Ministry for Regulation
Te Manatū Waeture

APPENDIX D : Part II

What we heard from engagement – Direct engagement

Hospitality Review

July 2026

Introduction and Context

This set of slides presents a summary of the themes discussed during the Hospitality Review's (the Review's) second stage of engagement. During this engagement, we met with stakeholders to understand the problems the Review was looking at and hear the sector's ideas for solutions.

The engagements were a mix of the Review team asking questions and stakeholders providing free-flow information. In some engagements, we asked specific questions to prompt stakeholder views on certain areas that we already had information about.

Some stakeholders provided specific examples to illustrate their points, which we have presented in these slides where relevant. The examples are not direct quotes and are paraphrased from written engagement notes and survey responses.

This summary is not the Ministry's view on the regulatory systems that affect the hospitality sector. The information received through this engagement process was analysed alongside other evidence to inform the Review's priorities, help us to identify regulatory issues, and form our recommendations.

Who did we meet with?

Group	Number
Hospitality businesses	19
Territorial authorities (TAs)	12
Members of District Licensing Committees (DLC)	24 individuals representing 27 DLCs
Community groups	2

Hospitality businesses we engaged with included restaurants, cafés, bars, wineries, and a hotel.

Some DLC members we met with sat on multiple DLCs. The table above reflects the number of DLC members we engaged with and the number of DLCs they represented.

The community groups we met with were focused on alcohol harm reduction.

ONE

Alcohol licensing in the hospitality sector

Summary of alcohol licensing themes

Licence types / settings:
- Some businesses said current licence types restrict business practice in ways that is not proportionate to risk
- Some businesses and territorial authorities said some requirements were unnecessary for the potential level of harm
- DLCs and territorial authorities said current training requirements for duty managers do not sufficiently prepare them for their role
- DLCs and a community group said Local Alcohol Policies are an important mechanism for community input in licensing decisions, but sometimes they are hard to implement, not implemented well, or create inconsistencies
- Businesses, territorial authorities and DLC members said special licence requirements and processes are not fit for purpose
- Some DLCs said current settings for club licences were problematic and not fit for purpose
- Some DLC members said DLC fees had not increased which limited territorial authorities' ability to fairly compensate them for their work.

Licence applications and process:
- Some businesses said the licensing process was unnecessarily complex
- Some territorial authorities and DLC members said agencies that contributed information to decisions was very helpful, others thought it was not helpful and that sometimes they circumvented proper processes
- Territorial authorities, DLC members, businesses and community organisations said public notification does not reach the public and current methods are ineffective
- One community group said DLCs do not represent local voice or interests and that local voice was not sufficiently taken into account, while DLC members said local voice was important in licensing decisions
- Businesses said the renewal process was administratively burdensome and had no clear purpose, some territorial authorities agreed.

Decision making about licences:
- Some territorial authorities, DLC members and one community group said hearings were not achieving their intended purpose
- While some businesses and a community group said licensing decisions were too varied in different places and over time, regulators thought the variation was explainable and part of the intended system
- Some territorial authorities and DLC members said elected council members should not be on DLCs
- Territorial authorities and DLCs said training practices across DLCs are inconsistent.

Compliance monitoring and enforcement:
- Some DLC members and businesses said enforcement action sometimes focused on the wrong things, a community group said enforcement action is superficial and ineffective
- One community group and some DLC members said DLCs should be able to suspend licences (and take enforcement action); others disagreed
- Some businesses said they were not recognised for ongoing compliance.

Licence types / settings (1)

- Views from businesses
- Views from TAs
- Views from DLCs
- Views from community groups

Current types of licences restrict business practices in a way that is not proportionate to risk, meaning business expansion and / or innovation is difficult. For example, a sit-down restaurant selling wine with takeaway food requires an additional off-licence.

Some requirements were unnecessary for the level of risk or potential harm. These were requirements either placed on them as licence conditions, or what regulators required to see to prove they met the licence criteria (such as territorial authorities requiring crime prevention through an environmental design site assessment for all licence applications, not just high-risk ones).

Special licence requirements and processes are not fit for purpose. Stakeholders said the requirements were not proportionate to the risk of harm for small-scale events, especially if the premises were already licensed.

A winery said they stopped hosting weddings because monitoring requirements are burdensome, e.g., requirement to question people about how they are getting home and supervising drinking in the parking area.

A hospitality business run on cruise ships said it was not allowed to offer a pre-ordered alcohol selection to go with the food pre-order as part of the cruise package, and they cannot serve alcohol until the boat is moving.

A DLC member said current rules do not allow event organisers to have one special licence if the sale or supply of alcohol is done at an individual stall level. They said a Wine Festival had one licence for the whole event and operated a centralised EFTPOS attached to one bank account.

A business gave us an example of a duty manager in Northland trying to return to work from maternity leave. They could only get a certificate if they have worked in a licensed premise in the past six months, which is a challenge for someone who has been away on maternity leave.

Licence types / settings (2)

- Views from businesses
- Views from TAs
- Views from DLCs
- Views from community groups

Training requirements for duty managers do not sufficiently prepare them for their role. This included a lack of on-going requirements and led to wide variation in capability. Stakeholders said Duty Managers faced tensions between their supervising responsibilities and the licence holder's commercial interests – making good training even more important.

Local Alcohol Policies (LAPs) are an important mechanism for community input in licensing decisions, but sometimes they are hard to implement, not implemented well, or create inconsistencies. DLCs said LAPs were effective at representing community voice, reducing availability of alcohol and creating consistency across licensing decisions. However, they are resource intensive to develop and can be influenced by lobby groups over community members. A community group thought they were a good concept but not implemented well.

Current settings for club licences are problematic and not fit-for-purpose. Some DLC members did not agree that clubs should be able to have off-licences and not have a duty manager present. This is because they did not think clubs were inherently less risky than other hospitality venues.

DLC fees had not increased which limited territorial authorities' ability to fairly compensate them for their work. Fees have not been increased since 2013 which means DLCs can not attract well qualified people.

> A winery owner gave an example of duty managers with experience in a winery, would not have the necessary knowledge and experience to work in a higher-risk premise like a night club.

Licence application and processes (1)

Views from businesses   Views from TAs   Views from DLCs   Views from community groups

The licensing process is unnecessarily complex. A general point made across most engagements with businesses and is the sum of the parts of all other specific points they made. This included that they sometimes outsource alcohol licensing application processes to consultants, creating costs on top of the licensing fees for the process.

Reporting agency involvement was thought by some to be very helpful and by others not helpful. Stakeholders said that sometimes reporting agencies (NZ Police, Medical Officers of Health) circumvented proper licensing processes by negotiating directly with licence applicants. Some DLC members said Medical Officers of Health involvement was less useful in low-risk applications and said it should focus on the higher-risk ones. The point was made that reporting agencies seek broad policy outcomes through individual licence applications.

DLCs need to understand the communities they are operating in.

A DLC member said applications could be re-litigated by reporting agencies when grounds for re-application that did not change the risk level were triggered – such as company name changes.

Licence applications and processes (2)

- Views from businesses
- Views from TAs
- Views from DLCs
- Views from community groups

Public notification does not reach the public and current methods are therefore ineffective. Stakeholders said current mechanisms for reaching the public like door notices, and public notifications in newspapers are outdated and often the public remain unaware of what is happening. DLC members said public views were only heard through objections rather than any proactive engagement. Stakeholders pointed out there was no requirement to involve the public proactively, and no specific requirement to engage iwi and Māori organisations which they thought there should be.

DLCs do not represent local voice or interests, and local voice is not sufficiently considered. The community group made the point that some DLC members sit on multiple groups across the country.

Decisions about licence applications take too long. Business said this creates uncertainty and can result in loss of revenue. Internal and external pressures are affecting timeframes, which can run into months for applications and renewals.

A community organisation gave the example of a busy venue required to place a sign on their premise to notify the public of a change on their licence. They said the sign was barely discernible and therefore ineffective at informing people.

A community organisation gave the example of a DLC chair flying into a town for hearings, indicating how far away their local community was. They also said this caused logistical issues with hearings not being able to be scheduled in a timely manner.

A business said the delays in the licensing process ended with 30 staff being let go and $200,000 lost in investment (and over $1 million lost if potential lost profits are included). As soon as the licence was granted, the business had to be sold.

A business had to obtain five temporary authorities to bridge the gap for one licensing transfer process.

Licence renewals

- Views from businesses
- Views from TAs
- Views from DLCs
- Views from community groups

Renewal processes are administratively burdensome and have no clear purpose. Businesses said applying for a renewal was effectively the same as applying for a new licence, created unnecessary costs, and adds no value when there are no changes to the business or licence. Some said it was used as a mechanism to change conditions and / or find non-compliance which they did not think was appropriate.

Territorial authorities had mixed views about the value of the renewal process. Some thought it was necessary and provided a good opportunity for regular check-ins, while others thought it created unnecessary burden on compliant operators, and that it should involve a lower level of scrutiny. Some thought renewals should be removed for lower-risk businesses, and others made the point that compliance issues should be dealt with through inspections.

A winery said they waited 18 months for their licence renewal even though they had no objections and had never had any complaints. They also said the application process was exactly the same as the initial licence which was frustrating.

A business said the Medical Officer of Health objected to their renewal but not due to any compliance issues, it just meant they could ask more questions about the licence being granted. While the objection was eventually withdrawn the business had to go through the preparation for a hearing and hired a lawyer.

Decision making about licences (1)

Views from businesses | Views from TAs | Views from DLCs | Views from community groups

Hearings are not achieving their intended purpose, including because people try to avoid them. Some stakeholders said the possibility of a hearing can incentivise 'back-door-deals', which can lead to applicants accepting unreasonable licence conditions. DLCs and territorial authorities said they often receive tick-box or template objectives which makes it hard to see genuine community interest or concern that needs to be discussed at a hearing. They also said objectors introduce new material at hearings which makes them long and drawn out.

Some stakeholders said licensing decisions are too varied in different places and over time, while others thought the variation was explainable as part of the intended system. Businesses said licensing decisions depended on the capabilities and commitment of the regulators and pointed out that there are different interpretations of the Act among regulators. One territorial authority noted inconsistencies in DLC decisions particularly about amenity and good order. DLCs said the broadly defined criteria can result in different interpretations and inconsistency, and that criteria are too vague.

A DLC member said because hearings were so time consuming and costly businesses sometimes accept restrictive conditions on their licence to avoid them, such as specific paint colours on external walls of their premises.

A bar said there were different decisions about requests to extend opening hours across neighbouring venues with similar circumstances and risk levels.

Decision making about licences (2)

- Views from businesses
- Views from TAs
- Views from DLCs
- Views from community groups

Council members should not be on DLCs. Stakeholders said counsellors serving on DLCs was a conflict of interest and should not be permitted. They said if they were not removed, then checks and balances needed to be in place.

Training practices across DLCs are different. Stakeholders said some DLC members were given in-depth training, while some treated DLC training as a tick-box exercise and that legislation and due process training was lacking. In general, stakeholders of all types said training for all involved parties should be improved.

Compliance monitoring and enforcement

- Views from businesses
- Views from TAs
- Views from DLCs
- Views from community groups

Enforcement action sometimes focuses on the wrong things. DLC members said the full breadth of offences in the Act were rarely used and some enforcement activity focuses on areas of limited risk and impact. For example, inspections focusing on signage, or licensing inspectors visiting premises during the daytime which may not be the most appropriate time to inspect to determine whether risks of alcohol harm were being appropriately managed. Territorial authorities said they needed graduated tools to enable effective enforcement. A community group said enforcement action is superficial and ineffective.

DLCs should be able to suspend licences and take enforcement action. Stakeholders said seeking a cancellation or suspension through the Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority can take a significant amount of time and DLCs have the capability to do it. Some expressly disagreed with this suggestion.

Businesses are not recognised for on-going compliance. Businesses said good operators should not be treated the same as those with compliance issues, and they are. Some thought they should have extended renewal periods.

Feedback from Hospitality Summit 2026

The Review engaged with attendees at the Hospitality Summit 2026. The Summit was hosted by the Minister for Tourism and Hospitality, in conjunction with Hospitality New Zealand and the Restaurant Association of New Zealand to bring together government and hospitality industry representatives. We ran a workshop asking them to re-design the alcohol licensing system. A member of the Review team also attended the whole Summit to engage with representatives and gather relevant information.

The themes below summarise what attendees' thought was working well and should be retained, and what should be changed. It is worth noting there was no consensus. Where some members wanted to see significant changes, others wanted to retain the status quo in those areas.

Some stakeholders wanted the following changes:

- Creation of a central regulator and / or a centralised application portal
- Clearly set out timeframes for key parts of the process
- Licence types aligned to business type (café, restaurant, bar, nightclub etc.,)
- Licensing fees aligned to risk
- Removal of some licence processes (public notification, hearings, re-application)
- Removal of some parties from the licensing process (territorial authorities, Medical Officers of Health, DLCs, licensing inspectors)
- Streamlining the renewal process, i.e., reduced information and application requirements if there are no changes
- Limit who can object to a licence application based on set criteria
- Meaningful and impactful engagement with applicants by territorial authorities
- Remove Local Alcohol Policies
- Introduce new / different licence conditions
- Introduction of preliminary / conditional decisions before the full licensing process
- Data and information driven risk-assessment (compliance history, age of the business, infringements, other relevant licences and consents)
- One licence per premise
- National standards for inspections
- Reward / incentivise good operators with good compliance history.

Some stakeholders wanted to retain parts of the status quo:

- Consideration of alcohol-related harm at application assessment
- Local Alcohol Policies in their current form
- The current structure of decision making by DLCs
- The current sequence of the licensing process
- Involvement of the reporting agencies
- Territorial authority involvement in the licensing process.

TWO

Food safety regulatory system

Summary of food safety themes

Registration and registration renewal:

- Businesses and territorial authorities said pre-application engagement between parties was effective at increasing safety and reducing compliance issues.

Risk-based measures and associated requirements:

- Businesses said the risk-based measures were difficult to understand, too rigid and sometimes disincentivised business expansion
- Businesses said some record-keeping requirements were time-consuming and not focused on key food safety risks
- Businesses and territorial authorities said the template Food Control Plan was difficult to understand and navigate.

Compliance monitoring and enforcement:

- Businesses and territorial authorities said verifications sometimes focused on areas with limited impact on food safety risks
- Businesses said practices and decisions of verifiers was inconsistent. Territorial authorities recognised this was an issue
- Businesses said verification over-relied on checking records that did not have a direct contribution to food safety, whereas some territorial authorities said written records provided useful prompts for conversation and education of businesses
- Businesses and some territorial authorities said that announced verifications mean what is really happening in a kitchen cannot be seen
- Businesses said good operators were not recognised for on-going compliance
- One territorial authority said enforcement of unregistered businesses is difficult.

Roles in the regulatory system:

- Businesses said some regulator practice and decision making was not transparent.

Registration, renewal and risk-based measures (1)

Views from businesses   Views from TAs

Pre-application engagement between parties was effective at increasing food safety and reducing compliance issues. Pre-application engagement led to better relationships, fewer follow ups and fewer corrective-actions for businesses. This engagement could also enable a business to adapt early if they discovered what they wanted to do would not be possible.

The risk-based measures were difficult to understand, too rigid, and sometimes disincentivised business expansion. The names of the measures are not intuitive which can make it difficult for businesses to understand what category they are meant to register under. Businesses that incorrectly self-assign to a risk based category sometimes receive corrective actions. Additionally, they are inflexible and not representative of the different risks posed by different types of hospitality businesses, with the vast majority having to register under the highest risk category. The tools that help businesses understand which category they should be in could be much simpler.

A business said they have never received a corrective action – potential issues they would have had at the beginning were filtered out with a pre-verification inspection offered by their territorial authority.

A business said another business they know, a fruit growing business, chose not to expand into making ice cream or processing the fruit at all because they would then have to operate under a Food Control Plan which would have costly requirements.

A territorial authority said new applicants often just tick every box on the form, or the wrong box, as they just are not sure. This creates re-work for everyone – regulators and regulated parties.

A Food Safety Officer said businesses find it difficult to interpret what “for immediate consumption” means in relation to ready-to-eat-meals and cabinet food, causing difficulties in categorisation.

Registration, renewal and risk-based measures (2)

- Views from businesses
- Views from TAs

Record keeping requirements are time consuming and not focused on key food safety risks. Complying with record-keeping requirements took significant time, which businesses felt was not time well-spent, in that it did not reduce or effectively manage their food safety risks. Some businesses could not afford the digital record-keeping systems that are privately available and therefore rely on paper-based systems.

The template Food Control Plan is difficult to understand and navigate. The plan is too long, the content not hospitality specific, and it can be difficult to understand. While available in several languages there are some key languages missing (e.g., Arabic). New to the sector business owners can find the plan difficult to understand and the volume of information means the key objectives and actions can get lost.

A business said they essentially need to hire "a full-time person with a clipboard" to manage and record everything they have to do.

A business owner said 1-2 weeks of full-time paperwork is required ahead of each verification.

A business owner said to comply with the template Food Control Plan they mostly rely on their experience as a chef in New Zealand and has seen chefs who have trained overseas, or who have not had formal training struggle with it . The same objectives of the plan could be achieved in a much less complex way.

Compliance monitoring and enforcement

Views from businesses   Views from TAs

Verifications sometimes focus on areas with limited impact on food safety risks. Some verifiers focus on areas that have limited impact on the safety and suitability of food being prepared and sometimes require actions to be put in place that are not requirements of the regulatory system. Some verifications focus on records and not on the highest food safety risks. A territorial authority said checking records provides a good opportunity for conversations with the business.

Practices and decisions of verifiers is inconsistent. Territorial authorities recognised this was an issue, and businesses said verifier practices and decision-making were inconsistent with some focusing on things another would not. Sometimes what a verifier is looking for is unclear and some verifiers do not know how kitchens / hospitality businesses work.

Announced verifications mean what is really happening in a kitchen cannot be seen. Poor operators can hide the day-to-day reality.

A business said they had corrective actions as a result of not having nail brushes or sink plugs at every handwashing basin – which are not requirements under the current regulatory framework.

A business said in their 12 years of being verified, 50% of corrective actions were in relation to changes recommended or required by the previous verifier.

A territorial authority said they knew some multi-site businesses just shifted their good staff around sites for when the verification was taking place.

A business said their on-site kitchen inspection lasted only 5 to 10 minutes and then a long time was spent checking records.

Compliance monitoring and enforcement (2), and roles in the regulatory system

- Views from businesses
- Views from TAs

- **Good operators are not recognised for on-going compliance.** It does not seem to impact verification frequency, or anything else, if a business has a good record of compliance, no incidents or complaints.

- **Enforcement of unregistered businesses can be difficult.** A territorial authority said they needed better legislative tools for enforcement as they were limited in what they could do when businesses were operating without registration.

> A business said they had been operating for 10 years with no compliance issues, but that did not seem to be taken into account when determining verification frequency.

THREE

Fees and levies

Summary of fees and levies themes

Regulatory design:

- Businesses said compliance costs are significant and unpredictable, and disproportionate for small businesses
- Territorial authorities said they do not fully cost recover across the food and alcohol licensing systems
- Territorial authorities said collecting the food business levy was inefficient for them
- Businesses and territorial authorities said fees should be better scaled to the size of the business and the risks they pose
- Territorial authorities and DLC members said alcohol licensing fees are too low for cost recovery and have not been changed since they were set in 2013.

Information, education and guidance

- Businesses said they do not always understand what they are paying for, and / or that they are not getting value for money.

Regulatory design and information & guidance

Views from businesses   Views from TAs

Compliance costs are significant and unpredictable, and disproportionate for small businesses. They also do not always understand what they are paying for, or it is not value for money. Businesses do not always receive cost breakdowns and hourly rates can vary significantly. You can be well into operating before being aware of all of the different costs.

Territorial authorities do not fully cost recover across the food and alcohol licensing systems. Shortfalls are subsidised by rates. While some cross-subsidisation is appropriate, they cannot even meet a lower cost-recovery target.

Collecting the food business levy is inefficient for territorial authorities. Territorial authorities said unnecessary administrative work was created by having to collect the levy and infrastructure changes they have had to make are not cost-recovered. Levy exemptions require case-by-case adjustments also creating administrative inefficiency.

Fees should be better scaled to size and risk. Business and territorial authorities said that fees were often the same for a low-risk, low-revenue business as higher-risk, high-revenue business. They said that it was not fair.

A business said a food safety verification can cost anywhere between $700 and $1,200 depending on the verifier (TA vs. 3rd party) and a visit to check for corrective actions costs over $160 an hour and can last 5 to 6 hours.

A territorial authority said the $11 collection fee they can charge to collect the food levy is not enough to recover the administration cost, while another said they had to upgrade their technology (with investment) to facilitate the new collection.

A territorial authority said that the special licence fee for big festivals being the same as a winery market stall did not make sense.

FOUR

Information Flows

Summary of information flows themes

Information, education and guidance:

- Business said they struggle to find information about compliance requirements
- Businesses said regulators are not forthcoming with advice on regulatory requirements, while regulators said they walk a fine line between support and advice.

Operational policy:

- Businesses said they provide the same information to the same regulator multiple times.

Information & guidance

Views from businesses   Views from TAs

Information about compliance requirements is not easy to find. It is not easy to find, understand and navigate information on their compliance requirements. It takes a lot of time and effort for them to interpret the legislation and requirements. Territorial authorities said they provide relevant information and guidance within their resource capacities. Some territorial authorities are working on solutions to this and acknowledge it is a problem.

Regulators are not forthcoming with advice, while regulators say they walk a fine line between support and advice. Businesses said territorial authorities do not provide advice on specific compliance matters or would not be definitive in their advice. Territorial authorities said they are permitted to 'coach' but not 'advise' and providing individual support to businesses took significant time and resources they often do not have.

Businesses have to provide the same information multiple times. This is across applications and regulatory systems, as well as within regulatory systems and to the same regulator. Information was also often requested that was beyond what the regulation said they needed to provide.

A mobile business said they had to speak to 13 officials in eight different departments to understand all the compliance obligations.

A business said they have to fill in the same application form and attach the same documentation every time they renew their alcohol licence even though their operation has not changed.

A business owner, when asked what one change they would like to see across all requirements, said they want the council to have a file with their name on it.

FIVE

Restricted trading

Policy justification, design and operational policy

- Views from businesses
- Views from TAs

Restrictions are outdated, impractical and confusing. The rules are not relevant to current New Zealand business practices and limit business choice to trade on those public holidays. Some businesses are more affected than others given the exemptions, and the rules are not easy to understand or comply with. There is a lot of confusion about the rules.

A DLC member said some businesses open when they are not allowed to, accepting the fines as part of the "cost of doing business".

A business said they just don't serve alcohol on restricted trading days as it is easier than figuring out who is there "to dine" and who is not.

A business said they received guidance that the 'dining requirement' meant patrons could drink alcohol one hour before and within one hour after a meal. They said complying with this was logistically difficult.

SIX

Club transport services

Summary of club transport service themes

Businesses told us that requirements to operate transport services to customers created a cost that could not be recovered. Since this issue was mainly raised by clubs, the Review conducted a short, targeted survey of clubs to understand the scale of the issue, nature of the transport services they provide, and any barriers they face to operate these services. An online survey was sent to a club industry representative body to be circulated among their members. The survey was open from 4 March to 20 March 2026.

Who responded to the survey?

- 65 (out of 300 clubs) responded to the survey
- They were a mix of RSAs, country clubs, cosmopolitan clubs and other social/community clubs
- They were from across urban, rural and provincial areas.

What are clubs transporting members for and who is doing the driving?

- 96% of respondents offer transport services to bring members to the club and take them safely back home
- Many (30%) also offer welfare trips, e.g., transporting members to healthcare appointments, the supermarket, or the airport etc.
- 75% of clubs use employees to drive, 14% use volunteers, while 18% use both employees and volunteers.

How are clubs funding the survey?

- 63% of clubs receive donations, mostly a gold coin or $2-$3 donation or a donation to the club welfare fund for the transport service
- Clubs said some users pay by the trip, depending on the distance of travel, with payment being between $3-$10
- 84% of clubs do not generate enough money to cover the running cost of the service, none are making a profit
- Only 19% of clubs that provide transport services use passenger (P) endorsed drivers.

What difficulties did clubs find with the rules?

- Clubs said the cost of operating a transport service, inability to charge for the service (without being considered a commercial passenger service), and passenger service requirements were barriers.
- Clubs run the service at a loss, largely because of the regulatory requirements.

SEVEN

Liquid petroleum gas storage

Policy justification and regulatory design

Views from businesses   Views from TAs

LPG gas requirements are too onerous. One business was engaged with specifically about this issue they raised. They said the dangerous good licence inspections did not focus on the risks, the requirement to renew annually with no changes in operation was pointless, that compliance costs were too high and unpredictable, and that accommodation providers' involvement in handling liquid gas is limited and therefore training requirements were too onerous.

EIGHT

Suggested ideas for change

Suggested ideas for change (1)

While many of these ideas are discussed throughout the slides, these slides summarise the ideas for change put forward during Stage Two engagement.

Alcohol licensing:

- Alcohol licence tailored to the business type and risk
- A probationary licence at first and then, an ongoing licence with periodic renewals based on performance
- A tiered system for special licences with larger events subject to more stringent requirements and exemptions for low-risk events, e.g., funerals
- Streamlined and accessible public notification process
- Licensing function transferred to a professional body, away from local government
- Performance/ risk-based renewals, i.e., good operators and venues with low risk profile renewing their licence less frequently
- Standardised licence application form and standardised licence conditions
- Training in tikanga and best practices for engagement with mana whenua
- Ability for DLCs to suspend and cancel licences
- National database of licences, manager certificates and infringements.

Food safety:

- Pre-application engagement with regulators to understand compliance requirements
- A standard online record keeping tool to simplify record keeping processes for businesses
- Unannounced verifications to enable verifiers to observe kitchen reality
- Enforcement powers for food safety officers to close non-compliant businesses
- ‘One stop shop’ for food safety training
- Combined training to staff on food safety and safe consumption on alcohol for businesses offering both alcohol and food
- One regulator for all food businesses, e.g., Ministry for Primary Industries.

Suggested ideas for change (2)

Fees and levies:
- Fees scaling based on business revenue
- Consolidate fees with the ability to stagger payments
- Combine fees for food and alcohol regulation
- Reward mechanisms in the fees structure via extension of annual fees or renewal timeframes
- Detailed invoices with cost components specified.

Information flows:
- Online portals to manage licensing applications
- Standard licensing applications across councils
- Use RealMe or New Zealand Business Number to pre-populate information on applications.

Restricted shop trading:
- Remove all shop trading restrictions
- Remove some restrictions and keep others.

Transport services:
- Allow clubs to charge a fee or donation to recover costs of operating club transport services, without engaging additional transport regulatory requirements.