



THE FEDERAL  
REDISTRIBUTION  
TASMANIA

# Submission COB15

Angela Offord

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [FedRedistribution - TAS](#)  
**Subject:** [Redistribution TAS - Submission] \*WWW\* [SEC=OFFICIAL]  
**Date:** Friday, 10 April 2026 5:20:28 PM

---

Form submitted: 10/04/2026 05:20 PM

# Offord, Angela - Redistribution TAS - Submission on the proposed Tasmanian redistribution (feedback on ideas)

## Personal details

**First name:** Angela  
**Surname:** Offord  
**Email:** [REDACTED]

## Submission on the proposed Tasmanian redistribution details

**Category:** Boundaries

**Details:** This submission is feedback on ideas about the short timeframes of the redistribution process and might be best classified as about other.

I understand that timeframes differ due to the nature of the issue being addressed, legal and regulatory requirements, stakeholder engagement, and government policy.

While differing timeframes for public consultation and submissions allow for flexibility and tailored engagement strategies, they also present challenges related to consistency, participation, and the overall quality of public involvement in decision-making processes in addition to having an affect on the quality and sustainability of any decisions made.

The proposed redistribution is complex, involving significant change, and the principle of due process should apply.

A complex issue of this nature requires full consultation, substantial background research and analysis to fully understand the issues and in order to make the best decision possible based on all of the available information at the time.

If we dont allocate sufficient time to consult and analyse the proposed redistribution of federal Tasmanian electorates we risk:

1. Inadequate Stakeholder Input:

The proposed redistribution demands a longer submission and consultation periods to adequately engage a diverse range of stakeholders, including community groups, individuals, councils and experts. Stakeholders may feel overwhelmed or unable to respond meaningfully when given short timeframes to respond, resulting in lower participation rates and limited diversity of perspectives. Short timeframes risk excluding marginalised voices. Individuals or groups who may need more time to engage for eg underrepresented communities and those with limited access to resources, may find it especially challenging to contribute or respond in short timeframes, further exacerbating inequities. Longer timelines can help streamline stakeholder engagement ensuring ample time for thorough assessment and consideration of all perspectives. We want to encourage broader community engagement and participation through extended timeframes giving diverse voices an opportunity to contribute meaningfully to the process.

2. Overlooked Concerns:

A condensed timeframe can lead to important issues, concerns, or objections being overlooked. Stakeholders may not have time to identify and articulate critical points, which may result in decisions that fail to account for significant risks or implications.

3. Potential for Miscommunication:

The complexity of the proposed changes involves intricate technical numerical details and legal requirements. The short timeframe may lead to a misunderstanding or misinterpretation of the proposal and insufficient time to examine alternative proposals.

4. Compromised Thoroughness:

This short period may pressure decision makers (the Commission) to expedite their review and analysis of submissions, potentially sacrificing thorough analysis and thoughtful responses to stakeholder concerns.

The thoroughness with which the feedback should be considered could be compromised, leading to hasty decisions that lack adequate scrutiny.

5. Public Trust and Credibility:

When consultation periods are perceived as too rushed or superficial, stakeholders may lose trust in the decision making process. This can lead to skepticism about the governments commitment to transparency and genuine engagement, harming the credibility of this and future consultations.

6. Reduced Quality of Feedback:

Limited timeframes may result in feedback that is less considered or less well-articulated. Quick responses may lack the depth and rigorosity that is necessary to inform sound decision-making, this in turn can lead to less effective outcomes.

Stakeholders may not have sufficient time to review materials, conduct necessary research, or organise their response.

Potential for oversight- important information or concerns might be overlooked, resulting in decisions that do not fully reflect community needs or interests.

7. Risk of Policy Repercussions:

The decisions made here without adequate consultation may face backlash from the community or stakeholders post implementation.

If the concerns raised in this round of ideas submissions are not addressed there is the potential for significant dissent or pushback against any changes that are enacted.

8. Failure to Build Consensus:

Deliberative effective decision making takes time. The aim is to foster dialogue and understanding among all stakeholders, which can lead to greater consensus on issues. Shorter periods forgo this process and result in polarised views pertaining and a lack of collaborative agreed solutions.

#### 9. Public Confusion

A disparity in timelines can create confusion among the public regarding when input is needed and may discourage or prevent participation. The variation in timeframes can lead to perceptions of inconsistency or inequity in how public consultations are conducted, potentially undermining public trust in the governments commitment to genuine engagement.

In summary, while expediency may be necessary in some situations, short consultation periods for complex issues involving big change, as is the case for this proposed federal electorate boundary redistribution, may undermine the integrity of the engagement process and result in poorly informed decisions that do not adequately reflect stakeholder needs and concerns. Balancing timeliness with thoroughness is critical for achieving meaningful public participation and effective decision making.

I trust the Commission will take the requisite time necessary to thoroughly review all of the ideas submissions and ideas on the ideas submissions thus far in order to make the changes that best serve the people going forward.

---