



19 February 2025

Gus M
fyi-request-29948-b323dd6d@requests.fyi.org.nz

Ref: PMO OIA 269-2024-25

Dear Gus,

Official Information Act request: All information regarding Tim Jago

Thank you for your Official Information Act 1982 (the Act) request, received on 31 January 2025. You requested:

“It is an absolute disgrace that the party involved with Tim Jago has both the Minister for Children and the Minister for Prevention of Family and Sexual Violence.

This is a massive conflict of interest by association of policies and ideals. Yet you went into agreement with this as Prime Minister.

Under the Official Information Act 1982, please provide all information you and your office holds that mentions or alludes to Tim Jago.”

The matters raised in the first part of your request would not be considered subject to the Act as these relate to the ACT Party. Any involvement of Rt Hon Christopher Luxon would be considered in his capacity as Leader of the National Party and is therefore also not subject to the Act.

The information held by the Prime Minister’s Office (the Office) that mentions or alludes to Tim Jago consists of correspondence from members of the public and news articles that have been shared amongst Office staff.

It is not in the public interest to collate this information for release as it would require substantial manual research and collation, particularly to identify correspondence that ‘alludes’ to the topic of your request. I am therefore refusing your request under section 18(f) of the Act, as it would require substantial collation to make the requested information available.

Please note, this does not necessarily indicate that this Office holds a large volume of information that mentions or alludes to Tim Jago; rather, that to identify this information, staff would need to manually assess hundreds, or potentially thousands, of pieces of correspondence from members of the public. This also applies to the news articles shared within the Office, where many news articles on a variety of topics are shared daily, often without commentary. To fulfil this part of your request, staff would need to manually assess all their electronic messages to identify the relevant articles, all of which are already publicly available via the media.

I considered whether there was any merit in seeking a refinement of your request. However, I do not feel that any refinement would make a significant difference as the same search functions, which amount to substantial collation, would still be required. Therefore, a refined request on the same topic is still likely to result in a refusal under section 18(f) of the Act.

You have the right to ask the Ombudsman to investigate and review my decision under section 28(3) of the Act.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Cameron Burrows', written in a cursive style.

Cameron Burrows
Chief of Staff