MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT
TE MANATŪ WAKA

Request for Information: Road User Charges – Services for Vehicle Owners
Key themes from responses

Context

In November 2025, the Ministry released a Request for Information (RFI) to assess the interest of businesses in offering future RUC services, assess the readiness of the market to support a full fleet transition, and identify any potential barriers.

This Request for Information (RFI) was used to gather high-level information to help inform future work. A summary of key themes has been prepared to provide transparency about the feedback we received.

The summary reflects overall insights and does not attribute comments to individual respondents or disclose commercially sensitive information.

Who responded

We received feedback from 44 organisations with experience providing RUC or similar services in New Zealand or overseas, or that plan to do so in future.

The organisations that responded fall into four broad groups:

- **Retail RUC providers**, offering services directly to vehicle owners
- **Over-the-counter or agent networks**, providing in-person payment options
- **Electronic and fleet-management providers**, often using telematics or digital tools
- **Technology and platform providers**, supplying systems and components rather than dealing directly with users.

What we asked

The Ministry sought to understand:

- what commercial opportunities providers were interested in
- what an end-user focused system could look like
- the role of technology, and the potential for more innovative, user-friendly, and cost-effective solutions for measuring, reporting and collecting RUC
- how services could meet the needs of a diverse range of vehicle owners, while ensuring system integrity
- barriers to market entry and where government might need to provide support.

What future RUC services could look like

Respondents described a future RUC system made up of connected parts, with different providers specialising in different roles.

March 2026

Easy ways for people to pay

Providers expect to offer simple, user-friendly services such as apps, websites, and fleet-management tools. Many emphasised “set-and-forget” options that make it easy for people to stay compliant without regular manual effort.

Different ways to measure distance travelled

Rather than one single approach, providers expect multiple options, including:

- odometer readings
- in-vehicle devices
- GPS-based solutions
- vehicle manufacturer data

These options would suit different vehicle types, user preferences, and privacy expectations.

Tiered choices for users

Several respondents supported a tiered system, where users can choose between manual options and higher-assurance, more automated solutions. This reflects differences in privacy concerns, compliance risk, and how much automation users want.

Back-office systems

Providers noted the need for robust back-office systems to manage payments, pricing rules, customer accounts, and official records. Some raised questions about the role of a central system that holds official records and how it should be governed.

In-person and assisted options

In-person payment options, including cash and EFTPOS, were seen as important for people who are digitally excluded, have privacy concerns, or need help transitioning into the new system.

Future flexibility

Some respondents expect RUC systems to eventually support other transport charges, such as tolls, parking, or time-of-use charging, if designed with flexibility in mind.

What could slow market readiness

Respondents also identified barriers that could affect how quickly new services become available.

Unclear rules and timelines

Many providers said uncertainty around legislation, approval processes, and performance standards could delay investment and planning. Clear and early direction was seen as critical.

Certification complexity

Device and provider certification was described as costly and complex, with concerns it may favour older technologies. Providers preferred technology-neutral, outcome-based requirements.

Fair competition

Respondents raised concerns about New Zealand’s small market, the advantages of established providers, and the risk that overlapping roles (such as regulation and service provision) could disadvantage new entrants during the transition.

Compliance and enforcement

There is uncertainty about how compliance would be monitored without physical labels, particularly during early stages. Providers emphasised designing systems that make compliance easy, rather than relying heavily on penalties.

Access to data

Limited or unclear access to data such as odometer readings, vehicle registers, or manufacturer data was seen as a barrier. Better data access could reduce fraud, improve onboarding, and lower costs.

Devices and hardware

Concerns were raised about device costs, installation capacity, supply constraints, and tampering. Some questioned whether hardware-based solutions should be required when lighter-touch options may work better.

Public trust and acceptance

Providers expect resistance if RUC is perceived as an extra tax or if people believe it requires constant location tracking. Clear privacy rules, transparent data use, and consistent public messaging were seen as essential to building trust.

Transition-phase risks

Many risks were seen as concentrated during the transition period, when unclear approvals, uneven entry timing, or inconsistent enforcement could lead to confusion, revenue loss, or market distortion.

How long could it take for a market to develop?

Most respondents believe the market could be ready within 12–24 months, provided regulations are clarified early and integration with NZTA systems is stable and predictable.

Some believe the technology is already viable but note that public understanding, trust, and legislation still need to catch up. A smaller group expects development to take several years if transition design or uptake is slow.

Next steps

We are considering this feedback to assess overall market readiness and identify what further policy, regulatory, or system design decisions are needed in order to prepare for the full fleet transition to RUC.