**New Zealand Sweep Results Report**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Authority Focus if applicable (e.g. mobile apps or financial sector)  | Websites |
| Date of Sweep | 7 May 2013 |
| Country | New Zealand |
| PEA (name of authority) | Office of the Privacy Commissioner |
| **Results** |
| Total number of websites or apps searched  | 393 |
| Number of sites/apps for which you found no privacy policy or equivalent | 125 |
| Number of sites/apps for which you identified a concern with respect to find-ability | 74 |
| Number of sites/apps for which you identified a concern with respect to contact-ability | 47 |
| Number of sites/apps for which you identified a concern with respect to in readability | 48 |
| Number of sites/apps for which you identified a concern with respect to the relevance of information provided | 82 |
| Overall percentage of sites/apps for which you identified one or more concerns | 31.8% |
| Number of sites/apps for which you are considering follow-up action | Not specific number – focused on sectors: Schools; legal; clubs; retail  |
| Number of follow-up actions taken to date | 1 |
| **Additional Data (optional)** |
| *If you collected information on reading level of privacy policies in your sweep:* What was the average reading level you found? What was the highest? | **Average: n/a****Highest:** |
| *If you collected information on word count of privacy policies in your sweep:* What was the average word count? What was the highest and lowest? | **Average:****Highest: n/a****Lowest:** |
| **Comments** |
| Best practices: did you find any examples of best practice you would like to share? | * Some layered notices – a brief and highly accessible explanation, with more detailed information available via hyperlink
* Use of anchor points or index for ease of navigation (another form of layering)
* Including information on specific uses of personal information, where certain types of information are handled differently from the norm (e.g. credit cards)
* A couple of sites had a link to the OPC website for further information about people’s rights and agency’s obligations
* Warnings to check privacy policies of linked sites – that agency not responsible for what those sites do with information.
 |
| Trends: are there particular trends or issues that you noticed in conducting the sweep? | * Many statements only related to personal information on the website – they weren’t privacy statements for the agency as a whole
* Many were clearly written and accessible, but said nothing about what actually happens with personal information – more lip service than reality
* Strong focus on legal protection for the agency, not about providing information for the consumer about their rights – hence frequently located under “terms and conditions” or “disclaimer” not identified as a privacy policy
* Common to find that by being on website, person ostensibly is ‘consenting’ to all uses as set out in policy
* Vague terminology common – e.g. “we use information for lawful purposes”; or “we use information in compliance with the Privacy Act”
* References to foreign law were surprisingly common (e.g. COPPA, or California Online Privacy Act) – not always with agencies that operate within those jurisdictions – suspect that considerable cut-and-pasting goes on, with little application to reality of how agency actually operates
 |
| Please provide any suggestions on ways to enhance the sweep | The topic worked well – common to all laws and relatively easy to look for and assess. Also was flexible enough to cater for individual offices’ interests and resource levels. Results of this sweep might indicate what we should look at next time – possibilities include particular sectors of interest to wide variety of regulators; particular topics in more depth (e.g. purpose specification, or uses of personal information; test how statements on websites match against reality of action or at least against policies in agencies – could use a standard-form “please explain” letter to get information …)  |