and that this work impacts democracy at a local level.</p> <p>The new Public Sector Act 2020 requires that all government entities report to the Public Service Commissioner on the progress of implementation of the new purpose, values, principles and more. In the spirit of Open Government (which is one of the PSA principles), these reports should be publicly available.</p> <p>Community policy – explain better why you’re doing what you’re doing.</p> <p>Make the use of Hansard for select committee oral submissions/testimony standard. Commit resources to producing and publishing Hansard of select committee’s public sessions.</p> <p>Be transparent about corruption and serious wrongdoing.</p> <p>Ambassadors for things, especially in isolated communities.</p> <p>Responsibility for information policy across all of government needs to be decided.</p>	<p>often there are in fact cross-Government groups established and meetings happening. It would be good to know who is in them and what their Terms of Reference are in the very least.</p> <p>There is a disconnect between voting and what actually changes.</p> <p>The IRM researcher repeats the IRM midterm report recommendation. The IRM researcher suggests linking or cooperating with the New Zealand Legal Information Institute site. The IRM researcher also recommends inclusion as a milestone in future action plans the Department of Internal Affairs’ future work to explore options for making local authorities’ legislation more accessible to users.</p> <p>Accountability and Transparency are frameworks for integrity and confidence in our Public Services.</p> <p>Responsibility should be clarified so that work to address the policy conflicts be undertaken.</p>
AUPI 14	<p>Reform OIA and LGOIMA legislation:</p> <p>Amend the OIA to encompass Parliamentary Services, the Office of the Clerk, the Ombudsman and the Controller and Auditor General, whilst retaining parliamentary privilege, in line with the recommendations by the Law Commission report in 2012 and others, and building on administrative and legislative developments since then such as the Parliamentary Privilege Act 2014.</p> <p>Comprehensive, independent review of the OIA.</p> <p>A joint working party of civil society and public servants should be</p>	<p>Build on transparency and set expectations</p> <p>It could make it easier for citizens to request official information, streamline OIA requests for agencies, and ensure that requests are dealt with in a standardised, transparent, fashion.</p> <p>There are some serious problems with both the design and operation of the OIA, and this is preventing the Act from doing what it was designed to do – make government more open. In March-April 2019, the Ministry of Justice sought public submissions on the question of whether issues with the OIA could be fixed through improvements in agencies’ practices, or whether a</p>

	<p>convened to discuss the issues and areas for reform short of a full re-writing of the legislation.</p> <p>Completely overhaul the Official Information Act, responding to widespread concerns that many areas of the Act, not just one, need urgent attention, the lack of meaningful penalties for non-compliance, and abuse of many of the current provisions.</p> <p>Strengthen the Official Information Act (OIA) to enhance people's ability to participate in the making and administration of laws and policies, and to hold ministers and officials to account. Apply the Act to more public sector organisations; make the section 6 withholding grounds subject to a public interest override test; remove the eligibility test in sections 12, 21, 22 and 23, insert a provision to require public consultation on any policy or draft proposal for legislation which would remove or hinder access to information under the OIA, or take an organisation partially or wholly outside the scope of the Act; recommend categories of information that should be required to be published via regulations made under an amendment creating an enabling provision.</p> <p>Legislation requiring specific procedures and methods to be followed before any clauses prohibiting disclosure of official information are inserted into legislation, and to mandate the setting up, carrying out and completion of a project to review existing secrecy clauses, and making recommendations for their removal or amendment, so that wherever possible the Official Information Act is the legislation that governs whether information will or will not be disclosed on request.</p>	<p>review of the law was needed. The submissions highlighted a broad range of issues</p>
AUPI 15	<p>Make OIA and LGOIMA information more accessible: Update websites to show when an OIA has progressed. OIA responses need to be released in a usable form, and in a timely manner.</p> <p>My suggestion is that government work with the owners of fyi.org.nz and other stakeholders to provide services, processes, standards, and systems which simplify and standardise the process of requesting official information. This could include a standard request interface, an all of government portal for publishing responses, and built in real time reporting and statistics. Better staff training to know what information requests are under</p>	<p>It could make it easier for citizens to request official information, streamline OIA requests for agencies, and ensure that requests are dealt with in a standardised, transparent, fashion.</p> <p>Frustration dealing with officials who don't realise all requests are under OIA, and excessive deletions when getting the response.</p> <p>At the moment, every government agency has its own systems and processes for dealing with OIA requests. Some deal with thousands a year. Others only get a few. The customer experience is very variable. There is demand for a service which makes this easier and more standardised. The site fyi.org.nz attempts to fill this gap, and seems to be quite successful. Should be easy to get information about services people are entitled to -</p>

the OIA.
More proactive release of information and making OIA requests easier, and releasing this information to the public.
The Ombudsman should be held accountable for their actions as well, just as the Government is, and the satisfaction survey results should be publicly available.
Responses to requests for official information to be more prompt and open in character.
Crown law should have to bylaw report on those are representing who fail to comply with the law.
The process for dealing with the Ombudsman and the Privacy Commissioner should be faster and simpler.
When contractors are used all the information they gather should be handed over to the agency who hired them so it does become subjected to the privacy and official information acts also making it easily accessible upon request.
We welcome the dialogue with members of civil society currently occurring. We would urge a critical look at how this process can ensure it upholds obligations under Te Tiriti o Waitangi, as well as an examination of who is missing, and what can be done to encourage and sustain wider participation.
Programme of work to train agencies to consider/explain how public interest test is applied.
Hire private marketing firm to undertake transparency and dissemination.

simplification of process and information - need to be intuitive to the user.
Have it accessible so not only law and politics students people can understand it.
Given the ombudsman is funded and appointed also being an office of parliament themselves that's two in-house and in my view the survey should be open to public scrutiny. Whenever someone questions the process, this is misconstrued as wanting to re-adjudicate the outcome rather than what it really is. Which is gaining an understanding of how a decision was made that lead to the outcome. The ombudsman's office performance also seems based on throughput like input and output rather than outcomes from a client satisfaction point of view. Eg, were you treated fairly, did you felt listen to, was the process explained to you... etc... There is a big difference between agreeing with the decision and being treated fairly and most people get that and on occasions and other processes I know where the decision has not gone in their favour and they understood why that was were more accepting of it.
People can't see what's recorded about them because of redactions.
Logically, a person can't seek correction of information held on them if they can't see what it is to start with. Nor can individuals raise questions about information misuse if they don't know what information is held on the to start with.
Even when it comes to supposed full disclosure where Crown Law acting on behalf of a government agency it's become obvious that information that should be handed over has not been. Then as part of settlement Crown Law insist the discovery file cannot be shared with anyone else which is essentially blackmail and covering up for wrongdoing that they are fully aware of.
Years ago you could speak to an ombudsman person and didn't have to go through anyone else to do that and they also held local clinics in rural areas for that reason. This was far better than what we have going on today and a massive step backwards in my view.
Investigations into complaints by the Ombudsman's Office can take months, meaning even if the information is eventually released the issue may no longer be topical making it hard to hold government to account.
A government agency admitted to me they use private contractors so to bypass the privacy and official information acts also the standards of

		<p>integrity and conduct for what was then State servants.</p> <p>I'm a little bit lost to understand why the no surprises policy used to brief ministers is one of the hardest things to get revealed.</p> <p>The OIA and Public Records Act haven't kept up with the massive changes in the technology used by departments to create, manage, find, publish and analyse information and data. Far more could be done with a strengthened OIA to create structures and mechanisms for proactive disclosure of information – in a way that enables the Ombudsman to hold departments to account without waiting for people to make an OIA request first.</p>
--	--	--