



New Zealand House of Representatives
Te Whare Māngai o Aotearoa

Petitions Committee

Komiti Whiriwhiri Take Petihana

54th Parliament

December 2025

Briefing on Government responses to committee recommendations

Interim report

Presented to the House of Representatives
by Greg O'Connor, Chairperson

Contents

Recommendation.....	3
About committee recommendations in petition reports	3
Petition of Hāwea Flat School Board—Reconsider school bus provision for Hāwea Flat School.....	4
Petition of Arthur Yeo on behalf of New Zealand Equestrian Advocacy Network—Government designers of public infrastructure be required to meet equine needs	6
Petition of Maggie Ross—Provide funding for all schools to have gender-neutral bathrooms	8
Petition of Eye Health Aotearoa—Fund the Aotearoa New Zealand Eye Health Survey.....	9
Petition of Claire Dale—Make mobility parking enforceable on all public-use property and increase fines.....	11
Petition of Andrew Wilson—Rezone Accommodation Supplement eligibility for Queenstown residents	15
Petition of Sabah Deniz Gulensoy—Temporary post-earthquake visas.....	16
Petition of Kiwilaw Probate and Estates Ltd—Raise the threshold for requiring probate or letters of administration	17
Petition of Carjam Online Ltd—Reverse plans for the NZTA to charge for free stolen status data in October	19
Appendix.....	20

Briefing on Government responses to committee recommendations

Recommendation

The Petitions Committee has considered a briefing on Government responses to committee recommendations, and recommends that the House take note of its interim report.

About committee recommendations in petition reports

We report to the House on the petitions we consider. When we feel it is appropriate, we make recommendations to the Government in our reports. Other select committees do the same with the petitions they consider. When any committee includes recommendations to the Government in a petition report, the Government must, within 60 working days, present a paper to the House responding to the recommendations.¹ This has been a requirement in the Standing Orders since 1967. The Government is expected to report to the House on what action, if any, it has taken to implement recommendations made to it on petitions.²

We have decided to seek updates from government departments on the progress made against Government responses to Petitions Committee recommendations that have been received in this term of Parliament. Other committees also make recommendations to Government on petitions that they consider, and we encourage them to follow up on their recommendations as well. This report summarises the first set of updates received from the relevant ministry or department on recommendations made by the Petitions Committee in the 53rd and 54th Parliaments.

¹ [Standing Order 256\(1\)](#). Government responses are tabled in the House and published on [the Parliament website](#).

² [Parliamentary Practice in New Zealand 49.10](#), footnote 120.

Petition of Hāwea Flat School Board—Reconsider school bus provision for Hāwea Flat School

The petition requested:

That the House of Representatives urge the Government to reconsider its decision regarding school bus provision for Hāwea Flat School.

Committee recommendations

The petition was considered by the Petitions Committee of the 53rd Parliament. It reported to the House on the petition in November 2022.³ It recommended that the Government reconsider school bus provision for Hāwea Flat School; reconsider the network-based approach to school bus provision, particularly as it relates to student safety and welfare in rural communities; and review the use of runbacks in rural areas.⁴

Government response to recommendations

The Government's response was due in March 2023. The response was presented to the House in May 2024.⁵ It said:

The Ministry considers ... that the current school bus provision for Hāwea Flat School is sufficient to meet the school's current needs and that runbacks remain the most viable immediate option for managing future changes in demand ...

Since the Committee delivered its recommendations, the Ministry of Education has continued to engage with Hāwea Flat School regarding school bus provision. This includes deploying higher capacity buses on two existing routes and adjustments of routes to better distribute students across the services. The Ministry is currently working with the school and transport service provider to manage the runback service which started on 3 April 2024. Following advice from the school, the routes that travel within the township have been further adjusted to better accommodate the runback, and to travel into a new housing development.

Follow-up with the Ministry of Education about the Government response

We wrote to the Ministry of Education in September 2025 asking for an update on the Government's response, including the higher-capacity buses, the runback service that started on 3 April 2024, the adjusted routes, and the ministry's engagement with the Hāwea Flat School Board.

The ministry responded in October 2025. It said that the school bus route adjustments and runbacks were developed in collaboration with the Principal and

³ The report of the Petitions Committee of the 53rd Parliament on the Petition of Hāwea Flat School Board is available on [the Parliament website](#).

⁴ A runback is where a single bus either runs an identical route twice, or runs a portion of the route first, then the bus returns to the school to pick up more students and continue the rest of the run.

⁵ The Government response to the report of the Petitions Committee on the Petition of Hāwea Flat School Board is available on [the Parliament website](#).

Board of Hāwea Flat School. The ministry said that, since the implementation of the changes, it had remained in contact with the school, and that no further changes had been made to the bus services.

We were told by the ministry that the introduction of higher-capacity buses and route adjustments had helped to ease the capacity issues that had previously been experienced. It said that the runback services had segmented the area geographically based on families' locations, which had resulted in a more balanced distribution of students across routes. Also, one route has been extended into a new subdivision. The ministry said this has improved the route's efficiency and leaves capacity for further growth as the area develops.

The ministry told us that feedback from both the school and the bus operator is that the runbacks are functioning effectively. It said that Hāwea Flat is a high-growth area, the school roll continues to increase, and at times the school's bus services are operating close to capacity. The ministry said it is continuing to monitor the situation.

Our response

We thank the ministry for its response. We are pleased to hear that communication has continued with the school community and bus operators, and that ministry continues to monitor the situation as the school roll increases.

Petition of Arthur Yeo on behalf of New Zealand Equestrian Advocacy Network—Government designers of public infrastructure be required to meet equine needs

The petition requested:

That the House of Representatives ensure, through legislation, that central and local government designers and planners of public works and policy are required to consider, inform, consult and include equestrian user's needs in the design and construction of all roading, pathways, reserves and parks.

Committee recommendations

The petition was considered by the Petitions Committee of the 53rd Parliament. It reported to the House on the petition in March 2023.⁶ The committee made four recommendations. It recommended to the Government that:

1. the Ministry of Transport and Waka Kotahi formally recognise horse riders as stakeholders in consultations regarding changes to road or pathway use
2. Land Transport (Road User) Rule 2004 section 11.14 be rewritten to provide greater clarity, using the more commonly used term of berm or verge, rather than road margin
3. Waka Kotahi review the proposed passing distances and speeds for horse riders and other road users in Accessible Streets
4. Waka Kotahi review driver education and licensing to ensure it prepares New Zealand drivers for rural settings, where they will encounter animals, as well as for urban built environments.

Government response

The Government response was due in June 2023. The response was presented to the House in December 2023.⁷ In response to the committee's four recommendations, it said:

1. the ministry and Waka Kotahi would explore opportunities to further improve their engagement with horse riders during consultation on transport infrastructure projects
2. changes to the Land Transport (Road User) Rule section 11.14 would be considered when the rule is next reviewed
3. work on passing distances and speeds had already been incorporated in proposed policy settings as part of the Accessible Streets package, which had been provided to the Government for consideration
4. the Government did not consider that driver education needed to be reviewed.

Follow-up with the Ministry of Transport and New Zealand Transport Agency

We wrote to the Ministry of Transport and the New Zealand Transport Agency | Waka Kotahi (NZTA) in September 2025 asking for an update on the Government's response, including

⁶ The report of the Petitions Committee of the 53rd Parliament on the Petition of Arthur Yeo on behalf of New Zealand Equestrian Network is available on [the Parliament website](#).

⁷ The Government response to the report of the Petitions Committee on the Petition of Arthur Yeo is available on [the Parliament website](#).

recognition of horse riders as stakeholders in consultation, review of the Land Transport (Road User) Rule 2004, and proposed passing distances and speeds in Accessible Streets.

The ministry and NZTA provided a combined response in October 2025. Regarding consultation with equestrians as stakeholders, NZTA said it engages with relevant stakeholders on a case-by-case basis to determine needs for each project. It gave as an example previous and ongoing consultation with horse riders about equestrian access on the Mackays to Peka Peka expressway project.

In response to our request for an update on rewriting section 11.14 of the Land Transport (Road User) Rule 2004, the ministry said it was not actively reviewing this section of the rule. However, it said the issue may be considered through future workstreams in the Government's Rules Reform programme.⁸ The ministry and NZTA told us that Accessible Streets was not progressed; however, minimum passing distances for horse riders and other road users are being considered as part of the Rules Reform programme.

Our response

Engagement with horse riders

We observe that both the Government response to the committee recommendations in July 2024 and the Ministry of Transport and NZTA response in October 2025 use the same example of consultation with horse riders about equestrian access on the Mackays to Peka Peka project. We would be interested in hearing about additional examples of consultation with the equestrian community on roading projects.

Reform programme for Land Transport (Road User) Rule 2004

The Government response to the committee's recommendations stated that changes to the Land Transport (Road User) Rule section 11.14 would be considered when the rule was next reviewed. We are concerned that this matter has not been included in the review of land transport rules which was announced in June 2025. We intend to write to the Minister of Transport to ask that consideration of this recommendation be included in the Rules Reform programme.

We welcome the inclusion of minimum passing distances for horse riders and other road users for consideration in the Rules Reform programme. We also note that, at the time of this interim report, the Transport and Infrastructure Committee was considering a further petition from the equestrian community asking for similar changes to be made to land transport rules.⁹

⁸ In June 2025, the Government announced a plan to reform New Zealand's land transport rules, which will begin with consultation on some specific matters in October 2025. Further consultation is due to take place in mid-2026.

⁹ Petition of New Zealand Equestrian Advocacy Network: Vulnerable road user status for New Zealand horse riders.

Petition of Maggie Ross—Provide funding for all schools to have gender-neutral bathrooms

The petition requested:

That the House of Representatives urge the Government to provide funding for all schools in New Zealand to have gender-neutral bathrooms.

Committee recommendation

The petition was considered by the Petitions Committee of the 53rd Parliament. It reported to the House on the petition in June 2023.¹⁰ It recommended that the Government continue to encourage schools to consider providing gender-neutral options as bathrooms are renovated.

Government response

The Government response was due in September 2023. The response was presented to the House in July 2024.¹¹ The response accepted the recommendation and said that it had directed the Ministry of Education to encourage policies and provide guidance that supports the provision of both single-sex and gender-neutral/unisex bathrooms in schools.

Our response

We do not feel that further follow-up is needed at this time.

¹⁰ The report of the Petitions Committee of the 53rd Parliament on the Petition of Maggie Ross is available on [the Parliament website](#).

¹¹ The Government response to the report of the Petitions Committee on the Petition of Maggie Ross is available on [the Parliament website](#).

Petition of Eye Health Aotearoa—Fund the Aotearoa New Zealand Eye Health Survey

The petition requested:

That the House of Representatives recommend that the Government fund the first ever Aotearoa New Zealand Eye Health Survey.

Committee recommendation

The petition was considered by the Petitions Committee of the 53rd Parliament. It reported to the House on the petition in August 2023.¹² It recommended to the Government that it consider expanding a University of Auckland survey or the New Zealand Health Survey to ensure that more comprehensive data could be gathered about eye health.

Government response

The Government response was due in March 2024 and was presented to the House that month.¹³ It observed that any new survey would need funding. The response said:

While the Government recognises the need for improved information on eye health, there are a number of other information needs not currently being met. Given the breadth of these needs, the Minister of Health will direct the Ministry of Health to develop and present options for how information needs might be met.

Follow-up with the Ministry of Health

We wrote to the Ministry of Health in September 2025 asking whether it had developed options for how health information needs—including eye health information needs—might be met, and any information it could share about progress in this area.

The ministry responded in October 2025. The ministry said some progress had been made towards meeting some key health information needs. It told us that reallocation of some funding has resulted in an announcement that the Government will fund New Zealand's first child and youth mental health survey.

However, the ministry said that no options for meeting information needs related to eye health have been developed or presented to the Government. The ministry noted Eye Health Aotearoa's submission to the Petitions Committee of the 53rd Parliament said that neither the design of the New Zealand Health Survey nor the University of Auckland study was sufficient to meet the need for eye health information. Given that position, the ministry said it was not considering expanding the New Zealand Health Survey or engaging with the University of Auckland on expanding its work.

¹² The report of the Petitions Committee of the 53rd Parliament on the Petition of Eye Health Aotearoa is available on [the Parliament website](#).

¹³ The Government response to the report of the Petitions Committee on the Petition of Eye Health Aotearoa is available on [the Parliament website](#).

Our response

While we welcome the news that reprioritisation of funding is enabling a child and youth mental health survey, this does not address the committee's recommendation to expand existing surveys to gather more comprehensive information about eye health.

In its recommendation, the Petitions Committee of the 53rd Parliament noted Eye Health Aotearoa's reservation about the limitations of the existing surveys. However, we note that the ministry itself had suggested, and the committee agreed, that expanding one of these surveys could be a useful first step. Despite the acknowledgement in the Government response that improved information on eye health is important, we observe that no progress has yet been made towards achieving that goal.

Petition of Claire Dale—Make mobility parking enforceable on all public-use property and increase fines

The petition requested:

That the House of Representatives change the law to substantially increase fines nationally for misusing any mobility parking spaces, including on privately owned land that is used publicly; and urge the Government to run an education campaign to desist able-bodied people from misusing mobility parking spaces for public use.

Committee recommendations

The petition was considered by the Petitions Committee of the 53rd Parliament. It provided an interim report to the House on the petition in November 2022,¹⁴ and a final report in August 2023.¹⁵ The committee made six recommendations. It recommended to the Government that it:

1. significantly increase, and index to inflation, the fine for illegal parking in mobility parking spaces
2. review current mobility parking requirements and research future needs with the aim of ensuring that appropriate numbers of mobility parks are available
3. consider support for road controlling authorities to develop technology for enforcing mobility parking
4. work with private sector carpark operators to develop a code of practice for enforcing mobility parking
5. consider whether technology that is being developed for enforcing mobility parking in public parks could also be used by owners of private carparks
6. undertake a public education campaign to improve public understanding of mobility parking and to encourage drivers to obey the rules about mobility parks.

The committee also wrote to the Business Committee recommending that a special debate be held in the 54th Parliament on the issues raised in this petition. That debate was held on 21 March 2024.¹⁶

Government response

The Government response was due in March 2024 and was presented to the House that month.¹⁷ It responded to the six committee recommendations:

1. **Fines for illegal parking:** The Government response said that the Minister of Transport would direct the Ministry of Transport to undertake a full review of parking fees and fines,

¹⁴ The interim report of the Petitions Committee of the 53rd Parliament on the Petition of Claire Dale is available on [the Parliament website](#).

¹⁵ The final report of the Petitions Committee of the 53rd Parliament on the Petition of Claire Dale is available on [the Parliament website](#).

¹⁶ The Hansard record of the Special Debate on the Petition of Claire Dale is available on [the Parliament website](#).

¹⁷ The Government response to the report of the Petitions Committee on the Petition of Claire Dale is available on [the Parliament website](#).

and that consideration would be given to a mechanism for regularly reviewing fees to ensure that they remain fit for purpose.

2. **Review of mobility parking requirements:** The Government responded that mobility parking requirements are reviewed as part of periodic processes and engagements by local government. The Government's focus was, at the time of the response, on delivering the Government's 100-day and manifesto commitments.
3. **Technology for enforcing mobility parking:** The response noted that the Minister of Transport encourages local councils to explore, develop, and share lessons on how to further roll out technological enforcement options.
4. **Work with private sector carpark operators to develop a code of practice for enforcing mobility parking:** In consultation with the Minister for Disability Issues, the Minister of Transport asked Whaikaha | Ministry of Disabled People to work with private carpark operators to support the development of a private sector code of practice for enforcing mobility carparking.
5. **Technology for enforcing mobility parking:** The Government response encouraged companies to explore the impacts of these technologies, as they would for other monitoring or security systems.
6. **Public education campaign:** The Government replied that the Minister of Transport would instruct the Ministry of Transport to encourage Road Controlling Authorities to use their resources to reduce disabled carpark misuse. The response also said that the Minister of Transport, in consultation with the Minister for Disability Issues, would ask the Ministry of Disabled People to discuss with CSS Disability Action opportunities to raise awareness of mobility parking issues.

Update

The Minister of Transport and Minister for Disability Issues announced on 29 August 2024 that the fee for wrongly parking in disabled carparks would increase from \$150 to \$750 in October 2024.¹⁸

Follow-up with the Ministry of Transport and Whaikaha

We wrote to the Ministry of Transport and Whaikaha | Ministry of Disabled People in September 2025.

Ministry of Transport

We asked whether the ministry had considered a mechanism to regularly review parking fines, whether it had the capacity to review mobility parking requirements and research future needs, and whether the ministry had encouraged Road Controlling Authorities to use their resources to reduce disabled carpark misuse.

The ministry replied that it had consulted with Road Controlling Authorities during the process of increasing the fee for wrongly parking in disabled carparks. It said that enforcement of mobility parking remains the responsibility of councils.

¹⁸ Hon Simeon Brown, Hon Louise Upston, [Government to update parking penalties](#), 29 August 2024.

A review of penalties for traffic offences is included in the Government Policy Statement on land transport 2024.¹⁹ The ministry said this includes consideration of indexing the value of infringements to inflation.

The ministry told us it has not reviewed mobility parking requirements or researched future needs, and that this is not part of its current work programme.

Whaikaha | Ministry of Disabled People

We asked Whaikaha what work it had undertaken on options for working with private carpark operators to support the development of a private sector code of practice for enforcing mobility carparking. We also asked the ministry to update us on its work with Local Government New Zealand to support Road Controlling Authorities to adopt technology for enforcing mobility parking, and asked whether it was aware of any work in private carparks using technology for enforcement. We also asked whether the ministry had any discussions with CSS Disability Action on opportunities to work together to raise awareness of mobility parking misuse.

Whaikaha responded that it has identified mobility parking as a key focus within its accessibility work programme. As part of this work, it continues to raise public awareness. It said it regularly engages with both public and private parking providers, as well as enforcement agencies.

The ministry told us it has been in regular contact with the New Zealand Parking Association (NZPA) about updating its Code of Practice to reflect a stronger emphasis on mobility parking enforcement. The NZPA released its updated Code of Practice 2025 in September 2025.²⁰

Whaikaha engages regularly with stakeholders in the parking sector, and told us that many Road Controlling Authorities are adopting licence-plate-recognition technology which can enforce parking from a moving vehicle. However, it said that, while there are benefits for councils, this technology cannot be used for enforcement of mobility parks. This is because parking permits for mobility parks are paper based, and are issued to a person, rather than a vehicle.

The ministry is working with the mobility parking sector on ways in which mobility parking permits can operate with parking enforcement technology. CSS Disability Action (CSS) and Wilson Parking Limited (Wilson) have signed a memorandum of understanding, which includes funding by Wilson of a portal to the CSS permit database. The ministry said this would enable enforcement officers on foot to verify whether a mobility permit is valid.

Whaikaha and CSS have been discussing how they can work together to raise awareness about the effects of mobility parking misuse and to help disabled people understand their rights. The ministry said it is working on a communications plan to raise awareness about the increase in mobility parking fines, and it will work with CSS to implement the campaign.

¹⁹ The Government Policy Statement on land transport 2024 is available on [the website of the Ministry of Transport](#).

²⁰ The New Zealand Parking Association's Code of Practice for Parking Enforcement on Private Land 2025 is available on [the NZPA website](#).

Launching the campaign at the beginning of the summer holiday season is one of the options being considered.

Our response

We welcome the October 2024 increase in fees for misuse of disabled carparks, and the inclusion of the issue of indexing road offence infringements to inflation in the Government Policy Statement on land transport 2024. We continue to encourage the Government to include research on mobility car park requirements and future needs in its work programme.

We also welcome the developments outlined by Whaikaha, including release of NZPA's updated Code of Practice 2025, work on developing car parking technology to include mobility parking permits, and work on a communications plan.

We think that access to mobility parking has been improved through the efforts by all public and private sector agencies following this petition, the committee's recommendations, and the Government response. We look forward to seeing this work continue.

Petition of Andrew Wilson—Rezone Accommodation Supplement eligibility for Queenstown residents

The petition requested:

That the House of Representatives amend Schedule 4, Part 7, clause 8 of the Social Security Act 2018 urban-rural statistical blocks so that urban-rural zoning for the purposes of Accommodation Supplement eligibility is based on the most recent population statistics.

Committee recommendations

The petition was considered by the Petitions Committee of the 53rd Parliament. It reported to the House on the petition in September 2023.²¹ It recommended to the Government that it update the Accommodation Supplement (AS) Areas every time Statistics New Zealand updates its geographic boundaries.

Government response

The Government response was due in March 2024 and was presented to the House that month.²² It said:

The Government does not agree to progress the recommendation ... to update AS Areas every time Stats NZ updates its geographic boundaries. The introduction of a regular update cycle for AS Areas does however merit further consideration, and the Government has commissioned further advice from officials on changes to the AS, including on updating AS Areas. ... linking AS Area boundary updates to every update made by Stats NZ could still result in disproportionate administrative and fiscal costs.

Update

Budget 2025 provided for changes to the Accommodation Supplement boundaries to “reflect changes in residential and urban development and more accurately account for people’s location and housing costs”. According to the Ministry of Social Development website, eligibility for the AS will be “more likely to increase in locations which move from Area 4 to Area 1 (e.g. parts of Queenstown)”.²³ The changes will come into effect in April 2027.

Our response

We welcome the updates to the Accommodation Supplement boundaries from April 2027.

²¹ The report of the Petitions Committee of the 53rd Parliament on the Petition of Andrew Wilson is available on [the Parliament website](#).

²² The Government response to the report of the Petitions Committee on the Petition of Andrew Wilson is available on [the Parliament website](#).

²³ Ministry of Social Development, [Changes to the Accommodation Supplement through Budget 2025](#).

Petition of Sabah Deniz Gulensoy—Temporary post-earthquake visas

The petition requested:

That the House of Representatives ask the Government to grant temporary work visas to family and loved ones affected by the earthquakes in Turkey.

Committee recommendation

The petition was considered by the Petitions Committee of the 53rd Parliament. It reported to the House on the petition in September 2023.²⁴ It recommended that the Government consider undertaking policy work to establish a visa framework to better support displaced persons who are not considered refugees.

Government response

The Government response was due in March 2024 and was presented to the House that month.²⁵ It said:

...expanding the immigration system, including a new visa framework for displaced persons, would need to consider the system as a whole and our wider national resources.

At this stage, the Government is focused on delivering its immediate priorities and will continue building our understanding of climate mobility which could inform future consideration of work on establishing a new visa framework for displaced persons who are not refugees.

Our response

We do not feel that further follow-up is needed at this time.

²⁴ The report of the Petitions Committee of the 53rd Parliament on the Petition of Sarah Deniz Gulensoy is available on [the Parliament website](#).

²⁵ The Government response to the report of the Petitions Committee on the Petition of Sarah Deniz Gulensoy is available on [the Parliament website](#).

Petition of Kiwilaw Probate and Estates Ltd—Raise the threshold for requiring probate or letters of administration

The petition requested:

That the House of Representatives raise the financial threshold from \$15,000 to \$25,000 for requiring probate or letters of administration before estate funds can be released by a financial institution.

Committee recommendations

We considered this petition and reported to the House in May 2024.²⁶ We recommended to the Government that an adjustment be made as soon as possible to the threshold for grants of administration that matches inflation since 2009, and that a mechanism be established that would regularly adjust the threshold for inflation in future years.

Government response

The Government response was due in August 2024 and was presented to the House that month.²⁷ The Government response agreed that work on the threshold was warranted. It said the Ministry of Justice had “begun work to increase the threshold in the Regulations”.

The response said that the second part of the committee’s recommendation—the mechanism to regularly adjust for inflation—would require a change to the Act, which would take longer than changing regulations. The Government said it would be considered “as priorities, and opportunities across the Justice portfolio for amending primary legislation, allow.”

Update

The Minister of Justice announced in July 2025 that the probate threshold would increase from \$15,000 to \$40,000 on 24 September 2025.²⁸

Follow-up with the Ministry of Justice

We wrote to the Ministry of Justice in September 2025, asking for an update on any work the ministry had undertaken to introduce a mechanism to the Act to allow the threshold for grants of administration to adjust to match inflation.

The ministry reiterated the information in the Government response, that introducing a mechanism to regularly adjust the Administration Act threshold would require a change to the Act. It said that amending the Administration Act is not currently on the Ministry of Justice work programme.

However, the ministry said it was aware that some provisions of the Administration Act may need to be reviewed and updated. It said these issues, together with the mechanism we

²⁶ Our report on the Petition of Kiwilaw Probate and Estates Ltd is available on [the Parliament website](#).

²⁷ The Government response to the report of the Petitions Committee on the Petition of Kiwilaw Probate and Estates Ltd is available on [the Parliament website](#).

²⁸ Hon Paul Goldsmith, [Increasing probate thresholds for families](#), July 2025.

recommended, have been added to the ministry's Internal Regulatory Issues Register for consideration in due course.

Our response

We welcome the increase in the probate threshold from \$15,000 to \$40,000. We continue to encourage the Government to establish a mechanism that would provide ongoing adjustments to the threshold in future years.

Petition of Carjam Online Ltd—Reverse plans for the NZTA to charge for free stolen status data in October

The petition requested:

That the House of Representatives urge the Government to reverse the decision to begin charging for free data including accurate stolen status in October as part of the planned “Fees review”.

Committee recommendations

We considered this petition and reported to the House in May 2025.²⁹ We recommended to the Government that it investigate whether there are discrepancies between the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) Motor Vehicle Register and the Police website and, if so, that steps be taken to ensure that both sources of official information are accurate and up to date.

We also encouraged NZTA to revisit the assumptions made in its business model regarding calculations for charges for commercial use of data in the Motor Vehicle Register.

Government response

The Government response was due in August 2025 and was presented to the House that month.³⁰ The response said that stolen vehicle information on both the New Zealand Police website and the Motor Vehicle Register is updated from the Police vehicle of interest database. It said there is a lag between Police public-facing data and the Motor Vehicle Register for a maximum of 10 minutes. The Government response said there are no plans to change the current method of data collection and storage.

The response also noted our encouragement that NZTA revisit the assumptions made in its business model about charges. It said there would be an opportunity to consider this in an upcoming NZTA funding review.

Follow-up with the New Zealand Transport Agency

We wrote to NZTA in October 2025 asking when its funding review is scheduled to take place, and requesting that our report, and the Government response to our report, be considered as part of that review.

NZTA replied in October 2025 that both our report and the Government response would be formally considered as part of the review. It told us the review was to be undertaken in four stages. The first stage involved seeking an endorsement of the scope of the review from the Minister of Transport and NZTA Board, which was due to be undertaken by the end of October 2025.

Our response

We look forward to seeing the outcome of the NZTA funding review.

²⁹ Our report on the Petition of Carjam Online Ltd is available on [the Parliament website](#).

³⁰ The Government response to the report of the Petitions Committee on the Petition of Carjam Online Ltd is available on [the Parliament website](#).

Appendix

Committee procedure

We began considering this briefing on 7 December 2023 and finalised this interim report on 11 December 2025.

Committee members

Greg O'Connor (Chairperson)

Carl Bates (to 29 Jan 2025)

Kahurangi Carter (to 8 May 2024, and from 29 January 2025)

Greg Fleming

Paulo Garcia (from 29 January 2025)

Francisco Hernandez (from 8 May 2024 to 29 January 2025)