18 December 2019

Dear [Name],

I refer to your request dated 12 November 2019, pursuant to the Official Information Act 1982 (the Act), seeking:

“I note the 23 August 2019 Board papers on p 18 say that Management has raised with Ministers “the desire to not apply the “feebate” for electric cars to one- and two-star - rated cars”: https://www.nzta.govt.nz/assets/About-us-2/docs/board-meeting-minutes-2019/minutes-20190823.pdf

Today in Question Time the Minister of Transport said on behalf of the Associate Minister, “I’ve asked the Ministry of Transport to work through those points with the transport agency.”

Under the OIA I seek copies of all emails sent/received by Ministry officials from 4 November 2019 to today relating to that request.”

The following documents fall within the scope of your request and are enclosed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Type/title</th>
<th>Date and time</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>5 November 2019, 7:54am</td>
<td>Some information withheld under section 9(2)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>7 November 2019, 11:22am</td>
<td>Some information withheld under section 9(2)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>Focus Area 2: Vehicle Safety (attachment)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Refused under section 18(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>Road Safety Strategy – Vehicles, Vehicle Standards and Certification Reference Group Outcomes Report (attachment)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Refused under section 18(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>7 November 2019, 11:57am</td>
<td>Some information withheld under section 9(2)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>Spreadsheet – CWR scores of light EV registrations 2016-2018 summary (attachment)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Refused under section 18(d)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Morning

My apologies I completely overlooked this. I’ll come back to you tomorrow morning at the latest – I’m in a workshop all day.

A few quick short points:
- Yes we can give you a file with CWR data for each year and method used.
- In terms of newer vehicles (EV’s in this case) having low CWR scores, we have to remember that if a vehicle model is manufactured between 2008 and 2014, the 2014 vehicle is no safer than the 2008 model. It just came out of the factory 6 years later. From memory the Nissan Leaf is based off the Nissan Tiida model and chassis and up until 2018 there was no change to that model since around 2011. Its party why just because a vehicle is newer in terms of manufacture year, doesn’t make it safer.
- Yes scores get updated every year as more data is received from crashes occurring in the previous year. So the scores would be more stable for older vehicles (more crash data) than for newer ones (fewer crashes).

I’ll go through yours and emails in more detail later today and give a fuller response.

Cheers,

S

Stu Ross
Principal Advisor Vehicles
Safety & Environment

Chews Lane Office Level 2, 50 Victoria Street,
Private Bag 6995, Wellington 6141, New Zealand

Please consider the environment before printing this email.
Hi

In regards to your question as to whether the Ministry has a firm position on NZTA’s concerns that the clean car discount may incentivise the purchase of unsafe cars, I can confirm that we do not have a firm view on this as yet. We have recently begun working with the Agency to understand their concerns and have requested that they provide the data they used to conduct their analysis. We have yet to receive this data.

Happy to help if you have any follow up questions.

Kind regards,

Adviser, Mobility & Safety
Ministry of Transport - Te Manatu Waka

www.transport.govt.nz

Enabling New Zealanders to flourish
From: Mark Rounthwaite  
Sent: Thursday, November 7, 2019 11:57 AM  
To: Glen-Marie Burns  
Subject: FW: NZTA Analysis of Clean Car Scheme & Safety - DRAFT  
Attachments: fuel_economy of registrations 201601-201906_v2_emissions only.zip; CWR scores of light EV registrations 2016-2018_Summary.xlsx  

---

Out of scope

Withheld under section 9(2)(a) of the Official Information Act 1982
Hi Mark,

As discussed with Glen-Marie. Our response below

Adviser, Mobility & Safety
Ministry of Transport - Te Manatu Waka

Enabling New Zealanders to flourish

---

From: Glen-Marie Burns
Sent: Thursday, 7 November 2019 12:24 PM
To: 
Subject: Re: 2 OPQs today (Associate Minister of Transport, Genter)

Thanks . Has NZTA seen this response? Is it a joint view?

Regards, Glen-Marie

Sent from mobile email

---

From: 
Sent: Thursday, November 7, 2019 12:04:19 PM
To: Glen-Marie Burns
Subject: FW: 2 OPQs today (Associate Minister of Transport, Genter)

Hi Glen-Marie

Some lines included below

- Officials' (NZTA and MOT) views on using driver protection star ratings as a regulatory measure for imported vehicles.

The Ministry has a number of concerns about using the ANCAP and UCSR as the basis for New Zealand’s regulatory regime. The Ministry’s concerns are based on the fact that:

- The data used to inform the ratings (in particular the UCSR) is not sufficiently comprehensive or robust to support regulation, especially any potential legal challenge.
- Using a ratings-based system would tie our regulatory regime to the decisions made by a third party
- Not all cars are rated
- ANCAP and UCSR do not always produce similar outcomes because of the different way tests are conducted in a laboratory compared to the real world
- UCSR is a comparative tool
- UCSR ratings can fluctuate
Corrected version.

The Mot’s response to this one is below.

- Officials’ (NZTA and MOT) views on whether clean car discounts should be applied for one-to-two star rated cars.

New Zealand’s vehicle standards ensure that all vehicles coming in meet a minimum level of safety. However, we are looking to ensure that the safety of vehicles coming into New Zealand consistently improves.

The Ministry has a number of concerns about using the protection star ratings as the basis for New Zealand’s regulatory regime.

Our view is that these should not be used as a qualification for a feebate.

(Refer to the detailed response on the rating systems)

Regards Glen-Marie
As discussed with Kirstie here is the second part of the request.

- Officials’ (NZTA and MOT) views on using driver protection star ratings as a regulatory measure for imported vehicles.

The Ministry has a number of concerns about using the ANCAP and UCSR as the basis for New Zealand’s regulatory regime. The Ministry’s concerns are based on the fact that:

- The data used to inform the ratings (in particular the UCSR) is not sufficiently comprehensive or robust to support regulation, especially any potential legal challenge.
- A regulatory system based on the ratings system would restrict trade in a way which would contravene our trade agreements because it would limit trade to countries using a standard that is not internationally recognised. (e.g. very few US manufactured vehicles appear on the UCSR, but this does not mean they are unsafe)
- Using a ratings-based system would tie our regulatory regime to the decisions made by a third party
- Not all cars are rated
- ANCAP and UCSR do not always produce similar outcomes because of the different way tests are conducted in a laboratory compared to the real world
- UCSR is a comparative tool
- UCSR ratings can fluctuate
- No other jurisdictions that we are aware of has based their vehicle regulatory regime on a the ANCAP, UCSR, or any similar systems

The ministry suggests that the rating systems can play a positive role in helping to inform the public on the benefits of vehicle safety outside of a regulatory role. For this reason, the action plan for the new RSS includes a focus area on improving consumer understanding of vehicle safety, of which the ratings system will play a part.

Adviser, Mobility & Safety

Ministry of Transport – Te Manatu Waka

|www.transport.govt.nz|
No other jurisdictions that we are aware of has based their vehicle regulatory regime on a the ANCAP, UCSR, or any similar systems.

The ministry suggests that the rating systems can play a positive role in helping to inform the public on the benefits of vehicle safety outside of a regulatory role. For this reason, the action plan for the new RSS includes a focus area on improving consumer understanding of vehicle safety, of which the ratings system will play a part.

Enabling New Zealanders to flourish

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Thursday, 7 November 2019 11:54 AM
To: [Redacted]
Subject: FW: 2 OPQs today (Associate Minister of Transport, Genter)
Importance: High

Hi [Redacted]
See below

Enabling New Zealanders to flourish

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Thursday, 7 November 2019 11:33 AM
To: [Redacted]
Subject: FW: 2 OPQs today (Associate Minister of Transport, Genter)
Importance: High

From: Glen-Marie Burns
Sent: Thursday, 7 November 2019 11:27 AM
To: [Redacted]
Subject: FW: 2 OPQs today (Associate Minister of Transport, Genter)
Importance: High

Can you look at the 2nd part. UDE will do the first part.

Out of scope

[Redacted]
Hi Stu,

Have you had a chance to look at my email below?

Thanks,

Withheld under section 9(2)(a) of the Official Information Act 1982

Out of scope
Certain information is being withheld in reliance on the following sections of the Act:

- section 9(2)(a), which relates to protecting the privacy of natural persons.

Document 2b has been refused under section 18(d) of the Act, as the information is publicly available at https://www.transport.govt.nz/multi-modal/keystrategiesandplans/road-safety-strategy/more-information-on-the-road-safety-strategy/.

Documents 2a and 3a have also been refused under section 18(d) of the Act. This information will be publicly available soon.

With regard to the information that has been withheld under section 9 of the Act, I am of the opinion that there are no countervailing considerations that make it desirable, in the public interest, to make the information available.

You have the right under section 28(3) of the Official Information Act to make a complaint about the withholding of information to the Ombudsman, whose address for contact purposes is info@ombudsman.parliament.nz.

The Ministry publishes our Official Information Act responses and the information contained in our reply to you will be published on the Ministry website. Before publishing, we will remove any personal or identifiable information.

Yours sincerely

Glen-Marie Burns
Manager, Urban Development and Environment