Study of the Responsiveness of Public Authorities to Email Applications under the Right to Information Act No. 12 of 2016
Study of the Responsiveness of Public Authorities to Email Applications under the Right to Information Act No. 12 of 2016

Centre for Policy Alternatives
December 2020
Study of the Responsiveness of Public Authorities to Email Applications under the Right to Information Act 12 of 2016

First Edition: December 2020
Designed by: Wakya Ru
Published by: Centre for Policy Alternatives

This publication is launched in partnership with the Naumann-Stiftung für die Freiheit (FNF). FNF’s work is centered on the substantive assessment of Freedom and Accountability. FNF, with its project initiatives, contributes to ensuring a world in which people can live with peace and human dignity. The contents of this publication are the responsibility of the Centre for Policy Alternatives.

The Centre for Policy Alternatives (CPA) is an independent, non-partisan organisation that focuses primarily on issues of governance and conflict resolution. Formed in 1996 in the firm belief that the vital contribution of civil society to the public policy debate is in need of strengthening, CPA is committed to programmes of research and advocacy through which public policy is critiqued, alternatives identified and disseminated.

No. 6/5, Layards Road, Colombo 5, Sri Lanka
Tel: +9411 2081384, +94112081385, +94112081386
Fax: +9411 2081388 email: info@cpalanka.org
Web: www.cpalanka.org
Email: info@cpalanka.org
Facebook: www.facebook.com/cpasl
Twitter: @cpasl
Contents

Executive Summary 5
Introduction 7
Objectives of the study 9
Methodology 9
Limitations of the study 9
Sample of the study 10
Key findings of the study 12
Status of Divisional Secretariats 14
Status of Provincial Councils 17
Status of Police Stations 19
Status of Hospitals 22
Status of Agrarian Development Offices 24
Status of Provincial Departments of Education 26
Status of Offices of the Sri Lanka Electricity Board 27
Status of Zonal Offices of the Water Supply and Drainage Board 29
Findings of the study 31
Recommendations and Observations 34
References 36
Annexure 01 37
Annexure 02 38
Executive Summary

The Right to Information Act No. 12 of 2016 affirms the fundamental right of citizens to access information guaranteed by the Constitution of Sri Lanka.

The Act contains provisions for requesting information from public authorities using modern technology, apart from the traditional procedures for requesting information. Accordingly, citizens can also request information electronically (i.e. by email) which can be considered as the use of modern technology to enforce the right to information.

As highlighted in this study, this section presents some basic identities of specific trends in the situation in various public authorities in requesting information from public authorities using the latest technology in relation to the right to information.

- Of the emails sent, 91 percent or 633 emails successfully reached the selected public authorities. All future analysis of this study will be based on the 633 emails that successfully reached said institutions with which this study collaborated.

- Out of 633 successfully sent emails, 165 were responded to by the relevant public authorities, which is 26 percent. Also, 468 information requests did not receive any response, which is 74 percent.

- Out of 165 emails which successfully reached recipients, the number of institutions that provided the requested information was 100, or 61 percent. Also, out of the successful emails reached, the number of public authorities that did not provide the expected information was recorded as 65 which was 39 percent as a percentage. This is a positive development and demonstrates the potential and willingness of public authorities to provide information electronically.

- Out of the emails sent to 337 Divisional Secretariats, 307 or 91 percent of emails successfully reached those institutions. Of the 307 institutions, 118 responded although only 81 Divisional Secretariats provided the requested information which is 69 percent.
• Three responses were received for 3 out of 8 emails that successfully reached the Provincial Council offices and no response was received for 5 such requests for information.

• Of the 229 emails sent to police stations, 226 were successfully reached, but only 31 responded, which is a percentage of 14 percent. Furthermore, 195 failed to respond at all, which is 86 percent.

• Out of emails sent to 31 hospitals requesting information, 27 were successful in reaching the respective institutions but only 3 hospitals responded while 24 hospitals failed to respond.

• Information requests were submitted to 7 Provincial Departments of Education and their official email addresses were in operation, but no response was received to any of those requests.

• Out of 40 emails sent to 40 Sri Lanka Electricity Board offices, only 24 were successfully reached. Of these, only one institution responded and the vast majority, 23 institutions, failed to respond at all.
Introduction

The Right to Information Act No. 12 of 2016 empowers citizens to exercise their fundamental right to access information guaranteed by the Constitution. Furthermore, the primary purpose of enacting the Right to Information Act is to foster a culture of transparency and accountability in public authorities, thereby promoting a society in which citizens can participate more in good governance and proactively participate in the public life of the country. Accordingly, citizens can request information from the public authorities specified under the Act and such information is required to be in the possession, custody or control of the relevant public authority. The provisions of the Right to Information Act stipulate that when citizens request information in writing and orally, it is not mandatory to fill up and submit Form RTI 01[1]. Apart from the traditional procedures for requesting information, the Right to Information Act also contains provisions for requesting information from public authorities using modern technology. Accordingly, citizens can also request information electronically which can be considered the use of modern technology to enforce the right to information.

Section 24 (6) of the Act stipulates that "in writing" includes writing done through electronic means. Also, as per Order 4 (1) of Gazette Notification No. 2004/66 dated 03.02.2017, “the Information Officer of every Public Authority should fill up an application and obtain or request information in accordance with the RTI Form 01 from the applicants requesting access to information or obtain a letter or email with identifiable details. The Information Officer should provide all the assistance required to make a request free of charge to the applicant. The Information Officer should provide reasonable assistance to a citizen requesting any form of information to fill out Form RTI 01”. Further, the order 4 (2) also states that the application prepared in accordance with RTI Form 01 should be issued free of charge to those requesting information. It should also be facilitated to obtain it electronically. “ Order 4 (4) also states that "in the case of an electronic request, a printed copy of the said electronic communication shall be obtained and attached to the application form and the Information Officer shall fill it out." Accordingly, within the RTI regime, citizens have been allowed to request information from public authorities using electronic means.

[1] Template of RTI Form 01 in Sinhala/Tamil and English languages attached in Annexure 02
Objectives of the study

The Centre for Policy Alternatives (CPA) recently conducted a series of seminars on the Right to Information island-wide, which revealed that citizens are not aware of the provisions related to the right to receive information from public authorities through electronic means, despite the fact this has been provided for in the Right to Information Act. It was also revealed that when requests for information to public authorities are made through emails, there is often no response. Based on such findings, the main objective of this study includes; assessing the responsiveness of public authorities to requests for information made via emails; and emphasizing the importance of the use of electronic media in making and requesting information in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic situation and its importance in relation to proactive disclosure.

Methodology

As part of this study, a total of 695 requests for information were sent by email using the Sinhala and Tamil languages, addressing the holders of the post of 'Information Officer' to the official email addresses of 695 public authorities. These 695 sample public authorities include Divisional Secretariats, Provincial Councils, Police Stations, Hospitals, Agrarian Development Offices, Provincial Departments of Education, Offices of the Sri Lanka Electricity Board and Regional Offices of the Water Supply and Drainage Board. The primary purpose of approaching these public authorities was to ensure that the public authorities were directly involved in the day-to-day life of the citizens and that the citizens interact closely with them.

Limitations of the study

This study was used only to assess the responsiveness of the Information Officers in public authorities because the Information Officer is the first officer in the process.
Also, the study was not extended to appeal to the designated officer, who is the appeals officer, after the 14-day period. Accordingly, attention was paid only to the responsiveness of the first officer, who is important to the right to information, by examining the responsiveness of the information officers of the public authorities to information requests made electronically.

**Sample of the study**

According to the study methodology used for this research, information requests were sent via email to the following public authorities from the beginning of November 2020 (Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of Public Authorities</th>
<th>No. of Emails Successfully Reached</th>
<th>Number of responses (with or without expected information)</th>
<th>Number of Emails without Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Divisional Secretariats</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Provincial Councils</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Police Stations</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Hospitals</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Agrarian Development Offices</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Provincial Education Departments</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Sri Lanka Electricity Board Offices</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Zonal Offices of the Water Supply and Drainage Board</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>633</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1:

As per the methodology, 695 information requests were sent via email to official email addresses of relevant public authorities, of which 633 emails were successfully received and 62 emails bounced. The targeted number of email addresses could not be reached successfully.
The overall sample used in this study and the status regarding the responsiveness to emails sent electronically to the respective public authorities in the selected sample is presented below (Figure 2)

**Responsiveness of Public Authorities for successfully received Emails**

**Total No. of Emails = 633**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Authority</th>
<th>No. of Emails Successfully Reached</th>
<th>Number of responses (with or without expected information)</th>
<th>Number of Emails without responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Divisional Secretariats</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Councils</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Stations</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agrarian Development Offices</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Education Departments</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka Electricity Board Offices</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zonal Offices of the Water Supply and Drainage Board</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key findings of the study

Of the 633 emails successfully received by respective public authorities, 165 were responded to by the relevant institutions, which is 26 percent. 468 public authorities failed to respond, which is 74 percent (Figure 3). This represents strong negativity on the part of public authorities regarding responses to requests for information, a situation that could lead to discouraging citizens from exercising their right to information by email.

Out of the 165 emails that were successfully received and responded to by respective public authorities, the number of responses with requested information was 100 or 61 percent. The number of such authorities that responded but did not provide the requested information was 65 or 39 percent (Figure 4).

Accordingly, the percentage of respondent institutions that provided the requested information is higher and the percentage of public authorities that responded but did not provide information is lower. This indicates a certain level of positivity in terms of providing information. This represents the potential and willingness of public authorities to provide information electronically.
Provision of requested information
Total No. of responded Emails = 165

Figure 4
Status of Divisional Secretariats

The following information was requested in the Sinhala or Tamil languages from 337 Divisional Secretariats in this study.

The question sent requesting relevant information

“Provide information about the number of Samurdhi beneficiaries, Grama Niladhari Division-wise in your Divisional Secretariat division during the period from 01.01.2020 to 01.10.2020”

Of the total 337 emails sent, 307 were successfully delivered to the Divisional Secretariats, which is 91 percent of the total, while emails sent were not successfully received by the targeted email addresses of 30 Divisional Secretariats. (Figure 5).

Successful delivery of Emails to Divisional Secretariats
Total No. of Divisional Secretariats = 337

Accordingly, the study found that the official email addresses of the Divisional Secretariats were mostly functional.
Accordingly, 118 out of 307 successfully received emails were responded to, which is 38 percent. However, the overwhelming majority of 189 Divisional Secretariats failed to respond at all, which is 62 percent (Figure 6).

This represents a somewhat negative situation in the Divisional Secretariats regarding the response to requests for information, a situation that discourages citizens from exercising their right to information obtained via email.

Out of the successful emails received, the Divisional Secretariats provided the expected information for 81 such information requests, which is 69 percent. Of the emails that were successfully received, 37 institutions did not provide any response, which is 31 percent (Figure 7).

It is to be noted here that nine Divisional Secretariats responded with instructions to forward the request for information under the prescribed format of RTI Form 01. This shows how some of the public authorities make the RTI Form 01 mandatory and discourage citizens when it comes to electronic requests made by people, while other Divisional Secretariats provided requested information based on a simple email request.
Provision of requested information
Total No. of Divisional Secretariats = 118

Figure 7
Status of Provincial Councils

In this study of the situation where citizens have been given the opportunity to request information from the public authorities using electronic means on the right to information, requests were made to 9 Provincial Council Offices in the Sinhala language for the following information.

**The question sent requesting relevant information**

“Provide information about the amount of funds spent for road development projects within your Provincial Council area during the period from 01.01.2020 to 01.10.2020”

Out of the 9 emails sent in this manner, 8 successfully reached those Provincial Council offices though one email was not received successfully (Figure 8).

Accordingly, it was clear from the data of this study that the official email addresses of the Provincial Council Offices are in operation.

**Successful delivery of Emails to Provincial Council Offices**

Total No. of Provincial Council Offices = 09

![Figure 8](image-url)
Accordingly, 3 out of 8 emails that successfully reached the Provincial Council offices were responded to and no response was received regarding 5 requests for information (Figure 9).

Responsiveness to Emails received by Provincial Council Offices
Total No. of Provincial Council Offices = 08

This represents some of the negativity in the provincial offices regarding the response to requests for information, a situation that discourages citizens to exercise their right to information electronically.

Out of the successful emails received, no provincial office provided the requested information which represents an extremely negative situation.
Status of Police Stations

In this study on the situation where citizens have been allowed to request information from the public authorities using electronic means regarding the right to information, information requests were electronically sent to 229 police stations in the Sinhala or Tamil languages requesting the following information.

The question sent requesting relevant information

“Provide information about the number of raids related to drugs within your police division during the period from 01.01.2020 to 01.10.2020”

Of the 229 emails sent, 226 reached the police stations successfully, which is 99 percent of the total while only 3 emails did not (Figure 10).

Thus, the official email addresses of a very high percentage of police stations were found to be accurate and functional.
However, only 31 out of 226 successful emails were responded to, which is only 14 percent. Therefore, the majority of 195 police stations failed to respond at all to the respective information requests, which is 86 percent (Figure 11).

Responsiveness to Emails received by Police Stations
Total No. of Police Stations = 226

![Figure 11](image)

This represents a negative situation in police stations regarding responses to requests for information, which can discourage citizens from exercising their right to information electronically.

Of the emails that were responded to by police stations, information requested was received only from 8 police stations (26 percent) while 23 did not provide requested information despite responding to the email (74 percent as a percentage) (Figure 12).

Some of the observations included questioning as to why such information requests are made, and asking the party requested information to physically come and reveal their identities. It should be emphasized that this is a situation that directly has a negative impact on the exercise of the right to information.
Provision of requested information
Total No. of Police Stations = 118

Figure 12
Status of Hospitals

In this study on the situation where citizens have been given the opportunity to request information from the public authorities using online methods on the right to information, 31 information applications were submitted to hospitals via emails in the Sinhala language requesting the following information:

**The question sent requesting relevant information**
“Provide segregated information about the number of patients with kidney diseases and cancers who attended clinics at your hospital during the period from 01.01.2020 to 01.10.2020”

Of the 31 emails sent to selected hospitals, 27 successfully reached those hospitals, which is 87 percent of the total while 4 emails bounced back (Figure 13). Accordingly, when considering the status of the 31 hospitals involved in this study, the data confirmed that the functionality of the official email addresses of those hospitals was high.
Subsequently, only 3 out of the 27 successful emails were responded to by respective hospitals while the overwhelming majority of 24 hospitals failed to respond at all (89 percent) (Figure 14).

This represents some of the negativity in hospitals regarding responses to requests for information, a situation that discourages citizens from exercising their right to information electronically.

Of the emails that were received with responses, two hospitals had provided the information requested while one hospital did not provide expected information (Figure 15).
Status of Agrarian Development Offices

In this study on the situation where citizens have been allowed to electronically request information from the public authorities on the right to information, 31 information applications were submitted to Agrarian Development Offices via email in Sinhala requesting the following information:

The question sent requesting relevant information

“Provide information about the number of persons to whom the fertilizer subsidy was provided for (information by monthly breakdown) during the period from 01.01.2020 to 01.10.2020”

Out of the 31 emails sent, 25 successfully reached the Agrarian Development Offices, which is 81 percent while six 6 emails were not successfully received by expected official email addresses. (Figure 16)

Therefore, it can be seen that a high percentage of the official email addresses of the Agrarian Development Offices are in operation.

Successful delivery of Emails to Agrarian Development Offices

Total No. of Agrarian Development Offices = 31

![Figure 16](image_url)
Accordingly, 8 out of 25 successfully reached emails were responded to by the respective Agrarian Development Offices while 17 institutions failed to respond (Figure 17).

**Responsiveness to Emails received by Agrarian Development Offices**

*Total No. of Agrarian Development Offices = 25*

This represents some negativity in Agrarian Development Offices regarding the response to requests for information, which is a situation that discourages citizens from exercising their right to information electronically.

All Agrarian Development Offices that responded with requested information show something of a positive trend in their respect and commitment to the implementation of the Right to Information Law, and should be appreciated.
Status of Provincial Departments of Education

In this study which focused on the opportunity, citizens have in requesting information from the public authorities using electronic means, seven (07) provincial education departments were contacted by submitting applications in the Sinhala language requesting the following information.

**The question sent requesting relevant information**

“Provide information about the number of teacher vacancy positions and the number of newly recruited teachers in your educational zone during the period from 01.01.2020 to 01.10.2020”

All the 7 emails sent in this manner successfully reached those departments. Accordingly, it was found that the official email addresses of all the Provincial Education Departments requesting information were in operation.

However, the fact that, in return, none of the 7 said successful emails have received any response which reflects an extremely negative situation, should be emphasized as one that adversely affects the use of the right to information (Figure 18).

**Successful delivery of Emails to Provincial Departments of Education**

Total No. of Provincial Departments of Education= 07

![Figure 18](image-url)
Status of Offices of the Sri Lanka Electricity Board

In this study, 40 offices of the Sri Lanka Electricity Board were contacted with information applications via email in the Sinhala language requesting the following information:

**The question sent requesting relevant information**

“Provide information about the number of new persons provided with electricity connections with monthly breakdown in your area during the period from 01.01.2020 to 01.10.2020”

Out of the emails sent to 40 offices of Sri Lanka Electricity Board, 24 were successfully received which was 60 percent of the total while 16 emails were not successful in reaching the official email addresses (Figure 19).

**Successful delivery of Emails to Offices of Sri Lanka Electricity Board**

Total No. of Offices of Sri Lanka Electricity Board = 31

![Pie chart showing successful and bounced back emails](image-url)
Accordingly, it was observed that the majority of the official email addresses of the offices of the Sri Lanka Electricity Board are in operation.

However, out of the 24 successful emails which reached intended institutions, only one public authority responded and the overwhelming majority of 23 institutions failed to respond at all (Figure 20).

Responsiveness to Emails received by Offices of Sri Lanka Electricity Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total No. of Offices of Sri Lanka Electricity Board = 24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This demonstrates strong negativity in the offices of the Sri Lanka Electricity Board regarding the response to requests for information, which discourages citizens from exercising their right to information through electronic means.

Except for one of the successful emails, no further responses have been received and the requested information has not been provided by these public authorities. This should be emphasized as a situation that directly has a detrimental impact on the exercise of the right to information.
Status of Zonal Offices of the Water Supply and Drainage Board

In this study on the situation where citizens have been allowed to electronically request information from the public authorities, 11 Zonal Offices of the Water Supply and Drainage Board were contacted by submitting information applications via emails in the Sinhala language requesting the following information.

The question sent requesting relevant information

“Provide information about the number of new persons provided with pipe water connections with monthly breakdown in your area during the period from 01.01.2020 to 01.10.2020”

Out of the 11 emails sent, nine successfully reached the Zonal Offices of the Water Supply and Drainage Board while two emails were returned. (Figure 21).

Successful delivery of Emails to Zonal Offices of the Water Supply and Drainage Board

Total No. of Zonal Offices of the Water Supply and Drainage Board = 11

![Bar Chart]

Figure 21
Accordingly, it was noticed that the official email addresses of the majority of the Zonal Offices of the Water Supply and Drainage Board are in operation. However, out of the 9 successful emails received, one institution responded and 8 public institutions under this institutional category failed to respond at all (Figure 22).

Responsiveness to Emails received by Zonal Offices of the Water Supply and Drainage Board
Total No. of Zonal Offices of the Water Supply and Drainage Board = 09

Thus, the Zonal Offices of the Water Supply and Drainage Board have shown a negative attitude towards responding to requests for information, which is a situation that discourages citizens from exercising their right to information electronically.
Findings of the study

1. **Minimum response to requests for information sent via email**

   Of the 633 emails that successfully reached public institutions, no response was received for 468 such requests, which should be considered as a serious negative. The reasons for this trend should be further studied, as the lack of any kind of response can discourage the citizen from using online methods to exercise their right to information.

2. **Unsuccessful emails**

   Of the total of 695 emails sent to various public authorities as part of this study, 62 did not successfully reach the official email addresses of the relevant public authorities and remained bounced or returned with "address not found". This may be due to improper use of existing email addresses or inaccurately stated email addresses. However, this may erode the confidence of citizens in the use of emails to communicate with such public authorities.

3. **Request to submit information request in RTI 01 format**

   It was seen that some public authorities were requesting that the RTI FORM 01 be filled in duly, stating that the email message alone was not sufficient to provide the requested information. This can in some way be considered unfair on the part of the citizen when there may not be a facility available to fill up the RTI form 01 and scan it and refer it to the public authority. It should be noted that in a context where RTI Form 01 is not considered mandatory by the Right to Information Act, the compulsory use of RTI Form 01 by some public authorities has a negative impact on the proper exercise of the citizen's right to information.
4. **Lack of uniformity on the part of public authorities in responding to requests for information emailed**

There is a lack of uniformity in responding to emails when considering the fact that some public authorities respond and provide information on time to emails addressed to the Information Officer, whereas some public authorities request that information be re-requested on RTI Form 01. This may be due to a lack of proper understanding of the relevant methodology, clarity of the provisions of the RTI Act, as well as the attitude of the officers.

5. **Ask for reasons for requesting information**

The citizen is not obliged to explain the reasons for requesting the relevant information under the Right to Information Act. However, the reasons for requesting the relevant information were sought, especially in requests for information directed to the police. This can be attributed to the fact that the information officers, mainly of the police stations covered in this study are not properly aware of the relevant process.

6. **Request for disclosure of identity**

It should be noted here that the relevant emails were forwarded to the relevant public authorities through their official email addresses and the name of the person requesting information was automatically available. Significantly, the response to emails directed to the police has been somewhat harsh. There were instances where the OIC of some police stations required submission of a letter requesting information, including information with the name and official stamp, and requiring physical presence at the Police Station to reveal the identity. Through such responses, the citizen may become discouraged, which creates a compelling negativity for the exercise of the right to information.

7. **Refer the request for information to the proper public authority if it is not the proper public authority**

If the request for relevant information has not been submitted to the competent public authority and the competent authority is aware of the relevant public authority having the relevant information, the request for such information should be forwarded to the competent public authority where the relevant information exists. We were informed that the relevant information regarding the requests made to the Provincial Councils was not in their possession and
was in the possession of a more appropriate public authority. However, after pointing out that in the above case, as per Rule 4 (6), it could be sent by the public authority itself, they informed that it has been referred to the relevant competent public authority. Here, too, it was revealed that the information officers had little awareness of how to act in such a situation.

8. **Proactive Disclosure**

When a request for information was made for information to one of the offices of the Senior Superintendents of Police, they point out that the relevant information is available on the website, which is a good example of how proactive disclosure works on certain issues.

9. **Failure to use the prescribed format for information by the officers**

It was observed that many public authorities have ignored the RTI 2, RTI 4 and RTI 5 forms, even though some public authorities have tried to respond in a way that includes or corresponds to these. Accordingly, it was observed that the information officers do not have a proper understanding of the importance of using those forms and the meaning they are trying to convey.

10. **Difficulty in finding the official email addresses of the Information Officers in the Public Authorities**

This was a crisis faced during the study but with perseverance it was possible to find out the official email addresses of public authorities. However, these official email addresses should be readily available to the public. It has been revealed that even the website www.rti.gov.lk contains inaccuracies in the information of the information officers and it is unfortunate that it also contains incomplete information. However, the fact that this information should be easily accessible under proactive disclosure should be emphasized as an inalienable requirement for the exercise of the right to information.

11. **Charging for providing information for requests for information made electronically**

Although some public authorities provided information electronically free of charge, some public authorities were observed charging fees for it. This can be seen as ignorance of some kind of methodology in a context where there is no charge for the information provided by email.
Recommendations and Observations

1. **To ensure that all relevant websites list functioning email addresses of all public authorities in an easily accessible manner.**

   This is essential as a first step in the use of electronic means concerning information rights, and on the other hand, it will proactively strengthen the availability of information of public authorities that can be accessed by citizens.

2. **To enhance public awareness about the implementation of the right to information using electronic means**

   Many citizens are unaware of the possibility of using electronic means to request information and citizens should be made aware of this through a comprehensive social awareness campaign and the initiation of social discourse.

3. **The authorities should take steps to further support the requesting of information and respond to it through electronic means as the best alternative to the direct exercise of the right to information amid the COVID-19 pandemic situation.**

   The right to information can be properly enforced by encouraging the requesting and dissemination of information through electronic means in a context where the entire public, as well as the public sector is inconvenienced in the face of the current COVID-19 pandemic. This is because using electronic media for this purpose can ensure maintaining social distance and preventing contact with potentially virus-laden stationery, facilities, counters, etc. Therefore, encouraging electronic means in the current situation should be cited as the most desirable option.
4. **Action should be taken to promote access information through electronic means to be able to save money spent on hard copies**

Using electronic media can save considerably in terms of costs incurred on printing hard copies of information being sent upon request. This will enable the citizen to enjoy the right to information by accessing relevant information already stored in electronic media and receiving it electronically at no extra charge.

5. **Electronic means should be made popularize as an innovative avenue for the effective use of electronic means**

By providing this public service through electronic means in general, it is possible to reach a technologically advanced level, and eventually, government officials, as well as the citizens, will be able to successfully use information technology in their daily lives and thereby systematically achieve development goals.

6. **The Commission on the Right to Information should take necessary action regarding the amendment of Rule 13 on Appeals to the Commission.**

When appealing to the Right to Information Commission, it is mandatory to submit hard copies, which has a negative effect on the use of electronic means. Therefore, the mandated authorities should amend the said rule to enable the Commission to act through electronic channels in the matter of appeals as well.
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Annexure 01

Categories of Public Authority accessed for this study

1. Divisional Secretariats
2. Provincial Councils
3. Police Stations
4. Hospitals
5. Agrarian Development Offices
6. Provincial Education Departments
7. Sri Lanka Electricity Board Offices
8. Zonal Offices of the Water Supply and Drainage Board
RTI 01

පත්‍රය ඉන්ඩිර පත්‍රය

01. කරතුරු ඉන්ඩිර

02. කරතුරු ඉන්ඩිර (ඇතිජීවන)

03. කරතුරු ඉන්ඩිර (මුල්ජනන)

04. කරතුරු ඉන්ඩිර (මුල්ජනන)

05. කරතුරු ඉන්ඩිර (ඇතිජීවන)

06. කරතුරු ඉන්ඩිර (ඇතිජීවන)

07. කරතුරු ඉන්ඩිර (ඇතිජීවන)

08. කරතුරු ඉන්ඩිර (ඇතිජීවන)

09. කරතුරු ඉන්ඩිර

10. කරතුරු ඉන්ඩිර (ඇතිජීවන)

11. විශේෂ ක්‍රම පද්ධතියක්?

- 38 -
RTI 01

தற்காலக்காலத்திற்கு உள்ளாலாற்றப் பாதுகாப்பு பிரிவுகளுக்கு என்ற அம்சங்களுக்கு பிரிவு உள்ளு. பிரிவுகள் ஆலோசனா கவுரக்களும் அதாயமாக காணப்பட்டுள்ளன. பிரிவுகள் பிரிவுகளின் அளவுகள் குறிப்பிட்டளவாக காணப்பட்டுள்ளன. பிரிவுகள் பிரிவுகளின் நிறைவுபடுத்தும் காரணிகளின் வளர்ச்சிகள்.

I. பிரிவுகள் பிரிவுகளின் நிறைவு

01. பிரிவுகளின் நிறைவு - ..............................................................
02. நிறைவு - ..............................................................
03. பிரிவுகளின் நிறைவு (பிரிவுகளின்) ...........................................
04. பிரிவுகளின் நிறைவு (பிரிவுகளின்) ...........................................
05. பிரிவுகளின் பிரிவுகளின் நிறைவு (பிரிவுகள் பிரிவுகளின்) 
   I. பிரிவுகள் பிரிவுகள் நிறைவு ..............................................................
   II. பிரிவுகள் பிரிவுகளின் நிறைவு ..............................................................

III. பிரிவுகள் பிரிவுகளின் நிறைவு (பிரிவுகளின்) ...........................................
06. பிரிவுகள் பிரிவுகளின் நிறைவு (பிரிவுகளின்) ...........................................
   I. பிரிவுகள் பிரிவுகளின் நிறைவு (பிரிவுகளின்) ...........................................
   II. பிரிவுகளின் நிறைவு பிரிவுகளின் நிறைவு (பிரிவுகளின்) ...........................................
   III. பிரிவுகளின் நிறைவு (பிரிவுகளின்) ...........................................
   IV. பிரிவுகளின் நிறைவு (பிரிவுகளின்) ...........................................

07. பிரிவுகளின் நிறைவு பிரிவுகளின் நிறைவு பிரிவுகளின் நிறைவு - ..............................................................
08. பிரிவுகளின் பிரிவுகளின் நிறைவு பிரிவுகளின் நிறைவு பிரிவுகளின் நிறைவு? (ஆதார/சீராடி)
    பிரிவுகளை, பிரிவுகளின் நிறைவு பிரிவுகளை குறித்து அதிகாரிகள் கருத்துரிந்து - ..............................................................

09. பிரிவுகளின் நிறைவு பிரிவுகளின் ..............................................................
10. பிரிவுகளின் நிறைவு பிரிவுகளின் பிரிவுகளின் (பிரிவுகளின்) ..............................................................
    I. ..............................................................
    II. ..............................................................
    III. ..............................................................
11. பிரிவுகளின் நிறைவு (பிரிவுகளின்) பிரிவுகளின்? (ஆதார/சீராடி)

தலை:

ஆலோசனை:
RTI 01

Note that completion of this Form is not a compulsory requirement to make a request for information and that any written letter, e-mail or a verbal request with the essential information to identify the requested information is sufficient.

Application to receive Information

Information Officer,

01. Name of Requestor - …………………………………………………
02. Address - …………………………………
03. Contact No. (if any) - ……………………………
04. Email Address (if any) - ………………..
05. Details about Information requested
   I. Specific Public Authority ……………………………
   II. Information requested
       …………………………………………………………………………………………………………
       …………………………………………………………………………………………………………
       …………………………………………………………………………………………………………
       …………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   III. Specific period information is requested (if applicable)………………

06. Manner in which information is requested –
   i. inspect relevant work, documents, records
   ii. Take notes, extracts or certified copies of documents or records
   iii. Take certified samples of material
   iv. Obtain information in the form of CD/DVD/storage media/tapes/video cassettes/ any other 
extronic mode/ printouts where such information is stored in a computer or in any other 
dvice.

07. Language in which requestor prefers access - ………………

08. Does the information request concern the life and personal liberty of a citizen? (Yes/No)
   If Yes, give reason for belief -
   ………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ………………………………………………………………………………………………………

09. Any other details- …………………………………………………

10. Relevant documents attached (If any)
   I. ……………………………
   II. ……………………………
   III. ……………………………

11. Is the requestor a citizen of Sri Lanka? (Yes/No)

Date: -
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We stand ready to provide you any Information you need to know regarding your Right to Information!

Hotline

Information Help Desk

011-30 30 463

(Weekdays from 9.00 am to 5.00 pm)