OFFICE OF THE
INFORMATION & PRIVACY
COMMISSIONER
for British Columbia

Protecting privacy. Promoting transparency

Six-month Check-up: Review of Government's Timeliness in Responding to Media and Political Parties' Requests

August 6, 2010 to February 5, 2011

Report Issued April 12, 2011

Six-month Check-up: Review of Government's Timeliness in Responding to Media and Political Parties' Requests (August 6, 2010 to February 5, 2011)

1

COMMISSIONER'S MESSAGE

In August of last year, I issued a report entitled *"It's About Time: Report Card on the Timeliness of Government's Access to Information Responses"*. This was the second report by my office measuring the performance of ministries in meeting their obligations under the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* ("FIPPA"). The report concluded that the government had made "extraordinary efforts to meet its timeliness obligations under FIPPA."

Despite the overall improvement in the timeliness of government's response to access requests, I remained concerned with government's record with respect to requests from media applicants and from political parties. These applicant types received the two lowest scores in my evaluation of the timeliness of government responses. As a result, I recommended that government take immediate action to re-evaluate the strategies used in processing these types of access requests. I indicated that I would review progress made six months after the release of my report.

Both the media and political parties play a fundamental role in the access to information process in British Columbia. The media reports on current events and helps to raise citizens' awareness of government action. Access requests by political parties further help to hold government accountable to the citizens they serve. Both media and political parties frequently make the results of their access requests public. This ultimately promotes accountability, openness and transparency of public bodies.

This report is my six-month review of the strategies and outcomes of government's efforts to improve response times to media and political party applicants.

I am grateful to the Ministry of Labour, Citizens' Services and Open Government for its cooperation with this process. As with the previous report, the Ministry provided my staff with several statistical reports and co-operated with the on-site portion of this audit. I am particularly grateful to Kim Henderson, Deputy Minister, Dave Nikolejsin, Chief Information Officer, and Kathleen Ward, Executive Director of the Information Access Operations Unit ("IAO").

The IAO Managers and their staff of analysts and technical staff also deserve special thanks for their cooperation and effort in gathering files for review and for facilitating database access by my staff. I am grateful for the excellent work done by the investigation team of Tina Doehnel, Caitlin Lemiski and Troy Taillefer.

April 12, 2011

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY

Elizabeth Denham
Information and Privacy Commissioner
  for British Columbia

Six-month Check-up: Review of Government's Timeliness in Responding to Media and Political Parties' Requests (August 6, 2010 to February 5, 2011)

2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Six-month Check-up: Review of Government's Timeliness in Responding to Media and Political Parties' Requests (August 6, 2010 to February 5, 2011)

3

1.0   REPORT SUMMARY

My office's first report, issued in February 2009, revealed significant and widespread non-compliance with the requirement in FIPPA for government to respond to requests for records within 30 business days. In my August 2010 report, I found that government had significantly improved its performance in this regard.   However, I also found that government was taking too long in responding to the access requests of media and political parties as compared to other applicant types.

After issuing last year's report, I felt it was too important to wait another year before reviewing the performance of government in responding to access requests by media and political parties. As such, I committed to this report covering the six months since my last report.

Having performed an audit of access requests by media and political parties, I conclude that government has improved its performance in responding to media requests in the past six months.   On the other hand, government's score for responses to political party requests has decreased slightly and is now even farther behind the average score for all applicant types.

I identify two areas of particular concern relating to political party requests, namely requests for the calendars of senior executives and requests for records on current event issues.

My key recommendation is for government to commit to the development of an effective strategy for the proactive disclosure of the calendars of senior executives. As I stated in my last report, it is time for government to adopt a presumption favouring disclosure.

2.0   INTRODUCTION

Freedom of information legislation sets a standard for government to follow in responding to requests for records.   An important aspect of this standard under FIPPA is the requirement that all public bodies respond to requests for records without delay and, barring special circumstances, within 30 business days. Timely access to information is a right of all British Columbians.

In my last report, I found that political parties who made requests were waiting the longest to receive responses from government of the nine applicant types.[1] In fact, responses to requests by political parties took 40 business days to process, almost twice the government's average of 24 processing days.

I also found that government took an average of 35 business days to respond to media applicants.   Government responses to requests by the media were, on average, 42 business days overdue.   This figure was significantly higher than the overall government average of 25 business days overdue.

---

[1] The nine applicant types are media, political parties, business, individual, law firm, other public bodies, researcher, interest group and other governments.

Six-month Check-up: Review of Government's Timeliness in Responding to Media and Political Parties' Requests (August 6, 2010 to February 5, 2011)

4

The purpose of this report is to determine whether in the past six months government has followed my recommendation to improve its response times for requests made by the media and political parties. The scope of this report is limited to these two requestor types only. My next report card, which I will issue later this year, will examine government's response to all requestor types.

For the purposes of this report, my investigation team reviewed access request files closed by government ministries and the Office of the Premier, but not at Crown Corporations or other public bodies.

The legal standard

Section 6 of FIPPA requires public bodies to make "every reasonable effort to assist applicants and to respond without delay to each applicant openly, accurately and completely."

Section 7 of FIPPA requires public bodies to respond within 30 business days of receiving a request. Under certain circumstances, s. 10 allows an extension to that timeline. These circumstances include the need to obtain more detail about the request, if a large volume of records is requested or the public body needs to consult with a third party or another public body. The Commissioner can also extend the time if it is fair and reasonable to do so.

In addition, in certain limited circumstances, requests may be put on-hold. The most common reason for doing so is when a public body has issued a fee estimate and is awaiting a response from the applicant.

The legal standard for responding to requests applies regardless of what type of applicant is requesting records.

3.0   METHODOLOGY

Consistent with the last timeliness report, three benchmarks form the basis for our evaluation of the government's response to requests by media and political parties. The first benchmark is the percentage of requests the government responded to on time. The second is the average processing time. The third is, for those files overdue, the average number of days overdue. The Information Commissioner of Canada also regularly evaluates the performance of federal agencies and issues public reports.[2]

We issued our last timeliness report on August 5, 2011. In that report, I committed to this six-month review regarding requests by media and political parties. For this reason, we applied our three benchmark measures to all access request files government closed during the six-month period from August 6, 2010 to February 5, 2011.

---

[2] The Information Commissioner of Canada's March 2011 report entitled "Open Outlook, Open Access" can be viewed at http://www.oic-ci.gc.ca/eng/rp-pr_spe-rep_rap-spe_rep-car_fic-ren_2009-2010.aspx.

Six-month Check-up: Review of Government's Timeliness in Responding to Media and Political Parties' Requests (August 6, 2010 to February 5, 2011)

5

Government used its Corporate Request Tracking System ("CRTS")[3] to generate all the statistical data we used in this report. This is the same type of data we reviewed in the last report.

In addition to evaluating the statistical information that the government supplied, my staff conducted a follow-up audit consisting of interviews of IAO staff and reviewing government's physical and electronic files.

Scoring performance

The scoring method we used for this report is the same as for the last report. We based the initial score on the percentage of requests the government responded to on time. Next, we considered the average time a ministry took to respond to all access requests for media and political parties. A ministry lost one point for every three business days the average response time exceeded 30 business days. For example, if a ministry averaged 42 business days to respond and the ministry was 12 days late, we deducted four points.

The final deductions related to the average overdue time. This was the extra time the ministry took to respond to access requests, when the response was late. For every 10 business days of overdue time, we deducted another point.

The most important factor from our perspective is the percentage of responses that were on time. For the purposes of this report, in determining whether or not a request was on time, we included the time the request was placed on-hold as permitted under s. 7 of FIPPA. We also included time taken for time extensions as permitted under s. 10 of FIPPA. In other words, a request was not considered overdue until the initial 30 business day time period plus any on-hold time, and/or any time extension period had expired.

File review

My investigation team conducted spot audits on 79 files from 22 ministries to confirm the accuracy of the CRTS data.[4] The files included 42 requests made by political parties and 37 requests made by the media.

We reviewed physical files as well as information on files using a software product called HP TRIM (Total Records and Information Management) that the government has designated as the standard software for document and records management. TRIM is part of the government-wide Enterprise Document and Records Management System.[5] We examined TRIM data where we were unable to find all necessary information by reviewing

---

[3] Publicly-available data from CRTS is available on the Ministry of Labour, Citizens' Services and Open Government's website: http://www.gov.bc.ca/citz/iao/foi/crts_statistics/index.html. CRTS is a database government uses to track the processing of access requests under FIPPA.

[4] The number of ministries is unusually high due to the government's reorganization and elimination of several ministries during the six-month reporting period on which this report is based.

[5] More information about TRIM is available Ministry of Labour, Citizens' Services and Open Government website: http://www.gov.bc.ca/citz/iao/records_mgmt/edrms_trim/.   See also the government's Information Management/Information Technology Standards Manual (v. 2.7 2010-2011) available online at http://www.cio.gov.bc.ca/local/cio/standards/documents/standards/standards_manual.pdf.

Six-month Check-up: Review of Government's Timeliness in Responding to Media and Political Parties' Requests (August 6, 2010 to February 5, 2011)

6

only the physical file. Data on TRIM typically includes correspondence documents such as letters and emails, but it can include other document types. In some instances, we also cross-referenced corresponding files from our office to confirm time extension data was accurate.

The intent of our audit strategy was to:

- confirm that dates ministry staff entered into CRTS were accurate and supported by evidence in the file;

- determine whether ministry staff were authorized under s. 7 of FIPPA to place a file on hold and whether there was evidence in the file to support the decision;

- determine whether ministry staff were authorized under s. 10 of FIPPA to take a time extension and whether there was evidence in the file to support the decision; and

- locate evidence that explained why the government was taking longer than average to respond to requests from media and from political parties.

My investigation team also interviewed the IAO managers and confirmed that they had not implemented any new strategies regarding requests from media and political parties since I had issued my last report.

4.0   RESULTS

Media

The chart below compares government's performance from the 2010 fiscal year (the time frame for our last report) to the six-month period covered by this report and shows that, due to an improvement in each of the three benchmarks, government's score for responding to media applicants improved from 82 to 88:

Year	% on Time	Average Processing Days	Average # Business Days Overdue	Score
2010 fiscal	88%	35	42	**82**
2010/2011 (6 months)	89%	30	9	**88**

Political Parties

The chart below compares government's performance from the 2010 fiscal year to the six-month period covered by this report. It shows that government's score for responding to political party applicants decreased from 83 to 82:

Six-month Check-up: Review of Government's Timeliness in Responding to Media and Political Parties' Requests (August 6, 2010 to February 5, 2011)

7

Year	% on Time	Average Processing Days	Average # Business Days Overdue	Score
2010 fiscal	89%	40	32	**83**
2010/2011 (6 months)	88%	42	26	**82**

Media, political party and all other applicant types

The chart below compares the results of government's responses to media and political parties against other applicant types in order of decreasing score for 2011:

Applicant Type	2010 Score	2010/2011 Score
Business	**93**	**98**
Individual	**88**	**94**
Law Firm	**85**	**93**
Other Public Bodies	**97**	**92**
Researcher	**86**	**90**
Interest Group	**88**	**89**
Media	**82**	**88**
Political Party	**83**	**82**
Other Governments	**98**	**81**
Average of all Applicant Types	**88**	**92**

The results show that response times for media requests are showing improvement and the score of 88 is closer to government's average score of 92. Requests from individuals and law firms make up 75% of the total closed requests and their improvements from fiscal 2010 have a significant influence on the higher average in this report.

While there is still room for improvement, there is now reason for optimism with respect to government's handling of media requests. On the other hand, political party requests have slipped farther behind the average score. See Appendix 1 for a chart with statistics for all three benchmarks for all applicant types.

It is important to note that the applicant type Other Governments only had 16 closed requests (as compared to 315 for media and 395 for political parties) in the past six months. This is not a particular area of concern given that this applicant type's score of 98 in 2010 is based on a much larger sample of 225 closed files.

Six-month Check-up: Review of Government's Timeliness in Responding to Media and Political Parties' Requests (August 6, 2010 to February 5, 2011)

8

Ministry groupings by IAO pods

Over a six-month time frame, most individual ministries do not close enough access requests to assign fair scores to them. However, government has chosen to place ministries in five distinct pods for the purposes of dealing with access requests. As such, I have examined each of these pods to see how they have dealt with media and political party requests during the six-month period from August 6, 2010 to February 5, 2011 as compared to the 2010 fiscal year. For a complete ministry-by-ministry breakdown, see Appendix 2.

IAO pods – media requests

Due to an improvement in each of the three benchmarks, government's score for responding to media applicants improved from 82 to 88 for this report.

From the chart below, we can see what pods were primarily responsible for this improvement:

	Score	
	2010	**2010/ 2011**
Social/Justice: Attorney General; Children & Family Development; Public Safety & Solicitor General; Social Development; Housing & Social Development*	68	83
Resource: Aboriginal Relations & Reconciliation; Agriculture; Agriculture & Lands*; Forest, Mines & Lands; Energy; Natural Resource Operations; Forests; Energy, Mines & Petroleum Resources; Environment	96	91
Health/Education: Education; Sciences & Universities; Advanced Education & Labour Market Development*; Health Services; Healthy Living & Sport*; Regional Economic & Skills Development; Labour	89	90
Business: Transportation; Tourism, Trade & Investment; Tourism, Culture & the Arts*; Community, Sport & Cultural Development; Community & Rural Development*; Finance; Small Business, Technology & Economic Development*	83	82
Central: Citizens' Services; Office of the Premier	82	96
Average	82	88

* Ministry has been amalgamated/renamed and no longer exists.

The two pods that improved their scores (Social/Justice and Central) were also the two pods with the most closed media requests (50% of the total media requests). These improvements more than offset the decrease for Resource Ministries.

IAO pods – political party requests

Government's score for political parties decreased from 83 to 82. This placed political parties even farther behind the government average, which improved from 88 to 92. From the chart below, we will be able to identify what pods contributed to this decline:

Six-month Check-up: Review of Government's Timeliness in Responding to Media and Political Parties' Requests (August 6, 2010 to February 5, 2011)

9

	Score	
	2010	**2010/ 2011**
Social/Justice	63	86
Resource	87	83
Health/Education	89	90
Business	82	73
Central	89	82
Average	83	82

Of note, the three pods that saw their scores drop (Resource, Business and Central) were the three pods with the most closed political party requests (67% of the total closed requests). These declines negated the substantial improvement from Social/Justice.

5.0 ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

Accuracy of data

Our audit showed that, for the most part, file documentation supports start and close dates entered into CRTS. Similarly, our audit showed that government is properly taking on-hold time and time extensions. To establish this, in some instances we needed to cross-reference our own files where we had granted time extensions to ministries, as there was not always sufficient documentation in the government files themselves.

Where we did have concerns was with the entering of stage data into CRTS. Government staff enters data into CRTS to track files through six stages from open to close. The six stages are Intake, Gathering Records, Reviewing, Consulting, Final Sign-Off and Release. However, inconsistencies in some of the data entered into CRTS made it difficult or impossible for my investigation team to determine how accurate the stage data was. In some instances, no stage data is entered for files. In other instances, data is not entered for all stages. In still other instances, close dates are not entered into CRTS for the file. Accurate stage data would allow our office and government to evaluate steps in the access request process that could be contributing to delay.

Causes for improvement for media requests

Given that government has not adopted any specific or unique strategies for processing the requests of media and political parties, the improvement regarding media requests appears to be attributable to the overall improvement in government's processing of requests. The change in score for media requests from 82 in my last report to 88 in this report is consistent with government's overall increase from 88 to 92.

Six-month Check-up: Review of Government's Timeliness in Responding to Media and Political Parties' Requests (August 6, 2010 to February 5, 2011)

10

Causes of delay for political party requests

Our review of the physical processing of files and of the electronic records relating to the processing of these requests failed to reveal any evidence of a difference in the approach to the processing of political party request files as compared to all other applicant types. We found that political party request files go through the same six stages, are processed by the same staff, go through the same sign-off process and have the same timeline expectations as all other requests.

It would have been helpful to have reliable stage data to evaluate if any stage in the processing of political party requests was taking longer than for other requestor types. It may be that certain stages are taking longer for political party requests than for other requestor types, but we were not able to evaluate this given the unreliability of the data.

From looking at CRTS data regarding the three benchmarks, we found that there are two distinct types of requests by political parties that government processes more slowly than others.

(a)   Political party requests for calendars

In interviewing IAO staff, my investigation team repeatedly heard of the challenges in dealing with requests by political parties for the calendars of government officials. Political parties routinely request the calendars of senior executives, such as Ministers and Deputy Ministers. IAO staff noted that these requests often take a long time to process and can involve consultation with numerous other parties. My investigation team's review of files confirmed that calendar requests are also statistically a problem area for government.

To confirm the significance of calendar requests, we requested the statistics for all calendar requests for files closed by government between August 6, 2010 and February 5, 2011. Government closed a total of 179 calendar requests from political parties over these six months. This represents 45% of all closed political party requests. The impact of these files is apparent when we consider that government's score improved for political party requests from 82 to 87 for the 216 non-calendar requests.[6]

From our review of the files, it appears that the long processing times for these files relate to the consultation that takes place with numerous third parties. These third parties can include other ministries and/or individuals.

(b)   Political party requests for information about current events

In reviewing the 42 political party files we had requested, my investigation team also noticed that four files relating to the Harmonized Sales Tax ("HST") had been a significant challenge for government. Each file was overdue (by an average of 99 days) and the

---

[6] Statistics for 179 calendar requests: % on time = 85; Average processing days = 59; Average days overdue = 14; Score = 75. Statistics for 216 non-calendar requests: % on time = 91; Average processing days = 28; Average days overdue = 43; Score = 87.

Six-month Check-up: Review of Government's Timeliness in Responding to Media and Political Parties' Requests (August 6, 2010 to February 5, 2011)

11

average processing time for the files was 159 days. If we look at non-HST and non-calendar files, the overall score for political party requests improved from 82 to 90.[7]

These four HST files were among the most problematic of any files that we reviewed. The current event nature of these records is likely a major factor contributing to the difficulty government had in responding in a timely fashion. While we cannot totally rely on CRTS for accurate stage data for reasons explained earlier in this report, these four files appear to have considerably longer than average data for the reviewing, consulting and sign-off stages. From our review, there was not sufficient evidence in the physical or electronic files to conclusively explain the cause of this delay.

6.0   GOVERNMENT STRATEGIES

In our last report, we stated that ministries must take steps to improve response times for requests from media and political parties. What the numbers show is that government has improved response times to media applicants, but government response times to political parties have slightly declined.

I suggested in my last report that one approach ministries could consider would be to routinely release as much information as possible on a topic following receipt of an access request. We also suggested that an executive member be made responsible for ensuring that requests are processed on time.

Through interviews and reviewing files, we concluded that government has not implemented any strategy unique to media and political parties. Instead, what we heard from government is that applicants are treated the same, regardless of whether they are from the media, a political party or any other group.

The improvement in the government's response to access requests from the media is consistent with the overall rise in timeliness seen across most applicant types. The lack of improvement in government's response to access requests from political parties is largely attributable to the problems I identified above in dealing with requests for calendars and requests for records relating to current events.

7.0   RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on our observations of the factors that contributed to the continued delay government is experiencing when responding to political parties, I recommend:

RECOMMENDATION 1:

ROUTINE PROACTIVE DISCLOSURE OF CALENDARS OF SENIOR EXECUTIVES

The majority of the requests for calendars we reviewed were requests for the calendars of senior executives such as Ministers and Deputy Ministers. Calendar requests made up almost half of all of the requests made by political parties between August 2010 and

---

[7] Statistics for 212 non-calendar and non-HST files: % on time = 93; Average processing days = 26; Average days overdue = 28; Score = 90.

Six-month Check-up: Review of Government's Timeliness in Responding to Media and Political Parties' Requests (August 6, 2010 to February 5, 2011)

12

February 2011. Due to the problems faced by government in responding to these requests in a timely manner, and because government regularly receives calendar requests for the same senior executives, we recommend that government proactively disclose these calendars. A survey of Canadian jurisdictions conducted by government concluded that other jurisdictions do not have significant numbers of requests for calendars. Foreign jurisdictions have embraced open government initiatives regarding calendars. In the United States, detailed calendars for the President[8], the Vice President[9] and some members of the U.S. Department of State, including the Secretary of State[10], are available online up to and including the current day.

Proactive disclosure of government records is something I recommended in our last timeliness report and is something I continue to recommend. Developing an efficient strategy for proactively disclosing calendars of senior executives would have a positive impact on the timeliness of government's response to access requests by political parties. I am aware that government is actively looking at the creation of a policy regarding proactive disclosure of the calendars of senior executives.

I anticipate that in the next few weeks I will be releasing a report regarding proactive disclosure. This report can help inform a future government strategy on this topic.

RECOMMENDATION 2:

DEVELOP A GOVERNMENT-WIDE STRATEGY FOR CALENDAR DATA-ENTRY

As a result of interviews of IAO managers, we learned that one of the reasons government takes longer than average to respond to requests for calendars is because staff enter data into calendars in different ways. For example, some staff attach documents to calendar entries, while others do not.

I recommend that government develop a uniform approach for entering calendar data, including appointments. Uniform entries and practices could improve government's ability to meet its statutory requirements under FIPPA when responding to this type of request. Further, consistent data entry practices will add to the efficiency of a proactive disclosure initiative.

RECOMMENDATION 3:

TIMELY PROACTIVE DISCLOSURE OF RECORDS RELATING TO CURRENT EVENTS

After calendars, access requests for records pertaining to current events appeared to be the government's greatest challenge in terms of meeting its statutory obligations to respond on-time to political parties. I recommend establishing electronic reading rooms and other proactive disclosure tools to reduce or eliminate the scope and volume of access requests that government receives pertaining to current topics within government. This

---

[8] Schedule of the U.S. President: http://www.whitehouse.gov/schedule/.
[9] Schedule of the U.S. Vice President: http://www.whitehouse.gov/schedule/vice-president.
[10] Schedules of members of the U.S. Department of State: http://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/appt/2011/index.htm

Six-month Check-up: Review of Government's Timeliness in Responding to Media and Political Parties' Requests (August 6, 2010 to February 5, 2011)

13

measure would also allow for more timely access to current documents and would increase accountability.

I also recommend that, when severing records with respect to current event requests, ministry staff should look for mandatory exceptions and withhold this information as required by FIPPA. However, discretionary exceptions should be viewed with a presumption in favour of openness. This could significantly lessen the time spent by ministry staff in reviewing, consulting and signing-off these requests.

RECOMMENDATION 4:

IMPROVED DATA-ENTRY INTO CRTS

Government staff use CRTS to track such events as when a file opens and when a file closes. Staff also enter data into CRTS to track files through the six stages from open to close. However, inconsistent practices in some of the data entered into CRTS made it difficult or impossible for my investigation team to determine how accurate the stage data was.

I recommend that government implement practices to ensure that CRTS data, particularly regarding reviewing and consulting times, is entered consistently and accurately. Better data will mean better information about what stage or stages of the process are the most time-consuming for staff.

RECOMMENDATION 5:

IMPROVED RECORD-KEEPING IN PHYSICAL FILES

In some cases, my investigation team was unable to confirm that the CRTS stage data matched the records in the physical file or in TRIM. This made it difficult to audit the data entered into CRTS. It also made it difficult to determine how the reviewing and consulting process worked.

I recommend that government implement policies to ensure that physical files contain all essential records needed to demonstrate how the file has progressed from opening to closing. Specifically, the physical file should contain the access request and closing letter or other clear indication of when and why the file closed. The file should also contain records substantiating the taking of, and reasons for, time extensions and on-hold time. Where a ministry has consulted with other parties, the file should include records reflecting the consultation.

8.0   CONCLUSIONS

This report evaluates whether government has improved its response times for requests made by the media and political parties during the last six months. During this period, government's response to access requests from the media improved markedly. By contrast, government's response to political parties has fallen even farther behind.

Six-month Check-up: Review of Government's Timeliness in Responding to Media and Political Parties' Requests (August 6, 2010 to February 5, 2011)

14

Giving the public a right of access to records is an essential means by which public bodies are made accountable to the public. However, the continued lack of success of government in providing political parties with timely access to information inhibits the public's right to expect that political parties will be able to hold government accountable to the citizens they serve. Timely responses to access requests promote public trust and confidence.

I have made a series of recommendations that I believe will help government to ensure that the response time to requests from political parties improves. I am committed to working with government to ensure the implementation of these recommendations.

I will continue to work with government to monitor responses to access requests and will be providing a further government-wide timeliness report later this year.

Six-month Check-up: Review of Government's Timeliness in Responding to Media and Political Parties' Requests (August 6, 2010 to February 5, 2011)

15

Appendix 1:

CRTS Statistics and Score for All Applicant Types

Applicant Type	Number of Requests Closed		% on Time		Average Processing Days		Average # Business Days Overdue		Score	
	2010	**2010/ 2011**	**2010**	**2010/ 2011**	**2010**	**2010/ 2011**	**2010**	**2010/ 2011**	**2010**	**2010/ 2011**
Media	446	315	88%	89%	35	30	42	9	**82**	**88**
Political Party	647	395	89%	88%	40	42	32	26	**83**	**82**
Business	231	138	94%	99%	19	22	14	6	**93**	**98**
Individual	3614	1799	90%	95%	23	20	22	10	**88**	**94**
Interest Group	317	116	92%	91%	34	27	58	24	**85**	**89**
Law Firm	2011	1258	87%	94%	21	16	21	14	**85**	**93**
Other Governments	225	16	99%	81%	6	26	11	5	**98**	**81**
Other Public Bodies	229	14	98%	93%	8	18	14	12	**97**	**92**
Researcher	30	10	90%	90%	37	22	20	1	**86**	**90**
Total	**7750**	**4061**	**90%**	**93%**	**24**	**22**	**25**	**14**	**88**	**92**

Six-month Check-up: Review of Government's Timeliness in Responding to Media and Political Parties' Requests (August 6, 2010 to February 5, 2011)

16

Appendix 2:

CRTS Statistics and Score for Media and Political Party Requests for All Ministries

* Ministry has been amalgamated/renamed and no longer exists.

Social/Justice		# of Requests Closed		% on Time		Average Processing Days		Average # Days Overdue		Score	
Ministry	**App Type**	**2010**	**2010/ 2011**	**2010**	**2010/ 2011**	**2010**	**2010/ 2011**	**2010**	**2010/ 2011**	**2010**	**2010/ 2011**
Attorney General	Media	23	17	87%	94%	44	28	130	7		
	Political Party	28	17	71%	88%	47	50	23	23		
Children & Family Development	Media	9	7	89%	100%	39	37	66	0		
	Political Party	28	15	82%	87%	41	43	34	7		
Public Safety & Solicitor General	Media	32	47	69%	85%	58	29	65	10		
	Political Party	32	17	59%	88%	49	45	24	12		
Social Development	Media		1		100%		18		0		
	Political Party		2		100%		26		0		
Housing & Social Development*	Media	44	15	75%	67%	31	42	21	12		
	Political Party	34	16	71%	100%	35	37	36	0		
TOTAL	**Media**	**108**	**87**	**77%**	**85%**	**42**	**32**	**53**	**11**	**68**	**83**
	Political Party	**122**	**67**	**70%**	**91%**	**43**	**43**	**28**	**14**	**63**	**86**

Six-month Check-up: Review of Government's Timeliness in Responding to Media and Political Parties' Requests (August 6, 2010 to February 5, 2011)

17

* Ministry has been amalgamated/renamed and no longer exists.

Resource		# of Requests Closed		% on Time		Average Processing Days		Average # Days Overdue		Score	
Ministry	App Type	2010	2010/ 2011	2010	2010/ 2011	2010	2010/ 2011	2010	2010/ 2011	2010	2010/ 2011
Aboriginal Relations & Reconciliation	Media	2	2	100%	100%	12	37	0	0		
	Political Party	16	12	75%	83%	50	46	14	3		
Agriculture	Media		0								
	Political Party		2		100%		21		0		
Agriculture & Lands*	Media	5	2	100%	100%	24	52	0	0		
	Political Party	17	12	94%	92%	47	56	21	1		
Forest, Mines & Lands	Media		3		100%		20		0		
	Political Party		2		50%		21		1		
Energy	Media		1		100%		14		0		
	Political Party		2		100%		20		0		
Natural Resource Operations	Media		1		100%		10		0		
	Political Party		1		100%		13		0		
Forests*	Media	21	9	95%	78%	33	41	19	11		
	Political Party	28	14	100%	93%	31	41	0	22		
Energy, Mines & Petroleum Resources*	Media	13	13	100%	92%	29	26	0	12		
	Political Party	21	16	86%	94%	49	44	46	2		
Environment	Media	21	17	100%	94%	28	24	0	9		
	Political Party	28	15	100%	80%	32	44	0	16		
TOTAL	**Media**	**62**	**48**	**98%**	**92%**	**28**	**29**	**19**	**11**	**96**	**91**
	Political Party	**110**	**76**	**93%**	**88%**	**37**	**43**	**27**	**9**	**87**	**83**

Six-month Check-up: Review of Government's Timeliness in Responding to Media and Political Parties' Requests (August 6, 2010 to February 5, 2011)

18

* Ministry has been amalgamated/renamed and no longer exists.

Health/Education		# of Requests Closed		% on Time		Average Processing Days		Average # Days Overdue		Score	
Ministry	**App Type**	2010	2010/ 2011	2010	2010/ 2011	2010	2010/ 2011	2010	2010/ 2011	2010	2010/ 2011
Education	Media	4	9	75%	100%	30	19	5	0		
	Political Party	24	11	100%	100%	38	44	0	0		
Sciences & Universities	Media		0								
	Political Party		4		100%		19		0		
Ad. Education & Labour Market Development*	Media	9	3	89%	100%	37	21	21	0		
	Political Party	26	9	96%	100%	45	36	124	0		
Health Services	Media	21	24	100%	88%	22	26	0	13		
	Political Party	31	13	90%	69%	35	50	42	5		
Healthy Living & Sport*	Media	51	5	88%	80%	30	36	23	12		
	Political Party	46	10	98%	100%	31	56	4	0		
Regional Economic & Skills Development	Media		1		100%		22		0		
	Political Party		3		100%		18		0		
Labour	Media	2	2	100%	100%	41	34	0	0		
	Political Party	15	14	100%	100%	34	41	0	0		
TOTAL	**Media**	87	44	91%	91%	29	26	21	13	89	90
	Political Party	142	64	96%	94%	36	43	51	5	89	90

Six-month Check-up: Review of Government's Timeliness in Responding to Media and Political Parties' Requests (August 6, 2010 to February 5, 2011)

19

* Ministry has been amalgamated/renamed and no longer exists.

Business		Number of Requests Closed		% on Time		Average Processing Days		Average # Days Overdue		Score	
Ministry	App Type	2010	2010/ 2011	2010	2010/ 2011	2010	2010/ 2011	2010	2010/ 2011	2010	2010/ 2011
Transportation	Media	25	16	88%	69%	34	25	18	8		
	Political Party	27	16	89%	69%	37	45	3	13		
Tourism, Trade& Investment	Media		3		100%		12		0		
	Political Party		5		100%		18		0		
Tourism, Culture & the Arts *	Media	16	3	100%	100%	26	59	0	0		
	Political Party	20	18	100%	78%	28	43	0	25		
Community, Sport & Culture	Media		2		100%		27		0		
	Political Party		2		100%		11		0		
Community & Rural Development *	Media	7	0	100%		32		0			
	Political Party	18	10	94%	80%	32	52	28	20		
Finance	Media	58	37	84%	84%	43	28	44	8		
	Political Party	66	37	85%	76%	50	45	48	33		
Sm. Business, Technology & Economic Development *	Media	8	3	100%	100%	22	50	0	0		
	Political Party	15	11	87%	100%	43	51	11	0		
TOTAL	**Media**	**114**	**64**	**89%**	**83%**	**36**	**29**	**38**	**8**	**83**	**82**
	Political Party	**146**	**99**	**89%**	**80%**	**42**	**44**	**34**	**25**	**82**	**73**

Six-month Check-up: Review of Government's Timeliness in Responding to Media and Political Parties' Requests (August 6, 2010 to February 5, 2011)

20

Central		# of Requests Closed		% on Time		Average Processing Days		Average # Days Overdue		Score	
Ministry	**App Type**	**2010**	**2010/ 2011**	**2010**	**2010/ 2011**	**2010**	**2010/ 2011**	**2010**	**2010/ 2011**	**2010**	**2010/ 2011**
Citizens' Services	Media	44	36	89%	97%	33	28	22	2		
	Political Party	35	40	97%	88%	37	44	2	70		
Office of the Premier	Media	31	36	87%	94%	43	33	54	1		
	Political Party	92	49	98%	96%	44	33	76	82		
TOTAL	**Media**	**75**	**72**	**88%**	**96%**	**37**	**31**	**36**	**1**	**82**	**96**
	Political Party	**127**	**89**	**98%**	**92%**	**42**	**38**	**51**	**73**	**89**	**82**

Six-month Check-up: Review of Government's Timeliness in Responding to Media and Political Parties' Requests (August 6, 2010 to February 5, 2011)

21

Appendix 3:

**CRTS Statistics and Score regarding Averages for
Media and Political Party Requests for All Ministries**

All Ministries	# of Requests Closed		% on Time		Average Processing Days		Average # Days Overdue		Score	
App Type	**2010**	**2010/ 2011**	**2010**	**2010/ 2011**	**2010**	**2010/ 2011**	**2010**	**2010/ 2011**	**2010**	**2010/ 2011**
Media	446	315	88%	89%	35	30	42	9	**82**	**88**
Political Party	647	395	89%	88%	40	42	32	26	**83**	**82**