

Open Government Partnership: Developing New Zealand’s Fifth National Action Plan

This table captures key discussion points from *Workshop 3*, held online on 26 November 2025.

If you have feedback on this record, including additions or corrections, please contact us at ogpnz@publicservice.govt.nz

Commitment or topic	Feedback and suggested changes
Review protected disclosure practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Commitment supported but milestones and activities too short.• Needs to add publishing of review/report as part of commitment• Commitment should include reporting on protected disclosure (PD) data by themes, e.g. agencies reporting how many PDs they received and what they were about by theme.• Need to include “rejected” disclosures in reporting.• Ombudsman could co-lead with PSC• Need to clarify scope, is it public or private sector or both? We should consider including non-government entities in a community of practice.• Need to address root causes of why people don’t feel safe to disclose. Current system doesn’t provide security and confidence.• The commitment needs to engage civil society organisations (CSOs) like Community Law Centres. NZCCL could be included as they are often approached with concerns.• Research needs to consider how we create an environment where people feel safe to disclose.• Should consider RCOI on Abuse in Care and people who tried to raise issues. Elizabeth Stanley has done research on this.• Problem of “false signals”. Agencies will receive spurious claims and vexatious or repeated litigants, how do you filter these? Need to be careful with how complainants are presenting because this doesn’t mean there is no complaint to answer – consider recent IPCA report.

FOR DISCUSSION – NOT GOVERNMENT POLICY

<p>Develop a Corruption Assessment Tool</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rename to Corruption <i>Risk</i> Assessment Tool. • Needs a broad scope and to include things like nepotism, undue influence, bribery. • Consider use by local government • Leverage existing tools (Transparency International Australia has a corruption risk assessment tool for Infrastructure, Ombudsman has created self-assessment tools that can be shared). • Add milestones for implementation • Publishing resulting data. Question raised about publicising results of risk assessment – is this a road map to an organisation’s weaknesses or do criminals already know what these weaknesses are? • Need to consider what triggers are for ad hoc reviews,
<p>Support ethical government – private sector career transitions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the commitment but title change makes it less clear what it is about. Suggest returning to “Revolving Door”. • Needs to cover movements in both directions (public to private and vice versa). • Lots of things already impact this commitment – Cabinet Manual, employment obligations etc. What are the gaps in existing mechanisms? Gap may be biggest for MPs. • Concerns raised that the focus is too much on public servants when issue is broader. • Commitment shouldn’t take two years – need more milestones. • Proposed solution is framed as reassuring public, but focus should be on actual risk mitigation. • Commitment should include publishing discussion document and research. • Need to think about what the problem is and what outcome we are wanting. Need tools available and ethical considerations taken into account when making hiring decisions. • Discussion document could include ideas for tools or case studies. • Engage civil society (Transparency International New Zealand, Trust Democracy NZ, Helen Clark Foundation, Health Coalition Aotearoa, PSA and academics). Possibly parliamentary groups like Global Organisation of Parliamentarians against Corruption (GOPAC)?

FOR DISCUSSION – NOT GOVERNMENT POLICY

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Political dimension of commitment may impact timing in an election year. • Look at models already out there – overseas examples, code of ethical advocacy for NGOs, procurement rules may require things from suppliers. • Should follow staged approach – publish research first then discussion document.
Explore options to improve transparency of senior leaders' conflicts of interest	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify who is covered (senior leaders, Crown entity CEs, short-term contractors). • Improve usability and findability of registers. Minister's register seen as useful but hard to find. Can we have one page for all registers of interest? • Need to regularly release data on themes of Conflicts of Interest (COIs). • COI discussions should be expected and normal for Boards e.g. ACC Board. • Link to private sector – institute of directors. • There are privacy concerns that must be balanced against public interest. Need a policy around access to information. • What is the role of Integrity Champions? Could a junior staff member contact an IC with an integrity concern? • Boards are different to employees and Board members will also have conflicts. May end up with a different register or requirements for directors. • Disclosing interests is widespread and is not the issue. Management is the important thing. A public register itself may be misleading. • When scoping a tool consider include a field that explains how the conflict is being managed – e.g. action taken to mitigate conflict.
Overall comments including the process followed to develop NAP5 and co-creation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commitments should be SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound). • Current plan is low ambition. Only four commitments included and in other plans there have been more. • Most commitments could be delivered in one year but it's a two year plan. • NAP5 should state that commitments can be added or extended. Will span election cycles and new Ministers may want to add commitments. • All commitments will have a reasonable, low-level impact. No one stands out.

FOR DISCUSSION – NOT GOVERNMENT POLICY

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Need to improve accessibility (avoid PDFs; use Word/HTML). Ombudsman has all documents up in Word and PDF, NAP5 documents should follow this approach.• Strengthen co-creation. Need to share full draft of NAP5 including milestones, implementation and Minister's foreword before submission. Otherwise New Zealand cannot say plan was "co-created".• It would be better to submit late (i.e. in January 2026) than submit a plan that was not co created.• StatsNZ hold quarterly hui on their work programme – a good example to follow.• Canada and Finland are developing open government strategies – good example for NZ to follow.• Good practice would be to establish a committee or group for each commitment with civil society involved.• Consultation has a legal meaning, is this consultation meeting that?• At the lower end of the IAP2 spectrum on consultation. If asked publicly was this co-design the answer is no.• Need to see commitment milestones.• With decisions delegated from Cabinet to the Minister for the Public Service civil society should be able to have more involvement.
--	---