



## BRIEFING

### Freedom camping consultation: preliminary advice

<b>Date:</b>	23 June 2021	<b>Priority:</b>	Medium
<b>Security classification:</b>	In Confidence	<b>Tracking number:</b>	2021-3955

Action sought		
	Action sought	Deadline
Hon Stuart Nash <b>Minister of Tourism</b>	<p><b>Provide</b> feedback on suite of recommendations</p> <p><b>Forward</b> this briefing to the Minister of Local Government, Minister of Transport and Minister of Conservation for their information</p>	30 June 2021

Contact for telephone discussion (if required)				
Name	Position	Telephone		1st contact
Rebecca Heerdegen	Director, Tourism Branch	04 901 1564	Privacy of natural persons	✓
Tracey Black	Principal Policy Advisor, Tourism Policy	-	Privacy of natural persons	-
Fraser Pearce	Senior Policy Advisor, Tourism Policy	-	Privacy of natural persons	-

The following departments/agencies have been consulted
Department of Conservation, Department of Internal Affairs, Kāinga Ora, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, Ministry of Social Development, Ministry of Transport, the Treasury, Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency

**Minister's office to complete:**

- |                                               |                                              |
|-----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Approved             | <input type="checkbox"/> Declined            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Noted                | <input type="checkbox"/> Needs change        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Seen                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Overtaken by Events |
| <input type="checkbox"/> See Minister's Notes | <input type="checkbox"/> Withdrawn           |

**Comments**



# BRIEFING

## Freedom camping consultation: preliminary advice

<b>Date:</b>	23 June 2021	<b>Priority:</b>	Medium
<b>Security classification:</b>	In Confidence	<b>Tracking number:</b>	2021-3955

### Purpose

---

This briefing provides a summary of the public feedback on the Government's freedom camping discussion document, and our preliminary advice.

### Executive summary

---

From 9 April to 16 May 2021, the Government consulted publicly on four proposed changes to support sustainable freedom camping in Aotearoa New Zealand. The discussion document set out the Government's concerns about the impact on our communities, our environment and on our international tourism brand caused by freedom campers staying in vehicles that are not self-contained and who do not camp responsibly.

Public feedback suggests that there is a moderate level of agreement (60 percent of respondents) that vehicle-based freedom camping is a problem, and a key concern is campers staying in vehicles that are not certified as self-contained. However, feedback from key stakeholders (local government, industry, camping and community organisations) is less in agreement with the problem as presented (just over 40 percent agreed or strongly agreed). Other concerns raised by submitters include litter, overcrowding, campers staying too long, and a lack of infrastructure.

These views point to the need for multifaceted solutions to address the issues caused by freedom camping. Continued investment in infrastructure and management activities (including education and enforcement) will be needed in addition to improving the regulatory system for managing freedom camping.

Based on our preliminary analysis, we recommend you progress the following proposals:

- introduce a regulatory regime for certification of self-contained vehicles
- require certified self-contained vehicles to have a permanent toilet – this would mean portable toilets would no longer be sufficient for certification, however it would not require a permanent black water tank
- require freedom campers staying in a vehicle (whether self-propelled or a caravan) to use a certified self-contained vehicle, unless staying at a place identified as suitable for freedom camping in non-self-contained vehicles by a local authority or Department of Conservation (DOC) (a mid-point between the proposals consulted on)
- introduce a sliding scale of infringement fees, with higher fines for more serious offences
- further explore the best method of ensuring campers who hire rental vehicles are held liable for the infringements they receive.

Constitutional conventions

---

---

---

## Recommended action

---

The Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment recommends that you:

- a **Note** the public feedback on issues arising from freedom camping and the Government's proposals, which includes:
- i. a moderate level of concern with vehicle-based freedom camping
  - ii. concern about a range of issues, including overcrowding, litter, anti-social behaviour and lack of infrastructure for freedom camping, in addition to those highlighted in the discussion document
  - iii. support for both regulatory and non-regulatory interventions, including provision of infrastructure and education for campers
  - iv. moderate support for establishing a regulatory regime for the self-containment of vehicles
  - v. mixed views about whether the self-containment requirements should allow the use of portable toilets or if toilets should be required to be fixed within the vehicle, but clear opposition to a requirement for permanent black water tanks
  - vi. moderate support for more stringent requirements for vehicle-based freedom campers, but interest in providing local authorities and DOC flexibility to decide if non-self-contained vehicles should be permitted at some sites or places
  - vii. moderate support for introducing higher fines, but no support for broader grounds for vehicle confiscation
  - viii. interest from a few local authorities in broadened criteria for making freedom camping bylaws, or a prohibition on freedom camping except where it is permitted, so they can put tighter controls over freedom camping
  - ix. widespread demand for relatively modest ongoing funding for infrastructure and management activities
- Noted*
- b **Agree** that officials continue work on:
- i. designing the regulatory regime for self-containment of vehicles and developing costings *Agree / Disagree*
  - ii. developing a new option for a national freedom camping rule (a modification to Proposals 1 and 2), to require vehicle-based freedom campers to use self-contained vehicles, unless staying at a place designated as suitable for non-self-contained vehicles by a local authority or DOC *Agree / Disagree*
  - iii. developing a new list of infringements and higher infringement fees (fines) under the Freedom Camping Act which align with the proposed changes *Agree / Disagree*
- c **Agree** that officials **not** progress work on:
- i. broadening the criteria in the Freedom Camping Act for confiscation of vehicles *Agree / Disagree*
  - ii. changes to bylaw-making criteria/powers under the Freedom Camping Act for restricting or prohibiting freedom camping, as this was not explicitly consulted on *Agree / Disagree*
  - iii. an option to allow local authorities to entirely prohibit freedom camping, as this was not explicitly consulted on *Agree / Disagree*

- d **Note** that work underway to facilitate the visitor market paying for impacts at place (including Constitutional conventions and a local government funding best practice toolkit) will provide local authorities and DOC with funding mechanisms to manage costs associated with freedom camping

*Noted*

- e **Forward** this briefing to the Minister of Local Government, the Minister of Transport and the Minister of Conservation for their information.

*Agree / Disagree*



Rebecca Heerdegen  
**Director, Tourism Branch**  
Labour Science & Enterprise, MBIE

23 / 06 / 2021

Hon Stuart Nash  
**Minister of Tourism**

..... / ..... / .....

## Background

---

### Outcomes sought from freedom camping

1. Freedom camping is an important part of both domestic and international tourism. Many visitors are attracted to freedom camping as a means of experiencing the outdoors and visiting our natural attractions. Freedom camping provides economic and social benefits – freedom campers spend money in our communities, and some contribute in other ways, such as participating in the seasonal workforce and volunteering.
2. Freedom camping can also cause harms to communities if camping is not done responsibly, or volumes are not managed appropriately. Despite improvements in visitor behaviour over the past three years (prior to the border closing as a result of COVID-19), issues were still being seen from both international and domestic freedom campers, including poor behaviour, waste and litter, and overcrowding. The absence of international visitors since the border closed has not eliminated the problems.
3. In your foreword to the Government's discussion document, *Supporting Sustainable Freedom Camping in Aotearoa New Zealand*, you prefaced the proposals by noting the need to ensure:
  - a. the costs of freedom camping are not borne by local councils and communities
  - b. we have the infrastructure and systems in place to support people to camp responsibly.
4. These are essential to rebuilding this part of the tourism system on a sustainable model, and to elevate Brand NZ.

### What the Government consulted on

5. From 9 April to 16 May 2021, the Government consulted publicly on four proposed changes:
  - a. Proposal 1: Make it mandatory for freedom camping in a vehicle to be done in a certified self-contained vehicle
  - b. Proposal 2: Make it mandatory for freedom campers to stay in a vehicle that is certified self-contained unless they are staying at a site with toilets
  - c. Proposal 3: Improve the regulatory tools for government land managers
  - d. Proposal 4: Strengthen the requirements for self-contained vehicles.
6. The Government also sought feedback on specific issues associated with implementing some of the proposals in the discussion document, namely:
  - a. the types of arrangements that would be needed to transition the voluntary approach for self-contained vehicles to a new regulated system
  - b. how to ensure people experiencing homelessness are not disadvantaged by the proposals, while supporting the effective implementation of any proposals that are introduced.

### How freedom camping is currently managed in New Zealand

7. The existing freedom camping system, which submitters have reflected on, has the following key aspects:
  - a. The Freedom Camping Act 2011 (the Act) regulates freedom camping on land controlled by local authorities and DOC. It does not cover private land.

- b. Freedom camping is defined in the Act; in summary it is staying for free within 200 metres of where you can drive, the coast, or a Great Walks Track, in a vehicle or tent.
  - c. Freedom camping is permitted anywhere unless expressly restricted or prohibited in a particular area:
    - i. local authorities can make freedom camping bylaws to restrict or prohibit freedom camping in an area if that is necessary to protect the area, or access to it, or to protect people's health and safety.
    - ii. DOC has a similar, but broader, power to restrict or prohibit freedom camping on public conservation land by making freedom camping notices.
  - d. Many freedom camping bylaws and notices require freedom campers in certain areas to stay in a vehicle that has been certified as self-contained under the New Zealand Standard for self-containment of motor caravans and caravans (the NZ Standard). Certification is not regulated.
  - e. Enforcement is carried out by local authorities and DOC.
8. The Government has previously provided support for local authorities to manage freedom camping in their district, funded through the Tourism Infrastructure Fund (TIF), including:
- a. investment in new tourism infrastructure, eg toilets, dump stations, freedom camping sites
  - b. operational funding for management activities in cities and districts with high demand, eg education, enforcement and waste and rubbish management
  - c. pilots of technological solutions to support responsible camping.

## **Public feedback on discussion document**

---

- 9. Over 5,100 submissions were received in response to the discussion document, including from members of the public, and from key stakeholders (local government, industry, camping and other community organisations).
- 10. The discussion document set out the Government's view that a core problem with freedom camping is campers staying in vehicles that are not self-contained and who do not camp responsibly (for example, in that they do not dispose of their waste appropriately).
- 11. Feedback on the discussion document indicates there is a moderate level of concern about vehicle-based freedom camping: 60 percent of submitters agreed or strongly agreed that certain types of vehicle-based freedom camping is a problem, and much of this centres on people staying in vehicles that are not self-contained.
- 12. Other issues of concern identified by submitters include waste and litter, overcrowding, antisocial behaviour and lack of infrastructure for freedom camping.
- 13. Feedback from public submissions suggests that a multifaceted approach is required to address the problems, including both regulatory and non-regulatory interventions. Non-regulatory interventions highlighted by many submitters include additional infrastructure for campers and day-trippers, and education about what is expected in terms of responsible camping behaviour. All local government submitters identified the need for a secure source of ongoing funding to manage freedom camping in their cities and districts.
- 14. A high level summary of the public's feedback on the proposals is set out below, and in Annex One.

Proposal	Support and comments
<p><b>Proposals 1 and 2</b></p> <p><i>Either</i></p> <p>Make it mandatory for freedom camping in a vehicle to be done in a certified self-contained vehicle (1)</p> <p><i>Or</i></p> <p>Make it mandatory for freedom campers to stay in a vehicle that is certified self-contained unless they are staying at a site with toilets (2)</p>	<p><b><i>Moderate support for both</i></b></p> <p>There was support from the public for Proposal 1 and 2, at 60% and 55% respectively. This indicates there is support for the introduction of a national rule relating to the use of self-contained vehicles, but not necessarily specifically Proposal 1 or Proposal 2. Highest levels of public support for the proposals came from those who never or rarely freedom camp.</p> <p>There was lower support for introducing either of these proposals from key stakeholders (around 40% for both proposals). Many local government submitters wanted flexibility to continue welcoming freedom campers in non-self-contained vehicles (Proposal 2 provides for this), but they considered the proposed exceptions (public conservation land and regional parks) to be unworkable. Camping organisations opposed the changes.</p>
<p><b>Proposal 3 – regulatory system for self-contained vehicles</b></p>	<p><b><i>Moderate support</i></b></p> <p>About half of the public and two-thirds of key stakeholders supported this proposal. Lower rates of support by the public are possibly linked to dislike of the cost-recovery aspect and general opposition to regulation. Some camping organisations are opposed in principle to any change to the freedom camping regulatory system.</p> <p>This is a necessary component of the system if other changes are made, and feedback from key submitters (including camping groups) acknowledges and supports this.</p>
<p><b>Proposal 3 – higher fines</b></p>	<p><b><i>Moderate support</i></b></p> <p>There was support for graduated, higher fines for more serious infringements across stakeholder groups, but little support for going as high as \$1,000 as allowed under the Act.</p>
<p><b>Proposal 3 – require rental vehicle companies to collect fines from customers</b></p>	<p><b><i>Moderate support</i></b></p> <p>Most public submitters agreed this should be part of the infringement system. Support from industry was more tentative, with companies generally open to the proposal if it is consistent with the traffic fines system (where rental companies, not having committed the offence, are not liable for the fine themselves).</p>
<p><b>Proposal 3 – broaden grounds for confiscation</b></p>	<p><b><i>No support</i></b></p> <p>There is significant opposition to extending the grounds that already exist in the Freedom Camping Act, as it is onerous for enforcement authorities and a significant step to deprive someone of a vehicle they are staying in.</p>
<p><b>Proposal 4 – strengthen the requirements for self-contained vehicles</b></p>	<p><b><i>Opposition to permanently plumbed toilets</i></b></p> <p>There was roughly even distribution between support and opposition to this proposal, but notably there was a high level of opposition from both the public and key stakeholders to requiring permanently plumbed toilets.</p>

<b>Transitional provisions</b>	<b>Moderate support</b> There was a split in feedback about how long the transitional period should be, ranging from one year to four years (the latter is the length of a self-containment warrant).
<b>Homelessness</b>	<b>Strong support for protecting vulnerable people</b> There was near unanimous agreement that people experiencing homelessness should not be affected by freedom camping requirements.
<b>Other topics outside scope of consultation</b>	Some territorial authorities indicated they would prefer broadened bylaw-making criteria to enable them to control freedom camping better, including in urban areas or to protect the interests of commercial campgrounds, and/or 'flipping' the presumption in the Act so that freedom camping would be prohibited unless it is specifically allowed.

## Comment

---

### Regulatory system for the certification of self-contained vehicles

#### *Recommendation*

15. We recommend the introduction of a regulatory system for the certification of self-contained vehicles (motor caravans and caravans). There are clear benefits to moving from unregulated certification of vehicles under the voluntary NZ Standard to regulated requirements for certification of self-contained vehicles. These include:
- a. consistency of certification, supported by specifying competencies for testing officers, and the provision of guidance and monitoring of registered issuing authorities by a regulator
  - b. increased public trust that vehicles displaying a warrant of self-containment have the appropriate facilities
  - c. certainty for enforcement authorities of a vehicle's self-containment status through a national register of self-contained vehicles.

#### *Discussion*

16. The Government has choices relating to the design of the regulatory system, for example who the regulator should be, who should be authorised to certify self-containment of vehicles, what systems and qualifications or competencies are required for authorised parties, and offences and penalties (such as display of a fraudulent warrant of self-containment).
17. These provisions would be split between a bill, and regulations to be made once the bill is enacted. We will report to you further with specific recommendations about regulatory design.
18. The introduction of a new regulatory system will come at a cost, and we recommend that ongoing operational costs are recovered from regulated parties through a fee. The initial set-up cost for the regulator – in particular designing and building a register of self-contained vehicles – could be either funded by the Crown or cost-recovered. We will discuss this further with the Treasury and report back with recommendations.



## **Mandatory minimum requirements for self-containment of a vehicle**

### *Recommendation*

19. We recommend introducing most elements of the (currently voluntary) NZ Standard as the minimum requirements for a self-contained vehicle. The exceptions to this would be:
  - a. The types of toilets. Further to submitters' feedback, there is a choice for you to make concerning what types of toilet are acceptable and whether you wish to narrow what is permitted under the current NZ Standard. Stipulating that toilets must be fixed within the vehicle will support your objectives – at a cost to some self-contained vehicle users. We do not recommend requiring permanent black water tanks.
  - b. Certain provisions which need updating to ensure consistency with plumbing requirements for foul water set out in the NZ Building Code and other plumbing standards.

### *Discussion*

20. There are two potential variables for the Government to consider in respect of allowable types of toilet. The first focuses on type (chemical, composting, macerating, with removable or permanent black water tanks), and the second focuses more on placement (portable or permanent, and/or in a separate 'room' within the vehicle).
21. The choice about what toilets are acceptable will be informed more by user behaviour than by sanitary adequacy. All of the toilets permitted under the NZ Standard meet sanitary requirements.
22. The public's feedback (opposing a requirement for permanent toilets) reflects the fact that portable toilets are very popular and widely used on self-contained vehicles (whether certified or not), as they are space savers and cheaper than other toilet types.
23. However, research indicates that portable toilets are far less likely to be used than a permanent toilet. In the context of a certified vehicle, portable toilets also have the disadvantage that it is possible for the toilet to be removed at any time.
24. Your objective of encouraging increased usage of toilets in camping vehicles is therefore likely to be supported by requiring toilets to be permanent, and no longer permitting portable toilets. A decision to require permanent toilets will place costs on vehicle owners who wish to continue using a vehicle to freedom camp, and on industry:
  - a. An unknown number of vehicles that currently have a portable toilet on board would need upgrading.
  - b. Some vehicles will not be large enough to be upgraded with a permanent toilet and provide space for the same number of campers.
25. We do not consider it is necessary to require the toilet to be in a separate room.
26. We do not consider that requiring permanent black water tanks is necessary. Removable tanks (as used with some types of permanent toilets) are adequate, and we do not have information suggesting that the type of black water tank affects toilet usage. In addition, we note that permanent black water tanks are not widely used (for example, 85 percent of New Zealand Motor Caravan Association members' certified vehicles have removable tanks). Upgrading vehicles to fit a permanent black water tank would be impractical in many cases, as it would place the vehicle over the maximum weight allowed for the class.
27. Self-containment requirements should be placed into regulations. These are readily amended as plumbing standards change, and not subject to the same consensus approach

that developing a Standard is. As previously advised (briefing 2021-3953 refers), we propose to commence developing regulations after Cabinet has made policy decisions.

## **National rule requiring use of self-contained vehicles**

### *Recommendation*

28. We recommend developing a national rule requiring the use of a self-contained vehicle by freedom campers using a vehicle (whether self-propelled or a caravan). However, based on the feedback noted earlier about Proposals 1 and 2, we consider a modified proposal should be explored. We seek your views on a modified proposal as follows:

Freedom campers staying in a vehicle must use a certified self-contained vehicle, unless staying at a site or place designated as suitable for freedom camping in non-self-contained vehicles by the local authority or DOC.

### *Discussion*

29. As noted earlier, there is a reasonable level of support from submitters for more stringent requirements for vehicle-based freedom campers.
30. However, some territorial authorities indicated that they wish to retain the flexibility to welcome freedom campers staying in non-self-contained vehicles at suitable sites. DOC has expressed a similar view, and considers that the proposed new rule about the use of certified self-contained vehicles should not apply to “traditional users” of public conservation land (for example, those who freedom camp in vehicles as part of going to tramp, hunt, or fish).
31. A modified proposal that provides a level of flexibility, as outlined above, would:
- a. create a strong presumption that vehicle-based freedom campers will use a self-contained vehicle, and
  - b. empower local authorities and DOC to make decisions about whether, and where, freedom campers staying in non-self-contained vehicles may stay, in line with their own objectives, camper volumes, and available amenities.
32. Freedom campers using a tent would be unaffected by this proposal (as is the case with Proposals 1), and would be able to camp in their tent in line with any freedom camping bylaws or notices (which can prohibit access, place restrictions on the conditions or length of stay, or require use of chemical toilets).
33. This proposal could go further, and also prescribe the types of facilities that should be present at designated sites (such as toilets, rubbish bins, and other facilities). However, our view is that it should be left for the decision-maker in each case to determine what facilities are necessary to support responsible use of the site, based on local knowledge. This is a function of destination management and the decision-maker can consider how individual sites integrate with other local commercial/non-commercial operations.
34. We seek your agreement to further progress this modified proposal for the use of self-contained vehicles, in consultation with partner agencies.

## **Higher fines, requiring rental vehicle companies to collect fines from customers and vehicle confiscation**

### *Recommendation*

35. We recommend that:
- a. officials undertake further work to identify infringements for which higher fees (fines) could be issued

- b. officials undertake further work relating to rental vehicle companies collecting fines from customers
- c. the proposal to broaden vehicle confiscation powers in the Act is not progressed.

#### *Discussion*

- 36. A sliding scale of fines, with higher fines for more serious offences, had broad support. As the Act already provides for regulations specifying higher fines to be made, we propose to progress this work later this year. We will use the Ministry of Transport penalties framework to assess proportionality and work with the Ministry of Justice offences team.
- 37. Further work needs to be done to identify the best method of ensuring campers who hire rental vehicles are held liable for the infringements they receive. Currently, rental companies that receive infringement notices as the registered owner of a vehicle have the option of charging the credit card of hirers during or after the hire. Many however instead choose to transfer liability to the hirer and provide the hirer's contact details to the issuing enforcement authority to chase up payment.
- 38. Our initial thinking is that we might, through the Act, require rental vehicle companies to demonstrate that they have made reasonable efforts to collect customers' fines under their rental arrangements, before transferring legal liability to the customer. We do not consider it would be an effective deterrent to poor freedom camper behaviour to make rental vehicle companies liable themselves for their customers' infringements.
- 39. We do not recommend progressing the proposal to broaden the existing powers in the Act for vehicle confiscation given the lack of support from submitters.

### **Broadening bylaw-making criteria and/or changing the presumption that freedom camping is permitted**

#### *Recommendation*

- 40. We recommend that you do not progress the following types of changes, as suggested by some local government submitters:
  - a. broader bylaw-making criteria to allow local authorities to more readily restrict or prohibit freedom camping, or
  - b. changing the presumption in the Act to a prohibition on freedom camping except where it is explicitly permitted.

#### *Discussion*

- 41. The discussion document stated that exploring wider reforms to the Act was out of scope for the public consultation.
- 42. Nevertheless, a small number of local government submitters took the opportunity to state that the bylaw-making criteria are too restrictive. They would like to be able to consider other criteria that would enable them, for example, to better manage freedom camping in urban areas and to protect commercial campgrounds. Some of these submitters suggested that reversing the presumption in the Act, to prohibit freedom camping except where it has been permitted, would support them to determine the best local approach.
- 43. The Act is currently weighted in favour of freedom camping, and local authorities have high thresholds to meet to restrict or prohibit it under a freedom camping bylaw. Bylaw-making criteria are limited to protecting people's health and safety, and protecting the area and/or access to the area.

44. However, in some cases, freedom camping bylaws are very restrictive, which suggests that the existing bylaw-making criteria may provide adequate scope for local authorities to control freedom camping based on the local needs. We would require further detailed information from local authorities about how the bylaw-making criteria were specifically frustrating their management objectives to be able to undertake a proper analysis of the need for change. We also note that, as this topic was out of scope for the consultation, other key stakeholders who would likely have views have not provided commentary.
45. Two freedom camping bylaws are currently under judicial review – those made by Queenstown-Lakes District and Marlborough District Councils. Future findings by the High Court in either of these cases could provide further information about the effect and/or limits of the bylaw-making criteria.

## Implementation

---

### Funding

#### *Funding regulatory change*

46. As noted above, initial funding would be needed to enable the regulator to design and build a national register of self-contained vehicles and set up systems. We are working on detailed costings and will report back with further information. Your Cabinet paper will need to identify the financial implications of the proposal and a between-Budget bid may be required, depending on timeframes.

#### *Funding freedom camping management activities*

47. Ongoing funding is needed for local authorities and DOC to carry out freedom camping management activities. Investment in new infrastructure is also periodically required (for both freedom campers and other visitors). Territorial authorities have been clear that a secure source of funding is essential to effective management. Over the past three years, the Crown has provided approximately \$8 million per annum for operational costs from the TIF.
48. Constitutional conventions

49.

50. Constitutional conventions

51.

### **Transitional arrangements**

52. We have identified four main groups for which transitional arrangements would need to be in place: the regulator, owners of self-contained vehicles, existing issuing authorities, and land managers (such as local authorities and DOC).

53. The main choice will be around how much time to allow for each group affected by the new requirements to develop systems and achieve compliance. For example:

- a. There are over 70,000 vehicles certified under the existing standard. We need to allow sufficient time for some vehicles to be upgraded, and for issuing authorities to check the vehicles meet the new requirements. These are skilled processes, with a limited pool of competent people. An appropriate transition period will ensure higher compliance and greater acceptance of change.
- b. The regulator will need to establish processes for issuing authorities and build the national register.

54. We will report back to you on transitional arrangements in a future briefing.

### **People experiencing homelessness**

55. We have identified two approaches to ensure that changes to the Act do not further disadvantage people who are experiencing homelessness:

- a. allow enforcement agencies to use their discretion
- b. place in legislation some protection for those who are living in vehicles because they lack access to minimally adequate housing.

56. At this stage, we do not have a recommended approach and we are exploring this issue with the Legislation Design Advisory Committee (LDAC).

57. Maintenance of the law

58.

59. We will provide you with advice after LDAC's consideration.

## **Next steps**

---

60. We will continue to develop further advice on the issues discussed above, and will provide this to you in the coming weeks to support you to make decisions on the policy proposals you wish to take to Cabinet.

## **Annexes**

---

Annex 1: High-level findings from public submissions