



**Ministry for Regulation**  
**Te Manatū Waeture**

# Plans for reviews of existing legislation

---

## Guidance for agencies

Version 1.0

Contact for enquiries about this guidance: [RMS@regulation.govt.nz](mailto:RMS@regulation.govt.nz)

Published in June 2026 by the Ministry for Regulation,  
Wellington, New Zealand.

This document is available on the Ministry for Regulation  
website: [regulation.govt.nz](https://regulation.govt.nz) Crown copyright © 2024

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution



4.0 International licence. You are free to  
copy, distribute, and adapt the work, as long

as you attribute the work to the Crown and comply with the  
licence terms. To view a copy of this licence, visit

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Please note that no departmental or governmental emblem,  
logo or Coat of Arms may be used in any way which infringes  
any provision of the Flags, Emblems, and Names Protection  
Act 1981. Attribution to the Crown should be in written form  
and not by reproduction of any such emblem, logo or Coat of  
Arms.

# Contents

---

|                                                                                           |           |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Introduction and key points .....</b>                                                  | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>Periodic review of legislation .....</b>                                               | <b>6</b>  |
| 1. Why legislation needs regular review.....                                              | 6         |
| 2. Regular review is a key expectation of the Act.....                                    | 7         |
| 3. New Zealand has international obligations for periodic review.....                     | 7         |
| <b>Producing plans for reviews .....</b>                                                  | <b>8</b>  |
| 4. Agencies must prepare plans for reviewing legislation .....                            | 8         |
| 5. Plans should include a core schedule of reviews, looking at least two years ahead .    | 9         |
| 5.1. Reviews that assess consistency with the principles in the Act.....                  | 9         |
| 5.2. Other types of reviews involving legislation .....                                   | 10        |
| 6. Plans should also outline the approach to review of all legislation covered by the Act | 11        |
| 7. The format and presentation of plans for reviews.....                                  | 11        |
| 8. Expected information about reviews included in plans.....                              | 12        |
| 9. Additional considerations for major regulatory agencies .....                          | 13        |
| 9.1. Plans should be organised by regulatory systems where practicable .....              | 13        |
| 9.2. Other agencies in the regulatory system should contribute to plans .....             | 14        |
| 9.3. Plans for review can be combined with advance regulatory plans.....                  | 15        |
| 10. Plan process and presentation considerations.....                                     | 15        |
| 10.1. Plans should be updated at least annually.....                                      | 15        |
| 10.2. Planned reviews should be endorsed by the responsible Minister .....                | 16        |
| 10.3. Plans to be published on agency websites .....                                      | 16        |
| <b>Other matters .....</b>                                                                | <b>17</b> |
| 11. Annual reporting on performance in carrying out plans .....                           | 17        |
| 12. Preparing Consistency Accountability Statements following reviews .....               | 17        |
| 13. Publishing the findings of other reviews .....                                        | 18        |

# Introduction and key points

---

## About this guidance

This document is part of a suite of guidance published by the Ministry for Regulation to support the implementation of the Regulatory Standards Act 2025 (the Act)<sup>1</sup> and the expectations set out in Cabinet Office circular CO(26)2: Expectations for Good Law-making<sup>2</sup>.

More specifically, it is intended to help agencies responsible for legislation<sup>3</sup> fulfil their obligations under sections 17-21 of the Act, and the Ministerial expectations set out in Part Three of the statutory guidance<sup>4</sup> issued by Ministers under section 26 of the Act, which concern the review, and plans for review, of existing legislation against the principles of responsible regulation.

In addition, as further provided for in Part 4 of Cabinet Office circular CO(26)2, it is intended to support:

- government agencies to meet the obligations and expectations in some of New Zealand's international trade agreements to undertake periodic review of existing legislation (see section 3)
- public service chief executives to discharge their statutory responsibilities for the stewardship of legislation and regulatory systems<sup>5</sup>
- the major regulatory agencies<sup>6</sup> to meet the government's expectations for regulatory system reporting.

This document is designed primarily for agency staff that will design, coordinate and oversee the development and publication of plans for the review of existing legislation. It is not a comprehensive step-by-step guide for agency staff that need to contribute to meeting these obligations and expectations. Agencies, and major regulatory agencies in particular, have a number of design, process and presentation choices to make before they can instruct staff on what to do.

---

<sup>1</sup> [Regulatory Standards Act 2025 | New Zealand Legislation](#)

<sup>2</sup> [CO \(26\) 2: Expectations for Good Law-making | Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet \(DPMC\)](#)

<sup>3</sup> See "responsible agency" definition, s 5 Regulatory Standards Act 2025.

<sup>4</sup> [Guidance issued under section 26 of the Regulatory Standards Act 2025 | Ministry for Regulation](#)

<sup>5</sup> See s.12(1)(e) of the Public Service Act 2020 and s.15 of the Regulatory Standards Act 2025

<sup>6</sup> For the list of major regulatory agencies, see footnote 10 of CO(26)2: Expectations for Good Law-making or section 9.1 of this guidance

## Key points

- The Regulatory Standards Act promotes the regular review of existing legislation by requiring agencies to publish plans for review and to report against those plans.
- New Zealand also has international obligations for the periodic review of a range of existing legislation, which this guidance also addresses.
- All agencies responsible for legislation covered by the Act must regularly publish information about planned reviews of their legislation. Publication serves both a public transparency and accountability purpose.
- The plans should look at least two years ahead and include both reviews of consistency with the principles of responsible regulation (consistency reviews) and other planned reviews, which may have a different scope, form and objectives.
- Ministers have issued statutory guidance that includes expectations for the development of plans for consistency reviews and the information to be reported for each of those planned reviews.
- Nonetheless, agencies have some flexibility in how their plans for reviews are presented. There is no specific form or template for presenting plans and, so long as the plans are updated at least annually, agencies may choose the publication timing and update frequency that best suits their stakeholder engagement needs.
- Agencies designated as major regulatory agencies should organise their plans for review by regulatory system, where practicable. This will involve identifying the regulatory systems they work within and asking any other agencies involved in those regulatory systems to add their proposed reviews into the relevant system review plan.
- If those other agencies do add their proposed reviews into the relevant system review, they would not need to separately publish their own review plan.
- Regulatory system review plans could be combined with the advance regulatory plan<sup>7</sup> for the same regulatory system (if one exists) if this would support stakeholder engagement.
- Some proposed reviews, and particularly consistency reviews, may need Ministerial endorsement before inclusion in plans.
- Plans for review must be published on agency websites – ideally in a place suited to supporting stakeholder engagement. Reporting against plans should be published in the same place.

---

<sup>7</sup> See the Ministry for Regulation's guidance on [Consultation, International Obligations, and Advance Regulatory Plans](#)

# Periodic review of legislation

---

## 1. Why legislation needs regular review

The regular review of existing legislation and regulatory settings is a key element of good regulatory stewardship practice. These settings need ongoing monitoring and maintenance to deliver effectively, proportionately, and fairly over time.

Regular review is important because legislation can significantly affect people's lives and livelihoods. Legislation can impose obligations, uphold or limit people's rights and freedoms, and authorise significant sanctions for departures from those expectations. Getting the legislative elements wrong or out of balance, perhaps due to constrained timeframes for development, inadequate supporting analysis, or limited consultation, can have negative and costly implications for affected groups until the legislation can be changed.

Even when developed in the best of circumstances, legislation is unlikely to be optimal first time. It is hard to correctly anticipate in advance all important impacts of new legislation, including how it will be administered in practice, interact with other existing regulatory requirements and processes, or interact with the behaviours, norms and capacities of different affected groups.

Over time, people will also adapt their behaviour in response to legislation – sometimes in unexpected ways. The regulatory context, markets, technologies and even social values also continue to evolve – sometimes fast.

Consequently, a “set and forget” approach to regulation will likely lead to ongoing regulatory underperformance or possibly regulatory failure.

As indicated in Cabinet Office circular CO(26)2, the monitoring and periodic review of legislation and regulatory settings helps to identify whether the existing arrangements:

- contain errors, inconsistencies or gaps
- are having unintended, unreasonable or inequitable impacts
- are being challenged by new social, demographic, technological, market or environmental developments.

It also allows an assessment of whether the existing arrangements are still the best regulatory option to meet the public policy objective, are no longer required, or whether there are opportunities to improve the performance of the regulatory system, reduce compliance costs, or address inequities for particular groups.

## 2. Regular review is a key expectation of the Act

One of the key intentions of the Act is to promote the regular and systematic review of existing legislation. It seeks to do this by requiring all agencies responsible for legislation covered by the Act to:

- develop and publish plans for regularly reviewing that legislation for consistency with the principles of responsible regulation in the Act
- produce a consistency accountability statement (CAS) for the legislation associated with each completed review, identifying any identified inconsistencies with the principles
- prepare and publish regular reports on its performance in carrying out their review plans.<sup>8</sup>

Not all review needs, however, can be met by assessing consistency with the principles of responsible regulation. Conducting other types of reviews of legislation will continue to be important for the government. These are discussed further in section 5.

## 3. New Zealand has international obligations for periodic review

Some of our international trade agreements also include obligations or expectations concerning the periodic review of legislation. In particular, the NZ-EU Free Trade Agreement requires New Zealand to:

- maintain processes or mechanisms to promote periodic reviews of regulatory measures in effect
- endeavour to ensure that periodic reviews consider, where appropriate:
  - whether there are opportunities to achieve its public policy objectives more effectively and efficiently, and
  - whether those regulatory measures are likely to remain fit for purpose, and
- make publicly available any plans for, and the results of, periodic reviews.<sup>9</sup>

The NZ-UK Free Trade Agreement contains very similar provisions.<sup>10</sup>

The review provisions in these Agreements will apply to a narrower range of legislation than is covered by the Act. They will, however, also apply to reviews conducted for purposes other than assessing consistency with the principles of responsible regulation under the Act.

---

<sup>8</sup> See s.17-21 of the Regulatory Standards Act 2025.

<sup>9</sup> See Article 22.9 in [NZ-EU FTA Text and Associated Documents | New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade](#)

<sup>10</sup> See Article 21.7 in [NZ-UK Free Trade Agreement by chapter | New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade](#)

# Producing plans for reviews

---

## 4. Agencies must prepare plans for reviewing legislation

As outlined in Cabinet Office circular CO(26)2, government agencies are expected to develop and publish information about planned reviews of their existing legislation. The published plans:

- must address agency plans for the review of legislation covered by the Act against the principles of responsible regulation, as required by section 17 of the Act
- are also expected to include any other planned reviews involving their existing legislation, which may have a different scope and form and have other objectives.

This recognises that:

- there are many different types of review and reasons for conducting a review
- all reviews require the commitment of limited agency resources and should be appropriately considered, prioritised and planned with other proposed reviews in mind
- stakeholders are also likely to be interested in these other types of reviews.

Publishing plans that cover all types of review supports good regulatory stewardship practice and helps ensure that New Zealand can meet its NZ-EU Free Trade Agreement obligation to make publicly available its plans for periodic review. Plans serve several functions, but each makes it more likely that reviews occur and produce useful findings. The production and publication of plans seek to:

- push agencies to move beyond general intentions and become more specific about the desired nature, scope and timing of a review, and to assign resources and responsibility for making it happen
- provide a basis for agencies to be accountable for their performance against their review plans
- provide early notice to interested stakeholders and regulated parties, which allows them more time and opportunity to provide input into a review
- provide an opportunity for better coordination of review work between government agencies, who may be proposing related initiatives or have related interests.



## 5. Plans should include a core schedule of reviews, looking at least two years ahead

Plans for reviews should set out a core schedule of specified reviews covering a period of at least two years ahead<sup>11</sup>. The schedule should include both reviews assessing consistency with the principles of responsible regulation (consistency reviews) and other types of reviews.

This core schedule should draw on specific internal agency plans, particularly for consistency reviews. Those internal plans should:

- be based on an assessment of the scope, priority and timing for each planned review,
- include the identification, availability and assignment of appropriate responsibility, resources and skills for each review
- take appropriate account of the priorities of the relevant Minister or decision-maker.

The intention is that published plans be robust enough:

- to ensure clear responsibilities for progressing planned reviews
- to be of value to interested stakeholders and regulated parties, by alerting them to when a planned review should occur and about any opportunities for them to be involved
- to limit how often an agency must report that it failed to deliver on its planned consistency reviews and give reasons for amendments, delays or cancellations to those planned reviews (see section 11 below).

In some cases, particularly for agencies that administer a limited amount of legislation, there might be no reviews scheduled in the plan period. In this case a note, or plan document with an empty review schedule,<sup>12</sup> should still be produced to indicate that this was a conscious decision and not an oversight.

### 5.1. Reviews that assess consistency with the principles in the Act

Part Three of the statutory guidance issued under section 26 of the Act<sup>13</sup> sets out Ministerial expectations on what to consider in developing a plan for reviews of existing legislation for consistency with the principles of responsible regulation. These include:

- identifying all the legislation for which they are responsible that is subject to the Act, and
- what to consider when determining which legislation should be prioritised for review.

As also indicated in the statutory guidance, a consistency review under the Act can cover:

- an individual Act or piece of secondary legislation
- parts of an Act (which may be useful for large Acts, or managing limited resources)

---

<sup>11</sup> See para 69 of Cabinet Office circular CO(26)2

<sup>12</sup> Note that plans for reviews are expected to include more than a core schedule of reviews and that some agencies may combine their plans for reviews with any advance regulatory plans (see section 6 of this guidance, and separate guidance covering advance regulatory plans).

<sup>13</sup> [Guidance issued under section 26 of the Regulatory Standards Act 2025 | Ministry for Regulation](#)

- multiple pieces of legislation that are meaningfully connected (such as for the whole of a regulatory system or for an Act and its associated secondary legislation).

## 5.2. Other types of reviews involving legislation

There are many different types of review, which focus on or seek to address other issues besides consistency with the principles of responsible regulation. Not all these types of other reviews can be planned for and scheduled well in advance but, wherever possible and appropriate, they should also be included in the core plan schedule for the benefit of interested stakeholders.

Examples of different types of review that should be included, if relevant, include:

- statutory reviews, under provisions in specific Acts (e.g. periodic reviews required under section 235 of the Intelligence and Security Act 2017)
- checking alignment of New Zealand legislation with international standards, to which New Zealand is expected to give effect (e.g. international civil aviation standards, or anti money laundering measures)
- independent reviews carried out by external parties, such as Law Commission inquiries or Minister-initiated inquiries or reviews with appointed external membership (e.g. Tax Working Groups)
- future-oriented reviews, looking at the potential regulatory implications of current or predicted developments or risks in the regulatory environment (e.g. the Civil Aviation Authority's project on Reduced and Zero Emission Aircraft)
- themed reviews, looking at a specific issue across a wide swathe of legislation
- reviews arising out of specific regulatory failures, seeking to provide accountability or lessons learned (e.g. the 2019 Transport Review into the Regulatory Capability and Performance of the NZTA)
- regulatory system reviews, looking at the whole operation of related legislation and administrative arrangements as an integrated package of interventions (e.g. the Regulatory Systems Assessments of LINZ's regulatory systems)
- reviews of the interface between regulatory systems or pieces of legislation that are related, have overlaps or gaps, or may impact on the same regulated parties
- process or implementation reviews, seeking to understand how legislative changes or implementation arrangements are working in practice compared with expectations – that is, primarily about good housekeeping rather than policy effectiveness.

When reviews are initiated for other purposes, such as those above, agencies are expected to consider and advise on whether it would be reasonable and practicable to:

- extend the scope of the review to also include an assessment of consistency with the principles of responsible regulation, or

- initiate a side project to complete a consistency assessment to take advantage of the fresh material produced by the review.

Not all review work should be included in review plans. Some review work will be sensitive and require confidentiality or might yield better information if conducted without external notice or awareness. More generally, Ministers or other decision-makers who might commission or approve particular reviews need to be comfortable with the review plans being public.

Other review work may not be substantive enough to warrant inclusion. For example, plans do not need to include internal, short exploratory reviews, which just seek to identify issues and the potential importance of those issues, to see if they warrant more in-depth review. These exercises are preparatory to a substantive review or review plan and better viewed as ongoing regulatory system scanning and information gathering associated with good regulatory stewardship.

## **6. Plans should also outline the approach to review of all legislation covered by the Act**

In addition to the core schedule of all planned reviews, the plan should include a short section outlining, at a high level, the agency's intended approach to the review of all its legislation covered by the Act for consistency with the principles of responsible regulation.<sup>14</sup>

That outline should include the proposed approach to prioritisation and an indicative timeframe for working through all covered legislation. This will likely draw on the preparatory work done by agencies, consistent with the expectations for developing plans in Part Three of the statutory guidance issued under section 26 of the Act.

The outline may also summarise reasons for the selection and size of the programme of proposed consistency reviews that have been included in the current review schedule, if not already clear.

This will allow external parties to assess the reasonableness of the current schedule of reviews, considered in the context of the size, scope and structure of the legislative stock needing to be reviewed over the longer term, and the proposed approach to prioritisation.

## **7. The format and presentation of plans for reviews**

Agencies have some flexibility in how their plans for reviews are presented. There is no specific form or template that agencies must use, beyond the need to consider providing certain information about each planned review (see section 8 below). This flexibility allows some tailoring of plans to the circumstances, stakeholder interests and preferred agency approaches to ongoing stakeholder engagement in the relevant regulatory systems.

---

<sup>14</sup> See para 69 of Cabinet Office circular CO(26)2

Some agencies may already have published work programmes that include, but may not be limited to, planned review activity. An example might be the Regulatory Initiatives Calendar published by the Council of Financial Regulators.<sup>15</sup>

Review plans could form part of a wider document if that is seen as the best way to inform and engage with external stakeholders. In section 9.3 we suggest that plans for reviews might be usefully combined with advance regulatory plans (where these are required), which will make it easier to report on initiatives that combine a review and development of a regulatory proposal.

## **8. Expected information about reviews included in plans**

In Part Three of their statutory guidance, Ministers have set some expectations for the information to be provided about each proposed consistency review. That guidance asks agencies to consider including information on:

- any helpful context (e.g. how it relates to broader work or why it has been selected now)
- the scope of the review (i.e. what legislation is to be covered)
- the expected timing of the review and any key milestones
- the stakeholders and regulated parties who may be interested in the review
- the nature and expected timing of any consultation opportunities.

For other reviews included in the plan schedule, agencies should consider including similar information, as well as:

- a title for the review (for easy ongoing reference)
- a brief description of the scope, nature and purpose of the review (which could include a link to further information)
- an indication of whether the review will also include an assessment against the principles of responsible regulation
- the lead agency responsible for the review and an agency email contact point for further information.

Some of this information may not be available at the time a review is first proposed. This could be acknowledged in the initial review entry and updated when more information is available. If the timing of the review or consultation opportunities is a little uncertain, this could be expressed as a time range or a “not before” or “no later than” date. We expect that plans will sometimes need to be revised or updated, as circumstances, scopes and priorities change. To make it easier for stakeholders, however:

- a review previously on the plan that has been cancelled or indefinitely postponed should, in the next plan update, indicate it has been cancelled

---

<sup>15</sup> [CoFR’s Regulatory Initiatives Calendar \(RIC\) | Kaunihera Kaiwhakarite Ahumoni - Council of Financial Regulators](#)

- a review that is substantially changed from its previous entry on the plan should explicitly indicate that it has been substantially changed.

## **9. Additional considerations for major regulatory agencies**

### **9.1. Plans should be organised by regulatory systems where practicable**

Cabinet has agreed that major regulatory agencies should organise their plans for review by regulatory system where practicable<sup>16</sup>. The major regulatory agencies are:

- Department of Conservation
- Department of Internal Affairs
- Inland Revenue Department
- Land Information New Zealand
- Ministry for Primary Industries
- Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment
- Ministry of Cities, Environment, Regions and Transport
- Ministry of Education
- Ministry of Health
- Ministry of Justice
- New Zealand Customs Service
- Reserve Bank of New Zealand
- The Treasury.

Plans organised by regulatory system will align with and support the major regulatory agencies to discharge their regulatory system stewardship responsibility under section 15 of the Act. It should also help external stakeholders locate information about the reviews that are most relevant to their interests.

Separate plans for each relevant regulatory system may support better engagement with external stakeholders with different areas of interest. However, plans for related regulatory systems could be presented together where they have common or overlapping stakeholder groups.

Some major regulatory agencies are yet to formally identify the regulatory systems they work within and the legislation that supports each system. Others will have “orphan” legislation, which is legislation not easily associated with any regulatory system. Where the relevant regulatory system is not yet defined, or it is not practicable to do so, the agency could prepare a

---

<sup>16</sup> See para 71 of Cabinet Office circular CO(26)2

plan just for proposed reviews of otherwise unassigned legislation or attach it to the plan for a regulatory system or related regulatory systems with which it has most in common.

### **Identifying regulatory systems**

The Ministry for Regulation estimates the government is responsible for around 170-200 regulatory systems, depending on how agencies choose to define those systems. Some major regulatory agencies have already identified and report on the regulatory systems in which they are involved. For other agencies, this may be something they need to do for the first time.

A regulatory system is a set of rules, organisations and their practices, designed to work together to shape how people behave and interact, in pursuit of a broad policy goal or outcome. Most regulatory systems include multiple pieces of legislation and the formal responsibilities of more than one organisation.

Identifying and defining the regulatory systems in which they operate is a key first step for agencies seeking to practice regulatory system stewardship.

Regulatory system stewardship is:

- a responsibility of chief executives under section 15 of the Regulatory Standards Act 2025, and
- outlined in more detail in Part B of the [Government Expectations for Good Regulatory Practice](#)

Some guidance on defining regulatory systems can be found in [Starting out with regulatory stewardship: A resource](#) – see Stewardship Topic 1

Some legislation will support more than one regulatory system. Reviews of such legislation can be presented in more than one plan. Some reviews may also extend across regulatory system boundaries. They too can be presented in more than one plan. Extensive cross-cutting reviews could be presented in plans that also cover any unassigned legislation.

## **9.2. Other agencies in the regulatory system should contribute to plans**

When organised by regulatory system, plans should include all qualifying reviews for that regulatory system, regardless of who is the responsible or lead agency for the review. If at all possible, we want any other central government agencies involved in those systems to add their proposed reviews into the relevant regulatory system plan. If they do, then those other agencies would not need to separately publish their own review plan.

Ideally, this would be part of the cross-agency coordination and prioritisation effort associated with good regulatory system stewardship. If these system governance arrangements are not yet

in place, the major regulatory agencies should contact other central government agencies that could be responsible for reviews in the same regulatory system to:

- discuss the proposed scope, form, content and update frequency of the plan, and how the plan will be promoted and used, with the intention to reach common agreement if possible
- agree on the process by which the other agencies will be prompted and able to provide regular input for updating the plan, ideally designed to minimise double-handling and make updating easy
- assess the potential for conducting joint reviews, where this might enhance a review.

However, the prime responsibility for identifying relevant reviews, and for providing timely and accurate information about those reviews for inclusion in a plan, should continue to rest with the responsible agency in each case. The responsible major regulatory agency can flag in the plan any potential gaps or material that has not been updated.

### 9.3. Plans for review can be combined with advance regulatory plans

Cabinet has separately agreed that the major regulatory agencies are to provide advance public notice of major regulatory proposals reasonably expected to be adopted in the near term. The Ministry has released guidance to support the major regulatory agencies to prepare advance regulatory plans<sup>17</sup>. One of the expectations is that advance regulatory plans should also be organised by regulatory system.

Not all regulatory systems will have advance regulatory plans. But where they do exist, agencies can, if they wish, combine their plan for reviews and their advance regulatory plan for the same regulatory system. The planning horizon and even frequency of updating do not have to be the same to combine the two plans. Stakeholders may find the combination useful, because they are likely to have an interest in both. It may also make it easier to address any regulatory initiatives that combine elements of a review and the development of a regulatory proposal.

## 10. Plan process and presentation considerations

### 10.1. Plans should be updated at least annually

There is no proposed common date for the publication and regular updating of plans for review. So long as plans cover a period at least two years ahead, agencies may choose a timing and frequency that suits their internal planning and stakeholder engagement needs – and those of any other contributing agencies for plans that are organised by regulatory system. However:

- agencies should be mindful that their statutory obligation to develop plans will apply as soon as the Act comes into force

---

<sup>17</sup> See [Consultation, International Obligations, and Advance Regulatory Plans](#)

- agencies should update their plans at least annually to ensure there always exists a forward schedule of reviews, and the plan incorporates any material changes to the timetable or scope of reviews
- agencies may wish to update their plans more frequently to ensure they remain useful for stakeholders, especially if combined with an advance regulatory plan which should be updated at least every six months
- agencies may otherwise need to update their plans early if there are very material additions, deletions or changes to the schedule of planned reviews (including because of Ministerial or Government direction on reviews, or changes of Government).

## 10.2. Planned reviews should be endorsed by the responsible Minister

For review plans to be realistic and successful, agencies need to take resource availability and Ministerial work priorities into account. Section 22 of the Act (which provides that chief executives must act independently from the Minister) does not apply to the development of plans for review under section 17 of the Act.

Agencies should therefore seek the endorsement of their responsible Minister(s) for proposed consistency reviews of legislation before the review plans are finalised and published. Plans for some other types of proposed reviews may also need Ministerial approval before publication. This does not necessarily require Ministers to review an actual draft of the review plan document.

This ensures that the responsible Minister receives an opportunity to provide comment on the agency's planned review commitments and can address any potential conflicts with the Minister's other work programme priorities. Any changes of government or Minister may also require changes to plans.

## 10.3. Plans to be published on agency websites

Once finalised, agencies will need to publish their plans for review on their website. Agencies will need to meet appropriate web accessibility standards, but agencies may also want to consider what publication form is best suited to supporting stakeholder engagement and efficient periodic updating of plans by contributing agencies.

Agencies that are not major regulatory agencies but contribute to a plan organised by regulatory system, could publish a link to the appropriate webpage of the relevant major regulatory agency.

To support external awareness of the plan, agencies should seek to publish their plans in a place most suited to supporting engagement with stakeholders in the relevant regulatory systems.

For major regulatory agencies, if this place is not in the pages set up by the agency to report on its regulatory systems (consistent with the government expectations for regulatory system reporting), then the agency should also provide a link to the review plan in those pages.

Please advise the Ministry for Regulation (at [RMS@regulation.govt.nz](mailto:RMS@regulation.govt.nz)) when review plans are published for the first time, including links to where the plans are located.



# Other matters

---

## **11. Annual reporting on performance in carrying out plans**

The Act requires agencies to prepare and publish regular reports on its performance in carrying out its plans for reviews of existing legislation for consistency with the principles of responsible regulation. These reports against plans need not address other types of reviews included in the published plans.

Consistent with the statutory guidance issued under section 26 of the Act, these reports should:

- focus on succinctly summarising any consistency review work completed and the results, along with reasons for any amendments, delays, or cancellations since the last performance report
- be published on the same webpage as the plans to which they relate.

Agencies should report annually on their performance in carrying out their planned consistency reviews. They should report against the relevant content of the plan that was in place at the time of the last performance report, rather than the current plan, which may have been updated more recently. If there were no scheduled consistency reviews in the relevant period, no report is required.

## **12. Preparing Consistency Accountability Statements following reviews**

The Act requires agencies to prepare and publish a Consistency Accountability Statement (CAS) as soon as reasonably practicable after reviewing existing legislation against the principles for responsible regulation. That review could relate to just part of an Act, or multiple pieces of legislation. Where an inconsistency is identified, the responsible Minister or maker must:

- provide a statement that briefly explains the reasons for the inconsistency
- set out the proposed actions (if any) to remedy that inconsistency.

It will be up to the responsible Minister or maker whether any actual action is proposed, and what priority it might be given.

Templates and guidance on the production and publication of a CAS and related information can be found on the Ministry for Regulation website and in the statutory guidance issued under

section 26 of the Act<sup>18</sup>. Agencies subject to government direction must use the specified templates and comply with the statutory guidance.

### **13. Publishing the findings of other reviews**

Agencies should normally publish the findings of any other types of reviews included in plans (and any analysis that support those findings) once those reviews are completed.

For major regulatory agencies, this is consistent with current government expectations for regulatory system reporting, and will support compliance with New Zealand's obligations under the NZ-EU Free Trade Agreement to make publicly available the results of its periodic reviews.

---

<sup>18</sup> [Guidance issued under section 26 of the Regulatory Standards Act 2025 | Ministry for Regulation](#)



**Te Kāwanatanga o Aotearoa**  
New Zealand Government

[regulation.govt.nz](https://regulation.govt.nz)