
From: Redacted under section 9(2)(a) of the OIA to protect individuals' privacy
Sent: Saturday, 14 May 2016 9:40 a.m.
To: LIAG - NZOGP Actionplan
Subject: Comment on engagement process for second OGP national action plan

Please forward this to whomever it may concern (ideally I would to hear the Minister's views, but I'm not holding my breath).

Presumably you are aware that, given New Zealand's recent track record concerning OGP (I understand it has already been warned about submission delays), the proposal to delay submission until the end of October 2016 is likely to get us suspended from the OGP? Or perhaps that is precisely the aim?

Can I suggest that - IF this administration is at all serious about OGP, which really doesn't appear to be the case at this time - it might be a good idea to apply some resource to the issues and actually DO something about it by announcing some measures (as the UK - hardly the main exemplar of open government - has just done), instead of just talking about how to consult - which screams either of "too hard basket" or, worse, a "let's just delay this until it's dead" approach?

It does appear to me that, rather than promote open government, the current administration is using delaying tactics to reign it back or even to scupper it entirely. The OGP policy seems entirely at odds with how this government has behaved so far - it's usual approach has been to fast-track policy through parliament (sadly in many cases without proper oversight) so I find this apparent desire to have extended consultation over OGP rather inconsistent. In any other scenario it would be most welcome, but given the timeframe here we do not have that luxury.

Regards

Redacted under section 9(2)(a) of the OIA to protect individuals' privacy
Redacted under section 9(2)(a) of the OIA to protect individuals' privacy

From: Redacted under section 9(2)(a) of the OIA to protect individuals' privacy
Sent: Tuesday, 17 May 2016 7:57 p.m.
To: LIAG - NZOGP Actionplan
Subject: Comment on engagement process for second OGP national action plan

Hi there,

In response to the invitation to contribute.

Send something or someone to universities and other campuses. During term time of course.

Have tents or stalls at major city/town gatherings being held during consultation period. Sure it's not going to cover everyone but at least it's an attempt to engage face to face. And cheaper than a roadshow maybe?

Yours sincerely,

Redacted under section 9(2)(a) of the OIA to protect individuals' privacy

Redacted under section 9(2)(a) of the OIA to protect individuals' privacy

From: Redacted under section 9(2)(a) of the OIA to protect individuals' privacy
Sent: Tuesday, 31 May 2016 1:34 p.m.
To: LIAG - NZOGP Actionplan
Subject: Submission on OGP engagement
Attachments: OGP-engagement-consultation.pdf

Please find attached my submission on the OGP engagement process, as requested here:

<http://www.ssc.govt.nz/change-timeframe-nz-nap>

Thanks,

Redacted under section 9(2)(a) of the OIA to protect individuals' privacy

Submission on Open Government Partnership Engagement

You have asked how the Government can enhance its engagement with civil society and reach a wider group of New Zealanders to get their views on open government so as to develop its next OGP action plan. I can think of a few things.

Firstly, the government could actually *announce what it is doing*, rather than operating in secret. You didn't announce that you were delaying the development of the action plan, except in a buried section of your own website. Even those who are dedicated to watching you on this took over a week to notice, you hid it so well. If you're actually seeking public engagement, that's not a good way to do things.

Secondly, you could *operate transparently*. People who are interested in the OGP find it difficult to find out what is happening. Your "Stakeholder Advisory Group" is a black hole where meetings aren't notified until after the fact, and summaries not posted for three months. You never proactively release material about the government's upcoming plans. If I want to find out what is going on, I need to lodge an OIA request, wait twenty working days, and then on some occasions complain to the Ombudsman to get anything. The public can't engage effectively without information, and you are keeping us in the dark.

Related to the above: your model of public interaction seems to be "people will visit an obscure part of our website" (where nothing new is posted anyway). That's simply not effective. You have no facility for people who are interested to sign up to receive notifications of upcoming changes. You don't even have a Twitter feed (or if you do, its secret). You simply don't communicate effectively with the public.

But the biggest problem is that you have utterly mishandled your past "consultation" exercises. Your consultation process for the first National Action Plan was a box-ticking exercise, designed to give the impression of consultation without actually doing anything substantive (and explicitly described that way in internal documents)¹. Your mid-term self-assessment consultation was a disaster where you initially wouldn't even show us the document we were supposedly being consulted about. You give the public the strong impression that you don't actually want to hear from us, and that it is a waste of time submitting our views. And when you do that, people naturally decide that they would rather spend their limited time on other things.

Taking you at your word that you actually want to do better, and that you want to change this toxic dynamic: The core requirement of the OGP isn't "consultation", but *co-creation*. That reflects the OGP's nature as a partnership - not just between states, but between states and their societies. Co-creation means not just that the public are "consulted", but that we have a real voice in the decision, that our voices are taken seriously. In practice, it means civil society being able to say which of the OGP's five "grand challenges" we want the government to focus on, to suggest policies as possible commitments, and have these suggestions taken seriously and given a fair assessment alongside those proposed by government agencies.

Romania², Australia³, and the UK⁴ provide good examples of how to do this in practice. The core of

1 Memorandum from Manjula Shivanandan to Gordon Davis on "OGP Action Plan status report", 12 February 2014. <https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2510240-nz-ogp-2014-advice.html#document/p6/a259852>

2 Ovidiu Voicu, *Romanian civil society takes co-creation very seriously*. 9 March 2016. <http://www.opengovpartnership.org/blog/ovidiu-voicu/2016/03/09/romanian-civil-society-takes-co-creation-very-seriously>

3 Open Government Partnership - Australia. *Preparing the National Action Plan*. <http://ogpan.govspace.gov.au/national-action-plan/>

4 UK Cabinet Office. *Open Government Partnership: UK national action plan 2016 consultation*.

each of their processes was multiple rounds of wiki-based engagement, coupled with workshops and public meetings to develop both preferred themes and specific commitments. SSC should adopt that model. This will require the capability to rapidly assess and propose for Cabinet approval proposals across a range of portfolios. This will obviously require more resources and the priority assistance of staff at Justice, MBIE, Environment and other agencies, as well as the support of Ministers. If you are not going to do that, then you should tell us up-front, so we can all stop wasting our time on this.

From: Redacted under section 9(2)(a) of the OIA to protect individuals' privacy
Sent: Wednesday, 1 June 2016 10:14 a.m.
To: LIAG - NZOGP Actionplan
Subject: Comment on engagement process for second OGP national action plan

Dear Madam or Sir,

I think with the current world state, the second OGP national action plan should integrate parts on **Carbon Emission, Sustainable development and Organic food.**

I think that improving the public service system is a good step, but if we improve the health of people by reducing air contamination (more green transport, cheaper...) and by producing food without chemicals, the public service system cost should be **most lower.**

Regards,

Redacted under section 9(2)(a) of the OIA to protect individuals' privacy