

Submission to the Enhancing Accountability and Transparency: A Review of Ministerial Diary Disclosure Practices Discussion Paper.

The Hon. Meg Webb MLC

December 2025

Introduction

“The public expects government decisions to be made in the best interests of the community, and that their state and local governments will be open to ideas and advocacy that enhance the quality of those decisions. For all views to be properly considered, access to decision-makers must be equitable and transparent. This will give the public confidence that no improper influence has affected the outcome, and will reduce the potential risk of corruption.”¹

It is with great pleasure I welcome the release of the *Enhancing Accountability and Transparency: A review of Ministerial Diary Disclosure Practices Discussion Paper* of November 2025.

It has taken some time to arrive at this point.

In March 2023 I tabled my first motion on this matter in the Legislative Council which specifically requested public consultation on the development of a mandatory and rigorous ministerial diaries disclosure scheme:

the Tasmanian government undertakes to introduce mandated requirements for the regular and routine disclosure of all Ministerial and Cabinet Secretary official diaries, detailing scheduled meetings, and their purpose, with stakeholders and organisations, including third parties and lobbyists; and when developing this disclosure regime to also;

- a) ensure the process is informed by best practice examples of mandatory disclosure of ministerial diary requirements established in other jurisdictions, including examples of oversight and compliance requirements; and*
- b) develop and publicly consult on a proposed Tasmanian mandatory disclosure of ministerial diaries scheme.*

Despite the Legislative Council voting to pass my 2023 motion, the requested public consultation did not occur. Instead, the Tasmanian government chose in April that year to introduce a quarterly ministerial diaries disclosures regime.

However, in doing so, we now have two examples of government approaches to implementing this transparency and accountability measure, with the 2023 Liberal government approach now able to be compared with the previous 2008 disclosure approach implemented by then Labor-Premier David Bartlett.

Those two relatively recent Tasmanian examples of implementation approaches, combined with developments occurring nationally both across parliaments and also the growing public debate and community expectations on transparency and accountability standards, provides an invaluable and rich source of relevant lived experience to inform this important consultation process.

This submission will provide a section of initial brief contextual comments, followed by a more detailed discussion on key criteria for an effective Ministerial Diaries Disclosure scheme.

¹ Queensland Crime and Corruption Commission, *Influence and Transparency in Qld's Public Sector*, January 2022; pg 4.

Some brief comments will also be provided in response to the Discussion Papers four Questions for Stakeholder Consideration.

Timeline of Recent Public Debate on Ministerial Diaries Disclosure in Tasmania

Tasmania has a fragmented and unsatisfactory history regarding timely and transparent release of ministerial diaries.

2008	the Bartlett Labor government introduced a quarterly disclosure scheme, but the practice ceased in 2014
	These reforms were not mandatory as they were not legislated and could be abandoned by the next change of either Premier, and/or government.
28 March 2023	Legislative Council voted in support of motion tabled by Meg Webb MLC calling for the Tasmanian government to:.
	... undertake to introduce mandated requirements for the regular and routine disclosure of all Ministerial and Cabinet Secretary official diaries, detailing scheduled meetings, and their purpose, with stakeholders and organisations, including third parties and lobbyists; and when developing this disclosure regime to also; (a) ensure the process is informed by best practice examples of mandatory disclosure of ministerial diary requirements established in other jurisdictions, including examples of oversight and compliance requirements; and develop and publicly consult on a proposed Tasmanian mandatory disclosure of ministerial diaries scheme.
April 2023	the Rockliff Liberal government reintroduced a limited quarterly disclosure scheme in response to a motion by Meg Webb MLC calling for consultation on best-practice models, passed with support by the Legislative Council.
	<i>Instead of consulting on a best-practice mandatory disclosure scheme, the Liberal government instituted a voluntary (non-legislated) quarterly release of basic ministerial diary details on a quarterly basis.</i> <i>Periodically these fail to be released in a regular or consistent manner</i>
10 Sept 2024	Legislative Council voted in support of motion tabled by Meg Webb MLC calling for the Tasmanian government to:
	(a) undertake comprehensive and public consultation on a best practice mandatory disclosure of Ministerial diaries model, and that process is to provide for input into the design, disclosure details, timeliness, application, and any other related matter; and (b) report back to the Legislative Council by 28 November 2024 in relation to the above. <i>The Tasmanian government failed to undertake the consultation in line with the 2024 vote of the Legislative Council.</i>
23 Sept 2025	Legislative Council voted in support of motion tabled by Meg Webb MLC calling for the Tasmanian government to:
	(a) undertake comprehensive and public consultation as a priority on a best practice mandatory disclosure of Ministerial diaries model, and that process is to provide for input into the design, disclosure details, timeliness, application, and any other related matter; and (b) report back to the Legislative Council by 5 December 2025 in relation to the above.
10 Nov 2025	Premier Rockliff announces a public consultation process commencing with the release of a Discussion Paper.

1. Intent and Purpose of this Transparency Tool in the Good Governance Toolkit

Civic engagement with governments, via individuals, businesses or organisations raising with elected representatives matters important to them, is an important function of our democracy.

Lobbying is not necessarily or inherently problematic. However, lobbying **can and does** become problematic when there is **actual or perceived** inequity, disproportional imbalance in, and secrecy surrounding, the access and the range of voices from public and private sectors into the decision-making process.

The transparency challenge is to make visible those seeking to influence decisions made by our elected state representatives. The mandatory, regular and consistent disclosure of Ministerial diaries is an important tool within the lobbyist oversight and public transparency toolkit.

Visibility encourages scrutiny to ensure access occurs on as level a playing field as possible, and that some 'voices' are not privileged over others, or the public interest in general. Potential conflicts of interest can be identified, and the public can be reassured vested interests are not exercising undue influence over government decision making.

Former Federal Attorney General, Mark Dreyfus advocated for greater transparency around ministerial diaries. In 2014, he argued that “[Australians] have a right to know what senior government ministers are doing with their time, who they’re meeting with, who they’re being lobbied by”.ⁱ

Primarily the key purpose of this systematic transparency mechanism is to keep the Executive accountable, and to ensure its decision-making process firmly place the public interest before either political party fortunes or to benefit vested interests at the expense of the public interest.

It provides a mechanism by which the public, news media and stakeholders can test whether there is a level playing field when it comes to access to the Executive particularly, where public policy priorities and decisions, potential expenditure of taxpayer funds, could be influenced by lobbyists seeking to secure advantageous outcomes for their interests.

2. Key Criteria

Any reform intended to “strengthen transparency, accountability, and public trust in government decision-making” must establish clear criteria by which outcomes can be assessed and evaluated.

The key criteria for a robust ministerial diaries disclosure scheme is it provides confidence to the community that undue influence, the result of lobbying or cronyism, did not occur during Executive decision-making processes.

In order to achieve this, the following questions require answering:

- **Timeliness:** are disclosures released in a consistent and reliable manner, and with sufficient frequency?
- **Content:** is the content meaningful, and sufficiently detailed the reader can assess not only who Ministers were meeting with, when and where, but for what purpose?
- **Scope:** to whom does the disclosure requirement apply? While it may appear relatively straight-forward as to those required to disclose their diaries, the range of contact Ministers may meet with, and the forums in which contact occurs need to also be rigorous while respecting constituents democratic right to have confidential meetings with the elected representatives and other legitimate considerations (such as matters of state security)
- **Disclosure Format:** is it digital, searchable and cross-referenceable?

- **Compliance and Oversight:** what are the ramifications for non-compliance? Is there in-built independent oversight monitoring and reporting?

3. Key Criteria: Assessing Strengths and Weaknesses of Current and Previous Disclosure Schemes

Applying the above criteria to recent Tasmanian experiences with both the 2008 Bartlett process and the current system in place since April 2023, can be summarised in the following assessment:

Timeliness: Quarterly disclosures are insufficient. Public policy decisions, as well as funding commitments, can be made by governments and then implemented – via legislation through the parliament or signing up to inter-governmental agreements for example – with very little turn around. In some instances, it can be very pertinent while debate on a proposed piece of legislation is underway to know who has been lobbying the government. It can also be just as pertinent to see who the government had not met with in the lead up to making executive decisions. The community being denied the capacity to assess this at the time of the public debate, rather than finding out after a vote has commenced, for example, is not satisfactory and actively undermines confidence in government decision-making processes.

This frustration is exacerbated with delays in the supposed routine disclosure publication.

Recommendation 1: Monthly disclosures to be the minimum disclosure publication schedule, where all meetings for one month are published by the end of the following month, as already happens in Queensland. Clearly, monthly disclosures are possible and deliverable.

Content: the meeting details released under the current system are deficient when compared with interstate jurisdictions, and also when compared with the former Bartlett system in some regards.

The previous Bartlett system detailed the location of meetings, ie Parliament House, or Party room, and meeting duration. Those disclosures were also more forthcoming with the purpose of the meeting, than we have received via the current disclosure system.

Currently the Tasmanian disclosures system provides dates, organisation names, and apparently the purpose of that meeting or visit. However, the content provided in the purpose column is usually meaningless and makes a mockery of the intent of ministerial work diary disclosures.

A recent *Tasmanian Inquirer* report detailed that in the 2024 quarter from July to September the Premier's diary entries cited for a total of 38 times,

"... listed the purpose of a meeting as "general issues", "various issues", or "various matters" ⁱⁱ

In contrast, an April – June 2025 disclosure form released by the Victorian Treasurer provides further detail as to the meeting's Purpose, for example the Purpose of a May meeting between the Treasurer and the Moira Shire Council and five others was for the Purpose of:

"Discussion on the Emergency Services and Volunteers Levy" ⁱⁱⁱ

Further, a later June Meeting between the Victorian Treasurer and 10 attendees was for :

"First meeting of the Alliance of state and federal law enforcement and regulators and other relevant entities to address allegations of criminal or unlawful conduct on Victorian Government construction sites." ^{iv}

The reader must be able to understand the purpose of the meeting.

Recommendation 2: Minimum standards of content of required disclosures should include:

- **Meeting dates and time,**
- **Location (including online and/or in-person)**
- **Attendees, (see below *Scope*)**
- **Organisation/company names, and**
- **the purpose of meetings and topics discussed.**

Scope: This submission recognises it is appropriate to exclude from disclosure personal matters, details of individual constituents who have a right to meet their elected representatives confidentially, or where meetings may reveal information which also requires confidentiality for legal, commercial-in-confidence, or public interest reasons.

However, it is insufficient to only include “external” meetings with solely other entities or individuals without a formal link to the government or the party of government.

Meetings with senior party personnel should be included as should ministerial attendance at party meetings and functions. We know that stakeholders and lobbyists will attend fundraiser functions, and those events and contacts should also be declared.

Although language of this disclosure scheme is ‘short-handed’ to referencing Ministerial diaries, it is worth clarifying that any Cabinet Secretaries, as defined under the *Constitution Act 1934* should also be required to comply with the disclosure scheme, as should Parliamentary Secretaries.

Recognising that Parliamentary Secretaries are technically not part of Cabinet, they are appointed specifically to assist the Portfolio Holder Minister, or Premier of the day in fulfilling government and ministerial portfolio responsibilities. As such, it could be perceived as a convenient ‘loophole’ should meetings with key stakeholders be deferred to Parliamentary Secretaries who then act as a conduit to the decision-making minister.

It should also be clarified that disclosable contact can also be digital, occurring online or via the phone. These modes of contact must also be recognised as disclosable contacts for the purpose of ministerial diary disclosures.

Recommendation 3: Minimum standards of “meeting” should include any contact that may be considered formally or informally to be part of the Minister’s role as portfolio Minister or as a member of Cabinet, and involving any of the following:

- **stakeholders,**
- **external organisations,**
- **lobbyists and anyone working for them,**
- **senior public sector officials (including GBEs and SOCs;**
- **other elected representatives;**
- **ministerial advisers;**
- **Party officials; and**
- **external individuals (excluding private constituent or personal matters).**

Disclosure format: currently ministerial diaries disclosures are released as a scanned PDF document uploaded to the DPAC Routine Disclosure website. As scanned pdfs there is limited, if any searchability, which limits accessibility and cross- referencing capability between and cross disclosure publications of different dates or Ministers.

Recommendation 4: Disclosures should be exportable and searchable for: specific dates, specific issues, and specific stakeholders and participants; Ministers and elected representatives.

Compliance and Oversight: currently there are no independent oversight or compliance mechanisms. See below for further discussion.

4. Stakeholder Questions for Consideration

The Discussion Paper's four Stakeholder Consultation Questions are addressed briefly below.

1. ***What are your views on the overall direction of the proposed changes to ministerial diary disclosure in Tasmania?***

The proposed changes, as presented in Part 4 of the Discussion paper provide a constructive and broad recognition of the significant contribution such transparency measures should play as part of the social contract between those elected and the electors.

Crucially, I note that Point 1. of Section 4 (page 8 of the Discussion paper) clearly states the intent for a revised disclosure scheme to be mandatory.

This is crucial for ongoing consistency, for helping to shape a 'push' rather than 'pull' information culture, and to provide a clear responsibility, oversight and compliance framework. As noted in the Discussion Paper, a goal is to be consistent with, and build upon, the objectives of the state's *Right to Information Act 2009*.

Recommendation 5: the reformed ministerial diaries disclosure regime is codified in legislation, inclusive of independent oversight, reporting and compliance responsibilities.

2. ***How might the proposed reforms improve transparency, accountability, and public trust in government decision-making?***

The discussion above in Parts 2 and 3 addresses in detail how the proposed reforms could involve transparency and accountability improvements.

Fundamentally, the proposed reforms must intend to improve, if not restore, public confidence in the state's integrity and regulatory frameworks, and the integrity of government decision-making processes.

By doing so, the reforms will also provide protection for government representatives and those involved in legitimate advocacy and lobbying by enabling the public to have confidence undue influence has not occurred in decision-making processes.

But to achieve this confidence, the reforms must be clear about the intent to establish the 'gold standard' of ministerial diary disclosures rather than attempt to justify half-measures.

Clear and comprehensive guidelines as to the minimum standards defining what constitutes disclosable contact is essential, as is the publication schedule, and the publication mode, as discussed above.

Further these reforms should be integrated into other elements of our integrity framework such as the Integrity Commission's Lobbyist Code of Conduct and Register.

3. ***Are there any practical considerations, risks, or challenges that should be taken into account when implementing these changes?***

Adequate funding

A clear risk and challenge will be the provision of adequate resourcing, both to establish an appropriate disclosure mechanism which provides for searchable content and data, as well as for those expected to implement, administer, comply and monitor the system.

A key concern in that regard is that the clearly identified goals and criteria of a functional and rigorous disclosure system which delivers on community expectations, will be watered down to the lowest common denominator under the guise of “realistic budgetary constraints.”

Instead, these proposed reforms should be perceived as a crucial investment in strengthening and making more robust our vital democratic oversight architecture.

Recommendation 6: in the interests of driving and embedding the necessary cultural change to ensure a robust mandated ministerial diary disclosure scheme delivers on its intent, that adequate and dedicated funding and resourcing is provided to ensure its successful development and implementation.

Performative window-dressing

As has been a criticism across jurisdictions which have sought to introduce this reform, including both the current and former Bartlett local experiences, the bare minimum of content detail is provided in the disclosures.

This risks the reform being perceived as little more than “performative window-dressing” which does little to provide public confidence or change a “mates-based” decision-making culture.

A challenge will be to change a deeply entrenched culture of secrecy where the default position is to find reasons why things do not require disclosure, and how to work around disclosure requirements.

It will also require balancing the principles of disclosure with ensuring it does not become onerous or impractical.

Clear implementation guidelines will be necessary, to both assist staff and new ministers’ inductions, as well as help guide public expectations.

4. ***What additional measures or improvements could further enhance the effectiveness and accessibility of ministerial diary disclosures?***

Oversight and Compliance measures

Currently, the main accountability mechanism to ensure that the actual accountability measure that is ministerial diary disclosures is occurring routinely and in the prerequisite format, is the Ministerial Code of Conduct.

That is, it is the responsibility of the Premier of the day to prioritise, or not, their Cabinet’s compliance with consistent and routine disclosure requirements.

While journalists and the public can raise questions or frustrations should routine disclosures be delayed for whatever reason, there is little evident repercussion.

In contrast a mandatory disclosure scheme should also include clear and independent oversight and compliance safeguards. Such safeguards should not be solely a checklist that disclosure dates are being met, but that the content of the diary disclosures is accurate and complies with the publication criteria.

The 2022 Coaldrake Report recommended the Queensland's state government's integrity reforms include the Auditor-General undertaking, *"performance audits of the lobbying register, ministerial diaries and public records to ensure recordkeeping obligations are being complied with."*²

Recommendation 7: This submission recommends that:

- a) the new mandatory Tasmanian Ministerial Diaries Disclosure Scheme provides for specified periodic performance auditing and reporting to be undertaken by the Tasmanian Auditor-General to fulfil the independent compliance and oversight component of the new framework;**
- b) that an independent annual report is to be tabled in the Parliament documenting disclosure compliance; and**
- c) failure to comply, and/or complaints regarding compliance concerns can be reported to the Tasmanian Integrity Commission.**

Relationship with a Lobbyist Code of Conduct and Register

While outside the immediate scope of the Discussion paper, it is worth noting there is a natural synergy between a robust mandatory ministerial diaries disclosure scheme and a mandatory Lobbyist Code of Conduct and Register regime.

These two transparency, accountability and good governance mechanisms must be recognised as complimentary and not mutually exclusive. Both are required as part of the state's robust integrity architecture.

Should a mandated ministerial diaries disclosure scheme be established in Tasmania, that welcome reform should not be perceived as obviating the need for an equally robust and mandated Lobbyist Code of Conduct and Register.

While noting Tasmania also currently has a Lobbyist Code of Conduct and Register administered by the Integrity Commission, recent reform moves have stalled. Other jurisdictions, such as Queensland, have both mandated oversight systems in place, and Tasmania needs to continue working towards securing the same.

Recommendation 8: It should be explicitly acknowledged that a robust mandated Ministerial Diaries Disclosures system is complimentary to, and does not replace the need for, a separate mandated and robust Lobbyist Code of Conduct and Register, with independent oversight.

² Coaldrake, *Let the Sunshine in: Review of culture and accountability in the Queensland public sector*, Final Report, June 202; pg 93.

5. Whether to extend disclosure requirements to Opposition Leader and Shadow Cabinet

The Discussion Paper proposes the reformed diary disclosure scheme is extended to include the Opposition Leader and Shadow members.

Recognising that Queensland's system includes both Government Ministers and the Opposition, there are pros and cons to expanding it beyond the government.

As sworn in Ministers of the Crown clearly have more responsibility and warrant closer scrutiny on how they are exercising the State tools and resources available to them under the auspices of that responsibility.

On one hand it can be considered good 'transparency training' for a 'government-in-waiting' to assist in providing a seamless transition in accountability standards should a current opposition become government.

Further, Opposition parties and MPs are also lobbied by stakeholders and registered lobbyists, and we saw the recent proposed but stalled Integrity Commission Lobbyist reforms did intend to include all elected representatives, not just the government. We have also seen Oppositions make sudden and inexplicable policy U-turns, which can then impact the outcome of 'live' public debates and the nature of legislative reforms passing the parliament – particularly pertinent during minority government situations. There is the very real possibility that although Opposition parties are not acting on behalf of the Crown, their actions can enable the action of governments to prioritise vested interests over that of the public interest.

However, as stated above, under the Westminster system, the fundamental role of Parliament is to hold the Executive of the day to account – that is the government, and its immediate Cabinet members as well as additional Parliamentary Secretaries.

There is also the real issue of inequity in resources. By default governments have more resources including office and administrative political staff, and can also call on departmental administrative support where appropriate.

Further, Opposition parties tend to share all their Shadow portfolios amongst their entire elected group, particularly in a small parliament such as Tasmania. There is rarely an opposition member without a Shadow portfolio responsibility. In that regard one party will have all its MPs taking on the responsibility to comply with the disclosure regime, whereas if the government of the day has a backbench, not all government members will be required to disclose.

It also raises questions regarding smaller parties represented in the Parliament, such as the five Tasmanian Greens MPs in the Assembly who also have a sixth elected member in the Upper House, all of whom hold Shadow portfolios. Would such a Party grouping in the parliament be expected to comply with diary disclosure requirements despite having even less resourcing than the government and the Opposition?

Opposition parties with Members in the Legislative Council also allocate shadow portfolios to them to share the load – as does government with Upper House Ministers. However, it again raises a matter of equity with other non-government MLCs who are not required to comply with diary disclosure requirements.

The proposed expansion for the disclosure system to include non-government MPs does raise the concern that particularly in the absence of equity in administrative and implementation resourcing, a proposal which looks superficially 'equitable' on the surface will in fact have the effect of detracting from the core focus of this particular transparency tool in the good governance and integrity toolkit – ***that being scrutiny of the Executive, as per Parliament's responsibility to hold to account the Executive and its use of its powers and state sanctioned tools.***

Ultimately it is government of the day, who is in charge of Treasury, and is usually in a position to enact changes which impact on the state. Disclosure of Ministerial Diaries is one mechanism by which non-government parliamentarians and the public can undertake that fundamental Westminster tenet of keeping the government and Executive accountable.

We cannot afford to allow ourselves to lose focus and be distracted from that core role and task. For it to be considered robust and ‘fit-for-purpose’ we first need to be very clear what its purpose is: and that is holding the Executive to account in an accountable and transparent manner, and by doing so, also restoring the public confidence in our systems of governance.

Recommendation 9: the development of a mandatory, robust, fit-for-purpose and effective ‘gold-plated’ ministerial diaries disclosure system should be prioritised for development and implementation, in keeping with the Westminster principles that it is Parliament’s role and responsibility to hold the Executive to account; and

Once the reformed mandatory diary disclosure system is in place, potentially it could then be publicly consulted and considered for expansion to include particular non-government elected representatives.

6. Conclusion & Recommendations

The Discussion Paper is a very good first step and welcome confirmation of the important role a genuine and robust ministerial diaries disclosure scheme plays as a key component within our integrity framework in restoring and maintaining public confidence in our systems of good governance.

It should serve as a regular democracy health -check.

However, in order to achieve this, it is vital the reforms get the details right. Public confidence will be undermined if there is any perception that corners have been cut, and that this is just an exercise in window-dressing for the government of the day to claim to be transparent, while business as usual with corporate mates and vested interests continue unabated.

Therefore, fundamental structural components such as timeliness, clearly defined minimal standards of disclosable content scope, and ministerial disclosures being provided in a digital and searchable format are crucial.

To reiterate, all elected representatives in public office, and senior staff with delegated roles and responsibility, are expected to maintain a high ethical standard of conduct. While it is understandable to some degree for these proposed reforms to be extended to other non-government parliamentarians, the key focus should be on how the parliament delivers on its core function of keeping the Executive to account.

Hence, it is this submission’s contention that the top priority for this reform is its application to Ministers, Cabinet Secretaries and Parliamentary Secretaries as the key ‘organs’ of Executive government under the Westminster system.

It is hoped that the government’s current focus on reforming and strengthening our ministerial diaries disclosure system will continue. To maintain that community engagement and momentum, it would be a useful next step for there to be released an indicative timeline of potential future stages in the reform project, including for example the release of a draft disclosure scheme, and a timeframe for implementation.

This will then reassure that intent continues beyond just a Discussion Paper.

Consolidated List of Recommendations:

(Note: the order of Recommendations below reflects the sequence in which they appear in the above discussion only, and do not reflect prioritisation of importance in any way.)

Recommendation 1: Monthly disclosures to be the minimum disclosure publication schedule, where all meetings for one month are published by the end of the following month, as already happens in Queensland.

Recommendation 2: Minimum standards of content of required disclosures should include:

- Meeting dates and time,
- Location (including online and/or in-person)
- Attendees, (see below *Scope*)
- Organisation/company names, and
- the purpose of meetings and topics discussed.

Recommendation 3: Minimum standards of “meeting” should include any contact that may be considered formally or informally to be part of the Minister’s role as portfolio Minister or as a member of Cabinet, and involving any of the following:

- stakeholders,
- external organisations,
- lobbyists and anyone working for them,
- senior public sector officials (including GBEs and SOC’s);
- other elected representatives;
- ministerial advisers;
- Party officials; and
- external individuals (excluding private constituent or personal matters).

Recommendation 4: Disclosures should be exportable and searchable for: specific dates, specific issues, and specific stakeholders and participants; Ministers and elected representatives.

Recommendation 5: the reformed ministerial diaries disclosure regime is codified in legislation, inclusive of independent oversight, reporting and compliance responsibilities.

Recommendation 6: in the interests of driving and embedding the necessary cultural change to ensure a robust mandated ministerial diary disclosure scheme delivers on its intent, that adequate and dedicated funding and resourcing is provided to ensure its successful development and implementation.

Recommendation 7: This submission recommends that:

- a) the new mandatory Tasmanian Ministerial Diaries Disclosure Scheme provides for specified periodic performance auditing and reporting to be undertaken by the Tasmanian Auditor-General to fulfil the independent compliance and oversight component of the new framework;
- b) that an independent annual report is to be tabled in the Parliament documenting disclosure compliance; and
- c) failure to comply, and/or complaints regarding compliance concerns can be reported to the Tasmanian Integrity Commission.

Recommendation 8: It should be explicitly acknowledged that a robust mandated Ministerial Diaries Disclosures system is complimentary to, and does not replace the need for, a separate mandated and robust Lobbyist Code of Conduct and Register, with independent oversight.

Recommendation 9: the development of a mandatory, robust, fit-for-purpose and effective ‘gold-plated’ ministerial diaries disclosure system should be prioritised for development and implementation, in keeping with the Westminster principles that it is Parliament’s role and responsibility to hold the Executive to account; and

Once the reformed mandatory diary disclosure system is in place, potentially it could then be publicly consulted and considered for expansion to include particular non-government elected representatives.