

Sharing information on Working for Families in AISA and incorporation of existing agreements for child support and student loans

A tax policy consultation document



Inland Revenue
Te Tari Taake

FIRST PUBLISHED

April 2026 by Policy, Inland Revenue, PO Box 2198, Wellington 6140.



© Crown Copyright

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International Licence. In essence, you are free to copy, distribute and adapt the work, as long as you attribute the work to the Crown and abide by the other licence terms.

The document is available at

<https://www.taxpolicy.ird.govt.nz/consultation/2026/aisa-ir-customs>

Inland Revenue can provide an alternate version of this material if requested. Please cite this document's title, website address, or PDF file name when you email a request to policy.webmaster@ird.govt.nz.

Making a submission

Inland Revenue invites submissions on the issues raised in this document, including the specific questions asked and any other issues relevant for officials to consider. A complete list of these questions can be found in the Appendix to this issues paper.

Include in your submission a brief summary of the major points and recommendations you have made. Please indicate if officials from Inland Revenue can contact you to discuss the points raised, if required.

The closing date for submissions is 5 June 2026

Submissions can be made:

- by email to policy.webmaster@ird.govt.nz with Information sharing between Inland Revenue and Customs in the subject line, or
- by post to:

Information sharing between Inland Revenue and Customs
C/- Deputy Commissioner, Policy
Inland Revenue Department
PO Box 2198
Wellington 6140

Privacy of submissions

This consultation process is done under section 150 of the Privacy Act 2020, which requires consultation on any proposed AISA before it can be finalised.

Submissions may be requested under the Official Information Act 1982. Please clearly indicate in your submission if you consider that any information should be withheld on the grounds of privacy, or for any other reason. Contact information such as an address, email, and phone number for submissions from individuals will be withheld. Whether any information is withheld will be determined using the Official Information Act 1982.

Contents

Making a submission	3
Chapter 1 – Introduction	5
Summary of proposals.....	5
Chapter 2 – Problem	6
Previous consultation as part of Budget 2025	8
Chapter 3 – Options	9
Base proposal: Improved information sharing between Inland Revenue and Customs	9
Legislative mechanisms allowing information to be shared.....	9
Criteria for assessment.....	10
Option 1: Section 316 agreement	10
Option 2: Change to primary legislation	10
Option 3: AISA	11
Identification process and information to be shared between agencies.....	12
Incorporation of existing information matching arrangements for student loans and child support into AISA	13
Chapter 4 – Privacy principles and safeguards.....	15
Modifications to information privacy principles.....	15
Privacy safeguards.....	15
Chapter 5 – Questions for Submitters	19

Chapter 1 – Introduction

- 1.1 The Government wants to support families by providing financial support through Working for Families (WfF) and by reducing the opportunity for these families to go into debt when WfF is overpaid.
- 1.2 When the WfF principal caregiver travels or moves overseas for a long enough length of time which means they no longer qualify for WfF, they can find themselves in debt.
- 1.3 The proposals in this document aim to help prevent that debt situation arising by allowing Inland Revenue and the New Zealand Customs Service to share information.
- 1.4 This proposal builds on the current successful information sharing activity undertaken for verifying border movements for the student loans and child support schemes.

Summary of proposals

- 1.5 To enable the sharing of information between Inland Revenue and Customs for WfF purposes, it is proposed to enter into an approved information sharing agreement (AISA) under the Privacy Act 2020. A formal sharing agreement such as this will help to minimise the problem, while maintaining the protections provided by the Privacy Act 2020 and the Tax Administration Act 1994.
- 1.6 It is also proposed that the existing Information Matching Agreements between Inland Revenue and Customs for Student Loans and Child Support purposes be replaced by the proposed AISA.
- 1.7 This consultation document outlines the problem, how we propose to address it, the sharing process, what information would be shared, and the safeguards that will be put in place to protect that information. We also discuss any debt collection actions that may be taken.
- 1.8 Also, the document proposes to move the current sharing for child support and student loan purposes under information matching agreements into the AISA at some point in the future. This would not result in any privacy impacts, it only updates the legislative mechanism and aligns all sharing of border information under one agreement.
- 1.9 The Government welcomes feedback on the perceived advantages and disadvantages of this proposal and whether further controls should be put in place.

Chapter 2 – Problem

- 2.1 WfF is administered by Inland Revenue under Part M of the Income Tax Act 2007. It provides financial assistance to low- to middle-income families with dependent children aged 18 and under to assist with the cost of raising children in New Zealand. To qualify, the principal caregiver or the dependent child must meet certain requirements that include living in New Zealand.
- 2.2 Principal caregivers might lose their entitlement when they depart New Zealand for extended periods or move overseas. They are therefore required to notify Inland Revenue when they depart New Zealand in case their departure affects their entitlements. If a WfF principal caregiver is no longer entitled but continues to receive WfF payments after they leave New Zealand, they may end up with a debt that needs to be repaid. Inland Revenue's preference is that the principal caregiver avoids debt by not receiving WfF payments they are not entitled to.
- 2.3 WfF recipients can still travel outside New Zealand for short periods, for instance, for holidays or family occasions, without losing their eligibility, as long as they continue to meet residency requirements. The proposed changes would mainly affect WfF customers who have left New Zealand permanently or have stayed away long enough that they no longer satisfy the eligibility criteria. Some WfF principal caregivers may not realise they are still getting paid, which could happen if they stop checking their New Zealand bank account. There have been cases when WfF payments have continued for several years, leading to large debts for these individuals.
- 2.4 If an individual receives a main benefit from the Ministry of Social Development, they will also receive their WfF payments from it. The Ministry of Social Development stops paying WfF when it stops paying a main benefit, such as Jobseeker support or sole parent support. Given that the travel conditions for main benefits are stricter than for WfF, similar issues generally do not arise for WfF principal caregivers paid by the Ministry of Social Development.
- 2.5 Some information about the travel movements of individuals receiving financial assistance is already shared between Inland Revenue, the Ministry of Social Development, and Customs. Inland Revenue and Customs share information about student loan borrowers and child support liable parents. However, the legislation precludes using travel movement information for the administration of WfF payments paid by Inland Revenue, which this discussion document seeks to address.

Current policy: Sharing for student loans and child support purposes

Inland Revenue provides Customs with a list of child support liable parents and student loan borrowers who meet certain criteria. Using this list, Customs advises Inland Revenue in real time when that person enters or leaves New Zealand. Inland Revenue has several options that can apply to recover debt, with the most severe being stopping liable parents or student loan borrowers from leaving New Zealand to avoid their child support or student loan obligations. Principal caregivers would not be stopped at the border under the proposal in this discussion document as a result of WfF entitlement being overpaid.

- 2.6 Inland Revenue and Customs do not have automated sharing of information that covers WfF. This means accessing information about WfF principal caregivers is a manual and time-consuming process.
- 2.7 Currently, if Inland Revenue suspects a WfF principal caregiver is no longer in New Zealand and is not eligible for WfF, it can request information from Customs on when that person left New Zealand and if they have returned. This request can be done under section 17B of the Tax Administration Act 1994 on a case-by-case basis. This has high administrative costs for both Inland Revenue and Customs, and it can mean some WfF principal caregivers continue to receive WfF payments they are not entitled to receive.

Example 1: WfF recipients incur debt when they leave New Zealand

Angela and John are moving permanently to England with their child, Denis. They currently receive WfF payments each week. They left New Zealand on 1 August 2025. Their weekly WfF payments are paid into Angela's New Zealand bank account, which they have not checked since they left New Zealand. When Inland Revenue runs the end of year square-up process in May 2026, they notice that Angela and John have not earned any income since August 2025 including no interest on the bank account. Inland Revenue notifies the couple and sends them a letter querying what income they are using to support their day-to-day living costs. When they do not respond, Inland Revenue requests information from Customs under section 17B of the Tax Administration Act 1994 to confirm the date they left the country. Inland Revenue stops their WfF payments on 8 August 2026. The couple have been overpaid from 1 August 2025 to 8 August 2026 and will need to repay the total amount they have received since they left New Zealand.

Questions for submitters

Q1. Do you consider that the issue outlined is of concern? If not, why not?

Previous consultation as part of Budget 2025

- 2.8 At Budget 2025, the Government consulted on a range of proposals to improve certainty and prevent debt in the WfF scheme.¹ The discussion document proposed simplifying the WfF residence requirements to make it easier for customers to determine whether they are eligible.
- 2.9 The discussion document proposed enhanced information sharing between Customs and Inland Revenue. Having access to timely information on the border movements of WfF principal caregivers would allow Inland Revenue to stop WfF payments when needed, reducing the risk of families getting into debt.
- 2.10 The results of that consultation are available on the Inland Revenue tax policy website.²

¹ <https://www.taxpolicy.ird.govt.nz/consultation/2025/empowering-families-wff>

² <https://www.taxpolicy.ird.govt.nz/publications/2025/consultation-summary-empowering-families-wff>

Chapter 3 – Options

Base proposal: Improved information sharing between Inland Revenue and Customs

- 3.1 As a result of consultation discussed above in chapter 2, we propose to progress enhanced information sharing between Inland Revenue and Customs to help reduce the risk of WfF principal caregivers being overpaid when they move overseas or are overseas for extended periods of time.
- 3.2 This would be a new information sharing agreement, which would expand on, and eventually replace existing agreements for student loan borrowers and child support liable parents between the two agencies.
- 3.3 Inland Revenue and Customs would share information automatically, similar to the current process for student loan borrowers and child support liable parents. Under this approach, Inland Revenue would provide Customs with a list of all WfF principal caregivers receiving WfF payments. Using information on border movements, Customs would then inform Inland Revenue when a person on that list crosses the border (either when they depart New Zealand or arrive in New Zealand).

Questions for submitters

Q2. Would information sharing address the problem we have outlined? If not, why not?

- 3.4 While eligibility for WfF could also depend on where the child is, we do not propose that information on dependent children be shared as part of this process. This is because the potential privacy concerns of collecting information about children outweigh any potential benefit. In most cases, we expect dependent children would travel with their principal caregiver, so we do not consider collecting their travel information is needed.
- 3.5 Existing manual processes to collect information on an individual case-by-case basis, under section 17B of the Tax Administration Act 1994, would continue to be used if required.

Legislative mechanisms allowing information to be shared

- 3.6 Because of legal requirements around the confidentiality of information held by Inland Revenue and Customs, a specific sharing mechanism enabled by legislation is needed to permit this improved information sharing between Customs and Inland Revenue. There are three potential legislative options:
 - **Option 1** – Ministers could enter into an agreement to share information under section 316 of the Customs and Excise Act 2018 (C&E Act) and introduce legislation authorising Customs' collection of WfF information from Inland Revenue, or

- **Option 2** – legislation could be introduced to expressly enable information sharing between Customs and Inland Revenue, or
- **Option 3** – negotiate an AISA under the Privacy Act 2020.

3.7 Consultation with the Privacy Commissioner would occur under all three options to ensure the information sharing maintains or complies with privacy requirements and includes all necessary safeguards. We understand the Office of the Privacy Commissioner prefers the use of an AISA because it includes consultation and incorporates privacy safeguards.

Criteria for assessment

3.8 The criteria officials used to assess the options are:

- **Timeliness:** Information sharing should be enacted by 1 April 2027 to align with other policy changes.
- **Viability:** Both agencies need to mutually disclose information to and receive information from each other.

3.9 Other criteria considered were the protection of privacy safeguards and transparency. However, all the options could be amended to incorporate these criteria and therefore were not used in the assessment of the options. The preferred option should satisfy both the timeliness and viability criteria.

Option 1: Section 316 agreement

3.10 Officials have considered the possibility of information sharing by way of a Ministerial agreement under section 316 of the C&E Act. However, Customs does not have a clear lawful purpose to collect the list of WfF recipients from Inland Revenue that would be required to facilitate an agreement under the C&E Act.

3.11 This option would only enable a one-way share from Customs to Inland Revenue. Another legislative mechanism would still be required to enable Customs to receive the information from Inland Revenue. While this change to primary legislation would enable the option to meet the viability criteria, it is unlikely to occur in time for a 1 April 2027 commencement date under standard Parliamentary processes. This means the option does not satisfy the timeliness criteria.

Option 2: Change to primary legislation

3.12 A direct change to primary legislation to enable the two-way share of information would involve changes to both the Tax Administration Act and the C&E Act. While this option is viable, it does not meet the timeliness criteria because it would be unlikely to occur in time for a 1 April 2027 commencement date.

Option 3: AISA

- 3.13 The only identified option that meets both criteria is an AISA, which is supported conceptually by the Privacy Commissioner because it incorporates public consultation and privacy safeguards. This option would enable both agencies to share information with each other, meeting the viability criteria and can be delivered in time for a 1 April 2027 commencement, therefore meeting the timeliness criteria. In addition, an AISA can be amended more easily than primary legislation.
- 3.14 This discussion document proposes that Inland Revenue and Customs enter into an AISA to facilitate information sharing for WfF purposes.
- 3.15 An AISA can also provide the following advantages:
- facilitates agency co-operation and efficiency in sharing information for public service delivery while maintaining privacy
 - clearly authorises the legal collection and disclosure of personal information for specific purposes
 - provides certainty and assurance about how information will be protected, reported and deleted
 - requires a consultation period that provides accountability and transparency to the public for information sharing arrangements
 - provides flexibility to tailor the privacy safeguards in the AISA depending on the privacy risks involved
 - provides flexibility to make minor changes without further legislative instruments, and
 - enables a transparent and coordinated approach to future amendments, including the potential to incorporate existing information matching arrangements and introduce new sharing arrangements.
- 3.16 The proposed parties to this AISA are Inland Revenue and Customs.
- 3.17 The proposal is for the AISA to authorise the sharing of information about WfF principal caregivers who:
- travel overseas on or after 1 April 2027, and
 - register for WfF payments for periods commencing on or after 1 April 2027.
- 3.18 In cases where a WfF principal caregiver is or has undertaken, extended travel overseas, the information shared under the AISA will allow Inland Revenue to:
- assess that person's entitlement or eligibility to receive WfF tax credits
 - assess the amount of WfF tax credits they are entitled to, or were eligible for
 - avoid overpaying WfF tax credits, and incurring debts to the Crown

- enable the recovery of any debt due to the Crown in respect of WfF tax credits, including the enforcement of obligations relating to WfF, and
- prevent, detect, investigate or prosecute offences relating to WfF tax credits.

3.19 WfF recipients would still be able to travel outside New Zealand for short periods, for instance, for holidays or family occasions, without losing their eligibility, as long as they continue to meet residency requirements.

Questions for submitters

Q3. Do you support this AISA being established to enable the sharing of contact and identification information of WfF recipients? If not, why not?

Identification process and information to be shared between agencies

3.20 Inland Revenue would share information about all WfF principal caregivers with Customs to identify individuals who have departed New Zealand for extended periods or moved overseas and therefore no longer qualify for entitlements. Once identified, those individuals would be checked against the residency criteria to see if they are still eligible to receive WfF. The information provided to Customs would be regularly updated.

3.21 We propose that Inland Revenue would send Customs the following information it holds on WfF principal caregivers:

- first or given name
- surname or family name
- alias (or any other name by which they are known so that Customs can identify the customer)
- date of birth
- passport number and country code (if known), and
- IRD number.

3.22 The IRD number is not part of the identification process and is provided so that Inland Revenue can easily identify the correct customer when the results are returned by Customs.

3.23 Customs would have an automated process to compare this information against its departure and arrival information. When there is a match, Customs would send the following information back to Inland Revenue:

- first or given names
- surname or family name
- date of birth
- IRD number

- passport number and country code
- date and time of travel
- flight details (flight number and arrival/overseas port), and
- direction of travel (arrival or departure).

- 3.24 The proposed data points are currently what is shared between the two agencies for the identification of border movements of student loan borrowers and some child support liable parents. Inland Revenue and Customs considers the information shared for the student loan and child support schemes is adequate for identification purposes and is the minimal information needed to meet the purposes of the AISA.
- 3.25 While Customs would also supply flight details for WfF customers, Inland Revenue would not insert that information into its systems because it does not use flight details to administer WfF. Customs would send this information to Inland Revenue to facilitate a single sharing mechanism for the recipients of all schemes administered by Inland Revenue. Aligning the sharing for WfF with the existing information sharing and incorporating all the border movement sharing in one place would create efficiencies and reduce risk.
- 3.26 Inland Revenue collects flight details for student loan borrowers and child support liable parents to locate the individual and for debt collection purposes. Flight details provide another way for Inland Revenue to locate borrowers and liable parents. For example, Inland Revenue can, under existing legislative authority, request further information from the relevant airline by using the flight number to obtain contact details for a particular customer. This information is not necessary for WfF purposes.

Questions for submitters

Q4. Do you support the sharing of information outlined in this document? If not, why not?

Incorporation of existing information matching arrangements for student loans and child support into AISA

- 3.27 The parties also propose to incorporate the existing information matching arrangements into the AISA. This would be done at a later date.
- 3.28 Inland Revenue and Customs have two information matching agreements to match personal information of student loan borrowers and child support liable parents to identify their border movements for administering the student loan and child support schemes. Currently, this information sharing occurs under legislation and information matching agreements that were originally introduced under the Privacy Act 1993 and enabled by the C&E Act.
- 3.29 Information matching has been superseded by the AISA regime and only limited changes can be made to information matching agreements. If the matching arrangements are incorporated into the AISA, the information shared between the two agencies would not

change, but the sharing process would be streamlined because the AISA would enable border movement information to be shared under a single agreement.

- 3.30 The sharing would also be more transparent to the public because Inland Revenue is required to report on the AISA operation each year. When incorporated, the reporting can include the current information matches for student loan borrowers and child support liable parents.
- 3.31 Adding the existing information matching arrangements into the AISA would not impact the privacy of individuals, since the collection, use and disclosure of information would not change and the transfer mechanism would continue to be secure.
- 3.32 The AISA would need to be amended to incorporate the existing information matching agreements. This is unlikely to have any effect on the privacy implications of the agreement because the information is already shared for similar purposes as the proposed AISA.
- 3.33 Managing all recipients of schemes administered by Inland Revenue through a single mechanism would improve the efficiency of the sharing by enabling Inland Revenue to avoid duplication by only sharing the details of an individual who is the recipient of more than one scheme once. A single mechanism for all schemes administered by Inland Revenue would reduce administrative and maintenance costs when compared to operating different channels for each scheme.
- 3.34 Operating a different channel for each scheme administered by Inland Revenue would also introduce the risk of Customs being able to identify which scheme an individual is a recipient of.

Questions for submitters

Q5. Do you support the future replacement of the existing student loans and child support information matching agreements by incorporating those sharing arrangements into this AISA? If not, why not?

Chapter 4 – Privacy principles and safeguards

Modifications to information privacy principles

4.1 An AISA aims to uphold privacy but in the interests of better service delivery, can modify the information privacy principles in the Privacy Act 2020 (by Order in Council), enabling the sharing of personal information that would not otherwise be allowed under that Act. The information privacy principles proposed to be modified in the proposed AISA are:

- **Principle 1 – Purpose of collection of personal information:** It will not be a breach of information privacy principle 1 for Customs to collect information from Inland Revenue for the purpose of comparing it against border movement information so Customs can supply information to Inland Revenue.
- **Principle 2 – Source of personal information:** It will not be a breach of information privacy principle 2 for Inland Revenue to collect information from Customs for any of the purposes set out in the AISA.

It will not be a breach of information privacy principle 2 for Customs to collect personal information from Inland Revenue for comparing against border movement information so Customs can supply information to Inland Revenue.

- **Principle 11 – Limits on disclosure of personal information:** It will not be a breach of information privacy principle 11 for Customs to disclose information to Inland Revenue for one or more of the purposes set out in the AISA.

Inland Revenue will not store any flight detail information received from Customs and will not use it to administer the WfF scheme.

4.2 An AISA provides transparency about the information that may be shared and the purposes of the sharing. It also provides further safeguards, which protect the security of the information shared under the AISA. Such transparency and safeguards are designed to encourage public trust in the information sharing process.

Privacy safeguards

Operational protocols to be developed

4.3 Inland Revenue and Customs would agree to operational protocols under the proposed AISA before sharing any personal information. The operational protocols would provide details on the methods of information sharing, including:

- security arrangements and technical standards for the transfer of information
- procedures to verify an individual's identity, to identify any discrepancies in the information that is held by each agency, and how to update that individual's record
- provisions that specify how frequently the information is to be shared and in what format

- secure storage and disposal of the information
- requirements for the retention and disposal of information shared, and
- the appointment and training of authorised staff, so that they can share information appropriately and according to the AISA.

Limits on use and disclosure

- 4.4 Information could only be shared for the purposes set out in the proposed AISA. Customs use of information it receives from Inland Revenue under the AISA, would be limited to the purpose of comparing it against border movement information, so Customs can supply that information to Inland Revenue.
- 4.5 Inland Revenue would use this information to determine whether a person's residency status means they are still eligible for WfF. If they are no longer eligible, Inland Revenue would stop payments.
- 4.6 If there is an outstanding liability, information would not be used to detain WfF principal caregivers at the border.
- 4.7 Inland Revenue and Customs would not be able to disclose information shared under the AISA to any third party, unless the disclosure is:
- necessary or incidental to the permitted use of the information
 - to other parts of Customs or Inland Revenue when the disclosure is reasonably necessary for a lawful business purpose connected to the purposes of the AISA
 - to the individual or entity that is the subject of the information, or their agents or advisors
 - permitted or required by law, or
 - to a court in the course of bringing a prosecution.
- 4.8 Staff who knowingly disclose Inland Revenue information outside what is permitted by the proposed AISA would face potential criminal liability for breaching taxpayer confidentiality under section 143C or 143D of the Tax Administration Act. On conviction, they could be liable to a term of imprisonment of up to six months and/or a fine not exceeding \$15,000.
- 4.9 Staff who knowingly disclose information outside of what is permitted by the proposed AISA would also be in breach of the Public Service Code of Conduct.

Secure transfer of information

- 4.10 Inland Revenue and Customs propose to transfer the information that is shared under the AISA using a secure transmission method that complies with government security standards, such as SEEMail8, Secure File Transfer Protocol, or B2B framework. The transmission method may change over time as new and improved technology becomes available. Information would be shared only by authorised staff.

Written notice to be given to individuals before adverse action is taken

4.11 Section 152 of the Privacy Act requires agencies that are party to an AISA to provide written notice to individuals before any adverse action is taken against them based on personal information shared under that AISA.

4.12 For example, the adverse actions that could be taken are:

- amending or ceasing entitlement to WfF, or
- the collection of overpaid entitlement (debt).

4.13 We propose that, as a starting point, Inland Revenue could give WfF principal caregivers a minimum of 10 working days' notice to enable them to challenge the findings of the match before any changes are made to their WfF entitlement (for example, because they qualify for an exception that allows them to be overseas and remain eligible for WfF payments). The written notice would include details of the proposed adverse action and the personal information on which the action is based. For example:

- Travel information indicates that a WfF principal caregiver has been out of the country for four weeks, Inland Revenue would contact them explaining it had received border movement information that indicated they may no longer be eligible for WfF. This letter would notify the caregiver that their WfF payments may stop, explain exceptions that may apply, and what to do if they disagree with the information received from Customs.
- If a WfF principal caregiver does not respond and has been out of New Zealand for more than six weeks, Inland Revenue would stop their WfF payments.
- At the 6-month mark, if there has still been no response from the WfF principal caregiver, Inland Revenue would cease their WfF registration.

4.14 There may be issues to work through in terms of this notification of adverse action if new residency requirements are introduced. For example, in Australia, if someone is overseas for more than six weeks, returns to Australia but then leaves again within six weeks from that arrival, they lose eligibility to the Family Tax Benefit. If a similar rule is introduced in New Zealand, then the 10-day adverse action notification requirement may need to be reviewed.

4.15 WfF recipients would still be able to travel outside New Zealand for short periods, for instance, for holidays or family occasions, without losing their eligibility, as long as they continue to meet residency requirements. Section 153 of the Privacy Act allows an AISA to provide that a party may dispense with the giving of a written notice.

4.16 The proposed AISA would allow Inland Revenue to dispense with the notice requirement in limited circumstances including:

- if Inland Revenue does not have accurate contact details for a WfF principal caregiver so is unable to give written notice
- immediately suspending a WfF payment when a discrepancy between Customs and Inland Revenue information is identified and Inland Revenue has reasonable grounds to

believe the WfF principal caregiver has been outside New Zealand for longer than the maximum period allowable to remain eligible to receive the WfF tax credit, or

- if to do so would likely interfere with an investigation of a suspected criminal offence or administrative sanction (civil penalties).

- 4.17 If a person's WfF payments have been erroneously stopped, Inland Revenue would ensure there is a process to address this. As WfF is paid out as an advance and is calculated on a forward-looking tax year basis, any missed payments would be paid out following the end-of-year square-up process.
- 4.18 WfF principal caregivers would not be stopped at the border and prevented from travelling under the proposal.

Questions for submitters

Q6. Are there sufficient safeguards for the protection of people's information? If not, why not?

Ongoing assessment of AISA

- 4.19 The draft AISA proposes Inland Revenue and Customs would each assess its operation annually to check that the safeguards are operating as intended, that they remain sufficient to protect the privacy of individuals, and to ascertain whether any issues have arisen in practice that need to be resolved. This assessment may involve a full audit or some other form of assessment.
- 4.20 Aligning with guidance from the Office of the Privacy Commissioner the operation of the AISA should be assessed within the first 12 months of operation. After the first year of operation, the frequency of any audit or assurance activity would be determined on a risk-based basis. The assessment may include the completion of the security Certification and Accreditation process.
- 4.21 Inland Revenue (as lead agency for the AISA) would report on the operation of the AISA in its annual report.

Questions for submitters

Q7. Do you have any views on the frequency of audit and reporting? If not, why not?

Q8. Is there any feedback on issues not covered by direct questions in this document? If not, why not?

Chapter 5 – Questions for Submitters

Inland Revenue invites submissions on the issues raised in this document, including the specific questions

Q1. Do you consider that the issue outlined is of concern? If not, why not?

Q2. Would information sharing address the problem we have outlined? If not, why not?

Q3. Do you support this AISA being established to enable the sharing of contact and identification information of WfF recipients? If not, why not?

Q4. Do you support the sharing of information outlined in this document? If not, why not?

Q5. Do you support the future replacement of the existing student loans and child support information matching agreements by incorporating those sharing arrangements into this AISA? If not, why not?

Q6. Are there sufficient safeguards for the protection of people's information? If not, why not?

Q7. Do you have any views on the frequency of audit and reporting? If not, why not?

Q8. Is there any feedback on issues not covered by direct questions in this document? If not, why not?