

Appendix A

I write to request information under the Official Information Act 1982 (OIA) relating to the above-named guidance document published by the Ministry for Regulation (the Ministry) in May 2026.

A. LensenMcGavin AI Peer Review

The guidance states that “The Ministry for Regulation acknowledges the contribution of LensenMcGavin AI, whose independent peer review of this guidance helped strengthen its technical grounding, clarity, and practical applicability.”

I request the following information relating to that peer review:

1. Scope and terms of reference. All documents, including any contract, letter of engagement, terms of reference, or brief, that set out the scope, purpose, and parameters of LensenMcGavin AI’s peer review.
2. The peer review report or output. The peer review report, feedback document, commentary, or any other written output provided by LensenMcGavin AI to the Ministry, including any draft versions if the final version differs materially from earlier drafts.
3. Consideration of Māori peer review. Any internal records, advice, correspondence, or meeting notes in which the Ministry considered whether to commission a separate peer review of the Te Tiriti and Māori data governance sections of the guidance by a reviewer with Māori expertise, and the reasons for any decision not to do so.

B. Māori Consultation

The guidance’s acknowledgements section does not name any Māori organisation, iwi, hapū, rūpū, Māori data governance body, or individual Māori expert as a contributor. Section 3.2 of the guidance states that regulators should “identify and engage with the Māori individuals, groups, or organisations who are affected by, or have mana in relation to, the regulatory activity.”

I request the following information about Māori engagement undertaken by the Ministry in developing this guidance:

4. Māori engagement records. All records including hui notes, correspondence, consultation summaries, feedback received, and records of meetings or discussions of any engagement with Māori organisations, iwi, hapū, rūpū, Māori advisory groups, Māori data governance experts, or individual Māori practitioners in the development of this guidance.

5. Decisions about Māori engagement. Any internal advice, briefings, or decision records relating to the nature, scope, or extent of Māori engagement in the development of the guidance, including any assessment of what level of engagement was required to meet the Ministry's obligations under Te Tiriti o Waitangi.
6. Māori AI ethics frameworks. Any records indicating whether the Ministry considered referencing Māori-specific AI ethics frameworks — including those developed by New Zealand-based Māori practitioners — in the guidance, and any reasons for not doing so.
7. Checklist development. Any records relating to the development of the AI checklist at the end of the guidance, specifically the decision to include a single question about Māori impacts ("Have impacts on Māori, data sovereignty, or cultural values been considered and addressed?") rather than more detailed Te Tiriti-specific questions.