

Submission form

Contact details

Name (Individual and/or organisation): David A. Jack	
Contact name (for organisation): Genealogy & Research Services	
Email address:	
Phone (day) (0)	Phone (mobile) (02)

Summary of proposals

1. The Department's proposals reflect two complementary drivers. First, users' expectations about how they access BDM information have changed since the access provisions were introduced in 2009. Second, enabling citizens to interact easily with government in a digital environment is a key Government Better Public Services target.
2. In the short to medium term, subject to existing legislative, systems, and technological constraints, the Department will investigate options for enhancing existing online services (eg, improved search functionality). Ultimately, the Department would like to facilitate access to BDM information via an all-of-BDM Internet-based search, pay-for-view, and records access and ordering facility, without compromising individual privacy and security interests.
3. Alongside the specific amendments to the access provisions detailed below, the Department wants to remove remaining legislative barriers to digital and online services (eg, by making language and delivery channels medium-neutral). This will support future enhancements for all BDM services, not just access to BDM information.

The Department proposes to—

General access rules

- Add historical and non-historical BDM indexes, but not full non-historical records, to the BDM information that can be searched online (some information may be behind a paywall);
- Authorise unedited historical register images to be made available online (behind a paywall);
- Provide online access to BDM information (beyond an initial high level search) would be subject to evidence of identity established via a RealMe ID, or through another future solution that would enable a verified identity to be asserted online; and
- Allow a user with a verified identity to order a certificate or printout for a non-historical record online.

Do you support the proposals?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Please use this space for any additional comments: <p>While I support the added layer of security, I find it way over the top, access via an application issuing a username and password like many other sites should be sufficient.</p> <p>Please can I draw your attention to the most successful genealogical site online, that of scotlandspeople. If your organisation mirrored this concept that would benefit us all in many ways. Give us a decent search functions, an onclick availability of getting the file images, free will and testament search index and any other relative new zealand genealogical sources, via pay to view.</p>		

Historical and non-historical information

- Reduce the time limit that defines historical marriage and civil union information from 80 years to 75 years; and
- Align rules for access to birth information (including information that could be made available through digital and online channels in future) based on when a death record becomes available.

Do you support the proposals?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Please use this space for any additional comments: <p>.</p>		

Source documents

- Classify Intention to Marry books as marriage registers, and authorise access in the same way, and subject to the same rules, as apply to solemnised marriage records.

Do you support the proposal?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Please use this space for any additional comments:		

Remaining access provisions

Access register; non-disclosure directions; research purposes; disclosure of death information

The Department has no specific proposals. We consider the current rules are appropriate and are working well; the individual privacy and security protections they provide will be integral in the context of the proposed new digital and online access channels.

Do you—	Agree? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree? <input type="checkbox"/>
Please use this space for any additional comments: <p>while I have ticked agree, I still find the layer of protection over the top. What or who are you protecting?</p>		

If you want to comment on any other matter related to the access provisions ...

... please use this space for your submission: