

---

**From:** Marilyn Little Withheld s 9(2)(a) >  
**Sent:** Thursday, 23 April 2015 6:01 p.m.  
**To:** Wakefield, Tina  
**Cc:** Denise Williams  
**Subject:** RE: PRA Audit MoJ

Kia Ora Tina

Good to hear from you. Going well here, thanks. How is it for you?

Appreciate your comments about the Ministry of Justice audit process. Could well be helpful as the first 5 year cycle comes to an end at 30 June, and we are reviewing the audit process in 15/16.

A bit of background might be useful. In 2010 when the PRA audit programme was developed we determined that the goal of the initial five year audit round was to benchmark how Public offices were implementing the Public Records Act and associated mandatory standards. The audit process itself was designed to be open, transparent and agreed in the terms of engagement - which meant that there was no need for management comment on the report. We've used this process for all of the 186 public offices we have audited to date. Appreciate that this is not the same process as for other audits such as security or IOA - that's because the intent behind the process introduced in 2010 was that all was agreed upfront in the terms of engagement.

At a meeting dated 11 August 2014, Rebecca Smart, Senior Audit Advisor took the Ministry Senior Responsible Officer for Ministry of Justice, Jasvinder Singh, General Manager Communication Services and Bronwyn Clifton, Manager Information Management Services through the Public Records Act audit process and assigned timelines as part of the terms of engagement. The process was agreed to by all parties concerned and as you know, has been implemented thus far.

Once the Ministry's self-assessment was completed, a desktop review was undertaken to validate the Ministry's self-assessment ratings with the evidence they had provided, where more clarification or validation was required the desktop reviewer asks questions and may/or may not request to see further evidence and suggest rating changes.

During the onsite audit additional evidence/ validation was requested and viewed by our auditor, this provided a basis for the rating changes and as part of the closing meeting process for the onsite audit those rating changes were discussed by the on-site auditor with Bronwyn Clifton on the 27 February 2015 and agreement was obtained for changes to be made.

Whilst I understand the issues you have raised, I would recommend that you await the final report where you will see that your concerns have been addressed in our recommendations as appropriate. My staff are willing to go through the audit findings and recommendations in May 2015 if required.

Ngā mihi  
Marilyn

**From:** "Wakefield, Tina" Withheld s 9(2)(a) >  
**Date:** 17 April 2015 9:00:24 am NZST  
**To:** Withheld s 9(2)(a) " Withheld s 9(2)(a)  
**Subject:** PRA Audit MoJ

Kia ora Marilyn

How's things going? I hope this finds you well.

I need to raise a couple of concerns I have wrt the recent of the Ministry's record keeping practices.

The Ministry of Justice Public Records Act Audit has been completed and we are expecting a final report to be sent in late April to our Chief Executive, Andrew Bridgeman. Unlike other audits -e.g. security, IQA etc, I have been involved with it seems we do not get the chance to check the report for factual accuracy (we have asked and been declined), nor is there a section for management comment- it just goes directly to the CE.

Some concerns have been raised by staff who were involved with the Audit process.

These concerns relate to the auditor's upgrading of some of our self-assessment ratings.

The email from my staff notes:

"In particular the questions:

- 5.1.1 "Records management requirements are identified in business processes and functions".  
Our original self-assessment rating was that there was no progress, no coverage and no intentions to progress. This is a true reflection of our current environment and system limitations. The auditor has chosen to upgrade this to Progress underway, Coverage to most and Intentions to Progress to plans in place. There is no evidence to support this.
- 5.2.1 "Records are captured routinely, documented and organised according to the organisation's business requirements". The auditor has changed our self-assessment rating to reflect that he believes this is complete and our intentions to progress from plans in place to completed. As the Ministry saves the majority of its content into a poorly controlled shared drive environment and email system then the auditor's upgrading is unsubstantiated.
- 5.3.3 Disposal authorities are mapped to systems that create and maintain records". The auditor has changed our coverage from some to all yet we know our disposal authorities are not mapped to either shared drives or our email system. There is no evidence to support this upgrade.

The audit of the Ministry's recordkeeping has failed to identify some fundamental and important gaps in our recordkeeping systems and processes. The audit is promoted by Archives New Zealand as a value-adding activity that will provide a gap analysis of our current recordkeeping capability against Public Record Act requirements and standards. The audit however, has failed to accurately identify areas for improvement by overstating the current level of the Ministry's compliance. This in turn will diminish our ability to justify recordkeeping improvements and initiatives to reduce the business risk from poor recordkeeping as Ministry priorities, and in particular investment in ECMS. Additionally I worry about risks to DIA to paint a more rosy picture than is the case. "

Marilyn, I am keen to understand where to from here? Do we just accept the findings and relay our concerns directly to our Chief Executive? I also think there is some reputational risk for DIA here as well.

Thanks,  
Tina

Tina Wakefield  
Deputy Secretary ICT/ Chief Information Officer  
Ministry of Justice  
19 Aitken Street  
Wellington  
DDI: +64 4 4664001  
M: ~~Withheld s 9(2)(a)~~

---

**Confidentiality notice:**

This email may contain information that is confidential or legally privileged. If you have received it by mistake, please:

- (1) reply promptly to that effect, and remove this email and the reply from your system;
- (2) do not act on this email in any other way.

Thank you.

---

RELEASED UNDER THE  
OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT