

Jessie Smart

From: Nic Hill <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Thursday, 9 April 2026 2:03 pm
To: Jono Arrell; s 9(2)(a)
Subject: RE: Review of the Social Housing system – draft Cabinet paper for agency consultation

SENSITIVE

Kia ora Jono and Jemima. Thanks for the opportunity to review the paper.

We have no specific comments on the paper but have two comments about implementation.

The evidence we have (see p95 in [Ethnic Evidence 2024](#)) suggests some Ethnic Communities are under severe housing stress and may be impacted by the proposed changes.

The paper refers to targeted engagement (para 52) and considering the detailed population impacts in future policy work (para 65). We would want to see Ethnic Communities both included in the engagement and considered in future analysis to ensure any impacts are identified..

We are happy to discuss our comments and any support we can provide.

Regards

Nic

Nic Hill ([she/her](#))

Mobile: s 9(2)(a)

Principal Advisor, Government Relations & Advisory
Advisory, Analytics and Ministerial

Ministry for Ethnic Communities | Te Tari Mātāwaka

www.ethniccommunities.govt.nz [Facebook](#) | [LinkedIn](#)



From: Jono Arrell <s 9(2)(a)>

Sent: Tuesday, April 7, 2026 5:48 PM

To: s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

Nic Hill <s 9(2)(a)>

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

Jasmine Lindsay

<s 9(2)(a)>

Celia Painter <s 9(2)(a)>

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

George Minton <s 9(2)(a)>

Alex Cliffe

<s 9(2)(a) Deborah Tucker <s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)
s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) Andy Doube
<s 9(2)(a) Erena McAllum <s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)
Cc: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)
Subject: Review of the Social Housing system – draft Cabinet paper for agency consultation

You don't often get email from s 9(2)(a) [Learn why this is important](#)

SENSITIVE

Kia ora koutou,

We are seeking agency feedback on the attached draft Cabinet paper: “Reviewing the social housing system: delivering better housing support to those who need it”. Please send your feedback to s 9(2)(a) and s 9(2)(a) by **COP Monday 13 April 2026**.

This document includes redactions due to Budget sensitivity. Please do not share this more widely. If you need to share this with your colleagues, we request that you pass on their names and email addresses.

If you would like to discuss the content in the attached or have questions about the Review of Social Housing system (RoSH), please don't hesitate to reach out to us. We'd be more than happy to discuss.

Note that Ministerial consultation is being undertaken simultaneously with agency consultation.

The final Cabinet paper will be considered at Cabinet committee in the week of 20 April and by Cabinet on 28 April.

Ngā mihi nui,

Jono Arrell (he/him) | Principal Policy Analyst – Housing Policy

📞 Mobile: s 9(2)(a)

The Aurora Centre | 56 The Terrace | PO Box 1556 | Wellington | New Zealand



This email and any attachments may contain information that is confidential and subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this email and attachments is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify the author immediately and erase all copies of the email and attachments. The Ministry of Social Development accepts no responsibility for changes made to this message or attachments after transmission from the Ministry.

From: s 9(2)(a)
Sent: Monday, 13 April 2026 9:44 am
To: Jono Arrell; Jemima de Lacey
Cc: Janna Campbell
Subject: Feedback on ROSH Cabinet Paper

Hi Jono and Jemima,

We have reviewed the paper and think you have done a great job at corralling all the info from the previous papers into a clear and succinct document. Just a few high level comments from us.

- **Clarification**
 - Para 24 refers to \$45k for a new social housing place including operating supplement. Note Kainga Ora only received an operating supplement for additional new homes (growth). Under a renewal scenario, we are currently not getting this.
 - Para 25 notes that social housing involves higher levels of tenancy management. It is important to note that Kainga Ora is funded in line with market rents, so its provision of this is only done on the basis that it can leverage its scale to do so i.e. this isn't provided at an additional cost to the system.
- **System view**
 - We think the paper misses the opportunity to articulate the role of social housing within the context of supported housing and the private sector from a system perspective, and suggest the paper references the Reset of Housing Supports work.
- **Implications**
 - We support para 45; however, think it needs to go a bit further. If social housing is going to be more focused on people that the market does not provide for, there should be an acknowledgement that this may have operating model/policy lever implications for social housing providers. For example, supporting more complex customers and the provision of housing that the market does not currently provide (such as accessible homes, larger family homes etc) aren't accommodated well under the current market rent model or within current placement settings.
- **Length of tenure**
 - Para 30 talks to people spending an average of 16.7 years in social housing. Our understanding from our conversation with Wayne at MSD is that this data is based on the length of time a person has been in a social house during their lifetime, not a concurrent tenancy. For example, a person may have been in a social home for 5 years, then private market for 5 years, then return to social housing for another 10 years, and this would count as 15 years in social housing. If this is correct, we think it would be worth making this clear and wonder whether it is the right data to justify tenure reviews? Instead, it potentially points to the need for greater tools to support people to live better in the private market when they exit so they don't boomerang back to social housing. As previously shared, our work has looked at average length of time people are in our homes (note we remove BIT transfers where there is less than a 28 day gap between tenancies in our homes), and it comes to an average of 9.7 years with there being some variation at a household level.

Note: This is not accurate. The estimate is an average of 16.7 future years in social housing and does not include their duration to date in social housing. The estimate is over the remainder of their lives.

We look forward to continuing to work with you on this.

Many thanks, s 9(2)(a)



s 9(2)(a)

Freephone: 0800 801 601 | Mainline: (04) 439 3000 | Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities

PO BOX 2628 Wellington 6140 | New Zealand Government | www.kaingaora.govt.nz

www.govt.nz - your guide to finding and using New Zealand government services

Any opinions expressed in this message are not necessarily those of Kāinga Ora. This message and any files transmitted with it are confidential, may be legally privileged, and are solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient or the person responsible for delivery to the intended recipient, you have received this message in error.

Please:

- (1) reply promptly to that effect, and remove this email, any attachment and the reply from your system;
- (2) do not use, disclose or act on this email in any other way. Thank you.

Mandy Stratford

From: Sarah Ward <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Friday, 10 April 2026 4:26 pm
To: Jono Arrell; s 9(2)(a)
Cc: Riaz Mohammed
Subject: RE: Review of the Social Housing system – draft Cabinet paper for agency consultation [SENSITIVE]

Thanks Jono,

That's very useful information – and based on low percentages that have been accessing over the last 10 years, would speak to the challenge of people being in tenancy's for an extended amount of time.

Thanks again for your response and the opportunity to provide feedback. We are open to being included in future developments in the housing space. This year we will be going out to Refugee communities resettled in the last 5 years, specifically around housing and health.

Under the refugee resettlement strategy we are currently working with agencies to develop a gaps analysis for Refugee Health and Housing. There seems like some opportunities to collaborate.

Nga mihi,
Sarah

From: Jono Arrell <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Friday, 10 April 2026 4:16 pm
To: Sarah Ward <s 9(2)(a)> s 9(2)(a)
Cc: Riaz Mohammed <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Review of the Social Housing system – draft Cabinet paper for agency consultation [SENSITIVE]

You don't often get email from s 9(2)(a) [Learn why this is important](#)

IN-CONFIDENCE

Kia ora Sarah,

Thanks for your response. I've checked this stat with our data folk on your query relating to the annexed table. It comes from IDI analysis which found 13,000 people with refugee status in the twelve months ending 30 June 2024. Of those 13,000 people, 31 percent were in social housing as at 30 June 2024. Taking your comment, we will work to make this table clearer.

Thank you for your comment on the barriers for single people accessing affordable single bedroom accommodation. We've included 'typology' as one of the four access barriers that would be assessed under the future system, which includes a lack of suitable housing available in the private market. We think this would capture this cohort in areas where there is a lack of one bedroom accommodation (as well as large families who face a similar issue with accessing housing with many bedrooms).

Ngā mihi,

Jono Arrell (he/him) | Principal Policy Analyst – Housing Policy

📞 Mobile: s 9(2)(a)

The Aurora Centre | 56 The Terrace | PO Box 1556 | Wellington | New Zealand

From: Sarah Ward <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Thursday, 9 April 2026 12:59 pm
To: Jono Arrell <s 9(2)(a)> s 9(2)(a)
Cc: Riaz Mohammed <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Review of the Social Housing system – draft Cabinet paper for agency consultation [SENSITIVE]

BUDGET SENSITIVE

Kia ora Jono and Jemima,

Thank you for circulating this paper for consultation. Overall we think the paper captures the complex challenges of the system and aligns with what we see in the refugee sector. I have copied an additional colleague, Riaz Mohammed in who is Manager – Refugee Strategy and Housing. Our key query is around the infographic, and the representation of former refugees being 31% of the Social Housing? We're really not clear on what this data represents – as doesn't align with our numbers. We have historically tracked under 10% of clients in social housing. This year we're tracking around 155 with the majority of those being singles in Auckland with CHPS. Wondering if you could explain, that to us, and where the data is pulled from.

Also, our other query relates to any potential unintended consequences for the under 25's – with real barriers to accessing private single accommodation in a budget.

We would be fine to line up a MS Teams call tomorrow (Friday) or early next week.

Cheers, and thanks again for the work behind this.

Sarah

Sarah Ward

MANAGER – REFUGEE AND MIGRANT SUPPORT (AUCKLAND)

Immigration New Zealand, Refugee and Migrant Services
Ministry of Business, Innovation & Employment

s 9(2)(a) | Telephone: s 9(2)(a) Mobile: s 9(2)(a)
PO Box 22315 Otahuhu, Auckland, New Zealand

NZBN 9429000106078



From: Jono Arrell <s 9(2)(a)>

Sent: Tuesday, 7 April 2026 5:48 pm

To: s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

Jasmine Lindsay

<s 9(2)(a)>

Celia Painter <s 9(2)(a)>

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

George Minton <s 9(2)(a)>

Alex Cliffe

<s 9(2)(a)>

Deborah Tucker <s 9(2)(a)>

Kat Watson

<s 9(2)(a)>

Paul Coggan <s 9(2)(a)>

Lisa Clephane

<s 9(2)(a)>

Sarah Ward <s 9(2)(a)>

Andy Doube

<s 9(2)(a)>

Erena McAllum <s 9(2)(a)>

s 9(2)(a)

Cc: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>

Subject: Review of the Social Housing system – draft Cabinet paper for agency consultation

You don't often get email from s 9(2)(a)

[Learn why this is important](#)

SENSITIVE

Kia ora koutou,

We are seeking agency feedback on the attached draft Cabinet paper: “Reviewing the social housing system: delivering better housing support to those who need it”. Please send your feedback to

s 9(2)(a) and s 9(2)(a) by **COP Monday 13 April 2026**.

This document includes redactions due to Budget sensitivity. Please do not share this more widely. If you need to share this with your colleagues, we request that you pass on their names and email addresses.

If you would like to discuss the content in the attached or have questions about the Review of Social Housing system (RoSH), please don't hesitate to reach out to us. We'd be more than happy to discuss.

Note that Ministerial consultation is being undertaken simultaneously with agency consultation.

The final Cabinet paper will be considered at Cabinet committee in the week of 20 April and by Cabinet on 28 April.

Ngā mihi nui,

Jono Arrell (he/him) | Principal Policy Analyst – Housing Policy

☎ Mobile: s 9(2)(a)

The Aurora Centre | 56 The Terrace | PO Box 1556 | Wellington | New Zealand



MINISTRY OF SOCIAL
DEVELOPMENT
TE MANATŪ WHAKAHIAITO ORA

This email and any attachments may contain information that is confidential and subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this email and attachments is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify the

author immediately and erase all copies of the email and attachments. The Ministry of Social Development accepts no responsibility for changes made to this message or attachments after transmission from the Ministry.

This email and any attachments may contain information that is confidential and subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this email and attachments is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify the author immediately and erase all copies of the email and attachments. The Ministry of Social Development accepts no responsibility for changes made to this message or attachments after transmission from the Ministry.

A URL scanning error has occurred because the security appliance was unable to verify one or more URLs contained in the email body or its attachments. Please exercise caution when clicking any hyperlinks, and ensure you recognise and trust the destination site before proceeding. If you have any questions or concerns relating to a particular URL, please contact the cyber.security@mbie.govt.nz mailbox.

Jessie Smart

From: Jono Arrell
Sent: Monday, 13 April 2026 11:37 am
To: 'Agency Consultation'; Jemima de Lacey
Subject: RE: Review of the Social Housing system – draft Cabinet paper for agency consultation

Thanks Lena. The separate paper you've referred to is no longer being taken to Cabinet. The AS proposal is instead included in this paper. Appreciate the note to clarify table one.

Jono Arrell (he/him) | Principal Policy Analyst – Housing Policy

📞 Mobile: s 9(2)(a)

The Aurora Centre | 56 The Terrace | PO Box 1556 | Wellington | New Zealand



From: Agency Consultation <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Monday, 13 April 2026 11:02 am
To: Jono Arrell <s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Agency Consultation <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Review of the Social Housing system – draft Cabinet paper for agency consultation

Kia ora both

Great to hear from you and thank you for sharing this paper with MfR for review.

We have only one minor comment, related to AS. Having also received a separate MSD Cab Paper with an AS proposal, both papers could be more aligned in how AS is characterised. It might be clearer to Cabinet to clarify whether Table 1 is accounting for the proposed reductions (from increasing the AS threshold), and how social housing reform might change those discrepancies (including AS changes).

Happy to chat if anything is unclear! 😊

--

Lena Kree (she/her)

Senior Advisor, Regulatory Policy Design | Kaitohutohu Mātāmua, Hoahoa Kaupapahere
Ministry for Regulation | Te Manatū Waeture

īmēra: s 9(2)(a) | waea pūkoro: s 9(2)(a)

If you have RIA questions: s 9(2)(a)

For agency consultation: s 9(2)(a)

For early engagement: use our [Portal](#)



Ministry for Regulation Te Manatū Waeture

From: Jono Arrell <s 9(2)(a)>

Sent: Tuesday, 7 April 2026 5:48 pm

To: s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

Agency Consultation <s 9(2)(a)>

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

Kirsten Dale <s 9(2)(a)>

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

Jasmine Lindsay <s 9(2)(a)>

Celia Painter <s 9(2)(a)>

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

George Minton <s 9(2)(a)>

Alex Cliffe

<s 9(2)(a)>

Deborah Tucker <s 9(2)(a)>

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

Lisa Clephane <s 9(2)(a)>

s 9(2)(a)

Andy Doube

<s 9(2)(a)>

Erena McAllum <s 9(2)(a)>

s 9(2)(a)

Cc: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>

Subject: Review of the Social Housing system – draft Cabinet paper for agency consultation

You don't often get email from s 9(2)(a)

[Learn why this is important](#)

SENSITIVE

Kia ora koutou,

We are seeking agency feedback on the attached draft Cabinet paper: “Reviewing the social housing system: delivering better housing support to those who need it”. Please send your feedback to

s 9(2)(a) and s 9(2)(a) by **COP Monday 13 April 2026**.

This document includes redactions due to Budget sensitivity. Please do not share this more widely. If you need to share this with your colleagues, we request that you pass on their names and email addresses.

If you would like to discuss the content in the attached or have questions about the Review of Social Housing system (RoSH), please don't hesitate to reach out to us. We'd be more than happy to discuss.

Note that Ministerial consultation is being undertaken simultaneously with agency consultation.

The final Cabinet paper will be considered at Cabinet committee in the week of 20 April and by Cabinet on 28 April.

Ngā mihi nui,

Jono Arrell (he/him) | Principal Policy Analyst – Housing Policy

Mobile: s 9(2)(a)

The Aurora Centre | 56 The Terrace | PO Box 1556 | Wellington | New Zealand

This email and any attachments may contain information that is confidential and subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this email and attachments is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify the author immediately and erase all copies of the email and attachments. The Ministry of Social Development accepts no responsibility for changes made to this message or attachments after transmission from the Ministry.

.....
Confidentiality notice: This email may be confidential or legally privileged. If you have received it by mistake, please tell the sender immediately by reply, remove this email and the reply from your system, and don't act on it in any other way. Ngā mihi.

From: cabinetpapers <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Tuesday, 14 April 2026 10:19 am
To: Jemima de Lacey; cabinetpapers; Jono Arrell
Cc: Laura Miller; Mary Graham
Subject: Re: Review of the Social Housing system – draft Cabinet paper for agency consultation

You don't often get email from s 9(2)(a) [Learn why this is important](#)

Kia ora Jono and Jemima

Thank you for providing the Ministry of Women with the opportunity to give feedback on the Cabinet Paper: *Reviewing the social housing system: delivering better housing support to those who need it.*

Our review shows that this cabinet paper has strongly gendered implications across the three Shifts. Due to the redactions and the absence of footnotes, the full implications of this cabinet paper are unclear.

Population Ministries – recommended consultation

Due to the gendered and intersectional impact of this proposal, we recommend that population ministries are consulted as the specific shift policies are developed.

Key Shift One – Refocus social housing on people with severe and persistent access barriers

Women earn lower average earnings, are more likely to work parttime, have caregiving responsibilities, and lower lifetime retirement savings. This is particularly true for sole mothers and older women living alone. As such they may experience more housing stress and difficulty accessing housing in the private market.

While this proposal could benefit some women, such as those with mental health issues or those escaping family violence, on balance a shift away from affordability will potentially negatively impact many women currently using social housing.

To ensure that women's homelessness does not increase, a gendered analysis of this access shift is required.

Key Shift Two – Improve sustainable flows through and out of social housing toward housing independence

Secure, stable housing is one of the strongest protective factors for women and children's safety, health, and longterm wellbeing. Housing insecurity is:

- a major driver of domestic violence,
- can lead to homelessness for women,
- has well documented negative effects on children, including on physical health, mental and emotional wellbeing and educational continuity.

While it is appropriate to review the status of social housing occupants to ensure the need for housing remains, it is important that this process does not introduce or increase housing insecurity and children (and women's) material hardship (as per the Government's Child and Youth Strategy priority to reduce child material hardship).

We recommend that the policy development include a gender lens avoid, or minimise, and potential increase in stress or hardship for women and families.

Key Shift Three: improving equity and the financial incentives to move into private housing by reducing the gap between the cost of private and social housing

Women (including those with families, living alone and retired) will be amongst the most impacted groups if measures to reduce the gap between the cost of private and social housing include increased contributions

for those in social housing, due to women's lower average income, caring responsibilities and lower retirement savings.

There is already considerable financial stress across the system as indicated by the increasing need to access the Temporary Additional Support (TAS).

We recommend that analysis to implement Shift three includes a gender and intersectional lens.

Overarching recommendation

We suggest the following paragraph be included in the section dealing with population impacts:

Women are more likely than men to experience housing stress driven by low income. A shift away from an affordability-based assessment and any increases in the cost of social housing, may adversely affect women's ability to access and remain in social housing, and may impact on their long-term outcomes. A gendered analysis is required to ensure that secure and affordable housing options for women are maintained.

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide feedback, if you have any clarifying questions please don't hesitate to get in touch. FYI, the paper was shared with myself (peer review) and Mary Graham (SME, CCed into this email).

Ngā mihi, Sean

I work Monday to Thursday.

From: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Monday, 13 April 2026 4:31 pm
To: cabinetpapers <s 9(2)(a)> Jono Arrell (Guest) <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: Re: Review of the Social Housing system – draft Cabinet paper for agency consultation

Hi Sean,

It really needs to be first thing as we have to get the final papers to Ministers' offices by 12pm and have to get the paper signed out.

Ngā mihi nui

Jemima de Lacey ([she/her](#))

Principal Advisor | Social Housing and Other Supports

s 9(2)(a) | Phone: s 9(2)(a)

From: cabinetpapers <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2026 4:24 PM
To: Jono Arrell (Guest) <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: Re: Review of the Social Housing system – draft Cabinet paper for agency consultation

Dear Jono,

Just letting you know that our agency response will probably be coming to you first thing tomorrow - I hope that will be fine.

Ngā mihi, Sean

I work Monday to Thursday.

From: Jono Arrell <s 9(2)(a)>

Sent: Tuesday, 7 April 2026 5:48 pm

To: s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

<s 9(2)(a)>

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

<s 9(2)(a)>

s 9(2)(a)

<s 9(2)(a)>

<s 9(2)(a)>

Cc: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>

Subject: Review of the Social Housing system – draft Cabinet paper for agency consultation

SENSITIVE

Kia ora koutou,

We are seeking agency feedback on the attached draft Cabinet paper: “Reviewing the social housing system: delivering better housing support to those who need it”. Please send your feedback to s 9(2)(a) and s 9(2)(a) by **COP Monday 13 April 2026**.

This document includes redactions due to Budget sensitivity. Please do not share this more widely. If you need to share this with your colleagues, we request that you pass on their names and email addresses.

If you would like to discuss the content in the attached or have questions about the Review of Social Housing system (RoSH), please don’t hesitate to reach out to us. We’d be more than happy to discuss.

Note that Ministerial consultation is being undertaken simultaneously with agency consultation.

The final Cabinet paper will be considered at Cabinet committee in the week of 20 April and by Cabinet on 28 April.

Ngā mihi nui,

Jono Arrell (he/him) | Principal Policy Analyst – Housing Policy

📞 Mobile: s 9(2)(a)

The Aurora Centre | 56 The Terrace | PO Box 1556 | Wellington | New Zealand



This email and any attachments may contain information that is confidential and subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this email and attachments is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify the author immediately and erase all copies of the email and attachments. The Ministry of Social

Development accepts no responsibility for changes made to this message or attachments after transmission from the Ministry.

[IN-CONFIDENCE]

Disclaimer

This email is confidential and solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you have received this email in error, then any use is strictly prohibited. Please notify us immediately and delete all copies of this email and any attachments. Any opinions expressed in this message are not necessarily those of the Ministry of Housing and Urban Development.

Jessie Smart

From: Policy (OT) <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Monday, 13 April 2026 4:46 pm
To: Jono Arrell
Cc: Mike Asplet; Bex Sullivan
Subject: Re: Review of the Social Housing system – draft Cabinet paper for agency consultation
Attachments: Oranga Tamariki - RoSH Cabinet Paper Feedback.pdf

You don't often get email from s 9(2)(a) [Learn why this is important](#)

IN-CONFIDENCE

Kia ora Jono,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback to the Cabinet paper: "Reviewing the social housing system: delivering better housing support to those who need it". We have reviewed the paper and have attached feedback.

We note that Oranga Tamariki has a statutory obligation to meet the needs of children in care, including supporting the provision of stable housing for them and their whānau. As such, any changes to housing provisions will have an impact on our obligations and operations.

Any reforms to the social housing system should consider how the wellbeing and best interests of children are prioritised particularly where housing instability may contribute to children being in need of care or protection, and the scarcity of housing options for young people transitioning out of care to independence. As such, we would appreciate the opportunity for further consultation moving forward.

Ngā mihi nui,
Stevie Hoesel (she/her)
Kaitātari Kaupapa | Policy Advisor
Youth Justice | Oranga Tamariki – Ministry for Children
The Aurora Centre, 56 The Terrace, Wellington



ORANGA TAMARIKI



From: Jono Arrell <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Tuesday, 7 April 2026 5:48 pm
To: s 9(2)(a) <s 9(2)(a)> s 9(2)(a) <s 9(2)(a)>
<s 9(2)(a)> <s 9(2)(a)> <s 9(2)(a)>
s 9(2)(a) <s 9(2)(a)> s 9(2)(a)
<s 9(2)(a)> s 9(2)(a) <s 9(2)(a)>
s 9(2)(a) <s 9(2)(a)> s 9(2)(a)
<s 9(2)(a)> Policy (OT) <s 9(2)(a)> s 9(2)(a)

<s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) <s 9(2)(a)
s 9(2)(a) <s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)
<s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)
<s 9(2)(a)
Painter <s 9(2)(a) Jasmine Lindsay <s 9(2)(a) Celia
s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)
<s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) George Minton
<s 9(2)(a) Alex Cliffe <s 9(2)(a) Deborah Tucker
<s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) <s 9(2)(a)
s 9(2)(a) <s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)
<s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) <s 9(2)(a) Andy Doube
<s 9(2)(a) Erena McAllum <s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)
<s 9(2)(a)
Cc: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)

Subject: Review of the Social Housing system – draft Cabinet paper for agency consultation

You don't often get email from s 9(2)(a) [Learn why this is important](#)

SENSITIVE

Kia ora koutou,

We are seeking agency feedback on the attached draft Cabinet paper: “Reviewing the social housing system: delivering better housing support to those who need it”. Please send your feedback to s 9(2)(a) and s 9(2)(a) by **COP Monday 13 April 2026**.

This document includes redactions due to Budget sensitivity. Please do not share this more widely. If you need to share this with your colleagues, we request that you pass on their names and email addresses.

If you would like to discuss the content in the attached or have questions about the Review of Social Housing system (RoSH), please don't hesitate to reach out to us. We'd be more than happy to discuss.

Note that Ministerial consultation is being undertaken simultaneously with agency consultation.

The final Cabinet paper will be considered at Cabinet committee in the week of 20 April and by Cabinet on 28 April.

Ngā mihi nui,

Jono Arrell (he/him) | Principal Policy Analyst – Housing Policy

📞 Mobile: s 9(2)(a)

The Aurora Centre | 56 The Terrace | PO Box 1556 | Wellington | New Zealand



This email and any attachments may contain information that is confidential and subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this email and attachments is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify the author immediately and erase all copies of the email and attachments. The Ministry of Social Development accepts no responsibility for changes made to this message or attachments after transmission from the Ministry.

----- This email message is intended solely for the person or entity to which it is addressed. The information it contains may be confidential and legally privileged. Any retransmission, dissemination or other sharing of the contents of this email with unauthorised persons may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify us immediately and destroy all copies of this email. Thank you. Oranga Tamariki-Ministry for Children accepts no responsibility for changes made to this email or to any attachments after transmission. -----

Oranga Tamariki feedback on MSD paper: *Reviewing the social housing system: delivering better housing support to those who need it*

General feedback

- Oranga Tamariki has a statutory obligation to meet the needs of children in care, including supporting the provision of stable housing for them and their whānau. Some of this housing is considered social housing and would be in scope of this work. As such, any reform to social housing will have an impact on our obligations and operations.
- Overall, the approaches outlined do not appear to account for the significance of the relationship between children and young people and social housing policy.
- We have particular concern for:
 - young people transitioning out of care or custody to independence (who may rely on social housing for that transition)
 - children and young people who will come to the attention of Oranga Tamariki due to whānau housing instability, and
 - children whose carers are recipients of Unsupported Child Benefit, Orphans Benefit, or the Independent Youth Benefit

Suggested changes

Population Implications

The paper could usefully outline this relationship more clearly. For example, we suggest that the population implications include the following language in relation to children and young people:

Children and young people known to Oranga Tamariki are particularly impacted by housing instability. Many young people leaving care or youth justice have additional barriers to obtaining accommodation in the private rental market due to age and with less support than their peers due to fractured family relationships. This cohort also has a high prevalence of disability, mental health and trauma related issues that require more intensive supports to maintain safe accommodation.

In addition, it could be useful to provide a definition of “severity” in this paper, which would help Cabinet understand who these changes may impact (para 41). The concept of severity should take into account factors such as the risk of harm to a child or young person.

“Key Shift One” and needs assessment clarity

The needs assessment is a critical piece of work that should include the specific needs and impacts on children and young people, particularly those in the care or custody of Oranga Tamariki. The paper could specifically reference the needs and impacts on children and young people (para 42) and signal the intention to pick this up as part of future work.

Implementation issues

"Key Shift Two" flows through and out of social housing

Young people transitioning out of care or custody have barriers to accessing existing urgent and transitional government housing interventions. It is important that these specific and unique barriers are considered when looking at "alternative ways to address access barriers" (para 46). We suggest a reference noting this, or that this be picked up again when work is progressed to develop these alternative ways/government interventions.

Textual suggestions

In addition to the above, we provide some minor textual suggestions as below:

- The paper refers to the Government's Child and Youth Strategy priority to reduce child material hardship (paragraphs 2, 37). It would be helpful to add a line about how these proposals may support that target.
- The paper states that the system is "unfair" as part of the problem statement (para 5). This seems normatively loaded, and it may be better to use a more evidence-based reference, such as "inconsistent", "unequal" or "inequitable" to more accurately reflect the subsequent recommendations.

Oranga Tamariki involvement in future work

Thank you for consulting us on this paper. As we note, there are significant implications for young people and children, including those in the care or custody of Oranga Tamariki.

We would welcome an opportunity to meet to discuss this work further; particularly how we might support policy development (including with data and evidence we may hold) in the next phases of work.

Please note the below individuals at Oranga Tamariki who have reviewed the paper:

Mike Asplet – s 9(2)(a)

Stevie Hoesel – s 9(2)(a)

Bronwyn Shanks – s 9(2)(a)

Paula Attrill - s 9(2)(a)

Alissa Burn - s 9(2)(a)

Kiri Milne - s 9(2)(a)

Annalise Sharp - s 9(2)(a)

Sarah Ashton - s 9(2)(a)

Jessie Smart

From: Kirsten Dale <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Monday, 13 April 2026 5:09 pm
To: Jono Arrell
Cc: Jemima de Lacey; Roger Macky; MB - Ministerials
Subject: RE: TPK 73879 Review of the Social Housing system – draft Cabinet paper for agency consultation

[IN-CONFIDENCE]

Kia ora Jono

Thank you for the opportunity to provide departmental feedback on the Cabinet paper on *Reviewing the social housing system: delivering better housing support to those who need it*.

The paper gives a comprehensive description of the case for change from a fiscal perspective. However, the paper does not adequately describe the possible impacts on current social housing tenants or the risks of adverse housing outcomes resulting from the changes to the allocation method and proposals to move people out of social housing into the private rental market.

Given Māori are more likely to currently live in social housing, we would like to see more analysis of the likely impacts for Māori from both individual and population perspectives. In particular we think the paper needs to include more analysis of the risk that the changes could exacerbate already inequitable housing outcomes for Māori (e.g. the proportion of people in severe housing need who are Māori compared to the percentage of Māori in the population overall) and how these risks will be mitigated.

The paper proposes that officials will undertake targeted engagement later this year, including with iwi and Māori, to strengthen the proposals for change. However, it does not mention any engagement with iwi or Māori that has contributed to the development of the proposals to date. Given the high proportion of Māori likely to be affected, care will need to be taken in the design, implementation and monitoring of the changes, to ensure the system meets Māori needs and that Māori housing outcomes do not become more inequitable. To achieve this, the new system and how it is monitored should be designed in collaboration with Māori (Māori social service and housing providers in particular) and iwi. Kaupapa Māori approaches to support systems should also be considered.

We also think it would benefit from more explanation of other options considered and why they are not being recommended.

Ngā mihi
Kirsten

Kirsten Dale (ia/she/her)

Kaitohu Matua/Senior Advisor

Te Puni Kaupapa | Policy Advice

Te Kaupapa Here, Whanaketanga | Development Directorate

Te Tima Whakawhare | Housing Team

Te Tari Matua | National office

Waea Pūkoro | Mobile: s 9(2)(a)
Waea Utu Kore | Freephone: 0800 875 663

Te Puni Kōkiri, Te Iho, 1 Bowen Street,
Wellington, New Zealand.
PO Box 3943, Wellington 6140



Te Puni Kōkiri
MINISTRY OF MĀORI DEVELOPMENT

Tūhono mai | Connect with us



[IN-CONFIDENCE]

From: Jono Arrell <s 9(2)(a)>

Sent: Tuesday, 7 April 2026 5:48 pm

To: s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)
s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)
s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)
s 9(2)(a) Kirsten Dale <s 9(2)(a)> s 9(2)(a)
s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) Jasmine Lindsay
<s 9(2)(a)> Celia Painter <s 9(2)(a)>
s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)
s 9(2)(a) George Minton <s 9(2)(a)> Alex Cliffe
<s 9(2)(a)> Deborah Tucker <s 9(2)(a)> s 9(2)(a)
s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) Andy Doube
<s 9(2)(a)> Erena McAllum <s 9(2)(a)> s 9(2)(a)

Cc: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>

Subject: Review of the Social Housing system – draft Cabinet paper for agency consultation

You don't often get email from s 9(2)(a) [Learn why this is important](#)

SENSITIVE

Kia ora koutou,

We are seeking agency feedback on the attached draft Cabinet paper: “Reviewing the social housing system: delivering better housing support to those who need it”. Please send your feedback to s 9(2)(a) and s 9(2)(a) by **COP Monday 13 April 2026**.

This document includes redactions due to Budget sensitivity. Please do not share this more widely. If you need to share this with your colleagues, we request that you pass on their names and email addresses.

If you would like to discuss the content in the attached or have questions about the Review of Social Housing system (RoSH), please don't hesitate to reach out to us. We'd be more than happy to discuss.

Note that Ministerial consultation is being undertaken simultaneously with agency consultation.

The final Cabinet paper will be considered at Cabinet committee in the week of 20 April and by Cabinet on 28 April.

Ngā mihi nui,

Jono Arrell (he/him) | Principal Policy Analyst – Housing Policy

☎ Mobile: s 9(2)(a)

The Aurora Centre | 56 The Terrace | PO Box 1556 | Wellington | New Zealand



This email and any attachments may contain information that is confidential and subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this email and attachments is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify the author immediately and erase all copies of the email and attachments. The Ministry of Social Development accepts no responsibility for changes made to this message or attachments after transmission from the Ministry.

From: Helen Walter
Sent: Monday, 13 April 2026 5:57 pm
To: Jono Arrell
Cc: Celia Painter; Sohini Smith; Claire Bretherton; Ben O'Meara
Subject: FW: FOR REVIEW: Feedback on Review of the Social Housing system – draft Cabinet paper for agency consultation

SENSITIVE

Kia ora Jono,

Thank you for the chance to provide feedback on this Cabinet paper.

We note that parts of the paper are redacted, so we have not been able to comment on all the proposals and their implications for disabled people. In particular, the redaction of the third key shift means we are not able to comment on that proposal. The consultation section (paragraph 70) should note that agencies were not consulted on the full Cabinet paper, and were only working with a redacted version.

Our key points of feedback are:

- Disability in itself creates severe and persistent barriers to housing for many disabled people, due to the lack of accessible housing, bias against disabled people in the private rental market, and difficulty navigating complex support systems. While these issues are captured broadly in the discussion on barriers, disability is absent. The paper should acknowledge that disability is a persistent and severe barrier to housing.
- The needs assessment process will need to be accessible for disabled people and a key question is how individuals will be able to demonstrate their persistent and severe barriers. For this reason, we recommend that disability itself is acknowledged as a persistent and severe barrier.
- Without significant changes in the availability of affordable, accessible housing in the private market, and in landlords' bias towards disabled people as tenants, there are significant risks in attempting to increase the flow of disabled people out of social housing and into private housing. This also reinforces the importance of acknowledging the multiple barriers to housing faced by disabled people (and the families of disabled children).
- The review of social housing is a key action committed to in the disability strategy 2026 – 30. This link to the NZDS needs to be acknowledged in the paper, with some indication of how the diverse needs of disabled people will be considered in the next steps of the review.
- The over-representation of disabled people in social housing, and the disproportionate level of housing need experienced by disabled people, need to be acknowledged in the population implications section – they will be a key group impacted by the review of social housing.
- Groups representing disabled people must be included in the proposed targeted engagement.

More detail is provided below - we are happy to talk through any of this feedback in person if helpful.

Key shift one: severe and persistent barriers to accessing private housing

While we see some potential benefit in prioritising access barriers as well as affordability issues, we have some comments and questions about this approach.

Disability is a severe and persistent barrier

All of the access barriers identified at paragraph 40 disproportionately impact disabled people compared to non-disabled people. There is strong evidence that disabled people with a range of impairment types experience significant ongoing barriers to obtaining and maintaining private market housing.

Recommendations:

- The Cabinet paper should acknowledge that disability itself acts as a severe and persistent barrier to accessing private housing. This would also help to mitigate the risk of it being difficult to measure the existing access barriers identified in the paper (as discussed later in our feedback).
- We recommend expanding on paragraph 43 to note that barriers related to sensory and/or mobility impairments should also be a key focus in a new needs assessment process.
- We would like to be involved in the development of the new needs assessment process to help ensure it meets the needs of disabled people and addresses the concerns outlined below.
- The design of the new assessment process should also be the subject of engagement with disabled people and their whānau.

‘Social functioning’ barriers

We recommend the sentence on ‘social functioning barriers’ explicitly recognises disability or impairment as factors which can also affect a person’s ability to navigate housing-related processes. Examples of relevant conditions include Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder, autism (and other forms of neurodivergence), and learning disabilities. We also recommend that this section acknowledges inaccessibility of the system acting as a barrier. This is consistent with the government’s commitment to the social model of disability, which emphasises societal barriers rather than the ‘inability’ of individuals, as is currently stated in the paper.

Recommendation:

- Edit wording to read: ‘...and **social functioning** barriers (e.g. difficulty navigating housing-related processes due to inaccessible processes, mental health issues or addiction, or disability or impairment).’
- We also recommend MSD/HUD consider changing the term ‘social functioning barriers’ to ‘**social support needs**’.

How will the needs assessment process enable disabled people to demonstrate that they have severe and persistent barriers?

We’re unclear how disabled individuals will be able to demonstrate that they are experiencing severe and persistent barriers to housing, as outlined in the paper. For example:

- Paragraph 40 notes that ‘**typology barriers**’ (including a lack of accessible housing) would be considered an access barrier under this shift. New Zealand currently has no system of identifying what is an ‘accessible house’, nor is there a system in place for monitoring the supply of houses that would be considered accessible.
- Similarly, regarding ‘**selection bias**’, some data exists in the Disability Survey on the people’s ease of finding an appropriate property, but this information is not collected regularly, and it does not explicitly address bias or discrimination.
- Regarding ‘**financial barriers**’, we have a concern that it would be difficult to accurately capture the affordability barriers experienced by disabled people (or families with a disabled person). Data shows that, for the year ended June 2025, 26.9% of disabled children lived in households with material hardship. This is significantly higher than the rate for non-disabled children (12.7%). Income-based measures of poverty and need may not fully capture the experiences of disabled children and children in disabled households because they do not take into account additional costs that disabled households often face. Data on material hardship can therefore be more useful in revealing affordability challenges than information on income and debt alone.

Recommendations:

- We strongly recommend the difficulties outlined above in collecting the relevant information on barriers are addressed in the design of any new social housing needs assessment.
- The paper could be clearer on how individuals will be expected to evidence their persistent and severe barriers to housing.
- A needs assessment process that relies on existing administrative data and information gathered from applicants themselves during the application process may not accurately capture people’s level of need for social housing. There is a risk that applicants for social housing who can more easily articulate their history

of housing access barriers will be prioritised over those who experience greater difficulty doing so. This could disadvantage some disabled people, such as those with psychosocial disabilities or impairments relating to communication or cognition.

Feedback on key shift two: improving sustainable flows through and out of social housing

To improve the movement of disabled people out of social housing and into private market housing in a way that is sustainable for the individuals and households concerned, there would need to be a significant increase in the availability of affordable, accessible private market housing options. There also needs to be a reduction in discrimination against disabled people as tenants. At present, these factors limit the extent to which disabled social housing tenants can 'improve their situation and move toward housing independence', as currently outlined in the proposed responsibilities framework at paragraph 46. If these changes are not achieved, there would be significant risks in moving disabled people out of social housing.

In addition, many disabled people already experience high administrative burdens in assessment and review processes relating to social security and other supports. We note that one of the proposals is to undertake regular interactions to identify changing needs and ensure eligibility.

Recommendations:

- If this proposed key shift progresses into the development phase, we recommend that MSD investigates ways of combining these regular interactions, where relevant, with other processes that many disabled people already undertake. Examples include DSS- and ACC-funded Needs Assessments (and subsequent regular reviews) (for those disabled people who are eligible for these supports) and reviews associated with disability-related benefits such as the Supported Living Payment.
- We recommend that the stakeholder engagement group referenced at paragraph 52 include representation from disabled people, disabled people's organisations, and disability NGOs.
- It is also important that the work on this key shift is aligned with other actions in the NZDS, including those on creating definitions of accessible homes, and identifying barriers to increasing the supply of affordable accessible homes in the private market and how these could be removed.

Link to the New Zealand Disability Strategy (NZDS)

The NZDS 2026 - 2030, launched in December last year, contains a commitment to review social housing with a focus on the needs of disabled people (action 7 in the housing outcome area): *"Review the social housing system, including considering the diverse needs of disabled people and how these could be addressed."* This link is not acknowledged anywhere in the paper.

Recommendations:

- The Cabinet paper should acknowledge the link to this action in the NZDS, and indicate at what stage of the process consideration of the needs of disabled people will take place and how.
 - Could we please have a copy of Appendix A (Work programme with timeline through to 2029) so we have an idea of the timing and process planned for the next stage of work.
- If the key shifts are agreed by Cabinet, it will be critical for HUD and MSD to work with disabled people and/or their representative organisations on the design of the reformed social housing system. This will help to ensure better outcomes for disabled people – who are overrepresented in social housing – and ensure that New Zealand meets its obligations to consult with disabled people on matters that affect them under the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. Consultation with disabled people is also expected for the majority of actions which appear in the NZDS.
- As part of engagement with disabled people and their representative organisations, there is a need to specifically engage with tāngata whaikaha Māori given – as acknowledged in the Treaty Implications section – there are Treaty risks associated with this work, and tāngata whaikaha Māori are particularly overrepresented in housing need statistics. Pacific disabled people are also overrepresented in severe housing deprivation statistics and should be engaged in this work.
- We would be happy to work with MSD and HUD in this area and provide advice.

Population implications

Disabled people are not referenced as a group overrepresented both in need of social housing, and as people living in social housing (unless that is contained in the redacted section at paragraph 67).

Recommendation:

- We strongly recommend that disabled people are listed as a population group overrepresented in high housing need. Tāngata whaikaha Māori and Pacific disabled people are particularly affected.
- We have set out data below which you could use to illustrate this reference (noting that MSD may now have more up-to-date data on recipients of the Disability Allowance and/or Supported Living Payment).
 - Between March 2022 and April 2023, only 30% of respondents reported having no disability of a sample of 500 Kāinga Ora customers.
 - As at 31 January 2025, over 8500 people on the Housing and Transfer Registers received Disability Allowance, Supported Living Payment, or both. Using the total number of people on the Housing and Transfer Registers from December 2024, this equates to around a third of people on the registers receiving a directly disability-related benefit.

This shows a likely overrepresentation of disabled people in need of social housing, with 17% of New Zealanders generally being disabled.

- The 2023 Census showed that 4.1% of disabled people aged 5 years and over were estimated to be severely housing deprived – double the 2.0% of non-disabled people. This figure has not changed since 2018.
 - 6.5% of tāngata whaikaha Māori aged 5 and over were experiencing severe housing deprivation at the time of the 2023 Census.
 - 9.9% of Pacific disabled people aged 5 and over were experiencing severe housing deprivation at the time of the 2023 Census.

We are keen to discuss with you how the disability statistics (7% of disabled people being in social housing and 2% on the Housing Register) provided in Appendix 2 were gathered. From our knowledge and given the data above, we are concerned these may be an underestimation of the proportion of disabled people on the Housing Register and living in social housing.

Further feedback

Paragraph 27 – A data request made by Whaikaha in 2025 showed that during January 2025, people on the Housing Register who required modified housing waited an average of 410 days to be housed, compared with 371 days for those who did not require modified housing. Those on the Transfer Register needing to move into modified social housing waited an average of 1,115 to be transferred, compared to 417 days for non-modified housing.

- We recommend referencing this disparity at paragraph 27 as it further demonstrates the difficulty that disabled people currently have in accessing appropriate social housing.

Paragraph 30 – This section notes that ‘social housing is seen by many as a house for life and is not utilised as a stepping stone toward housing independence.’ StatsNZ data shows that disabled people are more likely than non-disabled people to live in housing that is crowded, damp, and mouldy, experience severe housing deprivation, and face compounded challenges in accessing affordable housing. These barriers are compounded for tāngata whaikaha Māori and Pacific disabled people. These factors point to disabled people benefiting from longer term, secure social housing given the barriers to accessing appropriate housing in the private market.

Recommendation 4 notes that Ministers will publicly communicate the aims of the review and key shifts.

Recommendation:

- We recommend that the aims of the review and key shifts are translated into [alternate formats](#) in time for public communication. The alternate formats team at Whaikaha is happy to help and advise on any questions relating to alternate formats.

Thank you again for the chance to provide feedback, and as always, we are happy to discuss any of our comments further.

Ngā mihi,

Helen Walter
Group Manager, Policy
Policy and Insights
Whaikaha | Ministry of Disabled People
Whaikaha.govt.nz



Me he aka rātā ka tipu tahi, ka puāai tahi kia tū kaha i ngā hihi ō Tamanuiterā.
Like the rātā vines growing together and flourishing to stand strong in the warmth of the sun.

From: Jono Arrell <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Tuesday, 7 April 2026 5:48 pm
To: s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)
s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)
s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)
s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)
s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) Jasmine Lindsay
<s 9(2)(a)> Celia Painter <s 9(2)(a)>
s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)
s 9(2)(a) George Minton <s 9(2)(a)> Alex Cliffe
<s 9(2)(a)> Deborah Tucker <s 9(2)(a)> s 9(2)(a)
s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) Andy Doube
<s 9(2)(a)> Erena McAllum <s 9(2)(a)> s 9(2)(a)
Cc: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: Review of the Social Housing system – draft Cabinet paper for agency consultation

SENSITIVE

Kia ora koutou,

We are seeking agency feedback on the attached draft Cabinet paper: “Reviewing the social housing system: delivering better housing support to those who need it”. Please send your feedback to s 9(2)(a) and s 9(2)(a) by **COP Monday 13 April 2026**.

This document includes redactions due to Budget sensitivity. Please do not share this more widely. If you need to share this with your colleagues, we request that you pass on their names and email addresses.

If you would like to discuss the content in the attached or have questions about the Review of Social Housing system (RoSH), please don’t hesitate to reach out to us. We’d be more than happy to discuss.

Note that Ministerial consultation is being undertaken simultaneously with agency consultation.

The final Cabinet paper will be considered at Cabinet committee in the week of 20 April and by Cabinet on 28 April.

Ngā mihi nui,

Jono Arrell (he/him) | Principal Policy Analyst – Housing Policy

📞 Mobile: s 9(2)(a) [REDACTED]

The Aurora Centre | 56 The Terrace | PO Box 1556 | Wellington | New Zealand



From: [Geraldine Wilkins](#)
To: [Simon MacPherson](#); [Hayley Hamilton - MSD](#); [Karen Hocking](#); [Shannon Soughtton](#); [Colin Lynch](#); [Jeremy Steele](#); [s 9\(2\)\(a\)](#) [Nikki Hurst](#); [Shelley Robertson](#); [Gareth Williams](#)
Cc: [Julia Pearce](#); [Jemima de Lacey](#); [Wayne Anderson](#); [Michelle Parsons](#)
Subject: RE: AS/IRRS Review Governance Group
Date: Tuesday, 10 December 2024 7:01:40 pm
Attachments: [Summer reading on SH - aide memoire \(draft for GG\).docx](#)
[Annex 2 - Existing and proposed data analysis.pptx](#)

IN-CONFIDENCE

Evening everyone,

Please see attached the draft memo + slidepack for discussion tomorrow at 11am. HUD and MSD have developed this in response to commissioning out of the Minister Bishop/Upston meeting last week.

This is still a work in progress but we are keen to get your views now ahead of sending it to Ministers on 18 December.

Thanks,

Geraldine and Jemima

-----Original Appointment-----

From: Simon MacPherson <[s 9\(2\)\(a\)](#)>
Sent: Monday, December 9, 2024 8:29 AM
To: Simon MacPherson; 56T_Mtg_L7_Rm_7.7; Hayley Hamilton; Karen Hocking; Shannon Soughtton; Colin Lynch; Jeremy Steele; [s 9\(2\)\(a\)](#) Nikki Hurst; Shelley Robertson ; Gareth Williams
Cc: Julia Pearce; Geraldine Wilkins
Subject: AS/IRRS Review Governance Group
When: Wednesday, 11 December 2024 11:00 am-11:30 am (UTC+12:00) Auckland, Wellington.
Where: Teams / Room 7.7

-----Original Appointment-----

From: Rhonda Blood **On Behalf Of** Simon MacPherson
Sent: Monday, December 2, 2024 12:05 PM
To: Simon MacPherson; 56T_Mtg_L7_Rm_7.7; Hayley Hamilton; Karen Hocking; Shannon Soughtton; Colin Lynch; Jeremy Steele; [s 9\(2\)\(a\)](#) Nikki Hurst; Shelley Robertson
Cc: Julia Pearce
Subject: AS/IRRS Review Governance Group
When: Wednesday, 11 December 2024 11:00 am-11:30 am (UTC+12:00) Auckland, Wellington.
Where: Teams / Room 7.7

From: [Jemima de Lacey](#)
To: [DL – Policy – Social Housing & Other Supports](#)
Subject: FW: Summer Material - SH
Date: Wednesday, 18 December 2024 11:03:00 am
Attachments: [image002.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image006.png](#)
[Summer reading on SH - aide memoire.docx](#)
[Annex 2 Existing and proposed analysis on the needs of people on the Register, in Social Housing and accessing Accommodation Supplement.pptx](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image005.png](#)
[image007.png](#)

Memo has been sent to the office!

Ngā mihi nui

Jemima de Lacey ([she/her](#))

s 9(2)(a) sing & Oth
Phone: **s 9(2)(a)**

From: Jemima de Lacey
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2024 11:03 AM
To: Adam Brown (Guest); **s 9(2)(a)**
Cc: Geraldine.Wilkins004 <**s 9(2)(a)**> Simon MacPherson <**s 9(2)(a)**> Colin Lynch <**s 9(2)(a)**> Jeremy Steele <**s 9(2)(a)**> Hayley Hamilton - MSD <**s 9(2)(a)**> Gareth Williams <**s 9(2)(a)**> Julia Pearce <**s 9(2)(a)**> Wayne Anderson <**s 9(2)(a)**> **s 9(2)(a)** Ministerial Services <**s 9(2)(a)**> Bronwyn Lauten <**s 9(2)(a)**>
Subject: RE: Summer Material - SH

Kia ora kōrua,

Please find attached the requested summer material memo.

Ngā mihi nui,

Jemima de Lacey ([she/her](#))

Principal Advisor | Social Housing & Other Supports
s 9(2)(a) Phone: **s 9(2)(a)**
www.hud.govt.nz | Level 8, 7 Waterloo Quay, Wellington 6011

[IN-CONFIDENCE]

From: Caitlin Hoskin <**s 9(2)(a)**>
Sent: Thursday, December 5, 2024 12:18 PM
To: Jeremy Steele <**s 9(2)(a)**> Hayley Hamilton - MSD <**s 9(2)(a)**> Colin Lynch <**s 9(2)(a)**> Simon MacPherson <**s 9(2)(a)**> Karen Hocking <**s 9(2)(a)**>
Cc: Sarah Palmer <**s 9(2)(a)**> Adam Brown (Guest) <**s 9(2)(a)**>
Subject: Summer Material - SH

Kia ora

Reporting back following the meeting this morning re AS and IRRS.

The overarching question to give direction to the work programme is ‘what is Social Housing, who is it for, and what is the Governments role in Social Housing’. A key part of this is to think about the segmentation of those on the register and those served by social housing to better target different needs – for example long term stable housing vs short term support towards transitions within and out of the system.

For Minister Bishop and Minister Upston’s summer material, can agencies please provide high level choices to guide thinking. This can me in the form of a memo providing an overview with A3s attached.

To be included in the material:

- any thinking that has been done on segmentation or bands/scale of support levels,
- MSD to scope reviewing the priority of people in SH and comparing this to register priority,
- a high-level work plan (proposed quarterly deliverables) working toward B26.

Noting, Minister Upston will progress in B25 with increasing the AS entry threshold for homeowners from 30 percent to 40 percent, with some exclusions (i.e., superannuates).

Can this be received by **midday 18 December**.

Thanks heaps

Caitlin



Caitlin Hoskin (she/her)

Private Secretary – Housing (Social Development) | Office of Hon Chris Bishop
Minister of Housing, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister Responsible for RMA Reform,
Minister for Sport & Recreation, Leader of the House, Associate Minister of Finance

M: s 9(2)(a)

Email: s 9(2)(a) Website: www.beehive.govt.nz

Private Bag 16041, Parliament Buildings, Wellington 6160, New Zealand

From: [Geraldine Wilkins](#)
To: [Simon MacPherson](#); [Viv Rickard](#); [Karen Hocking](#); [Shannon Soughtton](#); [Hayley Hamilton - MSD](#); [Colin Lynch](#); [Jeremy Steele](#); [Nikki Hurst](#); [Shelley Robertson](#); [56T_Mtg_L9_Rm_9.1](#)
Cc: [Jemima de Lacey](#); [Ally Quatermass](#); [Kam Salt](#); [Julia Pearce](#); [David Shamy](#)
Subject: RE: AS/IRRS Review Governance Group
Date: Tuesday, 28 January 2025 5:02:53 pm
Attachments: [Draft Outline for February briefing 280125.docx](#)
[Draft Governance one pager 280125.pptx](#)
[Draft Terms of Reference - Governance Group - Role of Social Housing 280125.docx](#)
[31-01-25 Agenda Governance Group.docx](#)

IN-CONFIDENCE

Tēnā tātou

Please find attached the agenda and papers for the meeting on Friday.

Ngā mihi,

Gerry

-----Original Appointment-----

From: Simon MacPherson <[s 9\(2\)\(a\)](#)>
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2024 4:12 PM
To: Simon MacPherson; Viv Rickard; Karen Hocking; Shannon Soughtton; Hayley Hamilton; Colin Lynch; Jeremy Steele; Nikki Hurst; Shelley Robertson ; Geraldine Wilkins; 56T_Mtg_L9_Rm_9.1
Subject: AS/IRRS Review Governance Group
When: Friday, 31 January 2025 11:30 am-12:00 pm (UTC+12:00) Auckland, Wellington.
Where: Teams / Room 9.1

Microsoft Teams [Need help?](#)

[Join the meeting now](#)

Meeting ID: 422 712 020 419

Passcode: qn2LP2ui

Dial in by phone

[+64 4 280 2674,306812549#](#) New Zealand, Wellington

[Find a local number](#)

Phone conference ID: 306 812 549#

For organizers: [Meeting options](#) | [Reset dial-in PIN](#)

From: [Talosaga Talosaga \[TSY\]](#)
To: [Jemima de Lacey](#)
Cc: [Colin Lynch](#); [Jeremy Steele](#); [Julia Pearce](#); [Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly \[TSY\] \(Guest\)](#); [Jinal.Mehta \(Guest\)](#)
Subject: RE: Social Housing System Review Governance Group: Agenda and Papers
Date: Monday, 24 February 2025 9:54:07 am
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

[IN-CONFIDENCE]

Kia ora Jemima

Here are some more detailed comments from Treasury on the 'Review of the Social Housing System' briefing. Apologies for the delay getting these to you and understand if it's too late to make substantive changes. (If there's only one change you could make, we'd be keen to get the paper forwarded to MoF.) Within TSY, we (the housing and urban growth team) have swapped in for our 'Welfare and OT' team, and it's taken a bit to come up to speed.

Cheers

Talo

Key things from TSY perspective:

- Please recommend that the briefing is forwarded to the Minister of Finance, i.e. add her to rec 5. It's unlikely she'll be able to read this before the 5 March Budget 'multilateral', but useful for her to have visibility when she does have time to consider.
- Budget 2026. I would work on the assumption that you may be asked to provide savings options from this work programme, potentially to be reprioritised towards other cost pressures. We also would also recommend being transparent with Ministers about this fact, by amending where savings are mentioned (para 13, 26). This is not because of any view TSY has on AS or public housing. The fact is we're facing a tsunami of cost pressures, this is a big spending area, and potential savings in this area may be requested for consideration.
- Similarly, the discussion of a potential front loading of spending at para 38 seems quite optimistic. Really what this is describing is a new initiative (more affordable housing or higher AS levels) which is insufficiently offset by savings in the short-term. It's also not clear savings could be "booked" before decisions are made on tightening the eligibility criteria for public housing, which would mean for at least one budget only the increase in spending would be factored in. We would include a caveat that "the bar for new spending initiative will be very high given the constrained fiscal environment".
- We would be keen to talk a bit more about the "social housing funding" workstream planned as part of this work. We see getting the funding settings 'right' as fundamental to both this work and other related work areas (e.g. CHPs access to finance, putting KO on a financially sustainable long-term path).

General comments:

- The paper's key rec is whether to do a fundamental review vs change within current settings. The paper could be more precise about what 'is lost' by sticking with the current system (what policy reform parameters are unavailable) and how much 'time' we gain by sticking with current settings (e.g. can certain report backs

be brought forward, are we any closer to making changes in B26).

- In the problem statement: may be worth including a clearer statement on the stark difference in financial supports between AS and IRRS. e.g.
 - There are a growing number of people facing housing insecurity, and a growing number of these people have complex needs. **There are multiple government housing supports that are not able to keep up with demand, poorly distinguish between different needs, and provide substantially different levels of support to people with similar needs.** The supports provided result in inequitable outcomes, and there are poor incentives for some to move towards independence, where appropriate. The cost of this system to Government continues to grow, but much of this is directed to demand-side subsidies which improve affordability for individuals but are ineffective to improve the overall affordability of the housing market.
- We found the work programme annex a bit confusing and we wonder if this level of detail is needed for Ministers. If you have time to adjust, we would focus on: when are key pieces of advice / meetings planned, what will be contained in this advice/meetings, what would be different if Ministers chose a narrower scope for the review (i.e. what can happen sooner, what won't happen).

From: Ally Quatermass <s 9(2)(a)>

Sent: Friday, 14 February 2025 4:06 pm

To: ^MHUD Colin Lynch <s 9(2)(a)> Simon Macpherson

<s 9(2)(a)> ^MSD: Viv Rickard <s 9(2)(a)>

Hayley Hamilton <s 9(2)(a)> Shannon Soughtton

<s 9(2)(a)> Karen Hocking <s 9(2)(a)>

Jeremy Steele <s 9(2)(a)> <s 9(2)(a)> Shelley Robertson

[TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Jason Raven <s 9(2)(a)>

Nikki Hurst <s 9(2)(a)> julia.pearce <s 9(2)(a)> ^MSD:

Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)> Ally Quatermass

<s 9(2)(a)>

Cc: Rhonda Blood <s 9(2)(a)>

Subject: Social Housing System Review Governance Group: Agenda and Papers

You don't often get email from <s 9(2)(a)> [Learn why this is important](#)

IN-CONFIDENCE

Tēnā tātou

Please find attached the agenda and papers for the Social Housing System Review Governance Group meeting on Wednesday at 2:00pm.

Ngā mihi,

Alexandra Quatermass ([she/her](#))

Kaimātai Kaupapa Here - Policy Analyst | Housing Policy

The Aurora Centre | 56 The Terrace, Wellington Central, Wellington 6011

MSD Purpose:

We help New Zealanders to be safe, strong and independent
Manaaki tangata, manaaki whānau



This email and any attachments may contain information that is confidential and subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this email and attachments is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify the author immediately and erase all copies of the email and attachments. The Ministry of Social Development accepts no responsibility for changes made to this message or attachments after transmission from the Ministry.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

The information in this email is confidential to the Treasury, intended only for the addressee(s), and may also be legally privileged. If you are not an intended addressee:

- a. please immediately delete this email and notify the Treasury by return email or telephone (64 4 472 2733);
- b. any use, dissemination or copying of this email is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

From: [Jemima de Lacey](#)
To: [Talosaga Talosaga \[TSY\] \(Guest\)](#)
Cc: [Geraldine.Wilkins004](#); [Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly \[TSY\] \(Guest\)](#); [Jinal.Mehta \(Guest\)](#)
Subject: FW: Briefing - Review of Social Housing - HUD2025-006230, REP/25/2/136
Date: Thursday, 27 February 2025 11:00:00 am
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image005.png](#)
[FINAL Feb briefing - Review of social housing.docx](#)
[FINAL Feb briefing - Review of social housing.pdf](#)
[Annex A - Illustrative packages to support decision on level of ambition the Review should consider.docx](#)
[Annex A - Illustrative packages to support decision on level of ambition the Review should consider.pdf](#)
[Annex B - Social Housing work programme.pptx](#)
[Annex B - Social Housing work programme.pdf](#)
[image009.png](#)
[image010.png](#)
[image011.png](#)

Kia ora Talo,

Thanks again for the feedback Treasury sent through on this paper which we took onboard (please see final version attached). In terms of forwarding to MoF, we did not add this as a rec to the paper but asked our offices to specifically consider this.

Ngā mihi nui

Jemima de Lacey ([she/her](#))

Principal Advisor | Social Housing & Other Supports
s 9(2)(a) | Phone: s 9(2)(a)

From: Jemima de Lacey

Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2025 9:59 AM

To: Laura Miller <s 9(2)(a)> Megan Anderson
<s 9(2)(a)> Rebekah Hood <s 9(2)(a)> Nick McNabb
<s 9(2)(a)> Kay Saville-Smith <s 9(2)(a)> Joseph
Winton <s 9(2)(a)> Saera Chun <s 9(2)(a)> Alex King
<s 9(2)(a)> Melanie Smith <s 9(2)(a)> Anna Lees
<s 9(2)(a)> Kuini Vidal <s 9(2)(a)> Malo Ah-You <Malo.Ah-
you@hud.govt.nz>; Rebecca Tong <s 9(2)(a)> Adam Brown
<s 9(2)(a)>

Cc: Robert Murray <s 9(2)(a)> David Hermans
<s 9(2)(a)> Julia Pearce <s 9(2)(a)>

Subject: FW: Briefing - Review of Social Housing - HUD2025-006230, REP/25/2/136

Kia ora koutou,

Thank you again for your helpful feedback on this paper 'Review of social housing'. I am pleased to report that it has now been finalised and is with Ministers.

Ngā mihi nui

Jemima de Lacey ([she/her](#))

Principal Advisor | Social Housing & Other Supports
s 9(2)(a) | Phone: s 9(2)(a)

From: Jemima de Lacey

Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2025 9:55 AM

To: Adam Brown <s 9(2)(a)> Sarah Palmer

<s 9(2)(a)

Cc: Geraldine.Wilkins004 <s 9(2)(a) Simon MacPherson

<s 9(2)(a) Hayley Hamilton - MSD

<s 9(2)(a) Colin Lynch <s 9(2)(a) Jeremy Steele

<s 9(2)(a) Julia Pearce <s 9(2)(a) Ministerial Services

<s 9(2)(a) Bronwyn Lauten <s 9(2)(a)

Darashpreet Johal (Guest) <s 9(2)(a)

Subject: Briefing - Review of Social Housing - HUD2025-006230, REP/25/2/136

Kia ora kōrua,

Please find attached the joint HUD/MSD briefing 'Review of Social Housing' with two annexes.

Please note Treasury suggested we add a forwarding rec to MoF but we wanted to leave that to offices to decide. Please let us know if time is booked in for Ministers Upston and Bishop to discuss this briefing (noting in could come up in the context of the Budget multi-lateral meeting on 5 March).

Ngā mihi nui,

Jemima de Lacey ([she/her](#))

Principal Advisor | Social Housing & Other Supports

s 9(2)(a) | Phone: s 9(2)(a)

www.hud.govt.nz | Level 8, 7 Waterloo Quay, Wellington 6011

From: [Talosaga Talosaga \[TSY\]](#)
To: [Mandy Stratford](#); [Jemima de Lacey](#)
Cc: [Colin Lynch](#); [Jeremy Steele](#); [Julia Pearce](#); [Jinal Mehta \(Guest\)](#); [Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly \[TSY\] \(Guest\)](#); [David Shamy](#); [Geraldine Wilkins](#)
Subject: RE: Social Housing Review - funding settings?
Date: Friday, 28 March 2025 10:33:56 am
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image005.png](#)
[image006.png](#)
[image008.png](#)
[image010.png](#)

Thanks Mandy! Glad to know it's still flashing on your radar screens. I can certainly understand wanting to keep the RoSH scope tight and it makes sense to keep this on a separate track.

Please do reach out when you have firmer timeframes / scope. We'd be keen to engage early, particularly since some work on our end will be dependent on your timeframes (e.g. review of KO's financing settings).

s 9(2)(a)



Talo

[IN-CONFIDENCE]

From: Mandy Stratford <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Friday, 28 March 2025 9:59 am
To: Talosaga Talosaga [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: ^MHUD Colin Lynch <s 9(2)(a)> Jeremy Steele <s 9(2)(a)> julia.pearce <s 9(2)(a)> Jinal Mehta [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> ^HUD: David Shamy <s 9(2)(a)> ^MSD: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Social Housing Review - funding settings?

Kia ora Talo

Thanks for your question.

We've been considering how the work on funding settings fits within the broader review work as we scope it up – we definitely agree that it's an important part of the overall picture. Originally we planned to include consideration of how supply of social housing should look in the RoSH work, however it was decided that the scope of this work should be tighter with a focus on demand/income side subsidies, s 9(2)(f)(iv)



s 9(2)(f)(iv)

This is still early stages but you will no doubt hear from us in due course!

Ngā mihi, nā

Mandy

[IN-CONFIDENCE]

From: Talosaga Talosaga [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>

Sent: Friday, 28 March 2025 9:32 am

To: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>

Cc: Colin Lynch <s 9(2)(a)> Jeremy Steele <s 9(2)(a)> Julia Pearce <s 9(2)(a)> Mandy Stratford <s 9(2)(a)>

Jinal.Mehta (Guest) <s 9(2)(a)> Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY] (Guest) <s 9(2)(a)>

Subject: RE: Social Housing Review - funding settings?

Kia ora Jemima

Thanks for sending through the agenda papers.

I had a question I was going to ask at the GG, but given limited time I'll just do via email (also trimming email list to just HUD people as probably less relevant to MSD).

What is plan for work on social housing funding? (for example, reviewing the market rent model underpinning IRRS and OS payments, whether social housing construction, asset management and tenancy management should be procured separately or jointly, etc.)

In a previous draft of the 'SH system review scope' advice, SH funding was a 'stream' within the system design part of the SH system review, with advice due later this year. However, I see that this has been removed in the final advice.

In our feedback on the earlier briefing, we said SH funding settings were really fundamental to this work and also other SH related work, so we were surprised to see it dropped (and to be honest, hadn't noticed the change until recently).

We see social housing funding settings are fundamental to a few different work areas:

- **KO financial sustainability** – Reviewing SH funding is essential to getting KO back on a financially sustainable path. Current funding settings also prevent Ministers from adjusting KO's capital settings (e.g. debt costs, cost of Crown capital) to ensure KO is on an even playing field with non-KO providers.
- **CHP financing** – In our view, CHP *revenue* settings (sufficiency and certainty) are the key barrier to greater CHP delivery. Once these revenue settings are improved (including the potential for greater delivery of aspects of social from a wider range of providers), CHP *financing* challenges will ease as through a market led transition.

- **Active purchasing** - Current funding settings do not provide KO (or CHPs) with the incentives to deliver SH in the places and typologies. This is particularly important for KO, which is planning ~1.5k renewals per year. We've heard from them that KO they know they're building typologies that are not what is needed most, but they do that anyway do to funding settings.
- **Medium to long run cost pressures** – Because rental growth has historically been above CPI inflation (and at times as high as income growth), tying SH funding to market rent leads to significant ongoing cost pressures, even if SH volumes stay constant. We've heard from CHP financiers that this high funding growth is often not needed, as CHP costs don't grow that fast, and because CHPs are constrained more by upfront funding. Reviewing funding settings could help ease cost pressures without too much impact on CHP delivery.

Keen to understand what the plan is from your end.

Cheers

Talo

[IN-CONFIDENCE]

From: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Wednesday, 26 March 2025 5:15 pm
To: Simon Macpherson <s 9(2)(a)> ^MSD: Viv Rickard
 <s 9(2)(a)> Karen Hocking <s 9(2)(a)>
 s 9(2)(a) ^MHUD Colin Lynch <s 9(2)(a)> Hayley
 Hamilton - MSD <s 9(2)(a)> Jeremy Steele
 <s 9(2)(a)> Nikki Hurst <s 9(2)(a)> Shelley Robertson [TSY]
 <s 9(2)(a)> Talosaga Talosaga [TSY]
 <s 9(2)(a)> Jason Raven <s 9(2)(a)>
 julia.pearce <s 9(2)(a)> Liesle Theron [DPMC] <s 9(2)(a)>
 ^MSD: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)> ^EXT: Tim Garlick
 <s 9(2)(a)> Mandy Stratford <s 9(2)(a)> Wayne
 Anderson <s 9(2)(a)> Ally Quatermass
 <s 9(2)(a)> Kam Salt <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Rhonda Blood <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: Social Housing Review Governance Group meeting - Friday 28 March - agenda, past minutes, and papers

Kia ora koutou,

Please find attached the agenda, past minutes, and draft aide memoire + slide pack for data session with Ministers.

The key agenda item will be a discussion of the narrative we want to get across to Ministers at the data session – the 'so what'. Once we have a steer from this group on this we will add this narrative into the front end of the draft aide memoire. The data session is 9 April, so we will have next week to finalise the material before getting to Ministers on 3 April.

Ngā mihi nui,

Jemima de Lacey ([she/her](#))

Principal Advisor | Social Housing & Other Supports

S 9(2)(a) | Phone: S 9(2)(a)

www.hud.govt.nz | Level 8, 7 Waterloo Quay, Wellington 6011

Disclaimer

This email is confidential and solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you have received this email in error, then any use is strictly prohibited. Please notify us immediately and delete all copies of this email and any attachments. Any opinions expressed in this message are not necessarily those of the Ministry of Housing and Urban Development.

[IN-CONFIDENCE]

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

The information in this email is confidential to the Treasury, intended only for the addressee(s), and may also be legally privileged. If you are not an intended addressee:

- a. please immediately delete this email and notify the Treasury by return email or telephone (64 4 472 2733);
- b. any use, dissemination or copying of this email is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

Disclaimer

This email is confidential and solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you have received this email in error, then any use is strictly prohibited. Please notify us immediately and delete all copies of this email and any attachments. Any opinions expressed in this message are not necessarily those of the Ministry of Housing and Urban Development.

From: [Talosaga Talosaga \[TSY\]](#)
To: [Mandy Stratford](#); [Jemima de Lacey](#); [Simon MacPherson](#); [Viv Rickard](#); [Karen Hocking](#); [s 9\(2\)\(a\)](#); [Colin Lynch](#); [Hayley Hamilton - MSD](#); [Jeremy Steele](#); [Nikki Hurst](#); [Shelley Robertson \[TSY\]](#); [Jason Raven](#); [Julia Pearce](#); [Liesle Theron \[DPMC\]](#); [Geraldine Wilkins](#); [Tim Garlick](#); [Wayne Anderson](#); [Ally Quatermass](#); [Alex Gunn](#)
Cc: [Rhonda Blood](#); [David Shamy](#); [Saera Chun](#); [Jinal.Mehta \(Guest\)](#); [Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly \[TSY\] \(Guest\)](#); [Olivia Paterson \[TSY\]](#)
Subject: RE: Social Housing Review Governance Group meeting - Friday 28 March - agenda, past minutes, and papers
Date: Tuesday, 1 April 2025 5:07:03 pm
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image007.png](#)
[image009.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)

Thanks Mandy

Some rapid feedback from us at TSY (with standard caveat that if we had longer, we would be more concise!):

Cheers

Talo

- **Purpose / objectives of meeting** – We think we need to be very tight on the purpose of this meeting and what we need from Ministers. We think the current objectives (para 2) are too loose, and risk creating a discussion about data (“what does this graph mean?”) that doesn’t end with clear direction from Ministers. We would suggest objectives like the following:
 - Clarifying your agreement to the scope, objectives and work programme of the Review as set out in previous advice.
 - *I understand that Min Housing has not formally agreed to the recs of the previous paper. This is a good opportunity to lock that in and get any steers from them on priorities.*
 - Discuss your prioritisation of the review’s five objectives
 - *We note in para 6 that we need greater clarity on trade-offs between objectives. We should make that an explicit objective of the meeting. We’ll never get a clean prioritisation (the world is messy), but early steers would be helpful, including where Ministers have different views.*
 - Discuss the data analysis provided, what it means for the review’s objectives and further information to support your thinking.
 - *For “implications for objectives” and “further areas for analysis”, ideally we’d have some suggestions of what these are.*
- **Framing of data insights:**
 - (Given time this may be more relevant for how we commission and present future data analysis)
 - We thought the framing of “SH addresses three types of need” is really useful (top of slide 3). However, we don’t use that framing in the data analysis, and default to just saying people are ‘higher or lower need’ (i.e. there’s one type of need).
 - The framing of ‘three needs’ helps to link the data analysis to the key choices Ministers face in the review: are we meeting these three needs in an efficient and equitable manner, and if not do we need a different/adjusted ‘bundle’ of supports to meet these needs. The current analysis is a good description of the general landscape of social housing need, but its less clear whether the data leads you to some reform options over others.

- Some data questions that would be useful to explore (noting this probably for the next round of analysis):
 - How prevalent are these three needs? (i.e. how many people in each circle of the venn diagram)
 - How often do these needs coincide? (i.e. how big are the overlaps in the venn diagram) This helps inform whether we need to 'unbundle' supports, or whether SH is good as it is, since these needs often coincide.
 - How do these three types of need vary across cohorts (SH tenants, people on register, AS recipients, etc.), and to what extent are these supports under (or even over) supporting people relative to their need? Helps inform whether current supports need to be adjusted up or down.
 - Some of these needs can be addressed by other govt interventions (e.g. we can reduce market rent levels and to an extent improve access through supply side reforms). What does that imply for prevalence of the three needs? Does it suggest SH having a greater (perhaps exclusive?) focus on accessibility, low supply typologies (i.e. 1-bedrooms and 4+bedrooms), and populations who can't maintain a private market rental?
- Given more time, it would be useful to use the "three needs" framing for the paper as a whole, or for future papers on the review.

● Key takeaways section:

- **Para 4** Assuming the data is robust, I think we should mention that SH tenants have higher rates of material deprivation. This is counterintuitive, surprising and pushes against with analysis Ministers have previously seen that SH tenants have lower rates on certain 'risk factors' (probably an earlier cut of MSD's analysis). § 9(2)(g)(i)
- **Para 5** discusses tightening SH eligibility in part to ensure a functioning system. This may be true, but it doesn't appear to be evidenced by the data provided, it's a separate 'insight' based on our analysis of the system. We would suggest: removing the point, or including more analysis to support the point. It also feels a bit premature to be discussing eligibility when that's what the May advice will cover – and what exactly people are eligible for is up for review (different SH, different subsidy levels, maybe SH and affordable rentals).
 - § 9(2)(g)(i)
- **Para 6.** Agree that we need more clarity, but are there some questions that we can provide to help tease out Ministers' preferences? Or do we literally just want them to rank the five objectives?
- **Para 8.** The analysis of needs and supply responses in different areas looks useful (and is something HUD will need to look at as purchaser of social housing) However, we do wonder if we need information on needs in specific places (e.g. Rotorua vs Auckland), since the settings will need to be enduring as housing markets adapt and evolve over time. I.e. we need to build a system that can meet needs for diverse locations, but don't want to focus on the specific challenges locations face now.
- **Para 8.** Also, we would remove the reference to flexible fund because:
 - It's budget sensitive... (if you leave the reference in, please change the paper's security to BUDGET SENSITIVE)
 - As far as we're aware, the flexible fund does not yet have agreed objectives (and we're the TSY, so please tell us if it does!)

Analysis included in the April 2025 advice (see slides four and five of the appendix titled "What do we know about people receiving social housing supports?") shows that:

- a higher proportion of people in social housing experience material hardship than those receiving the Accommodation Supplement. However, a higher proportion of people on the Register and receiving the AS experience material hardship than those either receiving AS, comparable to the rate for people in social housing.
- people on the Register are more likely to experience other negative factors, such as acute hospitalisation, police proceedings, and mental health and addiction services.
- a lower proportion of tenants who have been in Social Housing for longer (10+ years) experience Material Hardship compared with tenants who have been in Social Housing for shorter periods of time.

Para 9. s 9(2)(g)(i)

By using the term, we are effectively saying “the high effective marginal tax rates generated by the abatement of IRRS are sufficiently strong that it prevents people from entering work, and the reduced income from not working greatly outweighs the higher after housing cost income that IRRS provides”.

s 9(2)(g)(i)

. Instead, we'd say something like “IRRS creates high effective marginal tax rates that potential act as a disincentive to enter work / take on more hours”.

- **Technical feedback on data analysis:**

- **Duration in social housing.** At various points, we say 'people who have been in social housing longer have better outcomes, but this might be due to people being housed in social housing more recently having higher need'.
 - This is empirically testable. Take the cohort of people who went into social housing in a particular year (e.g. 2010) and track that cohort's outcomes over time. If the outcomes are flat, it suggests there are selection effects driving the above trend. If outcomes get better, it might suggest a positive 'dose response' from social housing (though not definitive evidence). Do that for all 'entry year cohorts' and see if there's a general pattern.
 - Has this analysis been performed? Is that something we could do?
- **People over 65** have lower rates of material deprivation, potentially due to NZS.
 - Is it possible to do a graph of material deprivation, broken down by individual age years (55, 56, 57...) and SH status? That would show if there's a big discontinuity at 65 - which suggests NZS as the primary driver - or if there's a gradual slope over age - which suggests wider age related factors and not NZS.
 - This data suggest it may be worth thinking about housing for over 65s (i.e. pensioner housing) separate from wider social housing. Retirement is also a time of changing housing needs (less need to be near work, greater accessibility requirements, smaller houses potentially). e.g. would it make sense to have different subsidy scales when someone turns 65 / gets NZS?
 - In general, it feels a bit weird that we've found one group with relatively low needs, but don't provide a next step for “right sizing” support to this group, or how we will think about this group throughout the review.

[IN-CONFIDENCE]

From: Mandy Stratford <s 9(2)(a)>

Sent: Monday, 31 March 2025 4:53 pm

To: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)> Simon Macpherson

<s 9(2)(a)> ^MSD: Viv Rickard <s 9(2)(a)> Karen

Hocking <s 9(2)(a)> s 9(2)(a) ^MHUD Colin

Lynch <s 9(2)(a)> Hayley Hamilton - MSD <s 9(2)(a)>

Jeremy Steele <s 9(2)(a)> Nikki Hurst <s 9(2)(a)> Shelley

Robertson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Talosaga Talosaga [TSY]

<s 9(2)(a)> Jason Raven <s 9(2)(a)> julia.pearce

<s 9(2)(a)> Liesle Theron [DPMC] <s 9(2)(a)> ^MSD:

Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)> ^EXT: Tim Garlick

<s 9(2)(a)> Wayne Anderson <s 9(2)(a)> Ally

Quatermass <§ 9(2)(a)> Alex Gunn <§ 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Rhonda Blood <§ 9(2)(a)> ^HUD: David Shamy
<§ 9(2)(a)> Saera Chun <§ 9(2)(a)>

Subject: RE: Social Housing Review Governance Group meeting - Friday 28 March - agenda, past minutes, and papers

Kia ora koutou

Following on from the feedback received at the Governance Group meeting last Friday, please find attached an updated aide memoire and slide pack. Note in particular:

- We have condensed the slide pack significantly
- The aide memoire now contains a summary of the key findings for Ministers to consider, as well as being clear what we would like Ministers to focus on in the session on the 9th April.

If you wish to submit any feedback, please do so by **COB tomorrow (Tuesday)**. Note that this is going to the Minister's office at **noon on Thursday**.

Ngā mihi, nā
Mandy

[IN-CONFIDENCE]

From: Jemima de Lacey <§ 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Wednesday, 26 March 2025 5:15 pm
To: Simon MacPherson <§ 9(2)(a)> Viv Rickard
<§ 9(2)(a)> Karen Hocking <§ 9(2)(a)>
<§ 9(2)(a)> Colin Lynch <§ 9(2)(a)> Hayley Hamilton -
MSD <§ 9(2)(a)> Jeremy Steele <§ 9(2)(a)>
<§ 9(2)(a)> <§ 9(2)(a)> Talosaga Talosaga [TSY] (Guest)
<§ 9(2)(a)> Jason Raven <§ 9(2)(a)> Julia Pearce
<§ 9(2)(a)> <§ 9(2)(a)> Geraldine Wilkins
<§ 9(2)(a)> Tim Garlick <§ 9(2)(a)> Mandy
Stratford <§ 9(2)(a)> Wayne Anderson
<§ 9(2)(a)> Ally Quatermass <§ 9(2)(a)> Kam
Salt <§ 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Rhonda Blood <§ 9(2)(a)>
Subject: Social Housing Review Governance Group meeting - Friday 28 March - agenda, past minutes, and papers

Kia ora koutou,

Please find attached the agenda, past minutes, and draft aide memoire + slide pack for data session with Ministers.

The key agenda item will be a discussion of the narrative we want to get across to Ministers at the data session – the 'so what'. Once we have a steer from this group on this we will add this narrative into the front end of the draft aide memoire. The data session is 9 April, so we will have next week to finalise the material before getting to

Ministers on 3 April.

Ngā mihi nui,

Jemima de Lacey ([she/her](#))

Principal Advisor | Social Housing & Other Supports
S 9(2)(a) | Phone: S 9(2)(a)
www.hud.govt.nz | Level 8, 7 Waterloo Quay, Wellington 6011

[IN-CONFIDENCE]

Disclaimer

This email is confidential and solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you have received this email in error, then any use is strictly prohibited. Please notify us immediately and delete all copies of this email and any attachments. Any opinions expressed in this message are not necessarily those of the Ministry of Housing and Urban Development.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

The information in this email is confidential to the Treasury, intended only for the addressee(s), and may also be legally privileged. If you are not an intended addressee:

- a. please immediately delete this email and notify the Treasury by return email or telephone (64 4 472 2733);
- b. any use, dissemination or copying of this email is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

From: [Jemima de Lacey](#)
To: [Sarah Ashton](#)
Cc: [Wayne Anderson](#); [William Wells](#); [Geraldine.Wilkins004](#)
Subject: RE: Cross-agency meeting on the review of the social housing system - data presentation
Date: Friday, 11 April 2025 2:45:00 pm
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)
[image006.png](#)

Thanks for this feedback Sarah – we'll take it into account when we start doing further thinking on the cohort segmentation next week. I'm sure we would all agree with you that those taken into care are a cohort with a very great duty of care owing from the Government. And thanks for specifying which parts of the data you think best represent this cohort.

Ngā mihi nui

Jemima de Lacey ([she/her](#))
Principal Advisor | Social Housing & Other Supports
s 9(2)(a) | Phone: s 9(2)(a)

From: Sarah Ashton <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Friday, April 11, 2025 1:59 PM
To: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Wayne Anderson <s 9(2)(a)> William Wells
<s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Cross-agency meeting on the review of the social housing system - data presentation

IN-CONFIDENCE

Kia ora Jemima,

Thanks for the presentation today, it was really interesting. In terms of the next stage of work and the further cohort segmentation, as William mentioned this morning it would be good to refine the Oranga Tamariki data further to look at those for whom we have had care or custody status. The briefing mentioned further segmenting need and considering policy responses to groups whom the government owes the greatest duty of care. Although those that have been in state care weren't mentioned in the groups you discussed from Minister's feedback (those leaving prison and parents with children in their first 2,000 days), arguably those that the state have taken into care are a group which the government owes a greater duty of care.

I would propose looking at all those that have had care or custody orders over 29 days (so beyond temporary care orders), and if it's feasible looking at those in the transition support service eligible group (this is flagged in the IDI), as this is the group who remain in care in their later teenage years so have the most recent experience of state care prior to moving into adulthood and having to access housing.

Happy to discuss further if needed.

Ngā mihi

Sarah

Sarah Ashton

National Manager | Transition Support Services

☎ T: s 9(2)(a)

From: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>

Sent: Thursday, 10 April 2025 9:01 am

To: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)>

s 9(2)(a)

<s 9(2)(a)>

s 9(2)(a)

Michaela Des Forges -

Health <s 9(2)(a)>

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

George Minton-MSD <s 9(2)(a)>

s 9(2)(a)

Steve Kerr - TPK <s 9(2)(a)>

s 9(2)(a)

Jinal.Mehta

(Guest) <s 9(2)(a)>

Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY] (Guest)

<s 9(2)(a)>

Jack Wellwood [TSY] (Guest)

<s 9(2)(a)>

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

DOUGLAS, Kat (PONEKE)

<s 9(2)(a)>

WECHSELBLATT, Sophie (PONEKE) (Guest)

<s 9(2)(a)>

Maxine Mallinson - Corrections

<s 9(2)(a)>

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

Kam Salt

<s 9(2)(a)>

James Bennett

<s 9(2)(a)>

Mandy

Stratford <s 9(2)(a)>

David Shamy <s 9(2)(a)>

Amalia

Wan Ismail <s 9(2)(a)>

Alex King <s 9(2)(a)>

Wayne

Anderson <s 9(2)(a)>

Saera Chun <s 9(2)(a)>

Alex

Gunn <s 9(2)(a)>

Joseph Winton <s 9(2)(a)>

Policy (OT)

<s 9(2)(a)>

Sarah Ashton <s 9(2)(a)>

William Wells

<s 9(2)(a)>

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

Julian Silver

<s 9(2)(a)>

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

Rachel Groves <s 9(2)(a)>

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

Cc: Julia Pearce <s 9(2)(a)>

Alex McKenzie <s 9(2)(a)>

Sidd Mehta <s 9(2)(a)>

Janna Campbell

<s 9(2)(a)>

Subject: Cross-agency meeting on the review of the social housing system - data presentation

Some people who received this message don't often get email from s 9(2)(a)

[Learn why this](#)

[is important](#)

Kia ora koutou katoa,

We are looking forward to seeing those of you who can make it to the hui āpōpō.

Please find attached an aide memoire and slide pack which we will be running through at the session. We will also update on how the discussion with Ministers went.

Ngā mihi maioha,

Jemima de Lacey ([she/her](#))

Principal Advisor | Social Housing & Other Supports

S 9(2)(a) | Phone: S 9(2)(a)

www.hud.govt.nz | Level 8, 7 Waterloo Quay, Wellington 6011

Disclaimer

This email is confidential and solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you have received this email in error, then any use is strictly prohibited. Please notify us immediately and delete all copies of this email and any attachments. Any opinions expressed in this message are not necessarily those of the Ministry of Housing and Urban Development.

[IN-CONFIDENCE]

----- This email message is intended solely for the person or entity to which it is addressed. The information it contains may be confidential and legally privileged. Any retransmission, dissemination or other sharing of the contents of this email with unauthorised persons may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify us immediately and destroy all copies of this email. Thank you. Oranga Tamariki-Ministry for Children accepts no responsibility for changes made to this email or to any attachments after transmission. -----

From: [Jemima de Lacey](#)
To: [Steve Kerr](#)
Cc: [Melanie Smith](#); [Geraldine.Wilkins004](#); [Julia Pearce](#)
Subject: RE: Cross-agency meeting on the review of the social housing system - data presentation
Date: Friday, 11 April 2025 4:39:00 pm
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image009.png](#)
[image010.png](#)
[image011.png](#)
[image012.png](#)
[image013.png](#)

Thanks very much for your feedback Steve. We will be sure to take this into account as we plan our next steps.

Ngā mihi nui

Jemima de Lacey ([she/her](#))

Principal Advisor | Social Housing & Other Supports
s 9(2)(a) | Phone: s 9(2)(a)

From: Steve Kerr <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Friday, April 11, 2025 4:20 PM
To: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)> Julia Pearce <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Melanie Smith <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Cross-agency meeting on the review of the social housing system - data presentation

Tēnā kōrua ,

Thanks Jemima for organising the hui this morning, it's an important kaupapa and the admin data and IDI analysis etc was super helpful. The review seems potentially a good opportunity to shift the system to include some models that are much more responsive to Māori tenants/whānau and more reflective of Māori housing aspirations.

The proportion of Māori in SH and on the register are so high that Māori solutions have to be a major part of improving the overall system – so I'm keen to explore whether we can support the review in some way.

There are a few solid connections to work that we have underway - both demand side (Whānau Ora and other whānau-centred programmes are leading the way in providing wraparound support to whānau Māori, including on housing/employment etc) and supply side (HUD/TPK have funded iwi housing developments, often tend to be in regions where development economics don't add up for mainstream developers, but iwi will have a totally different perspective). My team has built up pretty good networks and intel on kaupapa Māori housing support; and we have just started an environment scan on iwi housing strategies and aspirations. We're in regular contact with Melanie's team and Kuini has shared a draft of her Māori impact analysis.

Anyway, I just wanted to reach out before the end of the day and encourage you to think about whether we can assist (noting your constrained timeliness and without wanting to make things messy). In the meantime, I'll have a chat to Melanie next week – perhaps the tidiest thing is for us to work with her team.

Ngā mihi,
Steve

-----Original Appointment-----

From: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Tuesday, 25 March 2025 10:25 am
To: Jemima de Lacey; Geraldine Wilkins; s 9(2)(a)
s 9(2)(a) Michaela Des Forges - Health; s 9(2)(a)
s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)
s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)
George Minton-MSD; s 9(2)(a) Steve Kerr;
s 9(2)(a) Jinal.Mehta (Guest); Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY] (Guest);
Jack Wellwood [TSY] (Guest); s 9(2)(a)
s 9(2)(a) DOUGLAS, Kat (PONEKE); WECHSELBLATT, Sophie
(PONEKE) (Guest); Maxine Mallinson - Corrections; s 9(2)(a)
s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) Kam Salt; James Bennett;
Mandy Stratford; David Shamy; Amalia Wan Ismail; Alex King; Wayne Anderson; Saera Chun; Alex
Gunn; Joseph Winton; s 9(2)(a) Sarah Ashton; William Wells;
s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)
s 9(2)(a) Julian Silver; s 9(2)(a)
s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)
s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)
s 9(2)(a)
Cc: Julia Pearce; Alex McKenzie
Subject: Cross-agency meeting on the review of the social housing system - data presentation
When: Friday, 11 April 2025 9:00 am-10:00 am (UTC+12:00) Auckland, Wellington.
Where: MEET WLG 9.03 (14) VC WB

Kia ora koutou,

Thanks again to those of you who could make our introductory session on our review of the social housing system last week (Thurs, 20 March). As discussed at that meeting we are now booking in a session with you to discuss the data.

As a reminder the scope of the review is:

- the provision of, and access to, government funded social and affordable rentals, and
- assistance with housing costs: income-related rent (IRR), Accommodation Supplement (AS) and Temporary Additional Support (TAS).

We will likely share content ahead of this meeting. ***As a reminder Ministers and Cabinet have not yet made decisions on this review so please treat this information sensitively.***

Ngā mihi nui,
Jemima and Gerry

Jemima de Lacey ([she/her](#))

Microsoft Teams [Need help?](#)

[Join the meeting now](#)

Meeting ID: 413 811 671 149

Passcode: RZ6cQ2JM

Dial in by phone

[+64 4 280 7338, 624030382#](tel:+6442807338624030382) New Zealand, Wellington

[Find a local number](#)

Phone conference ID: 624 030 382#

Join on a video conferencing device

Tenant key: [847795097@t.plcm.vc](https://t.plcm.vc/847795097)

Video ID: 137 309 579 2

[More info](#)

For organizers: [Meeting options](#) | [Reset dial-in PIN](#)

Disclaimer

This email is confidential and solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you have received this email in error, then any use is strictly prohibited. Please notify us immediately and delete all copies of this email and any attachments. Any opinions expressed in this message are not necessarily those of the Ministry of Housing and Urban Development.

From: [Geraldine Wilkins](#)
To: [Jinal.Mehta \(Guest\)](#); [Jemima de Lacey](#)
Cc: [Talosaga Talosaga \[TSY\] \(Guest\)](#); [Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly \[TSY\] \(Guest\)](#); [David Shamy](#); [Jason Raven](#); [Tim Garlick](#)
Subject: RE: Social Housing System Review Governance Group: Agenda and Minutes
Date: Tuesday, 15 April 2025 1:23:56 pm
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[Social Housing work programme updated 10 April pptx.pptx](#)

IN-CONFIDENCE

Thanks Jinal for sending this through. I think your thinking is aligned with ours – my detailed responses to your questions below.

As promised, attached is our **draft** approach to organising the Review into workstreams. We're in the process of working out the detailed role of each of the workstreams, ways of working etc, but thought I'd share now to gauge your interest in being part of this work.

As per our discussion last week, we thought you might be particularly interested in being part of the subsidy design and supply workstreams, but let us know your preference for how you are involved in this project.

From: Jinal Mehta [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Tuesday, April 15, 2025 10:49 AM
To: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)> Geraldine Wilkins
<s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Talosaga Talosaga [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Social Housing System Review Governance Group: Agenda and Minutes

Kia ora Jemima and Geraldine,

I think Talo gave some of this feedback at the GG meeting yesterday morning, but here's a bit more fleshed out thinking from us on the draft options for the May advice:

- Our reading of option 2 is that it is effectively a "do less" option – is that correct? If so, we recommend clarifying and reframing it so that is clearer. **Yes – will be made clearer once we develop up options on how you could tighten eligibility.**
- We also think there should be an intermediate option between options 2 and 3 around recalibrating existing policy settings (e.g., IRRS and AS levels and thresholds). Ultimately what is possible here may be inconsistent with the objectives or broader direction of travel, but we think should be included for completeness. **Yes – the purpose of the table was to show different options for changing the role/eligibility for SH so didn't show 'enhanced' status quo option where you change the different components but not the role, but we will provide this option in the advice.**
- Our understanding of Option 3 and 3b is that both decouple housing, subsidy, and supports, and the distinction between the two is that option 3 would effectively pre-package different configurations of housing, subsidy, and support, while option 3b would present individualised packages for clients. If that is the case, we recommend:

- Reframing Option 3 as “decoupling housing, subsidy, and support”, with the key choice being about when/how supports are packaged up
 - Framing Option 3A as “pre-designed packages of support”
 - Framing Option 3B as “individualised packages of support”
- For option 3A, we’ll need to be clear how this is different from the status quo. We currently have SH, affordable rentals and AS, which roughly match the bundles in 3A. e.g. the difference might be shifting to using affordable rentals for ‘most’ people, with SH reserved for people with accessibility, typology and complex needs. **Yep this is one key difference from status quo – you also might look to convert a bunch of existing SH into affordable social rentals, with the residual left for the ‘intensive model of SH’.** The other key difference is that currently we don’t have many models of SH that provide house + subsidy + wraparound support or if we do it is relatively small scale/programme based (e.g. Single Site Supported Housing and Housing First). 3A includes a more wraparound model of care for those that need it than what we currently have.
- To that end, we think it would also be helpful to overlay an achievability lens on all the options considered, particularly from a data lens – we’d want to know early if we don’t have the data infrastructure to support our recommended future state as this might constrain our options.
- We’ve previously discussed the need for more data analysis to better understand need across various cohorts to be able to ascertain appropriate policy interventions. Copied below is the feedback we gave last time, which we think would help frame and inform the choices in the May advice. **Thanks – this aligns nicely with the data segmentation thinking our respective data teams are starting to work through now – I’ll forward through.**

Cheers,

Jinal

- The framing of ‘three needs’ helps to link the data analysis to the key choices Ministers face in the review: are we meeting these three needs in an efficient and equitable manner, and if not do we need a different/adjusted ‘bundle’ of supports to meet these needs. The current analysis is a good description of the general landscape of social housing need, but its less clear whether the data leads you to some reform options over others.
- Some data questions that would be useful to explore (noting this probably for the next round of analysis):
 - How prevalent are these three needs? (i.e. how many people in each circle of the venn diagram)
 - How often do these needs coincide? (i.e. how big are the overlaps in the venn diagram) This helps inform whether we need to ‘unbundle’ supports, or whether SH is good as it is, since these needs often coincide.
 - How do these three types of need vary across cohorts (SH tenants, people on register, AS recipients, etc.), and to what extent are these supports under (or even over) supporting people relative to their need? Helps inform whether current supports need to be adjusted up or down.
 - Some of these needs can be addressed by other govt interventions (e.g. we can

reduce market rent levels and to an extent improve access through supply side reforms). What does that imply for prevalence of the three needs? Does it suggest SH having a greater (perhaps exclusive?) focus on accessibility, low supply typologies (i.e. 1-bedrooms and 4+bedrooms), and populations who can't maintain a private market rental?

From: Talosaga Talosaga [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Monday, 14 April 2025 8:28 am
To: Jinal Mehta [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: FW: Social Housing System Review Governance Group: Agenda and Minutes

Fyi, papers for the GG meeting at... 9.30am today. No need to look... but if you do the memo to the GG is would be the one.

From: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Friday, 11 April 2025 4:30 pm
To: ^MHUD Colin Lynch <s 9(2)(a)> Simon Macpherson
<s 9(2)(a)> ^MSD: Viv Rickard <s 9(2)(a)>
Karen Hocking <s 9(2)(a)> Shannon Soughtton
<s 9(2)(a)> Hayley Hamilton - MSD
<s 9(2)(a)> Jeremy Steele <s 9(2)(a)> Nikki Hurst
<s 9(2)(a)> Liesle Theron [DPMC] <s 9(2)(a)> julia.pearce
<s 9(2)(a)> Jason Raven <s 9(2)(a)> Talosaga Talosaga
[TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> ^MSD: Geraldine Wilkins
<s 9(2)(a)> ^HUD: Nick McNabb <s 9(2)(a)>
Wayne Anderson <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Mandy Stratford <s 9(2)(a)> Ally Quatermass
<s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: Social Housing System Review Governance Group: Agenda and Minutes

Kia ora koutou,

Please find attached the papers for the Governance Group meeting on Monday morning.

Ngā mihi nui,

Jemima de Lacey ([she/her](#))

Principal Advisor | Social Housing & Other Supports
s 9(2)(a) | Phone: s 9(2)(a)

[in](#) [t](#) [f](#) [www.hud.govt.nz](#) | Level 8, 7 Waterloo Quay, Wellington 6011



He kāinga ora, he hapori ora - our purpose is thriving communities where everyone has a place to call home.

From: [Jemima de Lacey](#)
To: [Talosaga Talosaga \[TSY\]](#)
Subject: RE: Social Housing System Review Governance Group: Agenda and Minutes
Date: Friday, 2 May 2025 3:45:00 pm
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)

Perfect have accepted the new time .

Ngā mihi nui

Jemima de Lacey ([she/her](#))

Principal Advisor | Social Housing & Other Supports
s 9(2)(a) | Phone: s 9(2)(a)

From: Talosaga Talosaga [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Friday, May 2, 2025 3:44 PM
To: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)> Geraldine Wilkins
<s 9(2)(a)> Jinal.Mehta (Guest) <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY] (Guest) <s 9(2)(a)> David
Shamy <s 9(2)(a)> Jason Raven <s 9(2)(a)> Tim Garlick
<s 9(2)(a)> Olivia Paterson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Shelley Robertson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Alex Harrington [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)>

Subject: RE: Social Housing System Review Governance Group: Agenda and Minutes

Thanks Jemima! The Thursday time would suit us best (Tuesday clashes with our team meeting). I'll respond to the meeting invite suggesting that time.

Hope you've all been able to stay relatively dry and have a good weekend!

Talo

[UNCLASSIFIED]

From: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Friday, 2 May 2025 2:27 pm
To: Talosaga Talosaga [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> ^MSD: Geraldine Wilkins
<s 9(2)(a)> Jinal Mehta [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> ^HUD: David
Shamy <s 9(2)(a)> Jason Raven <s 9(2)(a)> ^EXT: Tim
Garlick <s 9(2)(a)> Olivia Paterson [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Shelley Robertson [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Alex Harrington [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)>

Subject: RE: Social Housing System Review Governance Group: Agenda and Minutes

Kia ora Talo,

Yes we can set up the first of the regular catch up series for next week. Let me know if the invite that comes through shortly does not suit at your end.

MSD/HUD attendees could alternatively do Wednesday 4-5pm or Thursday 3:30-4pm next week instead.

I have asked our office to send on the signed February briefing through to Moffice but I understand we're still waiting on signature from Minister Upston.

And agreed we are now thinking August for the Cabinet paper following our 16 June advice on the system direction/purpose and role of social housing and affordable rentals.

Ngā mihi nui

Jemima de Lacey ([she/her](#))

Principal Advisor | Social Housing & Other Supports
s 9(2)(a) | Phone: s 9(2)(a)

[UNCLASSIFIED]

From: Talosaga Talosaga [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>

Sent: Thursday, May 1, 2025 9:49 AM

To: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)> Jinal.Mehta (Guest)

<s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>

Cc: Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY] (Guest) <s 9(2)(a)> David

Shamy <s 9(2)(a)> Jason Raven <s 9(2)(a)> Tim Garlick

<s 9(2)(a)> Olivia Paterson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>

Shelley Robertson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Alex Harrington [TSY]

<s 9(2)(a)>

Subject: RE: Social Housing System Review Governance Group: Agenda and Minutes

Thanks Gerry! A few points from our end:

- **Could we also have a catch up next week?** Just aware that 19 May is pretty soon before the first draft will be provided (22 May). Would also be good for us to understand a bit more about the workstreams and if there are any particular pieces we're keen to feed in on ahead of draft coming. We're free at 1pm-1.45pm time this coming Monday (5 May), but happy to meet at a different time if that doesn't suit your end.
- **Can you ask Min Housing's office to forward the signed February briefing to MoF?** @Jemima, let us know if you need a request from MoF's office to do this, and we'll get in contact with them. For context, AS/IRRS has come up in Budget discussions in the past two years, and the decision has been "let's wait for proper policy work on this". So MoF will be wanting to know the status of this work. MoF / Min Social Investment also has a high interest in social housing in general.
- **Cab paper timings.** The scope of the review of social housing was going to be included in a Cab paper on 'resetting investment in housing', originally intended for march. FYI we understand that paper is now going up either w/c 2 June (ambitious timing from Min Office) or 23 June (more realistic). Two implications:
 - Might be some feedback on scope / emphasis from other Cabinet members / coalition partners.

- Since the review scope is agreed by Cab sometime in June, the subsequent Cab paper could be pushed out from the currently planned for July/Aug.

Talo

From: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Wednesday, 30 April 2025 4:23 pm
To: Talosaga Talosaga [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Jinal Mehta [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> ^HUD: David Shamy <s 9(2)(a)> Jason Raven <s 9(2)(a)> ^EXT: Tim Garlick <s 9(2)(a)> Olivia Paterson [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Shelley Robertson [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Alex Harrington [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Social Housing System Review Governance Group: Agenda and Minutes

IN-CONFIDENCE

Thanks for your email Talo. Given your interest across several of the workstreams, Jemima and I thought the most productive way to discuss where the work is at is to have a three-weekly meeting with you and the relevant workstream leads. I'll set up a series starting on 19 May so that we're able to share our draft thinking for the June paper.

From: Talosaga Talosaga [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Wednesday, April 23, 2025 9:49 AM
To: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)> Jinal Mehta [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> ^HUD: David Shamy <s 9(2)(a)> Jason Raven <s 9(2)(a)> Tim Garlick <s 9(2)(a)> Olivia Paterson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Shelley Robertson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Alex Harrington [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Social Housing System Review Governance Group: Agenda and Minutes

Kia ora Geraldine

Apologies for our slow reply to your email!

Thanks for your responses in red – those all make sense and looks like we're all on the same page!

On the workstreams, we're most interested in '*purpose, eligibility, tenure duration*', '*subsidy design*' and s 9(2)(f)(iv). Once processes / ways of working are sorted, we can come back to you with who from our side will engage and how best to do that. Treasury's WOT team (Shelley and Alex cc'd) are probably more relevant for '*subsidy design*' and HUG team more relevant for the other two.

Cheers

Talo

From: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Tuesday, 15 April 2025 1:23 pm
To: Jinal Mehta [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey
<s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Talosaga Talosaga [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> ^HUD: David Shamy <s 9(2)(a)>
Jason Raven <s 9(2)(a)> ^EXT: Tim Garlick <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Social Housing System Review Governance Group: Agenda and Minutes

IN-CONFIDENCE

Thanks Jinal for sending this through. I think your thinking is aligned with ours – my detailed responses to your questions below.

As promised, attached is our **draft** approach to organising the Review into workstreams. We're in the process of working out the detailed role of each of the workstreams, ways of working etc, but thought I'd share now to gauge your interest in being part of this work.

As per our discussion last week, we thought you might be particularly interested in being part of the subsidy design and supply workstreams, but let us know your preference for how you are involved in this project.

From: Jinal Mehta [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Tuesday, April 15, 2025 10:49 AM
To: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)> Geraldine Wilkins
<s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Talosaga Talosaga [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Social Housing System Review Governance Group: Agenda and Minutes

Kia ora Jemima and Geraldine,

I think Talo gave some of this feedback at the GG meeting yesterday morning, but here's a bit more fleshed out thinking from us on the draft options for the May advice:

- Our reading of option 2 is that it is effectively a "do less" option – is that correct? If so, we recommend clarifying and reframing it so that is clearer. **Yes – will be made clearer once we develop up options on how you could tighten eligibility.**
- We also think there should be an intermediate option between options 2 and 3 around recalibrating existing policy settings (e.g., IRRS and AS levels and thresholds). Ultimately what is possible here may be inconsistent with the objectives or broader direction of travel, but we think should be included for completeness. **Yes – the purpose of the table was to show different options for changing the role/eligibility for SH so didn't show 'enhanced' status quo option where you change the different components but not the role, but we will provide this option in the advice.**

register, AS recipients, etc.), and to what extent are these supports under (or even over) supporting people relative to their need? Helps inform whether current supports need to be adjusted up or down.

- Some of these needs can be addressed by other govt interventions (e.g. we can reduce market rent levels and to an extent improve access through supply side reforms). What does that imply for prevalence of the three needs? Does it suggest SH having a greater (perhaps exclusive?) focus on accessibility, low supply typologies (i.e. 1-bedrooms and 4+bedrooms), and populations who can't maintain a private market rental?

From: Talosaga Talosaga [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Monday, 14 April 2025 8:28 am
To: Jinal Mehta [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: FW: Social Housing System Review Governance Group: Agenda and Minutes

Fyi, papers for the GG meeting at... 9.30am today. No need to look... but if you do the memo to the GG is would be the one.

From: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Friday, 11 April 2025 4:30 pm
To: ^MHUD Colin Lynch <s 9(2)(a)> Simon Macpherson
<s 9(2)(a)> ^MSD: Viv Rickard <s 9(2)(a)>
Karen Hocking <s 9(2)(a)> Shannon Soughtton
<s 9(2)(a)> Hayley Hamilton - MSD
<s 9(2)(a)> Jeremy Steele <s 9(2)(a)> Nikki Hurst
<s 9(2)(a)> Liesle Theron [DPMC] <s 9(2)(a)> julia.pearce
<s 9(2)(a)> Jason Raven <s 9(2)(a)> Talosaga Talosaga
[TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> ^MSD: Geraldine Wilkins
<s 9(2)(a)> ^HUD: Nick McNabb <s 9(2)(a)>
Wayne Anderson <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Mandy Stratford <s 9(2)(a)> Ally Quatermass
<s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: Social Housing System Review Governance Group: Agenda and Minutes

Kia ora koutou,

Please find attached the papers for the Governance Group meeting on Monday morning.

Ngā mihi nui,

Jemima de Lacey ([she/her](#))

Principal Advisor | Social Housing & Other Supports

[s 9\(2\)\(a\)](#) | Phone: [s 9\(2\)\(a\)](#)

[www.hud.govt.nz](#) | Level 8, 7 Waterloo Quay, Wellington 6011



Disclaimer

This email is confidential and solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you have received this email in error, then any use is strictly prohibited. Please notify us immediately and delete all copies of this email and any attachments. Any opinions expressed in this message are not necessarily those of the Ministry of Housing and Urban Development.

[IN-CONFIDENCE]

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

The information in this email is confidential to the Treasury, intended only for the addressee(s), and may also be legally privileged. If you are not an intended addressee:

- a. please immediately delete this email and notify the Treasury by return email or telephone (64 4 472 2733);
- b. any use, dissemination or copying of this email is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

This email and any attachments may contain information that is confidential and subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this email and attachments is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify the author immediately and erase all copies of the email and attachments. The Ministry of Social Development accepts no responsibility for changes made to this message or attachments after transmission from the Ministry.

This email and any attachments may contain information that is confidential and subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this email and attachments is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify the author immediately and erase all copies of the email and attachments. The Ministry of Social Development accepts no responsibility for changes made to this message or attachments after transmission from the Ministry.

From: [Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly \[TSY\]](#)
To: [David Shamy](#); [Mandy Stratford](#); [Roger Styles](#); [Nick McNabb](#); [Talosaga Talosaga \[TSY\] \(Guest\)](#); [Jason Raven](#); [Tim Garlick](#)
Cc: [Julia Pearce](#); [Jemima de Lacey](#); [Stacey Beer](#)
Subject: RE: S 9(2)(f)(iv) and RoSH
Date: Wednesday, 7 May 2025 12:42:43 pm
Attachments: [image004.png](#)
[image001.png](#)

[IN-CONFIDENCE]

Hey Shamy,

Thanks for your email and for inviting us to the meeting Monday. Appreciate this is a gargantuan and nebulous piece of work and grateful to be involved early as it develops. Our key pieces of feedback on proposed framing for the advice going forward, with a particular view on the Phase One report, are below:

1. Characterising what we fund: We think it could be useful to be explicit about what inputs the Govt is paying for in social housing, at a level that sits above the more specific tools and models. This helps us avoid being too constrained by existing settings. From our perspective, it seems like there's three broad buckets here:

- a. The physical dwelling (and asset maintenance)
- b. Tenancy management and support services
- c. Subsidies

a is clearly supply-side, c is demand-side and b is in-between. While the details of b may be dealt with in other workstreams, it's important that funding settings consider the interaction. As a practical matter, tenancy management is currently purchased through the 'supply-side' contract.

We also think it's worth being explicit about the outputs and outcomes we are aiming to purchase, as this will inform how we purchase the inputs (e.g. where should we use outcomes-based payments). In our view, these could be:

- d. Output: the tenant household has a dwelling with the characteristics that meet their needs (location, typology, accessibility) and additional support where needed.
- e. Outcomes: tenant household transitions into housing independence, improved wider tenant outcomes (e.g. health)

2. Articulation of problem definition: We support, and for consistency think it would be useful to borrow, the problem definition of the wider RoSH, which is (paraphrasing here!) the system is expensive, it's not keeping up with demand nor necessarily providing the supports people need, and it may not always be leading to improved outcomes. Underneath this, there would be an opportunity to tailor the definition to this specific stream of work. Linking to our point around characterising what the Govt pays for and buys, this could include whether we are focusing on buying the right things, and using the right mechanisms, in the right combinations, and calibrated at the right amounts to achieve this.

3. Assessing effectiveness of what we fund: As mentioned by Jinal, and

captured in your email, one of our key pieces of feedback is that we think status quo funding settings and their effectiveness should also be assessed against the five objectives of the RoSH, focusing in particular on the two objectives we understand Mins are especially keen to prioritise: supporting people for the duration of need, and moving them through the housing pipeline including into independent housing where feasible. I've captured below what this could look like for the structure of the Phase One report.

4. System reform options: As flagged by Talo at the RoSH GG meeting, we understand Ministers have Bold Ambitions for the review, and accordingly, we think it would be useful to consider a wider set of options for system direction to ensure we meet Ministers' expectations. s 9(2)(f)(iv) we think assessing the effectiveness of what we fund against Ministers general objectives for the RoSH could still usefully give a view on the possible spectrum of changes, how they might be sequenced and calibrated over time, and how tricky that will be.

Practically speaking, we think something like the below could meet Bishop's and Upston's ambitions for the Phase One report, while also giving a nod to MoF's desire to see possible short-term saving options, which have been (understandably) bumped from the last two-budgets:

- Here's how the Govt currently funds SH supply-side measures, and how this is working
- Here are your objectives of the RoSH and how funding settings link up with delivering on this
- The design of the SH system should inform how it's funded including what you're funding (1a, b, c, d and e) and its delivery
- You have options for sequencing change and could make tweaks now with a focus on moving towards the review objectives and/or delivering immediate savings
- Short-term changes include XYZ, but should not be at odds with, or undermine the longer-term direction of travel
- Once you've clarified the scale of change and the way you want the system to operate moving forward, s 9(2)(f)(iv)

Appreciate this is a lot to digest, and very happy to chat if useful.

Thanks again,

Caitlin et al

[IN-CONFIDENCE:RELEASE EXTERNAL]

From: David Shamy <s 9(2)(a)>

Sent: Tuesday, 6 May 2025 12:07 pm

To: Mandy Stratford <s 9(2)(a)> Roger Styles

<s 9(2)(a) ^HUD: Nick McNabb <s 9(2)(a) Talosaga
Talosaga [TSY] <s 9(2)(a) Jason Raven
<s 9(2)(a) ^EXT: Tim Garlick <s 9(2)(a)
Cc: julia.pearce <s 9(2)(a) Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)
Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY] <s 9(2)(a) Stacey Beer
<s 9(2)(a)
Subject: RE: s 9(2)(f)(iv) and RoSH

Hi all thanks for the discussion yesterday. Attached is the slides I used (noting I've not incorporate anything from yesterday's discussion. As noted, HUD will be discussing the s 9(2)(f)(iv) on Wednesday and we'll look to provide some more concrete next steps and working arrangements following that.

My key takeaways from this meeting:

- TSY noted the importance of this programme for the KO turnaround plan (it's not just an interdependency)
- Suggestion that status quo be test against the ROSH objectives
- s 9(2)(f)(iv)
- Different approaches for different circumstances will be needed
- s 9(2)(f)(iv)
-

Generally I think some of themes that came through are the basics around certainty, flexibility and transparency.

Feel free to let me know if you have further thoughts.

David Shamy

Principal Policy Advisor | Social Housing & Other Supports

Policy

s 9(2)(a) | Phone: s 9(2)(a)

www.hud.govt.nz | Level 7, 45 Queen Street, Auckland



He kāinga ora, he hapori ora - our purpose is thriving communities where everyone has a place to call home.

[IN-CONFIDENCE:RELEASE EXTERNAL]

-----Original Appointment-----

From: David Shamy

Sent: Thursday, 1 May 2025 12:23 pm

To: David Shamy; Mandy Stratford; Roger Styles; Nick McNabb; Talosaga Talosaga [TSY] (Guest);

Jason.Raven005; Tim Garlick

Cc: Julia Pearce; Jemima de Lacey; Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY]; Stacey Beer

Subject: s 9(2)(f)(iv) and RoSH

When: Monday, 5 May 2025 4:00 pm-5:00 pm (UTC+12:00) Auckland, Wellington.

Where: Microsoft Teams Meeting; MEET WLG 9.01 (10) VC WB

Per my email – the purpose of this meeting is to discuss supply settings choice in relation to the RoSH work. I will endeavour to pull together some initial thoughts ahead of the meeting to support the discussion.

Proposed agenda

1. Confirming context – what are existing supply side settings and key interdependencies
2. Problem definition - I will try and send thoughts before or table something at the meeting
3. Approach to RoSH options - what are the implications for our choices on supply settings
4. Next steps and tasks.

Microsoft Teams [Need help?](#)

[Join the meeting now](#)

Meeting ID: 459 196 954 077 7

Passcode: xb754NA2

Dial in by phone

[+64 4 280 7338,,279149255#](#) New Zealand, Wellington

[Find a local number](#)

Phone conference ID: 279 149 255#

Join on a video conferencing device

Tenant key: [847795097@t.plcm.vc](#)

Video ID: 134 782 676 1

[More info](#)

For organizers: [Meeting options](#) | [Reset dial-in PIN](#)

Disclaimer

From: [Talosaga Talosaga \[TSY\]](#)
To: [Jemima de Lacey](#); [Simon MacPherson](#); [Colin Lynch](#); [Viv Rickard](#); [Karen Hocking](#); [Shannon Soughtton](#); [Jeremy Steele](#); [s 9\(2\)\(a\)](#); [Nikki Hurst](#); [Liesle Theron \[DPMC\]](#)
Cc: [Julia Pearce](#); [Geraldine Wilkins](#); [Jason Raven](#); [Ally Quatermass](#); [David Shamy](#); [Tim Garlick](#); [Alex Gunn](#); [Eimear Doyle](#); [Michelle Parsons](#); [Emily Wong](#); [Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly \[TSY\] \(Guest\)](#); [Jinal.Mehta \(Guest\)](#); [Olivia Paterson \[TSY\]](#)
Subject: TSY feedback on Review of the Social Housing System – Options for System Direction draft paper
Date: Friday, 6 June 2025 1:14:41 pm
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image005.png](#)
[image009.png](#)
[image010.png](#)
[image011.png](#)

Kia ora Jemima and Gerry,

Thanks very much for sharing this paper with us early!

First off, we want to acknowledge that this is a really challenging situation with the scale and complexity of the problem, coordinating work across multiple agencies, and the many interested stakeholders with varied perspectives and lots of feedback.

However, we don't think the current draft provides Ministers with suitable options to meet their expectations nor sufficient information to allow Ministers to make an informed choice on the options provided.

- At present, the paper's options (including the preferred option) aren't well supported by data on needs analysis, and we think the paper could do more to analyse how different interventions are better suited to different needs / population cohorts.
- In our view, the case for change (and for the options) could be articulated more clearly in the paper by explicitly assessing the status quo against the agreed objectives of the review, highlighting analysis of material deprivation rates for those in SH (relevant to the 'equity' objective), and analysis of people in SH beyond duration of need.

The rest of this email sets out suggested framing for the paper, capturing a lot of our feedback we've shared in various forums over the past few weeks. It includes a proposed purpose for the role of physical social housing. Ideally we would consider the role of all interventions together: however, we understand Ministers expect this to be landed.

We can use the TSY-RoSH meeting on Monday to discuss this feedback. I imagine the governance group meeting next Thursday will also be used to discuss a near final draft of the paper?

Cheers

Talo, Caitlin, and Jinal

Suggested framing of analysis of the social housing system as a whole

We think it is worth stepping back from the existing individual interventions and options, and thinking of the social housing system as a whole.

Building off the objectives agreed for the review and the recent decisions on resetting investment, we think the purpose of the overall social housing system can be set out as:

Proposed purpose: The purpose of the social housing system is to *match* people with high and varying *housing needs* to *interventions* that provide equitable and timely access to stable and secure housing.

This sets out that the ‘problem’ the system needs to solve is how to match interventions that are suited to the need type people have, and do so in an equitable (i.e. proportionate to need) and timely (i.e. fast, but also only for duration of need) manner, in the context of the Minister’s objectives for the review.

The paper can then set the different components of this purpose (need types, intervention types and the Government’s key choices on system architecture):

Drivers of need: Peoples’ need for housing support is driven by one or more of the following:

1. Affordability: cannot afford suitable private housing
2. Availability: cannot find suitable private housing (e.g. typology, accessibility) even at market price
3. Other needs: require support to obtain and remain housed (e.g. poor rental history, mental health issues)

Mechanisms for providing support through the social housing system: the Government can provide support in one or more of the following ways:

1. Physical house: could be Government built, owned, leased
2. Financial supports: could be a grant, cash payment or subsidy to household or provider, or guarantee to provider, to support access to private market
3. Other supports: could be direct to individuals and families or to providers, or could be brokering service

The Government has choices about who it supports, which mechanisms it uses to support them, the scale (duration and intensity) of support provided, and how different supports are combined.

Some interventions are better or worse suited to different purposes and achievement of objectives. For example, financial supports can be turned on and off relatively quickly relative to the provision of physical homes.

After setting out the above, ideally the paper would then go through and analyse which interventions are suited to which cohorts / types of need. This would be the place to build on the findings of the previous data analysis – s 9(2)(g)(i)

, and this paper is a good opportunity to update them on more detailed analysis that has since been undertaken.

However, we know that there are time and data constraints and this might not be possible for this paper, but we think it is useful setting out this framework and continuing work on this analysis to inform subsequent advice.

Suggested framing of analysis of the purpose of ‘physical housing supply’ within the system (i.e. social housing the intervention)

The role of physical social houses could be more targeted in the new system. In a system where need and intervention type are more closely matched, one option is to tighten eligibility to physical housing support so that it is provided *only where* alternative mechanisms are likely to be ineffective or represent poor value for money.

Data shows that physical social houses are expensive to deliver and maintain, are not always allocated in a way that is well-aligned with need type or duration, and may dis-

incentivise movement along the housing continuum.

This would imply that the long-term purpose of physical social housing should be to support people whose needs:

- cannot be adequately or efficiently met through financial and/or other supports, and
- mean they are likely to require long-term or ongoing support

It would also imply that people not in this group (e.g. those who only face affordability challenges) would have their needs met by other financial and non-financial interventions.

Subsequent advice and analysis will be provided on how to design the provision of physical social housing to achieve the long-term purpose above. A range of options will be considered, and can include:

- Narrowing the eligibility for social housing, with those ineligible being served by other financial and non-financial supports (option 2)
- Establishing multiple tiers of social housing, with allocation to tiers based on degree and duration of need (option 3a)
- Establishing multiple tiers of social housing, with different tiers targeted at different population groups (e.g. households with children, over 65 year olds, people with long-term mental or physical needs).
- Maintaining social housing and establishing affordable rental housing a separate distinct programme and tenure type.
- Maintaining social housing, but with more graduated subsidy levels, allowing people to shift between a 'social housing' and 'affordable rental' level of subsidy over time while remaining in the same physical home.

Recommendations

Therefore, based on the above, we think the recommendations in the paper can be framed as follows:

- **Agree** that the purpose of the social housing system is to match people with high and varying housing needs to interventions that provide equitable and timely access to stable and secure housing.
 - **Note** the Government has different mechanisms to provide this support, one of which is provision of physical social housing
 - **Note** that the provision of physical social housing is inflexible and not always allocated in alignment with need type and duration, and therefore may not always represent value for money
 - **Note**, in a system where needs and interventions are more closely matched, one option is to tighten eligibility to physical housing support so that it is provided *only where* alternative mechanisms are likely to be ineffective or represent poor value for money
 - **Agree** that the long-term purpose of physical social houses should be to support people whose needs:
 - cannot be adequately or efficiently met through financial and/or other supports, and
 - mean they are likely to require long-term or ongoing support
 - **Note** that people who do not meet the criteria above but still have high housing needs would be served by other financial and non-financial supports
-

[IN-CONFIDENCE]

From: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Thursday, 29 May 2025 4:48 pm
To: Simon Macpherson <s 9(2)(a)> ^MHUD Colin Lynch
<s 9(2)(a)> ^MSD: Viv Rickard <s 9(2)(a)> Karen Hocking
<s 9(2)(a)> Shannon Soughtton
<s 9(2)(a)> Jeremy Steele <s 9(2)(a)>
s 9(2)(a) Nikki Hurst <s 9(2)(a)> Liesle Theron [DPMC]
<s 9(2)(a)> Talosaga Talosaga [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: julia.pearce <s 9(2)(a)> ^MSD: Geraldine Wilkins
<s 9(2)(a)> Jason Raven <s 9(2)(a)> Ally
Quatermass <s 9(2)(a)> ^HUD: David Shamy
<s 9(2)(a)> ^EXT: Tim Garlick <s 9(2)(a)> Alex Gunn
<s 9(2)(a)> Eimear Doyle <s 9(2)(a)> Michelle Parsons
<s 9(2)(a)> Emily Wong <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: FYI - Review of the Social Housing System – Options for System Direction draft paper

Kia ora koutou,

Please find attached the version of the paper *Review of the Social Housing System – Options for System Direction*, that we have just sent out for internal HUD and MSD review FYI.

We will be sending the paper for external review at the end of next week Treasury and DPMC, but wanted you to get a chance to see the paper now. It takes on board the discussion from Monday's Governance Group meeting.

Ngā mihi nui,
Jemima & Gerry

Jemima de Lacey ([she/her](#))
Principal Advisor | Social Housing & Other Supports
s 9(2)(a) | Phone: s 9(2)(a)
www.hud.govt.nz | Level 8, 7 Waterloo Quay, Wellington 6011

Disclaimer

This email is confidential and solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you have received this email in error, then any use is strictly prohibited. Please notify us immediately and delete all copies of this email and any attachments. Any opinions expressed in this message are not necessarily those of the Ministry of Housing and Urban

From: [Jinal Mehta \[TSY\]](#)
To: [Jason Raven](#); [Olivia Paterson \[TSY\]](#)
Cc: [Geraldine Wilkins](#); [Jemima de Lacey](#); [Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly \[TSY\] \(Guest\)](#)
Subject: RE: Next steps for SH report
Date: Monday, 16 June 2025 12:12:44 pm
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)

Thanks Jason – Olivia and I have discussed this, and we used ‘expect’ quite deliberately because Ministers have already set that expectation (most recently through the resetting investment Cabinet paper, and previously through their Budget discussions at B24 and B25), so we’d be grateful if we could stick to the original wording please

From: Jason Raven <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Monday, 16 June 2025 11:21 am
To: Jinal Mehta [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Olivia Paterson [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: ^MSD: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey
<s 9(2)(a)> Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY] s 9(2)(a)
<s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Next steps for SH report

Some people who received this message don't often get email from s 9(2)(a) [Learn why this is important](#)

IN-CONFIDENCE

That works, thank you Jinal. I just made one more small tweak if that’s ok – in yellow. I didn’t think the idea that the Treasury could set expectations for a review was quite the right way to put it (ministers set the expectations after all). Let me know if that’s ok or if you have better wording.

From: Jinal Mehta [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Monday, June 16, 2025 11:08 AM
To: Jason Raven <s 9(2)(a)> Olivia Paterson [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey
<s 9(2)(a)> Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY] s 9(2)(a)
<s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Next steps for SH report

Hi Jason,

Thanks for the update! Could you please include the following Treasury comment (slightly tweaked from what we first provided) in the consultation section:

- *The Treasury supports system reform given the financial unsustainability of the current system, noting that further analysis is required to support detailed design decisions. In particular, social housing cost pressures continue to grow, driven by market rent increases, and further funding will be required at future Budgets in the absence of substantial policy*

change. At Budgets 2024 and 2025, Ministers deferred making decisions on savings from the IRRS in favour of this Review. Given the Government's tight fiscal constraints, the Treasury's view is that this Review should identify options for potential savings in Budget 2026.

Thanks!

Jinal

From: Jason Raven <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Monday, 16 June 2025 10:45 am
To: Jinal Mehta [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Olivia Paterson [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: ^MSD: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey
<s 9(2)(a)> Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY] s 9(2)(a)
<s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Next steps for SH report

Some people who received this message don't often get email from s 9(2)(a) [Learn why this is important](#)

IN-CONFIDENCE

Hi Jinal,

Thanks for coming back to me so quickly. Yes, the paper is still going up today – we're just putting the final touches on it now.

I'm afraid we're not keen to include the text on Treasury's views about the specifics of analysis required, so I'll take out the paragraph 2 highlighted in yellow in my earlier email below. Do you still want to have the first paragraph of that section included?

Jason

From: Jinal Mehta [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Monday, June 16, 2025 9:46 AM
To: Jason Raven <s 9(2)(a)> Olivia Paterson [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey
<s 9(2)(a)> Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY] s 9(2)(a)
<s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Next steps for SH report

Hi Jason,

Hope you had a nice weekend! We've had a read, and we're not comfortable with the below (particularly without seeing the rest of the paper). The key thing in our comment was the specificity about the types of analysis we'd like to see to inform the options, which doesn't seem to come through below. Therefore, we'd be grateful if you could please include our comment (as

written) in the consultation section, or just include a holding line like “The Treasury was consulted and can provide further advice.”

Also just checking: is the paper still planned to go up today?

Thanks!

Jinal

From: Jason Raven <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Friday, 13 June 2025 3:45 pm
To: Olivia Paterson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Jinal Mehta [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Next steps for SH report

Some people who received this message don't often get email from s 9(2)(a) [Learn why this is important](#)

IN-CONFIDENCE

Great thank you. We're still working on the paper itself, but here is the section we've included. It's mostly verbatim, but I've tweaked the bits in yellow. I've also included paras 67 and 68 as they're referenced...

Treasury support system reform

1. Treasury supports system reform (option 3) given the financial unsustainability of the current system. SH cost pressures continue to grow, driven by market rent increases, and further funding will be required at future Budgets in the absence of substantial policy change. At Budgets 2024 and 2025, Ministers deferred making decisions on savings from the IRRS in favour of this Review. Given the Government's tight fiscal constraints, the Treasury has advised that in its view this Review should identify options for potential savings in Budget 2026.
2. Treasury notes that further analysis that is required and is underway as referenced in paragraphs 67 and 68.

67. However, there are some difficult design and transition decisions with this model that we will need to work through, including:

- a. If a tiered model, what proportion of current SH fits into each tier,
- b. how eligibility is determined, and/or tightened, including through what allocation and prioritisation), and how incentives are managed (informed by data analysis on different cohorts)
- c. what the appropriate balance is between what the tenant pays and what the government pays.
- d. whether a single or dual subsidy model is the best fit.

e. Whether this model integrates broader housing tenures (i.e. Transitional, Supported Housing, council housing). Some of the external stakeholders argued that TH should be integrated with SH in a future state to provide more long-term supported housing solutions to people in need.

68. Additionally, we will need to do detailed cost modelling to understand whether this model generates sufficient savings to fund a fiscally neutral system change, or whether additional funding would also be required/other choices made around further tightening eligibility for social or affordable housing.

From: Olivia Paterson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>

Sent: Friday, June 13, 2025 3:20 PM

To: Jason Raven <s 9(2)(a)>

Cc: Jinal Mehta [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>

Subject: RE: Next steps for SH report

Hi Jason,
Jinal and I can check the text given that Talo is on leave.
Kind regards,

Olivia

From: Jason Raven <s 9(2)(a)>

Sent: Friday, 13 June 2025 3:13 pm

To: Talosaga Talosaga [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> ^MSD: Geraldine Wilkins
<s 9(2)(a)> Shannon Soughtton

<s 9(2)(a)> Simon Macpherson

<s 9(2)(a)> ^MHUD Colin Lynch <s 9(2)(a)>

Jeremy Steele <s 9(2)(a)> julia.pearce <s 9(2)(a)> Liesle

Theron [DPMC] <s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey

<s 9(2)(a)> Katy Te Amo <s 9(2)(a)> Jo Hughes

<s 9(2)(a)>

Cc: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)> Jinal Mehta [TSY]

<s 9(2)(a)> Olivia Paterson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>

Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>

Subject: RE: Next steps for SH report

IN-CONFIDENCE

Hi Talo,

Just coming back to you on where we got to with this. We didn't feel that a formal Treasury Comment section was the right approach for a joint MSD/HUD paper, and we substantively agree with much of your comment anyway so we've looked to incorporate the substance into

the paper. We have also included a short section attributed to Treasury with your views on the fiscal imperative and noting the need for further work – so basically your first bullet point below mostly verbatim.

I'll separately send the draft text so you can check your happy with it.

Jason

From: Talosaga Talosaga [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Thursday, June 12, 2025 3:00 PM
To: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)> Shannon Soughtton
<s 9(2)(a)> Simon MacPherson
<s 9(2)(a)> ^MHUD Colin Lynch <s 9(2)(a)>
Jeremy Steele <s 9(2)(a)> Jason Raven <s 9(2)(a)>
julia.pearce <s 9(2)(a)> Liesle Theron [DPMC] <s 9(2)(a)>
Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)> Katy Te Amo
<s 9(2)(a)> Jo Hughes <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)> Jinal Mehta [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Olivia Paterson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Next steps for SH report

[IN-CONFIDENCE]

Thanks Gerry <s 9(2)(a)>

Thanks for the opportunity to include an agency comment from us. This email includes:

- The agency comment itself
- Some suggested text on the fiscal context
- Smaller comments that I didn't have time to cover in the GG meeting (and which you may not have time to incorporate but sending just in case!)

Treasury agency comment for inclusion

[Note this is written assuming the recs do not change and that preferred option is quite general 'system reform'. If that is changed to a more specific reform, we may need to adjust the wording to make clear we support "some kind of reform" but haven't formed a view on a specific reform]

- *The Treasury supports system reform given the financial unsustainability of the current system. In particular, social housing cost pressures continue to grow, driven by market rent increases, and further funding will be required at future Budgets in the absence of substantial policy change. At Budgets 2024 and 2025, Ministers deferred making decisions on savings from the IRRS in favour of this Review. Given the Government's tight fiscal constraints, the Treasury expects this Review to identify options for potential savings in Budget 2026.*
- *The Treasury believes significant additional analysis will be needed to provide Ministers with fulsome advice on system reform options. This analysis should include:*
 - *data analysis of the needs of different population cohorts, including identifying gaps*

in the government's understanding of need,

- *analysis of existing and potential interventions, including how well interventions are suited to different situations and population cohorts,*
- *advice on how the system can better identify and match the need of population cohorts with appropriate interventions, and*
- *analysis of the fiscal implications of any reform options.*

Suggested comment on the wider government fiscal context, and fiscal context of SH system

The social housing system is a significant driver of expenditure, adds pressure to Budget allowances and impacts the key fiscal indicators. For example, spending on social housing is forecast to grow from \$1.8b in 2024/25 to \$2.2b in 2028/29 (largely driven by increasing market rent), with further growth to be managed against Budget allowances. The government also spends roughly \$2b per annum on the accommodation supplement, which is demand driven, with any changes in demand flowing onto OBEGALx (i.e., not managed against allowances). Given New Zealand's significantly constrained fiscal position, it will be critical for the Review to find opportunities to improve value for money, including identifying potential savings options for Budget 2026.

[Note numbers are from CFISnet, you may want to use different figures to be consistent with your advice]

Additional comments

- **Affordable rentals:** s 9(2)(g)(i) [redacted] Noting that further advice is underway, the key message that needs to be delivered is that ***affordable rentals may not be needed as a separate tenure in the reformed system, if other changes are made that achieve the Minister's intent*** such as the creation of separate SH tiers, or changes to subsidy levels for SH tenants.
 - This point is mentioned in the paper, but somewhat hidden in the table describing Option 3. We think this point should be made explicitly in the section on AR, potentially even pulling out as a rec (e.g. "note further advice will be provided on the permanent role of ARs in the reformed system, including whether the intent can be achieved by other system changes").
- Paper is quite long. May be worth considering shifting full content of the section "Current purpose and effectiveness of SH..." to an appendix and including a summary in the body.
- Worth including more of the data that was included in the April briefing, e.g. material deprivation of SH tenants, main reasons for moving out of SH, etc. s 9(2)(g)(i) [redacted]
- Would be worth having a separate 'risks' section in the paper, since the risks are many and large, and therefore worth highlighting.

Cheers

Talo

From: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a) [redacted]>

Sent: Thursday, 12 June 2025 10:39 am

To: Shannon Soughtton <s 9(2)(a)> Simon Macpherson
<s 9(2)(a)> ^MHUD Colin Lynch <s 9(2)(a)>
Jeremy Steele <s 9(2)(a)> Jason Raven <s 9(2)(a)>
julia.pearce <s 9(2)(a)> Liesle Theron [DPMC] <s 9(2)(a)>
Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)> Talosaga Talosaga [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Katy Te Amo <s 9(2)(a)> Jo
Hughes <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: Next steps for SH report

IN-CONFIDENCE

Hi everyone,

As requested at the GG here is our current timeline to delivering the SH paper to Offices.

TSY – please note time to get us TSY comment, and text on fiscal context by 3pm today. Note – we will take on board your/GG feedback about suggesting to the Minister that Cabinet update happens post report elaborating on system direction, alongside eligibility and subsidy design.

Thanks,
Geraldine and Jemima

Action	Date
Gerry and Jemima inputting final GG feedback • TSY to send comment and fiscal context text by 3pm today	Thursday until COP
Send revised paper to DCEs + Jeremy for review, including to data and proof reader for final QA	Thursday COP
Final DCE + Jeremy feedback due to Gerry and Jemima	Friday COP
Katy and Julia sign out report	Monday afternoon
Paper due to Ministers, and will send back to GG	Monday COP
Meeting with GG to discuss approach to Ministers meeting, and data	19 June 3pm
Ministers meeting to discuss report	Tuesday 24 June, 7pm



Geraldine Wilkins ([she/her](#))

Principal Policy Analyst | Kaitātari Matua ā-Kaupapa Here
Housing | Housing, Employment and Labour Market Policy

s 9(2)(a)

The Aurora Centre | Level 9 | 56 The Terrace | PO Box 1556 | Wellington | New Zealand



**MINISTRY OF SOCIAL
DEVELOPMENT**
TE MANATŪ WHAKAHIATO ORA

This email and any attachments may contain information that is confidential and subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this email and attachments is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify the author immediately and erase all copies of the email and attachments. The Ministry of Social Development accepts no responsibility for changes made to this message or attachments after transmission from the Ministry.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

The information in this email is confidential to the Treasury, intended only for the addressee(s), and may also be legally privileged. If you are not an intended addressee:

- a. please immediately delete this email and notify the Treasury by return email or telephone (64 4 472 2733);
- b. any use, dissemination or copying of this email is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

This email and any attachments may contain information that is confidential and subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this email and attachments is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify the author immediately and erase all copies of the email and attachments. The Ministry of Social Development accepts no responsibility for changes made to this message or attachments after transmission from the Ministry.

This email and any attachments may contain information that is confidential and subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this email and attachments is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify the author immediately and erase all copies of the email and attachments. The Ministry of Social Development accepts no responsibility for changes made to this message or attachments after transmission from the Ministry.

This email and any attachments may contain information that is confidential and subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this email and attachments is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify the author immediately and erase all copies of the email and attachments. The Ministry of Social Development accepts no responsibility for changes made to this message or attachments after transmission from the Ministry.

This email and any attachments may contain information that is confidential and subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this email and attachments is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify the author immediately and erase all copies of the email and attachments. The Ministry of Social Development accepts no responsibility for changes made to this message or attachments after transmission from the Ministry.

From: Jemima de Lacey
To: s 9(2)(a)
Cc: s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) Geraldine Wilkins
Subject: RE: Draft for review by COP 10 June - Review of the Social Housing System – Options for System Direction
Date: Wednesday, 18 June 2025 1:11:00 pm
Attachments: image001.png
image003.png
image005.png
image007.png
image009.png

Kia ora s 9(2)(a)

Thanks very much for sending the Kāinga Ora feedback through last week. I am pleased to report that the paper went across as planned on Monday and we'll shortly send a copy through to all agencies we consulted.

In terms of how we took on board your feedback, we have already had a discussion with s 9(2)(a) about this.

- **Lack of data** – we acknowledge that the level of cohort segmentation analysis that was able to be done for this advice, wasn't what we hoped but that further analysis will be particularly key going forward – specifically for the next round of advice which will be focusing on how you might determine eligibility and subsidy design.
- **Description of options** – we had a lot of feedback on how we described the system direction options in the paper. Where we landed was three options: small tweaks largely within the current system, tightening access to social housing and focus on assisting those no longer eligible, or full system reform. We worked on making the description of each option clearer, and linked them clearly to the objectives for the review.
- **Supports** – we reframed the advice in the briefing on supports, saying we will provide advice on what support services people on the Register, in social housing and those exiting social housing have access to, and how access to these services work, s 9(2)(f)(iv).
- We also considered the detailed points you raised below.

Ngā mihi nui

Jemima de Lacey (she/her)
Principal Advisor - Social Housing & Other Supports
Phone: s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)

From: s 9(2)(a)
Sent: Wednesday, June 11, 2025 9:21 AM
To: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)
Subject: Fw: Draft for review by COP 10 June - Review of the Social Housing System – Options for System Direction

Kia ora Jemima,

Thank you for the opportunity to review the attached paper and for extending your timeframe for us.

Please see below for our comments, do get in touch if it would be useful to discuss further.

Ngā mihi,
s 9(2)(a)

General comments:

- The options and discussion are high level and conceptual. We were concerned at the lack of data/impact analysis included in the paper to highlight the implications of each of the options the Minister is being asked to consider. Without this analysis, the options are quite hypothetical. It would be great to understand why this isn't captured - is it because this work is still underway and the supporting information will be provided at a later date?
- It was unclear to us how we can disentangle/ sequence the key building blocks: system direction options, subsidy options, govt purchasing of social housing, social support etc. These are all interdependent – e.g. 1b isn't really the status quo if it starts to play around with the subsidy design; funding of social housing (para 82-83) is intrinsic to any of the options.
- Options 2 and 3a - it was also unclear to us how different these options are in practice. Option 3a still requires targeting of eligible applicants so as to stream them into the right level of tenure and support. We consider that social support should be a core part of the options, building on the Engagement Findings.
- Option 3a also makes the assumption that social housing is the right form of provision for very high needs cohorts who otherwise can't sustain a tenancy. The role of Supported Housing or any other form of housing provision is missing, which would be integral to this model being a sustainable option for very high needs cohorts. While the role of supported housing, transitional, emergency and other forms of housing provision are briefly mentioned they are not reflected across any of these options.

Comments specific to IRRS / funding settings:

The paper doesn't clearly articulate the current settings at play under IRRS, specifically that this subsidy is adjusted based on changing household circumstances.

For example:

- Para 10 (a) references people outside of SH being unable to access the same levels of support as those within SH. It would be beneficial to clarify what is meant by support in this context. It would also be beneficial to clarify that IRRS subsidies are intended to bridge the gap between what a tenant can afford and the market price of that house - i.e. as household income improves, the level of financial assistance paid by the government (via IRRS) falls. A SH household paying market rent does not receive any government support in the form of a subsidy, as levels of financial support adjust as financial circumstances change.
- Para 10 (e) - reference to affordable rentals for low income households. We question what this means, as it potentially confuses the built product with the subsidy system. IRRS subsidies just bridge the gap between what a tenant can afford and the market price of that house. If the tenant has relatively high income, the subsidy will be small or even zero for market renters. On average, its cost is high and increasing, as the underlying cost of the product and its rent is increasing faster than the incomes of the tenants. We do not have a cap on the subsidy for IRRS, but we do for AS, so there is no incentive for households to organise themselves into groups with higher household incomes, or to select properties with lower rents. This is playing out in the increase in demand we are seeing from one person households, which is potentially the most expensive way to house people.
- Para 12 - refers to the dual system option as reducing disincentives to leave SH and improve incentives to work. While there are disincentives to exit SH, there are clear incentives why people choose to leave. For example, households paying market rent (and therefore not receiving IRRS subsidy) may be entitled to receive AS if they move into the private market, depending on their circumstances. SH tenants are not eligible to access AS, even if they are receiving no financial assistance through IRRS. While this isn't necessarily the case for the majority of SH tenants, it is a reality for some.

Accommodation Supplement:

- Reference to AS being a less generous subsidy than IRRS - we consider there is a good opportunity to expand here on the point that AS is capped whereas IRRS is not capped. For low income households in high market-rent areas, the subsidy can be very high. AS recipients are incentivised to be more frugal with their choice of home, as their subsidy is capped. IRRS tenants have the contribution to rent capped so have no such incentive. Practically this manifests in how the households form, with no incentive to share housing as happens in the private market. Potentially this could help explain the growth in single person households.

Affordable Rentals (para 43)

- 'On average the grant funding per home for a new affordable rentals has cost less to the government than delivering new SH (\$xxxx for Affordable Rentals compared to \$360,000 on average per home in IRRS)' - we question whether this refers to a lifetime payment? Based on the footnote, we presume that it is. However, this comparison doesn't account for the fundamental policy choice as to how much the government is comfortable subsidising, versus requiring the household to pay. We suggest focusing on subsidy design only, to avoid conflating other issues here.

Specific paras:

- Para 9 – it's unclear from the way it's worded as to whether the 3.8% is something the Govt thinks should be increased, or not. What should the share be, and how might that need to change given demographic and market trends etc?
- Para 29 - 'SAS appears to be prioritising people in need' - SAS is predicated on housing those in the highest housing need, however this sentence suggests that may not be the case. Is there a reason why this statement has been positioned this way?
- Para 30 - states that the system does not work but provided no further explanation. Would benefit from a brief description on why not.

- Para 31 - "lack of access to supports" - is this social service support, benefit support or both?
- Para 77 – is this suggesting that the single subsidy would remove the IRR and amend the AS? We questioned how this is different to the accommodation supplement in the 1990s (there's been plenty of research on the impacts of that policy change)? It immediately starts to beg the questions then raised in the next section re: funding models.



s 9(2)(a)

I work Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Friday, 9am - 4pm.

I work additional hours in the evening and may respond to your email outside of office hours. No need to read or reply to these emails outside of your working hours.

Ō TĀTOU UARA – OUR VALUES

Manaakitanga
People at the Heart

Mahi Tahī
Better Together

Whanake
Be Bold

Freephone: 0800 801 601 | Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities PO Box 2628 Wellington 6140 | New Zealand Government | www.kaingaora.govt.nz

From: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Wednesday, June 4, 2025 16:17
To: WORTHINGTON, Tom (PONEKE) <s 9(2)(a)> s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) Nikki Hurst
 <s 9(2)(a)> Liesle Theron [DPMC] <s 9(2)(a)> s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)
 <s 9(2)(a)> s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)
 <s 9(2)(a)> s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) Michaela Des Forges - Health <s 9(2)(a)>
 <s 9(2)(a)> s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) White, Michael <s 9(2)(a)>
 <s 9(2)(a)> s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) MPP Advice <s 9(2)(a)> s 9(2)(a)
 <s 9(2)(a)> s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) George Minton-MSD
 <s 9(2)(a)> Katharine Haddock <s 9(2)(a)> s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) Sarah Ashton <s 9(2)(a)>
 <s 9(2)(a)> s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) Steve Kerr - TPK <s 9(2)(a)>
 Mattie Geary Nichol (Guest) <s 9(2)(a)> s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) Jinal Mehta <s 9(2)(a)> Caitlin
 Daugherty-Kelly [TSY] (Guest) <s 9(2)(a)> s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) Jack Wellwood [TSY] (Guest) <s 9(2)(a)> Shelley Robertson
 <s 9(2)(a)> Talosaga Talosaga <s 9(2)(a)> s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) Celia Painter
 <s 9(2)(a)> s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) Sohini Smith <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: Draft for review by COP 10 June - Review of the Social Housing System – Options for System Direction

Kia ora koutou,

Please find attached our draft paper, *Review of the Social Housing System – Options for System Direction*.

Context

This paper seeks a decision on the direction of the Social Housing system, and the role of Social Housing. It also seeks Ministers initial views on what they want included in future advice on two key levers system levers (the subsidy model and how supports are provided) to help inform the series of briefings that will follow later this year.

Please provide any **feedback by COP Tuesday, 10 June**. Please let us know if you would like to discuss any feedback/happy to meet with you.

The paper is due to Ministers Bishop, Upston and Potaka on 16 June 2025.

Please treat this draft briefing with sensitivity as Ministers have yet to make any decisions about this work.

Ngā mihi nui,

Jemima and Geraldine,

Jemima de Lacey ([she/her](#))

Principal Advisor - Social Housing & Other Supports

Phone: s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)

www.hud.govt.nz | Level 8, 7 Waterloo Quay, Wellington 6011



He kāinga ora, he hāpori ora - our purpose is thriving communities where everyone has a place to call home.

Disclaimer

This email is confidential and solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you have received this email in error, then any use is strictly prohibited. Please notify us immediately and delete all copies of this email and any attachments. Any opinions expressed in this message are not necessarily those of the Ministry of Housing and Urban Development.

[IN-CONFIDENCE]

www.govt.nz - your guide to finding and using New Zealand government services

Any opinions expressed in this message are not necessarily those of Kāinga Ora. This message and any files transmitted with it are confidential, may be legally privileged, and are solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient or the person responsible for delivery to the intended recipient, you have received this message in error.

Please:

- (1) reply promptly to that effect, and remove this email, any attachment and the reply from your system;
- (2) do not use, disclose or act on this email in any other way. Thank you.

From: [Jemima de Lacey](#)
To: [White, Michael](#)
Cc: [Geraldine Wilkins](#)
Subject: RE: Draft for review by COP 10 June - Review of the Social Housing System – Options for System Direction
Date: Wednesday, 18 June 2025 1:25:00 pm
Attachments: [image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)
[image006.png](#)
[image008.png](#)

Kia ora Michael,

Thanks again with your assistance on this wording and more general feedback on the paper. I am pleased to report that the paper went across as planned on Monday and we'll shortly send a final copy through to all agencies we consulted.

We reconsidered the wording we worked with you on below, and decided this paper was at too high level/was not the right point for this level of analysis so took the section out of this paper. We will ensure this advice is included later when options are more developed (and you will see in the paper when we send it through that we're signaling that the next advice will be in September).

Ngā mihi nui

Jemima de Lacey ([she/her](#))

Principal Advisor | Social Housing & Other Supports
s 9(2)(a) | Phone: s 9(2)(a)

From: White, Michael <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Wednesday, June 11, 2025 3:08 PM
To: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Draft for review by COP 10 June - Review of the Social Housing System – Options for System Direction

Perhaps something like this:

Cabinet decisions on changes to our SH system may have disproportionate effect on particular demographics of SH, and thus engage the New Zealand Bill of Rights 1990. This presents a litigation risk in that decisions could be challenged by judicial review. This is an existing risk for any changes to the SH system.

Happy to discuss.



Michael White

Senior Advisor | Human Rights

Ministry of Justice | Tāhū o te Ture

s 9(2)(a) | justice.govt.nz

[IN-CONFIDENCE]

From: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Wednesday, June 11, 2025 1:14 PM
To: White, Michael <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Draft for review by COP 10 June - Review of the Social Housing System – Options for System Direction

Thanks very much for your feedback Michael.

We have updated the first para below but could be grateful if you could advise wording for the second?

There are international and domestic obligations around the provision of housing

1. The right to housing is set out in the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights to which New Zealand is a party. As a party to this Covenant New Zealand must take progressive steps to realise the right to housing and there is the possibility of international scrutiny if New Zealand is seen as failing to uphold the rights and aspirations it has publicly endorsed. The Review will carefully consider any impacts going forward.
2. There is also a risk that Cabinet decisions on changes to our SH system could be challenged by a judicial review on the basis that they may have disproportionate effect on particular demographics of SH, and thus may conflict with the New Zealand Bill of Rights. This is an existing risk for any changes to the SH system.

Ngā mihi nui

Jemima de Lacey ([she/her](#))

Principal Advisor | Social Housing & Other Supports
s 9(2)(a) | Phone: s 9(2)(a)

[IN-CONFIDENCE]

From: White, Michael <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Wednesday, June 11, 2025 9:31 AM
To: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Draft for review by COP 10 June - Review of the Social Housing System – Options for System Direction

Kia ora Jemima

Please see comments below. Apologies for the slight delay in getting this to you.

The Ministry does not have any recommended substantive changes to this briefing. However, we note the below for your consideration.

Human rights

- Paragraph 102 of the briefing notes that “there are no international obligations we are

likely to breach". s 6(a)

The right to housing (noted in footnote 16) is set out in the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights to which New Zealand is a party. As a party to this Covenant New Zealand must take progressive steps to realise the right to housing. Any retrogressive steps (in other words if the realisation of the right is reduced in any way) are considered a breach of New Zealand's legally binding obligations. The possible changes to the SH system may reduce access to SH in some circumstances and have a disproportionate impact on some groups. This would be considered a retrogressive step. You may want to consider this further in the briefing and/or as an assessment criteria as options are further developed over time.

- Paragraph 103 refers to the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990 (BORA). We recommend that this paragraph be more specific to highlight the issue. The changes **will** engage s19 of BORA (the right to be free from discrimination). However, whether the changes are inconsistent or in breach of BORA will depend on whether they can be justified in terms of s5 which acknowledges that some rights can be limited where there is a significantly important objective, and the measures are proportionate and limit the right no more than necessary to achieve the objective. We are happy to assist in providing some wording if that would be helpful.

Needs based approach

- We note that there are opportunities for further work with the agreement of the Minister. In particular, to update the approach to needs-based assessments. The Ministry would welcome the opportunity to be involved with this further work. In particular, to help develop advice on different approaches to needs-based assessments.

Social needs

- The briefing notes that there is room to consider social needs as well as economic needs. The Ministry agrees. We believe that the impacts of victimisation and a wider assessment of the interests of children and young people would be useful when assessing need. The Chief Victims' Advisor and Victims Support could also support advice on this area.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on this briefing. Please do not hesitate to reach out if we can be of further assistance.



Michael White

Senior Advisor | Human Rights

Ministry of Justice | Tāhū o te Ture

s 9(2)(a)

| justice.govt.nz

[IN-CONFIDENCE]

From: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>

Sent: Wednesday, June 4, 2025 4:15 PM

To: WORTHINGTON, Tom (PONEKE) <s 9(2)(a)>

s 9(2)(a) Nikki Hurst <s 9(2)(a) Liesle
Theron [DPMC] <s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)
<s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) Anne.O'Brien
<s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)
s 9(2)(a) Michaela Des Forges - Health
<s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)
s 9(2)(a) White, Michael <s 9(2)(a)
s 9(2)(a) MPP Advice <s 9(2)(a)
s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)
s 9(2)(a) George Minton-MSD <s 9(2)(a)
Katharine Haddock <s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) Sarah Ashton
<s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)
s 9(2)(a) Steve Kerr - TPK <s 9(2)(a) Mattie Geary
Nichol (Guest) <s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)
Jinal.Mehta (Guest) <s 9(2)(a) Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY] (Guest)
<s 9(2)(a) Jack Wellwood [TSY] (Guest)
<s 9(2)(a) Shelley Robertson <s 9(2)(a)
Talosaga Talosaga [TSY] (Guest) <s 9(2)(a)
s 9(2)(a) Celia Painter <s 9(2)(a)
s 9(2)(a) Sohini Smith <s 9(2)(a)
Cc: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)

Subject: Draft for review by COP 10 June - Review of the Social Housing System – Options for System Direction

Kia ora koutou,

Please find attached our draft paper, *Review of the Social Housing System – Options for System Direction*.

Context

This paper seeks a decision on the direction of the Social Housing system, and the role of Social Housing. It also seeks Ministers initial views on what they want included in future advice on two key levers system levers (the subsidy model and how supports are provided) to help inform the series of briefings that will follow later this year.

Please provide any **feedback by COP Tuesday, 10 June**. Please let us know if you would like to discuss any feedback/happy to meet with you.

The paper is due to Ministers Bishop, Upston and Potaka on 16 June 2025.

Please treat this draft briefing with sensitivity as Ministers have yet to make any decisions about this work.

Ngā mihi nui,
Jemima and Geraldine,

Jemima de Lacey ([she/her](#))

Principal Advisor | Social Housing & Other Supports

s 9(2)(a) | Phone: s 9(2)(a)

www.hud.govt.nz | Level 8, / Waterloo Quay, Wellington 6011

From: [Jemima de Lacey](#)
To: [Meisha Nicolson](#)
Cc: [Michaela Des Forges - Health](#); [Ella Arbury](#); [Kiri Waldegrave](#); [Geraldine Wilkins](#)
Subject: RE: Draft for review by COP 10 June - Review of the Social Housing System – Options for System Direction
Date: Wednesday, 18 June 2025 1:30:00 pm
Attachments: [image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image008.png](#)
[image010.png](#)
[image012.png](#)
[image001.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)

Kia ora Meisha,

Thanks very much for sending the Health feedback through last week. I am pleased to report that the paper went across as planned on Monday and we'll shortly send a final copy through to all agencies we consulted.

In terms of how we took on board your feedback:

- **Upfront framing of the paper** – we received a lot of feedback about the framing of the paper. We balanced how much we'd told Ministers in previous advice about the scale of the problem we are trying tackle, with adding more on recent housing Cabinet papers which agree the role of Government in delivering better social housing.
- **Data in the paper** – we acknowledge that the level of cohort segmentation analysis that was able to be done for this advice, wasn't what we hoped but that further analysis will be particularly key going forward – specifically for the next round of advice which will be focusing on how you might determine eligibility and subsidy design.
- We also considered the detailed points you raised below.

Ngā mihi nui

Jemima de Lacey ([she/her](#))

Principal Advisor | Social Housing & Other Supports
S 9(2)(a) | Phone: S 9(2)(a)

From: Meisha Nicolson <S 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Tuesday, June 10, 2025 4:46 PM
To: Jemima de Lacey <S 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Michaela Des Forges - Health <S 9(2)(a)> Ella Arbury
<S 9(2)(a)> Kiri Waldegrave <S 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Draft for review by COP 10 June - Review of the Social Housing System – Options for System Direction

Kia ora Jemima,

Thanks so much for the opportunity to provide feedback on this very important briefing. We've been a bit pushed for time but we've got some quick feedback for you below – brief and not super well framed, but hopefully helpful for your revisions and helping with further thinking.

We have some general feedback and then some more specific feedback below. We are also keen

to meet and discuss the briefing further with you to understand the broader context and intentions around it, and to make sure our feedback is relevant. Do you have time to meet this week or next?

General feedback:

- Overall the brief could make a better case for the benefits of providing support around housing – especially reducing the burden on the health system.
- The evidential negative impact of poor housing quality on health needs a bigger focus in this briefing. Changes to social housing risk placing more pressure on our health system and shifting costs from the housing system to the health system. This would not save money but would instead lead to increased health costs and health services utilisation at a time when our public health system is already under significant pressure. The introduction of market rents and reduced access social housing in the 1990s had negative health outcomes due to greater rates of overcrowding as a result of higher housing costs. While this briefing is focussed on system changes - there needs to be consideration of the housing quality - and also more of a discussion of housing insecurity - which is likely to increase for a cohort of people if SH becomes more limited. In system reform like this there is an opportunity to think more holistically and reduce silos in the way we support people in housing and health. A greater case could be made for the importance of this and the need to support vulnerable cohort groups through this process - aging population, people with disabilities, serious health conditions etc
- Some concern around suggestions of limiting eligibility to SH and the impacts this will have for people who are no longer eligible. While efforts will be made to provide alternative supports – people may slip through the gaps. This briefing could discuss the risks around limiting eligibility in greater detail or provide more clarity on this.

Specific feedback:

- **Options proposed on page 5:** Option 3a – will this include AS and IRRS? It is unclear. Option 3b: Interested in what you mean by support here. IRRS doesn't really cover support or not explicitly
- **Option 1a** – there would be value in describing what option 1a is and the risks if it is chosen. E.g. it is a high cost option as mentioned in Annex 1.
- **Point 16:** The main ongoing benefits of SH would be greater security of tenure... greater than what? Is this suggesting that the single subsidy model would have greater security of tenure than the dual subsidy model? Or just saying that a benefit of SH is security of tenure?
- **Point 17:** What support is provided and what are the barriers for this not following the person already.
- **Point 25b** - We note in footnote 3 Cabinet has agreed to extend the eligible cohort to those who are older than 70 years old. What are the implications of this for people who are aged between 65 and 70 years old and are unable to work due to ill-health or disability but also do not receive a SLP due to being eligible for universal superannuation? Should this remain at 65 to include this potentially vulnerable to housing insecurity cohort? Also not all parents are able to work fulltime once their children turn 14 - some children aged 14+ may have disabilities or higher health needs that mean that their parents need to continue to work part-time or not at all to care for them.

Note: Whai Kāinga Whai Oranga funding was discontinued in Budget 2025 with remaining funding reallocated to the Flexible Fund

- **Point 41** - Whai Kāinga Whai Oranga (which translates as to have a home, to have wellbeing) has also provided funding to repair whānau-owned homes in areas of high housing need in a similar manner to Ireland's housing repair scheme outlined later in this document. These housing repairs help reduce the number of Māori families living in unsafe or substandard housing situations. This helps improve health for these families. However, funding for both repairs and new house building through Whai Kāinga Whai Oranga was discontinued in Budget 2025.
- **Point 46** – For clarity, has funding for Whai Kāinga Whai Oranga has been shifted to this new flexible fund?
- **Point 50** – how will duration of need be calculated?
- Option 2 on page 13 – The trade-off section feels like its emphasising the wrong point – the trade off is that outcomes won't improve for some people, or could get worse – risk of further inequity or harm.
- **Point 60** - This section doesn't mention the implications of limiting eligibility - there will be potential negative consequences for those that are no longer eligible and so it needs to be clear that appropriate pathways/protections/supports exist to ensure they don't fall through the gaps
- **Point 69** - Housing insecurity is associated with a range of negative health, mental health and wellbeing outcomes - rather than just a loss of benefits, you could talk about the increase in negative outcomes that are likely to be seen if secure tenure is removed.
- **Point 83** – support is tied to households – and is also short term – leaving the possibility for gaps in support as people transition between accommodation and/or services.
- **Point 88** – providing support services would also reduce likelihood of people falling through the gaps as they move between services and organisations not knowing whose responsibility it is to support someone
- **Point 101** – more specifically the Right to a decent home is referred to in multiple international human rights treaties: International Bill of Rights, Convention on the Rights of the Child, Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, United Nations Declarations on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. And in New Zealand there are Te Tiriti O Waitangi obligations.
- **Comment on intergenerational housing and support for Māori and Pacific Peoples on page 23** - Support for papakāinga developments (including intergenerational and kaumātua housing) on Māori land holds significant potential to address inequitable housing conditions and improve health and wellbeing for Māori who are more likely to be renters. Rental tenure is associated with poorer health. Difficulties in accessing finance, planning restrictions, and other long-standing barriers to building on Māori land need to be addressed so iwi, hapū and Māori trusts can build more papakāinga housing. See: [Long-term Insights Briefing 2023 - Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga - Ministry of Housing and Urban Development](#).
- **Comment on older people on page 23** - Older renters tend to be economically disadvantaged and in poorer health than owner-occupiers. Over time, the proportion of older renters has been increasing. Higher rates of renting among older Māori and Pacific people and older females (from all ethnicities) means that these groups are particularly vulnerable to the negative health impacts of renting. See: [The health of older New Zealanders in relation to housing tenure: analysis of pooled data from three consecutive annual New Zealand Health Surveys - PubMed](#)

Older renters are more likely to live in poorer health and, overall, are more likely to use some (public) health services than owner-occupiers yet are more likely to have unmet health needs. The increasing reliance on renting among older people has implications for population health and wellbeing, health service delivery and transitions to residential care. See: [Is the use of health services by older adults in New Zealand associated with their housing tenure? - PubMed](#)

- **Point regarding cash subsidies on page 24** - Support for homeownership is a better option than rental subsidies. Homeowners have better health outcomes and tend to live in healthier housing than renters. Yet the accommodation supplement makes it harder for people to shift to homeownership due to means and asset testing (couples are disqualified from the AS if they have cash assets exceeding \$16,200 and \$8,100 for single individuals) restricting people's ability to save for a mortgage deposit while receiving the AS. The introduction of the AS in 1993 accompanied a decline in both homeownership and social housing in New Zealand as earlier government housing support focused on the construction of new houses (both privately owned and social housing).
- **Point regarding CHP settings on page 24** – would be interesting to understand more about what settings are considered limiting.
- **Page 25** – what are the denominators referring to, e.g. 4/34 for English SH?
- **Point 2d on page 27** - This is a large number and raises concern for the health of these people. While they have been provided housing it is not adequate, and is not meeting appropriate standards. This group might be at risk of poorer health outcomes and having a higher cost impact on the health system.

We're very happy to discuss any of these points further with you.

Ngā mihi nui

Meisha Nicolson (she/her/ia)

Senior Advisor | Determinants of Health

Public Health Agency | Te Pou Hauora Tūmatanui

s 9(2)(a)

Manatū Hauora, 133 Molesworth Street, Thorndon, Wellington 6011



[IN-CONFIDENCE]

From: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>

Sent: Wednesday, June 4, 2025 4:15 PM

To: WORTHINGTON, Tom (PONEKE) <s 9(2)(a)>

s 9(2)(a) Nikki Hurst <s 9(2)(a)> Liesle

Theron [DPMC] <s 9(2)(a)> s 9(2)(a)

<s 9(2)(a)> s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) Emma

Prestidge <s 9(2)(a)> Michaela Des Forges

<s 9(2)(a) Diana Suggate <s 9(2)(a)
Nashwa Boys <s 9(2)(a) White, Michael <s 9(2)(a)
s 9(2)(a) MPP Advice <s 9(2)(a)
s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)
s 9(2)(a) George Minton-MSD <s 9(2)(a)
Katharine Haddock <s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) Sarah Ashton
<s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)
s 9(2)(a) Steve Kerr - TPK <s 9(2)(a) Mattie Geary
Nichol (Guest) <s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)
Jinal.Mehta (Guest) <s 9(2)(a) Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY] (Guest)
<s 9(2)(a) Jack Wellwood [TSY] (Guest)
<s 9(2)(a) Shelley Robertson <s 9(2)(a)
Talosaga Talosaga [TSY] (Guest) <s 9(2)(a)
s 9(2)(a) Celia Painter <s 9(2)(a)
s 9(2)(a) Sohini Smith <s 9(2)(a)
Cc: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)

Subject: Draft for review by COP 10 June - Review of the Social Housing System – Options for System Direction

Kia ora koutou,

Please find attached our draft paper, *Review of the Social Housing System – Options for System Direction*.

Context

This paper seeks a decision on the direction of the Social Housing system, and the role of Social Housing. It also seeks Ministers initial views on what they want included in future advice on two key levers system levers (the subsidy model and how supports are provided) to help inform the series of briefings that will follow later this year.

Please provide any **feedback by COP Tuesday, 10 June**. Please let us know if you would like to discuss any feedback/happy to meet with you.

The paper is due to Ministers Bishop, Upston and Potaka on 16 June 2025.

Please treat this draft briefing with sensitivity as Ministers have yet to make any decisions about this work.

Ngā mihi nui,
Jemima and Geraldine,

Jemima de Lacey ([she/her](#))

Principal Advisor | Social Housing & Other Supports

s 9(2)(a) | Phone: s 9(2)(a)

www.hud.govt.nz | Level 8, / Waterloo Quay, Wellington 6011

From: [Jemima de Lacey](#)
To: [Talosaga Talosaga \[TSY\]](#)
Cc: [Nick McNabb](#); [Allie Jarratt \[TSY\]](#); [Geraldine Wilkins](#); [Jinal.Mehta \(Guest\)](#); [Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly \[TSY\] \(Guest\)](#); [Mandy Stratford](#); [Jason Raven](#)
Subject: RE: TSY + ROSH meeting [extra thoughts on eligibility]
Date: Wednesday, 2 July 2025 12:00:00 pm

Thanks for sending through this thinking Talo.

We're going to have a go at using the framework you suggest below to help shape up some of our thinking over the next few days over workshopping of cohort we have underway and will come back to you with where we get to on this (likely next week) for further testing.

Ngā mihi nui

Jemima de Lacey ([she/her](#))

Principal Advisor | Social Housing & Other Supports
s 9(2)(a) | Phone: s 9(2)(a)

From: Talosaga Talosaga [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Tuesday, July 1, 2025 3:04 PM
To: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)> Jinal.Mehta (Guest)
<s 9(2)(a)> Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY] (Guest) s 9(2)(a)
<s 9(2)(a)>; Mandy Stratford <s 9(2)(a)> Jason Raven
<s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Nick McNabb <s 9(2)(a)> Allie Jarratt [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: TSY + ROSH meeting [extra thoughts on eligibility]

[IN-CONFIDENCE]

Kia ora koutou

Thanks for meeting with us yesterday on all things RoSH. Really appreciate you running us through your thoughts on eligibility. This email gives a bit more detail on our thoughts.

As mentioned yesterday and at the 'eligibility' session last week, we think it's worth thinking about the different "types" of need that people have (or alternatively, the types of "value" that people receive from SH). This helps to: 1. Understand the population we're serving, what 'mixes' of need types they have, and the relative size of different cohorts; and 2. Think of different interventions other than "status quo SH" which could potentially meet these needs more effectively.

The table below is my very rough attempt to 'disaggregate' the different types of 'value' that SH provides to the tenant, who needs that 'value', how SH current provides it, and (very, very, very rough) a list of possible alternatives. I think Nick has sent a (probably better) breakdown / framework. The table is just to 'spark' thoughts, rather than saying "this is the framework / list that you should use".

I think the table illustrates a few things:

- "Status quo SH" is a very particular bundle of characteristics, and many alternative SH bundles are possible.

- There are a wide range of interventions that exist or are possible in the wider “SH system”. While the Review is looking at the “core” (SH, AS, TAS), we’ll need to consider the alternatives to understand if the system is working effectively. E.g. if a cohort in SH or on the Register has needs that can be more effectively met by a lower cost alternative, that suggests the system isn’t meeting the vfm objective.

Happy to chat further.

Talo

	‘Value’ provided by SH	Cohorts who need this	How current SH provides this	Alternatives
subsidy	High subsidy level	Low AHC income and / or high material hardship	High IRRS subsidy	AS, redesigned subsidy
‘the house’	Accessibility features	People with physical impairments (elderly, people with disabilities)	Some properties are accessible, but I suspect vast majority are not.	Subsidised house improvements for rental properties. Subsidies for market supply with accessibility features
	‘rare’ typologies (1-bed, 4+bed)	Single people (with barriers to flatting), large families	Unclear if SH stock is any ‘better’ than general housing stock	Subsidise market supply of rare typologies
	healthy home (Warm, dry)	Everyone, but particularly those at risk of respiratory diseases (children, elderly, those with medical conditions, people leaving hospital)	Very good for new builds, poor for houses reaching end of life	Effectively implementing healthy home regulations. Healthy Homes Initiative (in Vote Health) Home insulation / heating subsidies
	LT secure tenure	Families with school age children, households with low tenure security, people dependent on local social networks	De-facto LT tenure, if tenure reviews have high threshold for change	RTA changes to encourage LT rentals, Build-to-rent, contracts with/subsidies for private landlords conditional on secure tenure

‘other needs’	‘socially-minded landlord’	People with other social needs	Govt ownership of KO, most CHPs are non-profit with philanthropic objectives	Affordable rentals, support for CHPs to provide market housing in some instances.
	Landlord ‘required’ to take placement of household	People facing discrimination in the private market, people with wider social needs	Currently strong for KO, but may be more flexibility for CHPs	Incentives for private landlords to take on tenants, ‘cover’ for property damage
	Urgent (time-sensitive) need for housing with risk of harm/homelessness	People at risk of violence, people exiting OT/prison/hospital	Long wait times mean SH is effectively not meeting this need	TH, EH, ‘short-term only’ version of SH, Housing Support Products (HSPs)

-----Original Appointment-----

From: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)>

Sent: Wednesday, 30 April 2025 4:30 pm

To: Geraldine Wilkins; Talosaga Talosaga [TSY]; Jinal Mehta [TSY]; Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY]; Shelley Robertson [TSY]; Alex Harrington [TSY]; Mandy Stratford; Jason Raven; ^EXT: Tim Garlick; ^HUD: David Shamy; Jemima de Lacey; ^HUD: Nick McNabb

Subject: TSY + ROSH meeting

When: Monday, 30 June 2025 1:00 pm-1:45 pm (UTC+12:00) Auckland, Wellington.

Where: Microsoft Teams Meeting

Let me know what times would suit better if this slot doesn't work.

Microsoft Teams [Need help?](#)

[Join the meeting now](#)

Meeting ID: 456 835 260 413 3

Passcode: UC9Pc74k

Dial in by phone

[+64 4 280 2674,367780252#](#) New Zealand, Wellington

[Find a local number](#)

Phone conference ID: 367 780 252#

For organizers: [Meeting options](#) | [Reset dial-in PIN](#)

This email and any attachments may contain information that is confidential and subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this email and attachments is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify the author immediately and erase all copies of the email and attachments. The Ministry of Social Development accepts no responsibility for changes made to this message or attachments after transmission from the Ministry.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

The information in this email is confidential to the Treasury, intended only for the addressee(s), and may also be legally privileged. If you are not an intended addressee:

- a. please immediately delete this email and notify the Treasury by return email or telephone (64 4 472 2733);
- b. any use, dissemination or copying of this email is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

From: [Jemima de Lacey](#)
To: [Talosaga Talosaga \[TSY\]](#); [Geraldine Wilkins](#)
Cc: [Jinal.Mehta \(Guest\)](#); [Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly \[TSY\] \(Guest\)](#)
Subject: RE: ROSH Ministers readout and some data questions
Date: Tuesday, 8 July 2025 4:16:00 pm
Attachments: [Summary from Ministers" meeting 25 June on RoSH.msg](#)

Kia ora Talo,

Indeed it's nice to see the sun for once!

Just responding to the first part of your email please find attached the summary we sent back to our offices re the latest RoSH Ministers' meeting.

We will respond separately re the second part.

Ngā mihi nui

Jemima de Lacey ([she/her](#))

Principal Advisor | Social Housing & Other Supports
s 9(2)(a) | Phone: s 9(2)(a)

From: Talosaga Talosaga [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 3:53 PM
To: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey
<s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Jinal.Mehta (Guest) <s 9(2)(a)> Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY] (Guest)
<s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: ROSH Ministers readout and some data questions

[IN-CONFIDENCE]

Kia ora Gerry and Jemima

Hope you're enjoying the unexpectedly sunny weather!

A few RoSH questions / requests from us at TSY:

- Do you have a written readout of the Bishop/Upston/Potaka meeting from a few weeks back? MoF has been forwarded the June RoSH advice (thank you for arranging!), and we want to give her a summary of what these Ministers discussed and decided. We can write this from our notes of various readouts, but just wanted to know if there's a formal readout we can quote to avoid any translation issues.
 - Is it possible to send this before **COP Wednesday** so we can meet the our MoF deadline?
 - We'll let you know if we get any comments back from MoF.
- Keen to hear how you're doing on the data side, if possible before the TSY/RoSH meeting in two weeks. In addition to the "understanding need of cohorts" data work, we would also be interested in what data work is planned on:
 1. Testing / understanding the result about high material deprivation among SH tenants. It's a very material result that has significant implications for the objectives of the review ("equitable outcomes" and "vfm").
 2. Testing of data result that people who stay longer in SH have better outcomes, either due to: a causal positive impact of SH, or to selection effect of Housing Register need increasing over time. We provided some feedback

on testing this hypothesis:

- “Duration in social housing. At various points, we say 'people who have been in social housing longer have better outcomes, but this might be due to people being housed in social housing more recently having higher need'.
- This is empirically testable. Take the cohort of people who went into social housing in a particular year (e.g. 2010) and track that cohort's outcomes over time. If the outcomes are flat, it suggests there are selection effects driving the above trend. If outcomes get better, it might suggest a positive 'dose response' from social housing (though not definitive evidence). Do that for all 'entry year cohorts' and see if there's a general pattern.
- Has this analysis been performed? Is that something we could do?”

Cheers

Talo

Talosaga Talosaga (he/him) | Principal Advisor, Housing and Urban Growth | Te Tai
Ōhanga **The Treasury**

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

The information in this email is confidential to the Treasury, intended only for the addressee(s), and may also be legally privileged. If you are not an intended addressee:

- a. please immediately delete this email and notify the Treasury by return email or telephone (64 4 472 2733);
- b. any use, dissemination or copying of this email is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

From: [Geraldine Wilkins](#)
To: [Talosaga Talosaga \[TSY\] \(Guest\)](#); [Jemima de Lacey](#)
Cc: [Jinal Mehta \(Guest\)](#); [Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly \[TSY\] \(Guest\)](#); [Tim Garlick](#); [Jason Raven](#); [Wayne Anderson](#); [Michelle Parsons](#); [Vidhiya Damodaran](#); [Mandy Stratford](#); [Nick McNabb](#)
Subject: RE: ROSH Ministers readout and some data questions
Date: Tuesday, 15 July 2025 4:27:35 pm

IN-CONFIDENCE

Sweet yep eligibility is on the agenda to discuss. Vidhiya and Mandy will be sending an internal working paper on eligibility to you by the end of the week, for discussion on Monday.

From: Talosaga Talosaga [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 4:20 PM
To: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey
<s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Jinal Mehta [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Tim Garlick <s 9(2)(a)> Jason
Raven <s 9(2)(a)> Wayne Anderson <s 9(2)(a)>
Michelle Parsons <s 9(2)(a)> Vidhiya Damodaran
<s 9(2)(a)> Mandy Stratford <s 9(2)(a)>
^HUD: Nick McNabb <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: ROSH Ministers readout and some data questions

Thanks Geraldine, Tim and team.

That all makes sense to me, including next steps. Definitely understand there are a lot of data requests from RoSH, and some of the ones listed here will take longer / are more complex, so not a priority at this moment.

Happy to file the “material deprivation” and “duration in SH” data issues as “*areas for further research*” and not discuss next Monday. Would be keen to hear where you’re getting to on the eligibility / ‘cohort segmentation’ at that meeting.

Cheers

Talo

From: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Tuesday, 15 July 2025 12:06 pm
To: Talosaga Talosaga [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey
<s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Jinal Mehta [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> ^EXT: Tim Garlick <s 9(2)(a)>
Jason Raven <s 9(2)(a)> Wayne Anderson
<s 9(2)(a)> Michelle Parsons <s 9(2)(a)>
Vidhiya Damodaran <s 9(2)(a)> Mandy Stratford
<s 9(2)(a)> ^HUD: Nick McNabb <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: ROSH Ministers readout and some data questions

IN-CONFIDENCE

Kia ora Talo

We've chatted to the data crew, and Tim about your data related questions. See responses below.

Testing / understanding the result about high material deprivation among SH tenants.

1. We've already done further work looking at the specific issue we were unsure about - why the numbers of AS recipients looked so different in the survey data compared with our admin data. We've since confirmed what we suspected, which was that the data and analysis is fine, it was simply a different 'unit' of assessment (there are often multiple 'families' receiving AS in the same household).
2. We do have a next stage of work planned, which is looking into the reasons material hardship is higher, despite IRR HH having more generous assistance. We do have a pretty good hypothesis – it's that they have other issues that impact on their material wellbeing, in addition to low residual income – but we're keen to test it for similar reasons to the ones you raise. Description of the work we have planned is below this email- however it's a largeish piece of work, and the person we have doing it is also engaged on a high priority piece of work that needs to be completed as a priority. The analysis is being completed in stages, so we're hopeful that we can have something early in time for the next stage of advice, but it will be tight and so we may not have anything meaningful until later in the year.

Testing of data result that people who stay longer in SH have better outcomes, either due to: a causal positive impact of SH, or to selection effect of Housing Register need increasing over time

Yes, the idea of tracking a cohort over time sounds appealing but there are, unfortunately, some issues that we'd need to allow for including:

- As durations increase so does their age and we know that as people age things like criminal activity tends to decrease. We could look at similar ages across each cohort, but incarceration rates also change over time with policing approaches etc.
- Additionally, those who remain in SH longer should have fewer interactions with the justice system because those going to prison can't remain in social housing; and people with worse health are less likely to remain in social housing longer (with some exiting due to death or into respite care). So, there is self-selection for people remaining in SH for longer durations.
- We may be able to get around this by only looking at the experience of those who remained in SH.
- But we also want to look at the outcomes of those who exit as we would also expect that those who's situation gets better can leave SH but those who remain have long-term risk/issues/barriers.

Given the large volume of other data work for RoSH underway, we're not able to take this on now but could be something we explore in time, and for the reasons set out above, we'd need to think it carefully through.

Happy to chat about all of this at our meeting on Monday

Ta,

Description of further Material Hardship Analysis

This analysis seeks to answer the question of why IRR households have such high levels of hardship relative to comparison households.

Some descriptive analysis of the characteristics of IRR and AS households was undertaken earlier in 2025 using several pooled iterations of HES linked to the IDI. Although this confirmed high levels of hardship among IRR households, relative to AS households and other households, it did not fully explain the drivers for this difference. While IRR households were more likely than AS households to be small (single-person) or large (6 or more people) households and were more likely to have members receiving the Supported Living Payment (indicating the presence of long-term and severe health conditions or disabilities), IRR households had similar rates of low after housing cost household equivalised disposable income to AS households.

This analysis could be extended to include a second comparison group; households which are on the housing register and have therefore been determined to meet the eligibility criteria for social housing. In exploratory analysis, these households have been shown to have similarly high rates of hardship to IRR households. Additional analysis could also be undertaken with a focus on particular aspects of material hardship. For example, are differences in hardship driven by responses to particular DEP-17 items? Analysis could also potentially be extended to look at broader material wellbeing questions asked in HES (such as those used to derive the MWI).

To better understand the drivers of IRR household poverty we could also develop statistical models of hardship and explore the extent to which differences between IRR and housing register/AS households are explained by differences in factors such as income, household composition and housing costs, and the extent to which they are unexplained by these factors. One possible analytical approach could be to use a Oaxaca-Blinder decomposition, a method commonly used to explore the gender wage gap. This quantifies the share of an observed difference which is explained and unexplained by observable factors.

Further analysis could be undertaken to try and shed light on the still-unexplained difference in hardship. Some options are to look at differences in patterns of expenditure or wealth by IRR and housing register/AS households. The nature of these differences could help explain why households with similar after housing cost disposable incomes experience very different levels of poverty, as measured by the official DEP-17 hardship measure.

A key limitation of this extended analysis is data availability. While HES does collect wealth (asset and liability) data and expenditure data, this is not collected from the entire HES sample, and it is not collected every year. Since the expansion of HES in 2018/19, the HES wealth component was only undertaken in one year (2020/21) and the HES expenditure component was only undertaken in two years (2018/19 and 2022/23). In total, this gives wealth data for around 4,000 households, and expenditure data for around 7,000 households. The IRR and AS sub-samples are expected to consist of approximately 180-300 IRR households and 600-1,000 AS households. Despite the small samples, we may be able to observe important differences in the patterns observed and potentially could extend the Oaxaca-Blinder decomposition modelling to include additional determinants of hardship derived from these data sources (for a sub-sample of HES respondents).

From: Talosaga Talosaga [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 5:02 PM
To: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)> Geraldine Wilkins
<s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Jinal Mehta [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: ROSH Ministers readout and some data questions

Thank you!

From: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Tuesday, 8 July 2025 4:17 pm
To: Talosaga Talosaga [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> ^MSD: Geraldine Wilkins
<s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Jinal Mehta [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: ROSH Ministers readout and some data questions

Kia ora Talo,

Indeed it's nice to see the sun for once!

Just responding to the first part of your email please find attached the summary we sent back to our offices re the latest RoSH Ministers' meeting.

We will respond separately re the second part.

Ngā mihi nui

Jemima de Lacey ([she/her](#))
Principal Advisor | Social Housing & Other Supports
s 9(2)(a) | Phone: s 9(2)(a)

[UNCLASSIFIED]

From: Talosaga Talosaga [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 3:53 PM
To: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey
<s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Jinal.Mehta (Guest) <s 9(2)(a)> Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY] (Guest)
<s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: ROSH Ministers readout and some data questions

[IN-CONFIDENCE]

Kia ora Gerry and Jemima

Hope you're enjoying the unexpectedly sunny weather!

A few RoSH questions / requests from us at TSY:

- Do you have a written readout of the Bishop/Upston/Potaka meeting from a few weeks back? MoF has been forwarded the June RoSH advice (thank you for arranging!), and we want to give her a summary of what these Ministers discussed and decided. We can write this from our notes of various readouts, but just wanted to know if there's a formal readout we can quote to avoid any translation issues.
 - Is it possible to send this before **COP Wednesday** so we can meet the our MoFfice deadline?
 - We'll let you know if we get any comments back from MoF.
- Keen to hear how you're doing on the data side, if possible before the TSY/RoSH meeting in two weeks. In addition to the "understanding need of cohorts" data work, we would also be interested in what data work is planned on:
 1. Testing / understanding the result about high material deprivation among SH tenants. It's a very material result that has significant implications for the objectives of the review ("equitable outcomes" and "vfm").
 2. Testing of data result that people who stay longer in SH have better outcomes, either due to: a causal positive impact of SH, or to selection effect of Housing Register need increasing over time. We provided some feedback on testing this hypothesis:
 - "Duration in social housing. At various points, we say 'people who have been in social housing longer have better outcomes, but this might be due to people being housed in social housing more recently having higher need'.
 - This is empirically testable. Take the cohort of people who went into social housing in a particular year (e.g. 2010) and track that cohort's outcomes over time. If the outcomes are flat, it suggests there are selection effects driving the above trend. If outcomes get better, it might suggest a positive 'dose response' from social housing (though not definitive evidence). Do that for all 'entry year cohorts' and see if there's a general pattern.
 - Has this analysis been performed? Is that something we could do?"

Cheers

Talo

Talosaga Talosaga (he/him) | Principal Advisor, Housing and Urban Growth | Te Tai
Ōhanga **The Treasury**

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

The information in this email is confidential to the Treasury, intended only for the addressee(s), and may also be legally privileged. If you are not an intended addressee:

- a. please immediately delete this email and notify the Treasury by return email or telephone (64 4 472 2733);
- b. any use, dissemination or copying of this email is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

From: [Jemima de Lacey](#)
To: [John Roy](#)
Subject: Re: Draft for review by COP 10 June - Review of the Social Housing System – Options for System Direction
Date: Friday, 25 July 2025 11:41:54 am
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)

Thanks John.

Ngā mihi nui

Jemima de Lacey ([she/her](#))
Principal Advisor | Social Housing and Other Supports
s 9(2)(a) | Phone: s 9(2)(a)

From: John Roy <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Friday, 25 July 2025 11:41 am
To: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Draft for review by COP 10 June - Review of the Social Housing System – Options for System Direction

Thanks Jemima,

That's enough of an update for now, thank you!

And no intention to share any information beyond our team – we deal with all manner of reg initiatives in development (including very sensitive, restricted etc) and consider every exchange to be in confidence unless otherwise specified.

Kind regards,

John

From: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Friday, 25 July 2025 11:34 am
To: John Roy <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: Re: Draft for review by COP 10 June - Review of the Social Housing System – Options for System Direction

Kia ora John,

Yes we did talk to Ministers about the June advice and they agreed with us progressing the work to the next stage - they agreed with option 3 in the paper which is the full system reform option. We are due to give further advice in September however this will be more tightly held given the sensitivities of the options being discussed.

Please remember this work has not yet been made public so please don't share this.

Was there anything else you were wanting to know?

Ngā mihi nui

Jemima de Lacey ([she/her](#))

Principal Advisor | Social Housing and Other Supports
s 9(2)(a) | Phone s 9(2)(a)

[IN-CONFIDENCE]

From: John Roy <s 9(2)(a)>

Sent: Thursday, 24 July 2025 12:50 pm

To: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>

Subject: RE: Draft for review by COP 10 June - Review of the Social Housing System – Options for System Direction

Kia ora Jemima,

Just wondering if you've been given a little more of a steer about the direction of social housing services from Ministers?

Would be interested in a quick update if you have one! Don't want to take up much of your time e.g. could be just a few sentences or sharing the recs of a briefing if most convenient for you.

Kind regards,

John

John Roy (he/him)

Principal Advisor

Regulatory Policy Design

Ministry for Regulation

waea pūkoro: s 9(2)(a) | īmēra: s 9(2)(a)



**Ministry for
Regulation**

[IN-CONFIDENCE]

From: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>

Sent: Monday, 9 June 2025 8:29 am

To: John Roy <s 9(2)(a)>

Subject: RE: Draft for review by COP 10 June - Review of the Social Housing System – Options for System Direction

Thanks John.

We will make sure we send around the final version of the briefing and will update once we hear from Ministers.

Ngā mihi nui

Jemima de Lacey ([she/her](#))

Principal Advisor | Social Housing & Other Supports
s 9(2)(a) | Phone: s 9(2)(a)

[IN-CONFIDENCE]

From: John Roy <s 9(2)(a)>

Sent: Friday, June 6, 2025 10:21 AM

To: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>

Subject: RE: Draft for review by COP 10 June - Review of the Social Housing System – Options for System Direction

Kia ora Jemima,

Thank you very much for the opportunity to review – no comments from us at MfR, but very keen to know the outcome of the briefing!

Kind regards,

John

John Roy (he/him)

Principal Advisor
Regulatory Policy Design
Ministry for Regulation

waea pūkoro: s 9(2)(a) | īmēra: s 9(2)(a)



**Ministry for
Regulation**

[IN-CONFIDENCE]

From: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>

Sent: Wednesday, 4 June 2025 4:15 pm

To: WORTHINGTON, Tom (PONEKE) <s 9(2)(a)>

s 9(2)(a) Nikki Hurst <s 9(2)(a)>

Liesle Theron

[DPMC] <s 9(2)(a)> s 9(2)(a)

<s 9(2)(a)> Rachel Voller <s 9(2)(a)>

s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a) Michaela Des Forges - Health
<s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)
s 9(2)(a) White, Michael <s 9(2)(a)
s 9(2)(a) MPP Advice <s 9(2)(a) Agency Consultation
<s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)
s 9(2)(a) George Minton-MSD <s 9(2)(a)
Katharine Haddock <s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) Sarah Ashton
<s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)
s 9(2)(a) Steve Kerr - TPK <s 9(2)(a) Mattie Geary
Nichol (Guest) <s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) Jinal.Mehta
(Guest) <s 9(2)(a) Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY] (Guest) s 9(2)(a)
s 9(2)(a) Jack Wellwood [TSY] (Guest) <s 9(2)(a) Shelley
Robertson <s 9(2)(a) Talosaga Talosaga [TSY] (Guest)
<s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) Celia Painter
<s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) Sohini Smith
<s 9(2)(a)

Cc: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)

Subject: Draft for review by COP 10 June - Review of the Social Housing System – Options for System Direction

You don't often get email from s 9(2)(a) [Learn why this is important](#)

Kia ora koutou,

Please find attached our draft paper, *Review of the Social Housing System – Options for System Direction*.

Context

This paper seeks a decision on the direction of the Social Housing system, and the role of Social Housing. It also seeks Ministers initial views on what they want included in future advice on two key levers system levers (the subsidy model and how supports are provided) to help inform the series of briefings that will follow later this year.

Please provide any **feedback by COP Tuesday, 10 June**. Please let us know if you would like to discuss any feedback/happy to meet with you.

The paper is due to Ministers Bishop, Upston and Potaka on 16 June 2025.

Please treat this draft briefing with sensitivity as Ministers have yet to make any decisions about this work.

Ngā mihi nui,
Jemima and Geraldine,

Jemima de Lacey ([she/her](#))

Principal Advisor | Social Housing & Other Supports

s 9(2)(a) | Phone: s 9(2)(a)

[www.hud.govt.nz](#) | Level 8, 7 Waterloo Quay, Wellington 6011



Disclaimer

This email is confidential and solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you have received this email in error, then any use is strictly prohibited. Please notify us immediately and delete all copies of this email and any attachments. Any opinions expressed in this message are not necessarily those of the Ministry of Housing and Urban Development.

[IN-CONFIDENCE]

.....
Confidentiality notice: This email may be confidential or legally privileged. If you have received it by mistake, please tell the sender immediately by reply, remove this email and the reply from your system, and don't act on it in any other way. Ngā mihi.

Disclaimer

This email is confidential and solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you have received this email in error, then any use is strictly prohibited. Please notify us immediately and delete all copies of this email and any attachments. Any opinions expressed in this message are not necessarily those of the Ministry of Housing and Urban Development.

.....
Confidentiality notice: This email may be confidential or legally privileged. If you have received it by mistake, please tell the sender immediately by reply, remove this email and the reply from your system, and don't act on it in any other way. Ngā mihi.

Disclaimer

This email is confidential and solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you have received this email in error, then any use is strictly prohibited. Please notify us immediately and delete all copies of this email and any attachments. Any opinions expressed in this message are not necessarily those of the Ministry of Housing and Urban Development.

.....
Confidentiality notice: This email may be confidential or legally privileged. If you have received it by mistake, please tell the sender immediately by reply, remove this email and the reply from your system, and don't act on it in any other way. Ngā mihi.

From: [Jemima de Lacey](#)
To: s 9(2)(a) [Geraldine Wilkins](#)
Subject: Re: Interesting income adequacy modelling
Date: Thursday, 7 August 2025 3:50:29 pm

Thanks for sending through s 9(2)(a) - really interesting.

Ngā mihi nui

Jemima de Lacey ([she/her](#))

Principal Advisor | Social Housing and Other Supports

s 9(2)(a) | Phone: s 9(2)(a)

[IN-CONFIDENCE]

From: s 9(2)(a)
Sent: Thursday, 7 August 2025 11:03 am
To: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)> Geraldine Wilkins
<s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: Fw: Interesting income adequacy modelling

Hi both just in case you haven't seen this yet...

From: s 9(2)(a)
Sent: Thursday, August 7, 2025 10:20
To: s 9(2)(a)

Subject: Interesting income adequacy modelling

This report was really interesting reading. There are only three families modelled in public housing, but that shows single adults in state housing on the benefit do not have enough income to cover their basic core needs in 2025Q2 (food, rent, utilities etc). And none of the three modelled public housing scenarios have enough income to cover basic social participation (like being able to take your kids to the pool or similar twice a month or buy cheap presents for close family). Also, not surprisingly, being in full-time minimum wage employment doesn't mean you have enough income to cover social participation if you have multiple children.

[Income+Adequacy+Paper+1+v2+FINAL.pdf](#)



s 9(2)(a)

[\(She/Her\)](#)

s 9(2)(a)



***Work days : Monday, Tuesday,
Thursday and Friday***

Freephone: 0800 801 601 | Mainline: (04) 439 3052 | Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities

PO BOX 2628 Wellington 6140 | New Zealand Government |
www.kaingaora.govt.nz

www.govt.nz - your guide to finding and using New Zealand government services

Any opinions expressed in this message are not necessarily those of Kāinga Ora. This message and any files transmitted with it are confidential, may be legally privileged, and are solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient or the person responsible for delivery to the intended recipient, you have received this message in error.

Please:

- (1) reply promptly to that effect, and remove this email, any attachment and the reply from your system;
- (2) do not use, disclose or act on this email in any other way. Thank you.

From: [Jemima de Lacey](#)
To: [Talosaga Talosaga \[TSY\] \(Guest\)](#)
Cc: [Geraldine Wilkins](#)
Subject: Re: Role of Social Housing Governance Group: Papers
Date: Friday, 8 August 2025 10:28:36 am
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Kia ora Talo,

Yes we can discuss this on Monday. We will just need to push the meeting back by 15 minutes as we have a clash but I think 30 minutes should still be plenty.

Ngā mihi nui

Jemima de Lacey ([she/her](#))
Principal Advisor | Social Housing and Other Supports
s 9(2)(a) | Phone: s 9(2)(a)

[IN-CONFIDENCE]

From: Talosaga Talosaga [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Thursday, 7 August 2025 4:55 pm
To: Ally Quatermass <s 9(2)(a)> Simon MacPherson
<s 9(2)(a)> Colin Lynch <s 9(2)(a)> Karen Hocking
<s 9(2)(a)> Julia Bergman <s 9(2)(a)> Shannon
Soughtton <s 9(2)(a)> Nikki Hurst <s 9(2)(a)>
Julia Pearce <s 9(2)(a)> Jason Raven <s 9(2)(a)> Jeremy
Steele <s 9(2)(a)> Viv Rickard <s 9(2)(a)> Vidhiya
Damodaran <s 9(2)(a)> Mandy Stratford
<s 9(2)(a)> Mariona Roige Valiente
<s 9(2)(a)> Eimear Doyle <s 9(2)(a)> Tim Garlick
<s 9(2)(a)> Wayne Anderson <s 9(2)(a)> Nick
McNabb <s 9(2)(a)> Heather Kirkham [DPMC]
<s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey
<s 9(2)(a)> Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY] (Guest) <s 9(2)(a)>
<s 9(2)(a)>

Subject: RE: Role of Social Housing Governance Group: Papers

[IN-CONFIDENCE]

Kia ora koutou

Thanks to the team for working through the update on work for the September papers. I had one additional comment that, due to time, I thought I'd send via email.

I am unclear how the September advice will advise on the question: who is SH for? i.e. For whom is SH the most effective and efficient support?

This is one of, if not the, most important questions for the Review, and it will be important for the September advice to provide clear analysis and options for Ministers

on this point.

I would expect the advice on 'who is SH for' would consider whether SH is better targeted at different need types (e.g. Affordability, Accessibility, Other needs; Permanent, Temporary, or Amenable need), informed by data (which looked quite useful and interesting!), and potentially consider changes to SH to better match need (e.g. should there be different Tiers of SH for different cohorts).

I understand we still have a bit of 'runway' before the September advice is due. However, 'who is SH for' is a big, thorny, complex question and it will require some time, discussion and iteration to land the substance and framing of the advice.

Gerry, Jemima – happy to chat about this at the 'regular' TSY meeting next week.

Cheers

Talo

From: Ally Quatermass <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Monday, 4 August 2025 4:32 pm
To: Simon Macpherson <s 9(2)(a)> ^MHUD Colin Lynch
<s 9(2)(a)> Karen Hocking <s 9(2)(a)> ^MSD: Julia Bergman <s 9(2)(a)> Shannon Soughtton
<s 9(2)(a)> Nikki Hurst <s 9(2)(a)> Liesle Theron
[DPMC] <s 9(2)(a)> julia.pearce <s 9(2)(a)> Jason Raven
<s 9(2)(a)> Jeremy Steele <s 9(2)(a)> Talosaga Talosaga
[TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> ^MSD: Viv Rickard <s 9(2)(a)>
Vidhiya Damodaran <s 9(2)(a)> Mandy Stratford
<s 9(2)(a)> Mariona Roige Valiente <s 9(2)(a)>
Eimear Doyle <s 9(2)(a)> ^EXT: Tim Garlick <s 9(2)(a)>
Wayne Anderson <s 9(2)(a)> ^HUD: Nick McNabb
<s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: ^MSD: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey
<s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: Role of Social Housing Governance Group: Papers

IN-CONFIDENCE

Kia ora koutou,

Please find attached the relevant papers for the upcoming Role of Social Housing Governance Group meeting this Thursday.

Ngā mihi,

Alexandra Quatermass ([she/her](#))

Kaimātai Kaupapa Here - Policy Analyst | Housing Policy

The Aurora Centre | 56 The Terrace, Wellington Central, Wellington 6011

MSD Purpose:

We help New Zealanders to be safe, strong and independent

Manaaki tangata, manaaki whānau



This email and any attachments may contain information that is confidential and subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this email and attachments is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify the author immediately and erase all copies of the email and attachments. The Ministry of Social Development accepts no responsibility for changes made to this message or attachments after transmission from the Ministry.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

The information in this email is confidential to the Treasury, intended only for the addressee(s), and may also be legally privileged. If you are not an intended addressee:

- a. please immediately delete this email and notify the Treasury by return email or telephone (64 4 472 2733);
- b. any use, dissemination or copying of this email is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

From: [Allie Jarratt \[TSY\]](#)
To: [Geraldine Wilkins](#); [Jemima de Lacey](#); [Nick McNabb](#); [Jason Raven](#); [Tim Garlick](#); [Kuini Vidal](#)
Cc: [Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly \[TSY\] \(Guest\)](#); [Amanda Wilson \[TSY\] \(Guest\)](#); [Kim Stansfield \[TSY\]](#); [Conor McBride \[TSY\]](#); [Alex Harrington \[TSY\]](#); [Jeanne Barnard \[TSY\]](#); [Shelley Robertson \[TSY\]](#); [Talosaga Talosaga \[TSY\] \(Guest\)](#)
Subject: RE: Draft subsidy advice + cover report for your review
Date: Thursday, 21 August 2025 3:26:12 pm
Attachments: [image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)

[IN-CONFIDENCE]

Kia ora koutou, thanks very much for sending these documents to us for our review and comment. Talo is on leave and Caitlin is unwell, so I am collating and writing our feedback from TSY, which includes feedback from our welfare and housing teams.

Overall, we want to acknowledge the mammoth effort to date in this work – the issues are really complex and detailed, and the reports do an excellent job of making this complexity both readable and informative.

We have some points that I have grouped below into themes. Much of this feedback follows on from what I understand Talo conveyed at the governance group meeting yesterday morning and hopefully it is helpful for you. Please let us know if you have any questions about our comments and/or if it would be helpful to discuss. It would also be good to know the timeline for when we might receive the draft eligibility report?

Ngā mihi

Timing, fiscals and B26:

- I understand there was a question about our advice on timing in terms of informing MoF - we advise doing this as early as possible, so meeting in late September if possible.
- MoF will have an interest in B26 options, and we recommend that any clear 'savings' options are already identified at this point.
- Officials are developing advice for the Ministers of Finance and Social Development and Employment on welfare reform options for Budget 2026 and beyond with a particular focus on improving work incentives. Giving them visibility of potential ROSH options will help Ministers to make well-informed decisions across these workstreams.
- Given the very high bar for new expenditure through Budget 26, options that include additional expenditure need to be very clear about what the benefits of AS increases would be. This should include providing options for targeting AS increases, given we know the AS population has lower rates of material deprivation than the SH population.
- In terms of options, we recommend that options are not excluded on the basis of having
- operational constraints, but that they are included with clear information about the nature of the constraints and implications they have for timeframes.
- It might also be helpful to provide some structure around fiscal implications to the effect of giving different options for: repri, return to centre, a bit of both.
- We have noted some suggestions / changes discussed in the paper that intersect with the welfare system and it would be good to know if these are also considered options at this stage:

- Points raised at paras 23 and 53, around non-take-up of AS for non-beneficiaries substantially reducing financial incentives to work for individuals with high housing costs. Similarly, there are some changes discussed at para 52 – are these plans to pursue these / develop them into options?

Framing and strategic question on who social housing is for and what needs it addresses:

Fully appreciate that we haven't seen the eligibility paper yet and so this point is likely covered in this, but we think it is worth raising explicitly in the cover report too – this is a really important piece of advice that sets the strategic direction for the review. It's an opportunity to hone in and frame the discussion around the questions of what needs social housing is addressing, and the key changes recommended in the subsequent papers. I understand that Talo raised this at the governance group meeting and discussed some suggested framing to capture this, so I have put below in case that is helpful:

- People's need for housing interventions can be driven by a combination of:
 - Affordability
 - Availability
 - Other needs
- These needs manifest in different ways like:
 - Urgent need
 - Transitional need
 - Permanent
 - Current state is unsafe or unsuitable
 - Current state is ok, but at high risk of deteriorating
- Ministers have a choice about whose needs they want the system to provide for, and how they want to support these people (physical house, subsidy, service), with an assessment of appropriate duration.
- To align with their review objectives, a key goal of system reform (however that shapes up) seems to be to better match *need* with *support*
- We know that physical social housing is expensive to deliver and maintain, with less flexibility than subsidies and supports (geographically, sliding scale of cost) and they may disincentivise movement along the continuum
- In a system where supports are better matched with need, physical social housing could be provided only where other supports are either ineffective or inefficient – e.g. to people whose needs
 - cannot be adequately or efficiently met through financial and/or other supports, and
 - mean they are likely to require long-term or ongoing support
- It would also imply that people who don't meet the above but still have other needs (likely physical or social) would have their needs met by other financial and non-financial interventions
- To align with need duration, these interventions would need to be tightly integrated with other supports, and give consideration to/provide flexibility for addressing need through one off support (e.g. wheelchair modifications), medium or long term support (e.g. for health care), with consideration of geography or changes to life circumstances (e.g. short-term supply issues, or changing family shapes as kids leave home)

Points on specific paragraphs: (Draft Advice on Housing Subsidies report)

- Paras 8 and 37: suggest it would be helpful to make the point that this is a static analysis - i.e. if IRR removed and current recipients moved to AS/TAs, then people will be worse off by an average \$176 per week *if people stay in those*

social houses. But presumably we would expect, as a result of the change, that some of those people would move to cheaper private sector rentals.

- Para 48: "it does not include any changes to geographic boundaries that may be out-of-date". How does this factor in update to AS boundaries funded through Budget 2025?

Allie Jarratt (she/her) | Te Tai Ōhanga The Treasury

Welfare and Oranga Tamariki, Principal Advisor

Public Sector Performance

tau waea phone: s 9(2)(a) | Īmēra email: s 9(2)(a)

treasury.govt.nz | [LinkedIn](#) | [Youtube](#)



**TE TAI ŌHANGA
THE TREASURY**

From: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Monday, 18 August 2025 12:55 pm
To: Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Amanda Wilson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Kim Stansfield [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Daniel White [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Conor McBride [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Alex Harrington [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Jeanne Barnard [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Shelley Robertson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Talosaga Talosaga [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Allie Jarratt [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> ^HUD: Nick McNabb <s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)> ^EXT: Tim Garlick <s 9(2)(a)> Jason Raven <s 9(2)(a)> Vidhiya Damodaran <s 9(2)(a)> Mandy Stratford <s 9(2)(a)> Kuini Vidal <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: FW: Draft subsidy advice + cover report for your review

IN-CONFIDENCE

Kia ora TSY colleagues

Talo has asked that you be added to the named distribution list for the Sept RoSH advice.

Please note the instructions on feedback and handling of this advice in the email below.

Ta,
Gerry

From: Geraldine Wilkins

Sent: Friday, August 15, 2025 2:45 PM

Cc: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)> Nick McNabb

<s 9(2)(a) Jason Raven <s 9(2)(a) Tim Garlick
<s 9(2)(a) Kuini Vidal <s 9(2)(a)

Subject: Draft subsidy advice + cover report for your review

IN-CONFIDENCE

Tēnā tātou

Please find attached the draft Review of Social Housing System subsidy design, and cover reports for your review by **Thursday 21 August COP.**

Note the eligibility report will follow next week once we've worked through some feedback – we'll update you on the timing of this when we can.

A few requests from us as you review these reports:

- Please provide collated feedback from your area to help us manage volumes
- Please send your feedback to everyone in the cc line of this email.
- As per our previous email, the Governance Group has agreed that the details of these reports and the reports themselves **should not be shared** beyond the named officials on our list (attached spreadsheet for your reference). If you want to add someone to this list because you think they need to review the advice, please contact Nick and I in the first instance.

Do let us know if you want to meet to discuss your feedback. As Jemima is away, Nick is your key HUD contact for this advice next week. Tim, Jason and I are the key contacts for these two reports on the MSD side.

I've added the timelines we are working to with this package of advice below this email for your information.

Ngā mihi nui,

Gerry

Action	Date
Sept pack of reports sent to Governance Group and named distribution list for feedback	Friday 15 Aug, COP
Governance Group discussion on first drafts	Weds 20 Aug
Named distribution feedback due	Thurs 21 Aug
Authors send draft reports to Debbie, for discussion following week	Friday 22 Aug
HUD discussion with Brad on advice	Monday 25 Aug
MSD mtg with Debbie on draft reports	Weds 27 Aug
Send Governance Group near final reports	Friday 29 Aug
Governance Group discussion on near final reports	Monday 1 Sept
GM/Manager sign out final advice	Monday 8 Sept



Geraldine Wilkins ([she/her](#))

Principal Policy Analyst | Kaitātari Matua ā-Kaupapa Here
Housing | Housing, Employment and Labour Market Policy

s 9(2)(a)

The Aurora Centre | Level 9 | 56 The Terrace | PO Box 1556 | Wellington | New Zealand



**MINISTRY OF SOCIAL
DEVELOPMENT**
TE MANATŪ WHAKAHIATO ORA

This email and any attachments may contain information that is confidential and subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this email and attachments is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify the author immediately and erase all copies of the email and attachments. The Ministry of Social Development accepts no responsibility for changes made to this message or attachments after transmission from the Ministry.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

The information in this email is confidential to the Treasury, intended only for the addressee(s), and may also be legally privileged. If you are not an intended addressee:

- a. please immediately delete this email and notify the Treasury by return email or telephone (64 4 472 2733);
- b. any use, dissemination or copying of this email is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

From: [Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly \[TSY\]](#)
To: [Mandy Stratford](#); [Vidhiya Damodaran](#); [Geraldine Wilkins](#); [Jemima de Lacey](#)
Cc: [Talosaga Talosaga \[TSY\] \(Guest\)](#); [Allie Jarratt \[TSY\]](#); [Amanda Wilson \[TSY\] \(Guest\)](#); [Alex Harrington \[TSY\]](#); [Jeanne Barnard \[TSY\]](#); [Conor McBride \[TSY\]](#)
Subject: RE: FOR REVIEW: draft briefing - Review of Social Housing: Eligibility and Duration
Date: Wednesday, 27 August 2025 4:10:02 pm
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image007.png](#)
[image006.png](#)
[image009.png](#)
[image010.png](#)
[CONSULTATION VERSION Eligibility and Duration - September 2025 advice \(002\).docx](#)

Kia ora koutou,

Please find below Treasury's consolidated, overarching feedback on the ROSH Eligibility and Duration paper, and attached a copy of the paper with specific comments. As always, we want to acknowledge the mammoth amount of work that has gone into this incredibly complex task, and thank you for the opportunity to provide comment. If you have any questions or concerns, please don't hesitate to reach out and we'd be happy to make time to chat.

Thanks,

Caitlin et al

Alignment with subsidy paper

Much of the feedback we provided on the subsidy paper also applies to this paper especially the fiscal context and desire to see savings options where these exist (and costed if possible) s 9(2)(g)(i)

. Appreciate that while the cover report provides and opportunity to "bridge" the two, we also think it would be useful to spell out some of the interdependencies – and in particular, where the papers' content coalesces or may be in tension. For instance, if we brought AS/IRRS together, we would recommend the same settings? If we changed AS subsidy rates, would the population we think should be eligible for IRRS change too? There is also a time element here: we think it would be useful to distinguish what makes sense now, versus in the longer-term. This applies to the paper's recommendations – discussed below. We also think it would be useful to outline how SIA could be involved in the work, especially as this report gets into referencing of data and evidence, and many of the issues it covers as are cross-cutting, for example transitional housing needs in OT, ex-prison populations.

Content

Who should Social Housing be for:

- Appreciate that answering this question is difficult, but as this is foundational to much of the direction of the review, and something that was intended to be provided in June, we expect Ministers are going to want to more of an answer than currently provided in the paper, including in the recommendations
- The current recs give the impression that officials broadly recommend no change to eligibility / who SH is for. We don't think this will meet Ministers desire for bold change options, and their decision in June to undertake "system reform" – s 9(2)(g)(i)

s 9(2)(g)(i)

- As part of our feedback on the subsidy paper, we recommended targeting SH only where other supports are either ineffective or inefficient – e.g. to people whose needs
 - cannot be adequately or efficiently met through financial and/or other supports, and
 - mean they are likely to require long-term or ongoing support
- The paper notes that SH has a few main benefits (stable tenure, higher quality house, higher subsidy) and that these benefits a wide range of people. This is true. However, we think the paper could do more to analyse who benefits most from SH / segmenting the need of the population. E.g. for some populations, SH is in fact a lower cost option compared to the alternatives. We also think the paper could do more to consider other ways of delivering the benefits of SH. E.g. should there be a ‘near cost recovery’ SH that is mainly aimed at providing security of tenure to those with children?
- If this sits uncomfortably and we feel we can’t confidently say *who* the demographics are (ie what their need looks like) that should receive SH, we think we still need to outline *how* allocation could/should look in a system where household needs and government responses are better matched and *when* such a system could be feasibly stood up
- The paper begins to nudge us in this direction of allocation when it talks about the benefits of social housing to households (including at para 65), but we think we also need to be clearer on limitations both for households (e.g. disincentiving movement) and the government (comparably expensive to a subsidy, inflexible) and how that gets us closer to or further from fulfilling the objectives

Eligibility settings:

- s 9(2)(f)(iv)

•

•

Duration limits:

- s 9(2)(g)(i)

s 9(2)(g)(i)

- The paper also references that the system is not designed to identify duration of need and with low visibility of peoples' needs and how these may change – do we have any commentary on ways we could fix this? Even if changing the system would be operationally complex, we think this should be covered off as it is something Ministers may want to understand. This could also perhaps be another area SIA could advise on?

Recommendations:

Irrespective of whether our suggested changes to who SH should be for are integrated into the report, we think the recommendations could be usefully sharpened. In particular, we think we need to be clearer about who SH should be for – outlining the approach to *how* if not *who* and being clearer on *when* we can give concrete recommendations on this. We also think we need to be clearer around system changes – do we recommend changes to allocation and prioritisation as a first best, or if pushed?

s 9(2)(f)(iv)

From: Allie Jarratt [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>

Sent: Tuesday, 26 August 2025 4:17 pm

To: Mandy Stratford <s 9(2)(a)> Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY]

<s 9(2)(a)> Amanda Wilson [TSY]

<s 9(2)(a)> Kim Stansfield [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>

Alex Harrington [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Jeanne Barnard [TSY]

<s 9(2)(a)> Talosaga Talosaga [TSY]

<s 9(2)(a)>

Cc: Vidhiya Damodaran <s 9(2)(a)> ^MSD: Geraldine Wilkins

<s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>

Subject: RE: FOR REVIEW: draft briefing - Review of Social Housing: Eligibility and Duration

Thanks for this Mandy, confirming we have received it and will get our feedback to you.
Thanks, Allie.

Allie Jarratt (she/her) | Te Tai Ōhanga The Treasury

Welfare and Oranga Tamariki, Principal Advisor

Public Sector Performance

tau waea phone: +s 9(2)(a) | Īmēra email: s 9(2)(a)

treasury.govt.nz | [LinkedIn](#) | [Youtube](#)



**TE TAI ŌHANGA
THE TREASURY**

From: Mandy Stratford <s 9(2)(a)>

Sent: Tuesday, 26 August 2025 3:32 pm

To: Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Amanda Wilson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Kim Stansfield [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Daniel White [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Conor McBride [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Alex Harrington [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Jeanne Barnard [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Shelley Robertson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Stacey Wymer [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Mark Sowden [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Darius Paschke [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Allie Jarratt [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Talosaga Talosaga [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Vidhiya Damodaran <s 9(2)(a)> ^MSD: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>

Subject: FOR REVIEW: draft briefing - Review of Social Housing: Eligibility and Duration

Some people who received this message don't often get email from s 9(2)(a) [Learn why this is important](#)

Kia ora koutou

Please find attached the draft briefing 'Review of Social Housing: Eligibility and Duration' attached for your feedback. Apologies for the delay, there was a mixup regarding consultation sequencing.

Please note that this paper is still a work in progress; in particular MSD and HUD are still working through the structure around how we present the choices for eligibility.

Also note that we are not sending this version to the wider Governance Group as they are receiving a version on Friday.

- Please provide collated feedback from your area to help us manage volumes.
- Please send your feedback to everyone in the CC line.
- The Governance Group has agreed that the details of these reports and the reports themselves **should not be shared** beyond the named officials on our list. If you want to add someone to this list because you think they need to review the advice, please contact Geraldine Wilkins or Jemima de Lacey in the first instance.

We are operating to tight timeframes, so would request that you get any feedback to us by **COB Wednesday 27th**. We will have limited time in which to turn around comments so will be unable to accept any late feedback – and earlier feedback would be greatly appreciated.

Please reach out if you have any questions.

Ngā mihi, nā

Mandy Stratford (she/her)
Senior Policy Advisor | Social Housing and Other Supports
Policy

Disclaimer

This email is confidential and solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you have received this email in error, then any use is strictly prohibited. Please notify us immediately and delete all copies of this email and any attachments. Any opinions expressed in this message are not necessarily those of the Ministry of Housing and Urban Development.

[IN-CONFIDENCE]

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

The information in this email is confidential to the Treasury, intended only for the addressee(s), and may also be legally privileged. If you are not an intended addressee:

- a. please immediately delete this email and notify the Treasury by return email or telephone (64 4 472 2733);
- b. any use, dissemination or copying of this email is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

From: [Talosaga Talosaga \[TSY\]](#)
To: [Geraldine Wilkins](#); [Jason Raven](#); [Nick McNabb](#)
Cc: [Jemima de Lacey](#); [Ally Quatermass](#); [Dinanie Abeyesundere](#); [Liam Hanley](#); [Vidhiya Damodaran](#); [Kuini Vidal](#); [Mandy Stratford](#); [Tim Garlick](#); [Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly \[TSY\] \(Guest\)](#); [Allie Jarratt \[TSY\]](#); [Amanda Wilson \[TSY\] \(Guest\)](#); [Conor McBride \[TSY\]](#)
Subject: RE: RoSH advice - final feedback due COP Weds
Date: Wednesday, 3 September 2025 6:43:46 pm
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[MASTER 010925 Eligibility and Duration - September 2025 advice - TSY.docx](#)
[Cover Report for Social Housing System Eligibility and Subsidy Design Reports - TSY.docx](#)

[IN-CONFIDENCE]

Kia ora Gerry and Jemima

Thanks for all your work and the work of the wider team pulling together this epic amount of advice. Really appreciate you taking on our feedback on earlier versions.

We have some suggestions and questions (tracked in the attached docs and in this email further below). However, a lot of this is about framing, clarity and 'bringing forward' points that are made elsewhere in the advice, so less substantive.

Cheers

Talo

Fiscal context / implications

- We've suggested some changes to the cover paper to bring up mention of fiscal costs. It would be useful to include fiscal costs in the table of options where we have them, just in brackets (\$Xm per year).

Implementation and Budget 2026

- We found when certain changes could be implemented quite confusing.
- I think there are two distinct questions on implementation, which makes it harder to communicate:
 - Could a **decision** on a **change** be made at Budget 2026?
 - When can a **change** be implemented?
- It would be useful to clearly list what things could be decided on in Budget 2026 (if Ministers wish) and which are B27 or beyond.
- Our understanding (which may be wrong) is some *decisions* can be made at Budget 2026 (if Ministers wish to), particularly on the *level* of subsidies (e.g. changes to IRR percentage, changes to AS maxima). However, it would take some time actually implement these changes, which would also delay the fiscal impacts.
- Then there are another set of changes where Budget 2026 is too early to make *decisions*. E.g. designing a single subsidy or redesigning SAS, even if agreed in principle, would take significantly more work before it could be even considered through Budget.

Feedback on eligibility paper

- s 9(2)(f)(iv)
- 

s 9(2)(f)(iv)

- Para 51 – risk that there may be increased numbers flowing into EH, TH, Health or Corrections spaces – this would have cost implications so need to be clear about this as part of the risks. The report should flag how this might be managed (even if this would need to be subject to more work). Similar points for paras 85 – 86 – likely costs for this? Understand may be hard to know now but still need to flag. Is there any research / analysis that SIA either has done, or could do regarding this risk?
- Need for transition planning if there is a system change – appreciate there are unlikely to be details for this yet, but suggest flagging this would need to be planned for and possibly resourced, including mitigating risks around increases to EH, impact on homelessness.
- Discussion of how peoples' needs change over time, and how some may be more amenable to improvement with supports (for example, compared to a permanent disability which will be less amenable to improvement) – would be helpful to have examples.

From: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)>

Sent: Tuesday, 2 September 2025 5:17 pm

To: ^MHUD Colin Lynch <s 9(2)(a)> Fiona Carter-Giddings

<s 9(2)(a)> Karen Hocking <s 9(2)(a)>

Shannon Soughtton <s 9(2)(a)> ^MSD: Julia Bergman

<s 9(2)(a)> Julia Pearce <s 9(2)(a)> Jeremy Steele

<s 9(2)(a)> Jason Raven <s 9(2)(a)> Nikki Hurst

<s 9(2)(a)> Heather Kirkham [DPMC] <s 9(2)(a)>

Talosaga Talosaga [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> ^HUD: Nick McNabb

<s 9(2)(a)> ^MSD: Viv Rickard <s 9(2)(a)> Simon

Macpherson <s 9(2)(a)>

Cc: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)> Rhonda Blood

<s 9(2)(a)> Ally Quatermass <s 9(2)(a)>

Dinarie Abeyesundere <s 9(2)(a)> Liam Hanley

<s 9(2)(a)> Vidhiya Damodaran <s 9(2)(a)> Kuini

Vidal <s 9(2)(a)> Mandy Stratford <s 9(2)(a)> ^EXT: Tim

Garlick <s 9(2)(a)>

Subject: RoSH advice - final feedback due COP Weds

IN-CONFIDENCE

Tēnā tātou

As requested at the Governance Group meeting yesterday, please find attached the full pack of September RoSH advice for your final review.

Please provide any final comments **by COP tomorrow (Wednesday)**.

Please note we will be working over the next couple of days to work on alignment and consistency between the papers, and key connections are made where relevant.

Ngā mihi,

Gerry and Jemima



Geraldine Wilkins ([she/her](#))

Principal Policy Analyst | Kaitātari Matua ā-Kaupapa Here
Housing | Housing, Employment and Labour Market Policy

s 9(2)(a)

The Aurora Centre | Level 9 | 56 The Terrace | PO Box 1556 | Wellington | New Zealand



**MINISTRY OF SOCIAL
DEVELOPMENT**
TE MANATŪ WHAKAHIATO ORA

This email and any attachments may contain information that is confidential and subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this email and attachments is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify the author immediately and erase all copies of the email and attachments. The Ministry of Social Development accepts no responsibility for changes made to this message or attachments after transmission from the Ministry.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

The information in this email is confidential to the Treasury, intended only for the addressee(s), and may also be legally privileged. If you are not an intended addressee:

- a. please immediately delete this email and notify the Treasury by return email or telephone (64 4 472 2733);
- b. any use, dissemination or copying of this email is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

From: [Jemima de Lacey](#)
To: [WORTHINGTON, Tom \(PONEKE\)](#); [Laura Miller](#)
Cc: [Jasmin Chapman](#); [Julia Pearce](#)
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] RE: Severe housing need & Corrections
Date: Monday, 22 September 2025 12:22:54 pm
Attachments: [image006.png](#)
[image008.png](#)
[image010.png](#)

Kia ora Tom,

In regard to the Review of the Social Housing system Ministers are considering advice. It is unclear when they want to take any update to Cabinet (you are correct that earlier in the year we had indicated they might like to take a Cabinet paper in November but this has not been confirmed at this stage).

Ngā mihi nui

Jemima de Lacey ([she/her](#))

Principal Advisor | Social Housing and Other Supports
s 9(2)(a) | Phone: s 9(2)(a)

[IN-CONFIDENCE]

From: WORTHINGTON, Tom (PONEKE) <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Monday, 22 September 2025 11:50 am
To: Laura Miller <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Jasmin Chapman <s 9(2)(a)> Julia Pearce <s 9(2)(a)>
Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] RE: Severe housing need & Corrections

Ok yep no worries, just as soon as you are able would be great.

Much appreciated
Tom

Tom Worthington | Adviser, Strategic Policy
Ara Poutama Aotearoa, *Department of Corrections*
e: s 9(2)(a)

From: Laura Miller <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Monday, 22 September 2025 11:48 AM
To: WORTHINGTON, Tom (PONEKE) <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Jasmin Chapman <s 9(2)(a)> Julia Pearce <s 9(2)(a)>
Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] RE: Severe housing need & Corrections

Kia ora Tom,

We will try to provide you with information on the second two, although we may struggle with your timeframe as we have other urgent work on today, but the first sits with a different team. I've copied the relevant people into this response so they can help you.

Thanks
Laura

[IN-CONFIDENCE]

From: WORTHINGTON, Tom (PONEKE) <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Monday, 22 September 2025 11:38 am
To: Laura Miller <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Jasmin Chapman <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] RE: Severe housing need & Corrections

Kia ano

Thanks for the assistance last week.

Hoping you might please be able to quickly assist us with a couple of further questions on work we had previously been involved with.

Any update on the **Review of the Social Housing System** –

- any particular timeframes you can inform us of?
- We see there was a Cabinet paper indicated for November – do we know what decisions/direction will be sought then?

s 9(2)(f)(iv)

- -
-

- -

If it's ok a response in the next few hours would be great,.
Very happy for you to call and talk through if preferred.

Thanks very much!

Tom Worthington | Adviser, Strategic Policy
Ara Poutama Aotearoa, Department of Corrections
ph: s 9(2)(a)
e: s 9(2)(a)

From: Laura Miller <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Friday, 19 September 2025 12:21 PM
To: WORTHINGTON, Tom (PONEKE) <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Jasmin Chapman <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] RE: Severe housing need & Corrections

Hi Tom,

Hopefully this helps – it isn't quite the workstreams that you had identified, we can address some of those but not today.

Thanks

Laura

s 9(2)
(f)(iv)

-
-

Short-term actions to address:

- *Context:* Homelessness is a problem Aotearoa New Zealand has grappled with for a long time. It is a symptom of a dysfunctional housing market and is exacerbated during challenging economic times.
- *Update:* In addition to the homelessness support services already provided by government agencies, the Government is taking further action to address the wider issue of homelessness. There will be an additional investment of \$17 million this financial year towards immediate actions to support those living without shelter. The actions focus on the main centers with the most need: Auckland, Hamilton, Wellington and Christchurch. The five immediate actions are:
 - Funding an additional 300 social homes for unhoused Housing First clients;
 - \$10 million in additional funding for support services for rough sleepers;
 - Increasing the efficiency of transitional housing;
 - Implementing a redirection for beneficiaries where good cause exists; and
 - MSD staff to use greater discretion when assessing emergency housing applications.

Target 8:

- *Context:* The early interventions workstream is part of the Emergency Housing Target 8 focus area aimed at reducing demand for emergency housing and ensuring it is only used when necessary.
- *Update:* Ministerial advice on the scope and work required for early intervention housing supports and services was developed and put forward for consideration by Ministers. Ministerial advice on improving transitions from state care and custody (a targeted form of early intervention) was also developed and put forward for consideration by Ministers.
- *Next steps:* HUD will update Ministers on early intervention before the end of the year.

[IN-CONFIDENCE]

From: WORTHINGTON, Tom (PONEKE) <s 9(2)(a)>

Sent: Friday, 19 September 2025 11:54 am

To: Laura Miller <s 9(2)(a)>

Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] RE: Severe housing need & Corrections

Thanks Laura, much appreciated.

If you're able to provide anything in the next hour or so that would be super helpful.

Thanks

Tom

Tom Worthington | Adviser, Strategic Policy

Ara Poutama Aotearoa, *Department of Corrections*

e: s 9(2)(a)

From: Laura Miller <s 9(2)(a)>

Sent: Friday, 19 September 2025 11:44 AM

To: WORTHINGTON, Tom (PONEKE) <s 9(2)(a)> Lauren Hannah

<s 9(2)(a)> Jasmin Chapman <s 9(2)(a)>

Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] RE: Severe housing need & Corrections

Apologies Tom, Jas is unwell and not working today and Lauren is also away. I have some material to you which I'll try to get to you this afternoon.

Thanks

Laura

[IN-CONFIDENCE]

From: WORTHINGTON, Tom (PONEKE) <s 9(2)(a)>

Sent: Friday, 19 September 2025 11:31 am

To: Laura Miller <s 9(2)(a)> Lauren Hannah <s 9(2)(a)> Jasmin

Chapman <s 9(2)(a)>

Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] RE: Severe housing need & Corrections

Kia ora

Very sorry for the nagging on this, but we are needing to provide something in the next couple of hours. Would like to make sure our information is accurate and up to date.

Three recent work streams we have been aware of are:

- s 9(2)(f)(iv)

- Review of the Social Housing System

- s 9(2)(f)(iv)

Is this correct? Is there anything else we should be aware of, or any further information about where these are at or heading?

Ngā mihi nui

Tom

Tom Worthington | Adviser, Strategic Policy

Ara Poutama Aotearoa, *Department of Corrections*

e: s 9(2)(a)

From: Jasmin Chapman <s 9(2)(a)>

Sent: Wednesday, 17 September 2025 6:34 PM

To: WORTHINGTON, Tom (PONEKE) <s 9(2)(a)>

Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] RE: Severe housing need & Corrections

Kia ora Tom,

Apologies for the delay – we were pulled into some things. I've sent some potential information to my manager, and we are aiming to send you something first thing in the morning.

Ngā mihi,

Jasmin

[IN-CONFIDENCE]

From: WORTHINGTON, Tom (PONEKE) <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Wednesday, 17 September 2025 12:18 pm
To: Jasmin Chapman <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Laura Miller <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] RE: Severe housing need & Corrections

Great, thanks Jasmin.

Update is for our CE – looking just for around a page total/paragraph or so on each work item.

Happy just for you to send through via email if preferred – equally to happy to talk through on phone, or both (:

Thanks
Tom

Tom Worthington | Adviser, Strategic Policy
Ara Poutama Aotearoa, *Department of Corrections*
e: s 9(2)(a)

From: Jasmin Chapman <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Wednesday, 17 September 2025 12:14 PM
To: WORTHINGTON, Tom (PONEKE) <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Laura Miller <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: Severe housing need & Corrections

Kia ora Tom,

Thanks for reaching out. I am available for a call later today.

In preparation, are you able to please provide some additional context on what sort of update you are looking for, including:

- Who is the audience?
- What level of detail is needed?

Thanks in advance,

Jasmin

Jasmin Chapman ([she/her](#))
Senior Policy Adviser | Responding to Severe Housing Needs
Policy Group
s 9(2)(a)



[IN-CONFIDENCE]

From: WORTHINGTON, Tom (PONEKE) <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Wednesday, 17 September 2025 11:29 am
To: Jasmin Chapman <s 9(2)(a)> Lauren Hannah <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: Severe housing need & Corrections

Kia ora Jasmin and Lauren

Hope you're well.

We've just had a request for a quick update on work on (generally) housing, homelessness / severe housing need - the various workstreams, and how they relate to Corrections.

Would it be possible to give me a quick call sometime today? Or otherwise if you'd prefer to email reply?
Number is s 9(2)(a) if a call works.

Thanks heaps.

Ngā mihi nui
Tom

Tom Worthington | Adviser, Strategic Policy
Ara Poutama Aotearoa, *Department of Corrections*
e: s 9(2)(a)

External Comms.

The information in this message is the property of the New Zealand Department of Corrections. It is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain privileged or in confidence material. Any review, storage, copying, editing, summarising, transmission, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, by any means, in whole or part, or taking any action in reliance upon, this information by persons or entities other than intended recipient are prohibited. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from all computers.

Disclaimer

From: [Geraldine Wilkins](#)
To: [Alex Harrington \[TSY\]](#); [Jemima de Lacey](#)
Cc: [Jason Raven](#); [Nick McNabb](#)
Subject: RE: Draft material for Ministers' meeting for your input/review
Date: Tuesday, 7 October 2025 4:31:03 pm
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[RoSH slidepack for Ministers Willis, Bishop and Upston mtg.pptx](#)
[Meeting on welfare reform and Review of Social Housing\(5191783.1\) \(7 Oct\).docx](#)

IN-CONFIDENCE

Thanks Alex. Your additions made sense – we've just added a bit more detail on the single subsidy options so that MoF understands the significant distributional impacts of this option.

Attached is final slidepack, and cover report with our tracked changes now. We will get the slidepack proofread first thing tomorrow too. Once you are happy with the cover report, do you want to send the pack through to the sign-out managers?

Note – there is a small chance we'll need to make some further adjustments following MSD Officials this evening. Will keep you updated there.

From: Alex Harrington [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Tuesday, 7 October 2025 1:48 pm
To: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey
<s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Draft material for Ministers' meeting for your input/review

Kia ora ano

Apologies, I also meant to mention a couple of minor things on the slide pack:

- If Minister Potaka is attending, do you want to add his name to the list of Ministers on the title slide?
- Can we update the classification to BUDGET-SENSITIVE?

Ngā mihi
Alex

Alex Harrington (he/him) | Principal Advisor, **Welfare and Oranga Tamariki Team**
| Te Tai Ōhanga The Treasury
tau waea phone: +64 4 890 3596 | imēra email: s 9(2)(a)

From: Alex Harrington [TSY]
Sent: Tuesday, 7 October 2025 1:44 pm
To: 'Geraldine Wilkins' <s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey
<s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Draft material for Ministers' meeting for your input/review
Importance: High

Kia ora Gerry and Jemima

Apologies for the delay. I have incorporated your changes into the report, and made a few other editorial changes (e.g. I have spelt out IRR, AS, TAS etc.).

As foreshadowed, I have also tracked in some changes to give Ministers (MOF primarily) greater visibility of the range of potential fiscal savings available, and being more explicit that Ministers may want to take some of these savings back to the centre. Please see attached. Hopefully you will recognise the material I have included – I have lifted things from the September reporting. While this material and these options will be well understood by Housing Ministers, MOF will be coming to this topic fairly fresh so we think it's important to show her the longer list, even if Ministers then narrow down.

I have deliberately sent this just to the two of you in the first instance to see if we can do some wordsmithing at a working level to get some text that we agree on. If it's easier to discuss, please let me know and I'm happy to get on a call at short notice.

Ngā mihi
Alex

Alex Harrington (he/him) | Principal Advisor, **Welfare and Oranga Tamariki Team**
| Te Tai Ōhanga **The Treasury**

tau waea phone: s 9(2)(a) | imēra email: s 9(2)(a)

From: Geraldine Wilkins s 9(2)(a)
Sent: Tuesday, 7 October 2025 10:41 am
To: Alex Harrington [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Daniel White [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Amanda Wilson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Shelley Robertson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Conor McBride [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Jeanne Barnard [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Samantha Fitch <s 9(2)(a)> Jason Raven
<s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)> ^HUD: Nick
McNabb <s 9(2)(a)> Wayne Anderson <s 9(2)(a)>
Jeremy Steele <s 9(2)(a)> ^MSD: Julia Bergman
<s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Draft material for Ministers' meeting for your input/review

IN-CONFIDENCE

Hey Alex

Please find attached the updated draft slidepack and cover report reflecting feedback from our CEs, DCEs and GMs. We also heard that Minister Bishop was fine with the pack – haven't heard from Minister Upston but we will follow up now.

You'll see there is one data point we're waiting on for the slidepack – should have in by 2pm today.

I understand you were also looking at making some changes to the cover report particularly re fiscal choices – happy to work with you to land some wording we're both happy on today. Jeremy and Julia Bergman have sign out time booked in for 1030am

tomorrow morning, so hopefully we can land the pack by the end of today?

Happy to discuss,

Gerry and Jemima

From: Alex Harrington [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Monday, 6 October 2025 9:29 am
To: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)> Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Daniel White [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Amanda Wilson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Shelley Robertson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
s 9(2)(a) Jeanne Barnard [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Samantha Fitch <s 9(2)(a)> Jason Raven
<s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)> ^HUD: Nick
McNabb <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Draft material for Ministers' meeting for your input/review

Kia ora Gerry

Thanks, I'm sure that will be fine. We can push out when we circulate the updated version of the material to GMs to Tuesday morning.

I expect we will have a few tweaks to the report from our end too, which we will circulate when available.

Ngā mihi
Alex

Alex Harrington (he/him) | Principal Advisor, **Welfare and Oranga Tamariki Team**
| Te Tai Ōhanga **The Treasury**

tau waea phone: s 9(2)(a) | īmēra email: s 9(2)(a)

From: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Monday, 6 October 2025 9:13 am
To: Alex Harrington [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Daniel White [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Amanda Wilson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Shelley Robertson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Conor McBride [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Jeanne Barnard [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Samantha Fitch <s 9(2)(a)> Jason Raven
<s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)> ^HUD: Nick
McNabb <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Draft material for Ministers' meeting for your input/review

IN-CONFIDENCE

Thanks Alex reflected that change now.

Just on our feedback back to you on the cover report and annotated agenda. We sent

the full draft pack (report, annotated agenda and slidepack) to our CEs and DCEs for review on Friday but we understand they might not have a chance to get us feedback until later today, so our feedback on the report/annotated agenda might not come through until COP today. Hope that still works OK?

Gerry

From: Alex Harrington [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Thursday, 2 October 2025 4:16 pm
To: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)> Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Daniel White [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Amanda Wilson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Shelley Robertson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
s 9(2)(a) Jeanne Barnard [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Samantha Fitch <s 9(2)(a)> Jason Raven
<s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)> ^HUD: Nick McNabb <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Draft material for Ministers' meeting for your input/review

Kia ora Gerry

Thanks for sharing the slidepack with us earlier. It is looking good, and it will be a helpful way for Ministers to bring MOF up to speed with the ROSH work and thinking.

No substantive feedback from us. Just one really minor point from me that you'll probably pick up in review: slide 7 has "dependant" which should be "dependent".

Ngā mihi
Alex

Alex Harrington (he/him) | Principal Advisor, **Welfare and Oranga Tamariki Team**
| **Te Tai Ōhanga The Treasury**
tau waea phone: s 9(2)(a) | imēra email: s 9(2)(a)

From: Alex Harrington [TSY]
Sent: Thursday, 2 October 2025 9:38 am
To: 'Geraldine Wilkins' <s 9(2)(a)> Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Daniel White [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Amanda Wilson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Shelley Robertson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Conor McBride [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Jeanne Barnard [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Samantha Fitch <s 9(2)(a)> Jason Raven
<s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)> ^HUD: Nick McNabb <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Draft material for Ministers' meeting for your input/review

[SEEMAIL][SENSITIVE]

Thanks very much Gerry! We will have a look and come back to you later today.

Updated version of the draft cover report/annotated agenda attached.

Ngā mihi
Alex

Alex Harrington (he/him) | Principal Advisor, **Welfare and Oranga Tamariki Team**
| Te Tai Ōhanga **The Treasury**

tau waea phone: s 9(2)(a) | imēra email: s 9(2)(a)

From: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Thursday, 2 October 2025 9:33 am
To: Alex Harrington [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Daniel White [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Amanda Wilson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Shelley Robertson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Conor McBride [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Jeanne Barnard [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Samantha Fitch s 9(2)(a) Jason Raven
s 9(2)(a) Jemima de Lacey s 9(2)(a) ^HUD: Nick
McNabb s 9(2)(a)
Subject: RE: Draft material for Ministers' meeting for your input/review

IN-CONFIDENCE

Kia ora Alex

Please find attached the latest version of the slidepack now updated for the MoF/Housing Mins meeting on Monday 13th. As per Bishop and Upston's request, it hasn't substantially changed since the version we took them through on Monday.

Note this only just went to HUD and MSD GM review last night, but sharing early to give you a chance to provide any views **by COP today** please, ahead of it going to our CEs/DCEs and Upston and Bishops' offices tomorrow COP for feedback. See timelines we're working towards below.

We'll take a look at your draft cover report and annotated agenda shortly, but just checking whether there is a more recent version that it would be more useful to review now? All good if not.

Ta,
Gerry

Action	Date
Send slide pack to HUD and MSD GMs for review	COP Wed, 1 Oct
Send to TSY for review by COP Thurs	Thursday 2 Oct
Review TSY cover report and annotated agenda	Thursday 2 Oct
Send to CEs/DCEs for review by Monday, also to Upston and Bishop's offices for their feedback)	COP Fri, 3 Oct
Reflect feedback from CEs/DCEs and Ministers' offices	Mon, 6 Oct

HUD/MSD sign-out, then send to Treasury to be attached to their memo	Tues arvo, 7 Oct for sign-out Wed morning, 8 Oct
Slidepack and memo goes to Ministers	2pm Thursday 9 October
Ministers' meeting	Mon, 13 Oct

From: Alex Harrington [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Wednesday, 1 October 2025 11:16 am
To: Jason Raven <s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey
 <s 9(2)(a)> Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)>
 ^HUD: Nick McNabb <s 9(2)(a)> Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY]
 <s 9(2)(a)> Daniel White [TSY]
 <s 9(2)(a)> Amanda Wilson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
 Shelley Robertson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
 s 9(2)(a) Jeanne Barnard [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Julia Bergman <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Draft material for Ministers' meeting for your input/review

Thanks very much Jason!

Ngā mihi
 Alex

Alex Harrington (he/him) | Principal Advisor, **Welfare and Oranga Tamariki Team**
 | Te Tai Ōhanga **The Treasury**
 tau waea phone: s 9(2)(a) | imēra email: s 9(2)(a)

From: Jason Raven <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Wednesday, 1 October 2025 9:03 am
To: Alex Harrington [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey
 <s 9(2)(a)> ^MSD: Geraldine Wilkins
 <s 9(2)(a)> ^HUD: Nick McNabb <s 9(2)(a)> Caitlin
 Daugherty-Kelly [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Daniel White [TSY]
 <s 9(2)(a)> Amanda Wilson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
 Shelley Robertson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Conor McBride [TSY]
 <s 9(2)(a)> Jeanne Barnard [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: ^MSD: Julia Bergman <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Draft material for Ministers' meeting for your input/review

IN-CONFIDENCE

Thanks Alex!

That sounds good from my perspective. Housing ministers seemed of the view that the powerpoint slides that we prepared for their meeting on Monday would be a good basis for the conversation, with some amendments. We're working on those now, but can send you the version they looked at, along with the longer background papers so you can see what we're working with.

Jason

From: Alex Harrington [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Tuesday, 30 September 2025 5:14 pm
To: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)> Geraldine Wilkins
<s 9(2)(a)> ^HUD: Nick McNabb <s 9(2)(a)> Jason
Raven <s 9(2)(a)> Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY] s 9(2)(a)
>; Daniel White [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Amanda Wilson
[TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Shelley Robertson [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> s 9(2)(a) Jeanne Barnard [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Draft material for Ministers' meeting for your input/review

[SEEMAIL][SENSITIVE]

Kia ora koutou

I understand that the meeting between Ministers Bishop, Upston and Potaka went ahead last evening – I hope it went well.

We also had the equivalent meeting in relation to s 9(2)(f)(iv) with Minister Watts yesterday evening. That was productive, and the material we provided to Ministers to support the meeting seemed to work well for them in terms of having a good, structured discussion.

Now is a good time for us to turn our minds back to the joint briefing we will need to provide for Ministers for their meeting on 13 October. I am re-attaching the draft briefing that I circulated back on 19 September, which was very similar in approach to what we used for the s 9(2)(f)(iv) meeting. I will go through and update that draft briefing for the new meeting time etc. Grateful if MHUD/MSD officials could have a think about what ROSH collateral we might want to provide as part of the briefing to give Minister Willis a sense of how the ROSH work is going, and also any thoughts/changes you might want in the body of the report, the annotated agenda, etc.

In terms of timeframes, I expect we will need to work to a deadline of 2pm Thursday 9 October to have papers delivered to Minister Willis's office – presumably deadlines for your Ministers will be similar? With that in mind, grateful if you could come back to me in the next couple of days in terms of what material you think we should be adding into this joint report so we can get it moving.

Ngā mihi
Alex

Alex Harrington (he/him) | Principal Advisor, **Welfare and Oranga Tamariki Team**
| Te Tai Ōhanga The Treasury
tau waea phone: s 9(2)(a) | imēra email: s 9(2)(a)

From: Alex Harrington [TSY]
Sent: Monday, 22 September 2025 9:41 am
To: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)> ^MSD: Geraldine Wilkins
<s 9(2)(a)> ^HUD: Nick McNabb <s 9(2)(a)> Jason

Raven <s 9(2)(a)> Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
>; Daniel White [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Amanda Wilson
[TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Shelley Robertson [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Conor McBride [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Jeanne Barnard [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Draft material for Ministers' meeting for your input/review

Thanks Jemima, that sounds like a good plan.

Ngā mihi nui
Alex

Alex Harrington (he/him) | Principal Advisor, **Welfare and Oranga Tamariki Team**
| Te Tai Ōhanga **The Treasury**
tau waea phone: s 9(2)(a) | īmēra email: s 9(2)(a)

From: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Monday, 22 September 2025 9:39 am
To: Alex Harrington [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> ^MSD: Geraldine Wilkins
<s 9(2)(a)> ^HUD: Nick McNabb <s 9(2)(a)> Jason
Raven <s 9(2)(a)> Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY] s 9(2)(a)
>; Daniel White [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Amanda Wilson
[TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Shelley Robertson [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Conor McBride [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Jeanne Barnard [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: Re: Draft material for Ministers' meeting for your input/review

Thanks very much for that update Alex.

Yes while not fully confirmed we understand plan is for the 3 housing Ministers to meet on Sep 29 for the follow up meeting ahead of the meeting with MoF. Once/if this is confirmed would be good to input into your briefing post the 29th.

Ngā mihi nui

Jemima de Lacey ([she/her](#))
Principal Advisor | Social Housing and Other Supports
s 9(2)(a) | Phone: s 9(2)(a)

[IN-CONFIDENCE]

From: Alex Harrington [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Monday, 22 September 2025 9:35 am
To: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)> Geraldine Wilkins
<s 9(2)(a)> Nick McNabb <s 9(2)(a)> Jason Raven
<s 9(2)(a)> Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY] (Guest) s 9(2)(a)
>; Daniel White [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Amanda Wilson
[TSY] (Guest) <s 9(2)(a)> Shelley Robertson [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Conor McBride [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Jeanne Barnard [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>

Subject: RE: Draft material for Ministers' meeting for your input/review

Kia ora koutou, I hope everyone had a good weekend.

I've checked in with MOF's office this morning for an update on timing for this meeting. They advise that, as of a few minutes ago, they have confirmation that **the meeting will be pushed out two weeks, to Monday 13 October, 10:30-11am.**

So that means we are not in such a rush to get material finalised for the meeting. It also may mean that Ministers Bishop, Upston and Potaka could have their follow-up meeting before the meeting with MOF.

In any case, happy to receive people's feedback on the draft material I circulated on Friday, but we now have a couple of extra weeks to get it finalised, so no great hurry to get back to me.

I hope everyone has a good week.

Ngā mihi
Alex

Alex Harrington (he/him) | Principal Advisor, Welfare and Oranga Tamariki Team | Te Tai Ōhanga The Treasury

tau waea phone: s 9(2)(a) | imēra email: s 9(2)(a)

From: Alex Harrington [TSY]

Sent: Friday, 19 September 2025 12:59 pm

To: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)> ^MSD: Geraldine Wilkins
<s 9(2)(a)> ^HUD: Nick McNabb <s 9(2)(a)> Jason
Raven <s 9(2)(a)> Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY] s 9(2)(a)
>; Talosaga Talosaga [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Daniel
White [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Amanda Wilson [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Shelley Robertson [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Conor McBride [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Jeanne Barnard [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>

Subject: Draft material for Ministers' meeting for your input/review

Importance: High

[SEEMAIL][SENSITIVE]

Kia ora koutou

Thanks very much for the discussion yesterday afternoon.

As promised, I have put together a first draft of some material that we could jointly provide to our Ministers for their meeting on (TBC) Monday 29 September. Please find this draft attached. Grateful for your thoughts and suggestions.

As well as seeking your feedback on what I've drafted, you'll see there are a few gaps for MHUD/MSD folks to fill in. The key gap is the question of what RoSH collateral we might provide to Ministers (as Appendix Two). One option we discussed yesterday was including Annex 1 of the RoSH September advice (the overview A3s); another option

was Annex 2 of the RoSH September advice (the fiscal implications A3). Very open to ideas about what you might want to include here to give Ministers (MOF mainly) a quick overview of the work. I recognise that you will need to talk to your Ministers' offices about what they would be comfortable with including.

While we are yet to have the date of the meeting confirmed, I think it's prudent to keep working towards a 29 September meeting date, and therefore the 12 noon Wednesday 24 September hard deadline to get final papers to MOF's office. With that in mind, **grateful if we could have comments/questions/contributions back by 5pm Monday (22 September)**, so we can then get material to our seniors on Tuesday for review. Of course, if we get an update on meeting timing, we can update this timeline.

Thanks in advance!

Ngā mihi nui
Alex

Alex Harrington (he/him) | Principal Advisor, Welfare and Oranga Tamariki Team | Te Tai Ōhanga The Treasury

tau waea phone: s 9(2)(a) | imēra email: s 9(2)(a)

-----Original Appointment-----

From: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>

Sent: Wednesday, 17 September 2025 3:13 pm

To: Jemima de Lacey; ^MSD: Geraldine Wilkins; ^HUD: Nick McNabb; Jason Raven; Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY]; Talosaga Talosaga [TSY]; Daniel White [TSY]; Amanda Wilson [TSY]; Alex Harrington [TSY]

Subject: Catch up on RoSH

When: Thursday, 18 September 2025 4:00 pm-4:30 pm (UTC+12:00) Auckland, Wellington.

Where: Microsoft Teams Meeting

Kia ora koutou,

Booking us in time to update you on our Ministers discussion on the review of the social housing system which happened on Monday and the next steps.

Ngā mihi nui

Jemima de Lacey ([she/her](#))

Principal Advisor | Social Housing and Other Supports

s 9(2)(a) | Phone: s 9(2)(a)

 www.hud.govt.nz | Level 8, 7 Waterloo Quay, Wellington 6011



He kāinga ora, he hāpori ora - our purpose is thriving communities where everyone has a place to call home.

From: [Alex Harrington \[TSY\]](#)
To: [Geraldine Wilkins](#); [Jemima de Lacey](#)
Cc: [Jason Raven](#); [Nick McNabb](#)
Subject: RE: Draft material for Ministers' meeting for your input/review
Date: Wednesday, 8 October 2025 10:23:06 am
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[Meeting on welfare reform and Review of Social Housing\(5191783.1\).docx](#)
Importance: High

Kia ora koutou

Please see attached for an updated (final?) version of the joint report. Grateful to confirm your comfort with this version before I send it to Shelley/Jeremy/Julia for sign-out.

Just checking – were there any adjustments needed as a result of the MSD officials meeting yesterday evening? And do you have a final version of the slide pack?

Ngā mihi
Alex

Alex Harrington (he/him) | Principal Advisor, **Welfare and Oranga Tamariki Team**
| Te Tai Ōhanga **The Treasury**
tau waea phone: s 9(2)(a) | imēra email: s 9(2)(a)

From: Alex Harrington [TSY]
Sent: Tuesday, 7 October 2025 4:57 pm
To: 'Geraldine Wilkins' <s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey
<s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Jason Raven <s 9(2)(a)> ^HUD: Nick McNabb
<s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Draft material for Ministers' meeting for your input/review

Thanks very much Geraldine and team. I like what you've done, and am working on getting it all incorporated and looking tidy.

I will circulate around Treasury folks and let you know if there are any final changes needed as a result. Let's touch base tomorrow morning on how we are placed for sign-out.

Ngā mihi
Alex

Alex Harrington (he/him) | Principal Advisor, **Welfare and Oranga Tamariki Team**
| Te Tai Ōhanga **The Treasury**
tau waea phone: s 9(2)(a) | imēra email: s 9(2)(a)

From: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Tuesday, 7 October 2025 4:30 pm
To: Alex Harrington [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey
<s 9(2)(a)>

From: [Alex Harrington \[TSY\]](#)
To: [Geraldine Wilkins](#); [Jemima de Lacey](#)
Cc: [Jason Raven](#); [Nick McNabb](#)
Subject: RE: Draft material for Ministers' meeting for your input/review
Date: Wednesday, 8 October 2025 10:52:14 am
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)

Wonderful, thank you! I shall circulate very shortly

Ngā mihi
Alex

Alex Harrington (he/him) | Principal Advisor, **Welfare and Oranga Tamariki Team**
| Te Tai Ōhanga **The Treasury**
tau waea phone: s 9(2)(a) | īmēra email: s 9(2)(a)

From: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Wednesday, 8 October 2025 10:48 am
To: Alex Harrington [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey
<s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Jason Raven <s 9(2)(a)> ^HUD: Nick McNabb
<s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Draft material for Ministers' meeting for your input/review

IN-CONFIDENCE

Thanks Alex – just two minor changes to the memo from us. Removed 'near term' as some of these changes may take some time, and fixed one typo.

Also attached is the proof read slidepack.

No changes required from MSD Officials last night.

Happy for you to send these through to sign-out now

From: Alex Harrington [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Wednesday, 8 October 2025 10:22 am
To: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey
<s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Jason Raven <s 9(2)(a)> ^HUD: Nick McNabb
<s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Draft material for Ministers' meeting for your input/review
Importance: High

Kia ora koutou

Please see attached for an updated (final?) version of the joint report. Grateful to confirm your comfort with this version before I send it to Shelley/Jeremy/Julia for sign-out.

Just checking – were there any adjustments needed as a result of the MSD officials meeting yesterday evening? And do you have a final version of the slide pack?

Ngā mihi
Alex

Alex Harrington (he/him) | Principal Advisor, Welfare and Oranga Tamariki Team
| Te Tai Ōhanga The Treasury

tau waea phone: s 9(2)(a) | īmēra email: s 9(2)(a)

From: Alex Harrington [TSY]

Sent: Tuesday, 7 October 2025 4:57 pm

To: 'Geraldine Wilkins' <s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey
<s 9(2)(a)>

Cc: Jason Raven <s 9(2)(a)> ^HUD: Nick McNabb
<s 9(2)(a)>

Subject: RE: Draft material for Ministers' meeting for your input/review

Thanks very much Geraldine and team. I like what you've done, and am working on getting it all incorporated and looking tidy.

I will circulate around Treasury folks and let you know if there are any final changes needed as a result. Let's touch base tomorrow morning on how we are placed for sign-out.

Ngā mihi
Alex

Alex Harrington (he/him) | Principal Advisor, Welfare and Oranga Tamariki Team
| Te Tai Ōhanga The Treasury

tau waea phone: s 9(2)(a) | īmēra email: s 9(2)(a)

From: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)>

Sent: Tuesday, 7 October 2025 4:30 pm

To: Alex Harrington [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey
<s 9(2)(a)>

Cc: Jason Raven <s 9(2)(a)> ^HUD: Nick McNabb
<s 9(2)(a)>

Subject: RE: Draft material for Ministers' meeting for your input/review

IN-CONFIDENCE

Thanks Alex. Your additions made sense – we've just added a bit more detail on the single subsidy options so that MoF understands the significant distributional impacts of this option.

Attached is final slidepack, and cover report with our tracked changes now. We will get the slidepack proofread first thing tomorrow too. Once you are happy with the cover report, do you want to send the pack through to the sign-out managers?

From: [Alex Harrington \[TSY\]](#)
To: [Julia Bergman](#); [Jeremy Steele](#); [Shelley Robertson \[TSY\]](#)
Cc: [Samantha Fitch \(Guest\)](#); [Jason Raven](#); [Jemima de Lacey](#); [Nick McNabb](#); [Wayne Anderson](#); [Geraldine Wilkins](#); [Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly \[TSY\] \(Guest\)](#); [Daniel White \[TSY\]](#); [Amanda Wilson \[TSY\] \(Guest\)](#); [Conor McBride \[TSY\]](#); [Jeanne Barnard \[TSY\]](#); [Lara Hu \[TSY\]](#)
Subject: Welfare reform/social housing material for sign-out
Date: Wednesday, 8 October 2025 10:58:01 am
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[Meeting on welfare reform and Review of Social Housing\(5191783.1\).docx](#)
[RoSH slidepack for Ministers Willis, Bishop, Upston and Potaka mtg.pptx](#)
Importance: High

[SEEMAIL][SENSITIVE]

Kia ora koutou

Please find attached, for your sign-out, the final version of the joint report and slide pack for Monday's Ministers meeting on welfare reform and social housing.

I have cc'ed Lara Hu, our team assistant, who can incorporate e-signatures – grateful if you could arrange for your e-signatures to be sent to Lara once you have given your OK.

Thanks everyone for your efforts on this one.

Ngā mihi
Alex

Alex Harrington (he/him) | Principal Advisor, **Welfare and Oranga Tamariki Team**
| **Te Tai Ōhanga The Treasury**

tau waea phone: +s 9(2)(a) | imēra email: s 9(2)(a)

From: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Tuesday, 7 October 2025 10:41 am
To: Alex Harrington [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Daniel White [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Amanda Wilson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Shelley Robertson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Conor McBride [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Jeanne Barnard [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Samantha Fitch <s 9(2)(a)> Jason Raven <s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)> ^HUD: Nick McNabb <s 9(2)(a)> Wayne Anderson <s 9(2)(a)> Jeremy Steele <s 9(2)(a)> ^MSD: Julia Bergman <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Draft material for Ministers' meeting for your input/review

IN-CONFIDENCE

Hey Alex

Please find attached the updated draft slidepack and cover report reflecting feedback from our CEs, DCEs and GMs. We also heard that Minister Bishop was fine with the

Deleted end of email thread repeated from earlier pages 103-112.

From: [Julia Bergman](#)
To: [Alex Harrington \[TSY\]](#); [Jeremy Steele](#); [Shelley Robertson \[TSY\]](#)
Cc: [Samantha Fitch \(Guest\)](#); [Jason Raven](#); [Jemima de Lacey](#); [Nick McNabb](#); [Wayne Anderson](#); [Geraldine Wilkins](#); [Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly \[TSY\] \(Guest\)](#); [Daniel White \[TSY\]](#); [Amanda Wilson \[TSY\] \(Guest\)](#); [Sacha Zaloumis](#); [s 9\(2\)\(a\)](#); [Jeanne Barnard \[TSY\]](#); [Lara Hu \[TSY\]](#)
Subject: RE: Welfare reform/social housing material for sign-out
Date: Wednesday, 8 October 2025 11:53:24 am
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[Meeting on welfare reform and Review of Social Housing\(5191783.1\).docx](#)

IN-CONFIDENCE

Thanks very much for this Alex. I'm happy with the memo just noted some minor changes in the attached please. I'd prefer my EA add my electronic signature once the memo's finalised if that's ok rather than me emailing it – I have cc'd Sacha in.

Thanks again
Julia

From: Alex Harrington [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Wednesday, 8 October 2025 10:57 am
To: Julia Bergman <s 9(2)(a)> Jeremy Steele
<s 9(2)(a)> Shelley Robertson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Samantha Fitch <s 9(2)(a)> Jason Raven
<s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)> ^HUD: Nick McNabb <s 9(2)(a)> Wayne Anderson <s 9(2)(a)>
Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)> Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Daniel White [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Amanda Wilson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
s 9(2)(a) Jeanne Barnard [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Lara Hu [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: Welfare reform/social housing material for sign-out
Importance: High

[SEEMAIL][SENSITIVE]

Kia ora koutou

Please find attached, for your sign-out, the final version of the joint report and slide pack for Monday's Ministers meeting on welfare reform and social housing.

I have cc'ed Lara Hu, our team assistant, who can incorporate e-signatures – grateful if you could arrange for your e-signatures to be sent to Lara once you have given your OK.

Thanks everyone for your efforts on this one.

Ngā mihi
Alex

Alex Harrington (he/him) | Principal Advisor, **Welfare and Oranga Tamariki Team**

From: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Tuesday, 7 October 2025 10:41 am
To: Alex Harrington [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Daniel White [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Amanda Wilson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Shelley Robertson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Conor McBride [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Jeanne Barnard [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Samantha Fitch <s 9(2)(a)> Jason Raven
<s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)> ^HUD: Nick
McNabb <s 9(2)(a)> Wayne Anderson <s 9(2)(a)>
Jeremy Steele <s 9(2)(a)> ^MSD: Julia Bergman
<s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Draft material for Ministers' meeting for your input/review

IN-CONFIDENCE

Hey Alex

Please find attached the updated draft slidepack and cover report reflecting feedback from our CEs, DCEs and GMs. We also heard that Minister Bishop was fine with the pack – haven't heard from Minister Upston but we will follow up now.

You'll see there is one data point we're waiting on for the slidepack – should have in by 2pm today.

I understand you were also looking at making some changes to the cover report particularly re fiscal choices – happy to work with you to land some wording we're both happy on today. Jeremy and Julia Bergman have sign out time booked in for 1030am tomorrow morning, so hopefully we can land the pack by the end of today?

Happy to discuss,

Gerry and Jemima

From: Alex Harrington [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Monday, 6 October 2025 9:29 am
To: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)> Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Daniel White [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Amanda Wilson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Shelley Robertson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
s 9(2)(a) Jeanne Barnard [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Samantha Fitch <s 9(2)(a)> Jason Raven
<s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)> ^HUD: Nick
McNabb <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Draft material for Ministers' meeting for your input/review

Kia ora Gerry

From: [Alex Harrington \[TSY\]](#)
To: [Geraldine Wilkins](#); [Jemima de Lacey](#)
Subject: RE: Welfare reform/social housing material for sign-out
Date: Wednesday, 8 October 2025 2:42:25 pm
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image005.png](#)
[image006.png](#)
[image007.png](#)

OK, our team assistant Lara now has all the e-signatures, so she will get final versions sent around to you very shortly for circulation.

s 9(2)(a) I will be back online around 3:25, by which time I'm hoping everything is sorted

Alex Harrington (he/him) | Principal Advisor, Welfare and Oranga Tamariki Team
| Te Tai Ōhanga The Treasury

tau waea phone: s 9(2)(a) | īmēra email: s 9(2)(a)

From: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Wednesday, 8 October 2025 2:35 pm
To: Alex Harrington [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey
<s 9(2)(a)> Sacha Zaloumis <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Welfare reform/social housing material for sign-out

IN-CONFIDENCE

As discussed just now Alex, we can sus sending to our offices.

And Julia fine with us suggesting the Minister only time to our offices.

Re her signature – can you please get your TA to email the report with the other two signatures through, and her EA [@Sacha Zaloumis](#) will add it in.

From: Alex Harrington [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Wednesday, 8 October 2025 2:18 pm
To: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey
<s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Welfare reform/social housing material for sign-out

Ah yes, sorry, that's something we should have covered earlier. What we've been doing for these joint reports is that, once we have them finalised, we circulate final versions with e-signatures to each agency, who then gets them to their Minister's office. Does that work for you?

Ngā mihi
Alex

Alex Harrington (he/him) | Principal Advisor, Welfare and Oranga Tamariki Team
| Te Tai Ōhanga The Treasury

tau waea phone: s 9(2)(a) | īmēra email: s 9(2)(a)

From: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Wednesday, 8 October 2025 2:14 pm
To: Alex Harrington [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey
<s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Welfare reform/social housing material for sign-out

IN-CONFIDENCE

Thanks Alex. How do you want to get this to Ministers' offices?

From: Alex Harrington [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Wednesday, 8 October 2025 2:03 pm
To: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Welfare reform/social housing material for sign-out

All good Jemima, I shall make that change now.

We're still sorting signatures etc., will circulate final versions hopefully soon.

Ngā mihi
Alex

Alex Harrington (he/him) | Principal Advisor, **Welfare and Oranga Tamariki Team**
| Te Tai Ōhanga **The Treasury**
tau waea phone: s 9(2)(a) | īmēra email: s 9(2)(a)

From: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Wednesday, 8 October 2025 2:00 pm
To: Alex Harrington [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: ^MSD: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: Re: Welfare reform/social housing material for sign-out

Hi Alex,

We just realised title for Annex 2 (slide 9) is wrong.

If possible please change to: "Annex 2: Characteristics of people on the Register, receiving AS or in social housing"

Ngā mihi nui

Jemima de Lacey ([she/her](#))

Principal Advisor | Social Housing and Other Supports

s 9(2)(a) | Phone: s 9(2)(a)

[SENSITIVE]

From: Alex Harrington [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Wednesday, 8 October 2025 1:33 pm
To: Jeremy Steele <s 9(2)(a)> Julia Bergman
<s 9(2)(a)> Shelley Robertson [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Samantha Fitch (Guest) <s 9(2)(a)> Jason Raven
<s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)> Nick
McNabb <s 9(2)(a)> Wayne Anderson <s 9(2)(a)>
Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)> Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY] (Guest)
<s 9(2)(a)> Daniel White [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Amanda Wilson [TSY] (Guest) <s 9(2)(a)> Conor McBride [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Jeanne Barnard [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Lara Hu [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Welfare reform/social housing material for sign-out

Thanks very much Jeremy!

Ngā mihi nui
Alex

Alex Harrington (he/him) | Principal Advisor, **Welfare and Oranga Tamariki Team**
| Te Tai Ōhanga The Treasury
tau waea phone: s 9(2)(a) | imēra email: s 9(2)(a)

From: Jeremy Steele <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Wednesday, 8 October 2025 1:30 pm
To: Alex Harrington [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> ^MSD: Julia Bergman
<s 9(2)(a)> Shelley Robertson [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Samantha Fitch (Guest) <s 9(2)(a)> Jason Raven
<s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)> ^HUD: Nick
McNabb <s 9(2)(a)> Wayne Anderson <s 9(2)(a)>
^MSD: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)> Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Daniel White [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Amanda Wilson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Conor McBride [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Jeanne Barnard [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Lara Hu [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Welfare reform/social housing material for sign-out

Thanks Alex. This all looks good to me.

I'll send my e-sign directly to Lara to add.

Ngā mihi nui

Jeremy Steele (he/him)

General Manager | Housing Supports and Supply
Policy Group

s 9(2)(a) | Phone: s 9(2)(a) | s 9(2)(a)

www.hud.govt.nz | Level 8, 7 WQ, 7 Waterloo Quay, Wellington



[SENSITIVE]

From: Alex Harrington [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Wednesday, October 8, 2025 10:57 AM
To: Julia Bergman <s 9(2)(a)> Jeremy Steele
<s 9(2)(a)> Shelley Robertson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Samantha Fitch (Guest) <s 9(2)(a)> Jason Raven
<s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)> Nick
McNabb <s 9(2)(a)> Wayne Anderson <s 9(2)(a)>
Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)> Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY] (Guest)
<s 9(2)(a)> Daniel White [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Amanda Wilson [TSY] (Guest) <s 9(2)(a)> Conor McBride [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Jeanne Barnard [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Lara Hu [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: Welfare reform/social housing material for sign-out
Importance: High

[SEEMAIL][SENSITIVE]

Kia ora koutou

Please find attached, for your sign-out, the final version of the joint report and slide pack for Monday's Ministers meeting on welfare reform and social housing.

I have cc'ed Lara Hu, our team assistant, who can incorporate e-signatures – grateful if you could arrange for your e-signatures to be sent to Lara once you have given your OK.

Thanks everyone for your efforts on this one.

Ngā mihi
Alex

Alex Harrington (he/him) | Principal Advisor, **Welfare and Oranga Tamariki Team**
| Te Tai Ōhanga **The Treasury**
tau waea phone: s 9(2)(a) | imēra email: s 9(2)(a)

From: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)>

From: [Lara Hu \[TSY\]](#)
To: [Shelley Robertson \[TSY\]](#); [Alex Harrington \[TSY\]](#); [Jeremy Steele](#); [Julia Bergman](#)
Cc: [Samantha Fitch \(Guest\)](#); [Jason Raven](#); [Jemima de Lacey](#); [Nick McNabb](#); [Wayne Anderson](#); [Geraldine Wilkins](#); [Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly \[TSY\] \(Guest\)](#); [Daniel White \[TSY\]](#); [Amanda Wilson \[TSY\] \(Guest\)](#); [Conor McBride \[TSY\]](#); [Jeanne Barnard \[TSY\]](#)
Subject: RE: Welfare reform/social housing material for sign-out
Date: Wednesday, 8 October 2025 3:04:06 pm
Attachments: [image002.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image008.png](#)
[image010.png](#)
[image014.png](#)
[image015.png](#)
[image016.png](#)
[image007.png](#)
[image009.png](#)
[image011.png](#)
[Joint Report T2025 2469 Meeting on welfare reform and Review of Social Housing + Slides.pdf](#)
[Joint Report T2025 2469 Meeting on welfare reform and Review of Social Housing.docx](#)
[RoSH slidepack for Ministers Willis Bishop Upston and Potaka mtg.pptx](#)

Hello everyone,

Please find the completed JR (all signatures) attached, the slide pack and a PDF version of both combined.

Best wishes,

Lara Hu | Te Tai Ōhanga The Treasury

Team Assistant, Welfare & Oranga Tamariki + Public Finance Policy +
Performance Reporting

Public Sector Performance, System & Sector Performance

tau waea phone: s 9(2)(a) | Īmēra email: s 9(2)(a)

treasury.govt.nz | [LinkedIn](#) | [Youtube](#)



**TE TAI ŌHANGA
THE TREASURY**

From: Shelley Robertson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Wednesday, 8 October 2025 2:21 pm
To: Alex Harrington [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Jeremy Steele
<s 9(2)(a)> ^MSD: Julia Bergman <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Samantha Fitch (Guest) <s 9(2)(a)> Jason Raven
<s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)> ^HUD: Nick
McNabb <s 9(2)(a)> Wayne Anderson <s 9(2)(a)>
^MSD: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)> Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Daniel White [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Amanda Wilson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Conor McBride [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Jeanne Barnard [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Lara Hu [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Welfare reform/social housing material for sign-out

Kia ora,

Approved for my sign out too, thanks team.

Shelley Robertson | Te Tai Ōhanga The Treasury

Manager, Welfare & Oranga Tamariki

Public Sector Performance, System & Sector Performance

tau waea phone: s 9(2)(a) | waea pūkoro mobile: s 9(2)(a) | Īmēra email:

s 9(2)(a)

treasury.govt.nz | [LinkedIn](#) | [Youtube](#)



TE TAI ŌHANGA
THE TREASURY

From: Alex Harrington [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>

Sent: Wednesday, 8 October 2025 1:33 pm

To: Jeremy Steele <s 9(2)(a)> ^MSD: Julia Bergman

<s 9(2)(a)> Shelley Robertson [TSY]

<s 9(2)(a)>

Cc: Samantha Fitch (Guest) <s 9(2)(a)> Jason Raven

<s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)> ^HUD: Nick

McNabb <s 9(2)(a)> Wayne Anderson <s 9(2)(a)>

^MSD: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)> Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY]

<s 9(2)(a)> Daniel White [TSY]

<s 9(2)(a)> Amanda Wilson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>

Conor McBride [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Jeanne Barnard [TSY]

<s 9(2)(a)> Lara Hu [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>

Subject: RE: Welfare reform/social housing material for sign-out

Thanks very much Jeremy!

Ngā mihi nui

Alex

Alex Harrington (he/him) | Principal Advisor, **Welfare and Oranga Tamariki Team**
| **Te Tai Ōhanga The Treasury**

tau waea phone: s 9(2)(a) | Īmēra email: s 9(2)(a)

From: Jeremy Steele <s 9(2)(a)>

Sent: Wednesday, 8 October 2025 1:30 pm

To: Alex Harrington [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> ^MSD: Julia Bergman

<s 9(2)(a)> Shelley Robertson [TSY]

<s 9(2)(a)>

Cc: Samantha Fitch (Guest) <s 9(2)(a)> Jason Raven

<s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)> ^HUD: Nick

McNabb <s 9(2)(a)> Wayne Anderson <s 9(2)(a)>

^MSD: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)> Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY]

<s 9(2)(a)> Daniel White [TSY]

<s 9(2)(a)> Amanda Wilson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>

Conor McBride [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Jeanne Barnard [TSY]

<s 9(2)(a)> Lara Hu [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>

Subject: RE: Welfare reform/social housing material for sign-out

Thanks Alex. This all looks good to me.

From: [Alex Harrington \[TSY\]](#)
To: [Nick McNabb](#); [Geraldine Wilkins](#); [Jason Raven](#); [Jemima de Lacey](#)
Subject: RE: Welfare reform/social housing material for sign-out
Date: Monday, 13 October 2025 9:03:40 am
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image008.png](#)
[image010.png](#)
[image014.png](#)
[image015.png](#)
[image016.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)

Kia ora koutou

Treasury attendance this morning will be Stacey Wymer and me.

Ngā mihi
Alex

Alex Harrington (he/him) | Principal Advisor, **Welfare and Oranga Tamariki Team**
| Te Tai Ōhanga **The Treasury**

tau waea phone: s 9(2)(a) | imera email: s 9(2)(a)

From: Nick McNabb <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Friday, 10 October 2025 10:45 am
To: ^MSD: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)> Alex Harrington [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Jason Raven <s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Welfare reform/social housing material for sign-out

It will Brad, Jeremy and me from HUD.

[IN-CONFIDENCE]

From: Nick McNabb
Sent: Friday, 10 October 2025 10:40 am
To: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)> Alex Harrington [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Jason Raven <s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Welfare reform/social housing material for sign-out

Hi

Colin indicated that for HUD will be him, Jeremy and me. Though Colin will check whether Brad intends to go. If so Colin will drop out.

Nick

From: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Friday, 10 October 2025 10:11 am
To: Alex Harrington [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Jason Raven

<s 9(2)(a) [redacted] Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a) [redacted] Nick McNabb <s 9(2)(a) [redacted]
Subject: RE: Welfare reform/social housing material for sign-out

IN-CONFIDENCE

Thanks Alex. Debbie is away today, so will likely decide on attendance on Monday morning but I suspect it will be her, Simon and Jason from MSD.

From: Alex Harrington [TSY] <s 9(2)(a) [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 10 October 2025 9:57 am
To: Jason Raven <s 9(2)(a) [redacted] Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a) [redacted] ^HUD: Nick McNabb <s 9(2)(a) [redacted] Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a) [redacted]
Subject: RE: Welfare reform/social housing material for sign-out

Kia ora koutou

I thought I would touch base with you about attendance at Monday's meeting. MOF's office has been in touch this morning to say they have been discussing with other offices and they are thinking 2-3 officials per agency to keep numbers manageable. Do you know yet who will be attending from your agencies? We have a pre-meeting this afternoon at which we'll finalise our attendance. Iain Rennie is unavailable; I think it will be a sub-set of Mark Sowden, Stacey Wymer, Shelley Robertson, Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly and me.

Ngā mihi
Alex

Alex Harrington (he/him) | Principal Advisor, **Welfare and Oranga Tamariki Team**
| Te Tai Ōhanga The Treasury
tau waea phone: s 9(2)(a) [redacted] | imēra email: s 9(2)(a) [redacted]

From: Lara Hu [TSY] <s 9(2)(a) [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 8 October 2025 3:03 pm
To: Shelley Robertson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a) [redacted] Alex Harrington [TSY] <s 9(2)(a) [redacted] Jeremy Steele <s 9(2)(a) [redacted] ^MSD: Julia Bergman <s 9(2)(a) [redacted]
Cc: Samantha Fitch (Guest) <s 9(2)(a) [redacted] Jason Raven <s 9(2)(a) [redacted] Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a) [redacted] ^HUD: Nick McNabb <s 9(2)(a) [redacted] Wayne Anderson <s 9(2)(a) [redacted] ^MSD: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a) [redacted] Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY] <s 9(2)(a) [redacted] Daniel White [TSY] <s 9(2)(a) [redacted] Amanda Wilson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a) [redacted] Conor McBride [TSY] <s 9(2)(a) [redacted] Jeanne Barnard [TSY] <s 9(2)(a) [redacted]
Subject: RE: Welfare reform/social housing material for sign-out

Hello everyone,

Please find the completed JR (all signatures) attached, the slide pack and a PDF version of both combined.

Best wishes,

Lara Hu | Te Tai Ōhanga The Treasury

Team Assistant, Welfare & Oranga Tamariki + Public Finance Policy +
Performance Reporting

Public Sector Performance, System & Sector Performance

tau waea phone: s 9(2)(a) | Īmēra email: s 9(2)(a)

treasury.govt.nz | [LinkedIn](#) | [Youtube](#)



**TE TAI ŌHANGA
THE TREASURY**

From: Shelley Robertson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>

Sent: Wednesday, 8 October 2025 2:21 pm

To: Alex Harrington [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Jeremy Steele

<s 9(2)(a)> ^MSD: Julia Bergman <s 9(2)(a)>

Cc: Samantha Fitch (Guest) <s 9(2)(a)> Jason Raven

<s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)> ^HUD: Nick

McNabb <s 9(2)(a)> Wayne Anderson <s 9(2)(a)>

^MSD: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)> Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY]

<s 9(2)(a)> Daniel White [TSY]

<s 9(2)(a)> Amanda Wilson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>

Conor McBride [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Jeanne Barnard [TSY]

<s 9(2)(a)> Lara Hu [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>

Subject: RE: Welfare reform/social housing material for sign-out

Kia ora,

Approved for my sign out too, thanks team.

Shelley Robertson | Te Tai Ōhanga The Treasury

Manager, Welfare & Oranga Tamariki

Public Sector Performance, System & Sector Performance

tau waea phone: s 9(2)(a) | waea pūkoro mobile: +s 9(2)(a) | Īmēra email:

s 9(2)(a)

treasury.govt.nz | [LinkedIn](#) | [Youtube](#)



**TE TAI ŌHANGA
THE TREASURY**

From: Alex Harrington [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>

Sent: Wednesday, 8 October 2025 1:33 pm

To: Jeremy Steele <s 9(2)(a)> ^MSD: Julia Bergman

<s 9(2)(a)> Shelley Robertson [TSY]

<s 9(2)(a)>

Cc: Samantha Fitch (Guest) <s 9(2)(a)> Jason Raven

<s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)> ^HUD: Nick

McNabb <s 9(2)(a)> Wayne Anderson <s 9(2)(a)>
^MSD: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)> Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Daniel White [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Amanda Wilson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Conor McBride [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Jeanne Barnard [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Lara Hu [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Welfare reform/social housing material for sign-out

Thanks very much Jeremy!

Ngā mihi nui
Alex

Alex Harrington (he/him) | Principal Advisor, **Welfare and Oranga Tamariki Team**
| Te Tai Ōhanga **The Treasury**
tau waea phone: s 9(2)(a) | imēra email: s 9(2)(a)

From: Jeremy Steele <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Wednesday, 8 October 2025 1:30 pm
To: Alex Harrington [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> ^MSD: Julia Bergman
<s 9(2)(a)> Shelley Robertson [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Samantha Fitch (Guest) <s 9(2)(a)> Jason Raven
<s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)> ^HUD: Nick
McNabb <s 9(2)(a)> Wayne Anderson <s 9(2)(a)>
^MSD: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)> Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Daniel White [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Amanda Wilson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Conor McBride [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Jeanne Barnard [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Lara Hu [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Welfare reform/social housing material for sign-out

Thanks Alex. This all looks good to me.

I'll send my e-sign directly to Lara to add.

Ngā mihi nui

Jeremy Steele (he/him)
General Manager | Housing Supports and Supply
Policy Group
s 9(2)(a) | Phone: s 9(2)(a) | Mobile: s 9(2)(a)
www.hud.govt.nz | Level 8, 7 WQ, 7 Waterloo Quay, Wellington

[SENSITIVE]

From: Alex Harrington [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Wednesday, October 8, 2025 10:57 AM
To: Julia Bergman <s 9(2)(a)> Jeremy Steele

<s 9(2)(a) Shelley Robertson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)
Cc: Samantha Fitch (Guest) <s 9(2)(a) Jason Raven
<s 9(2)(a) Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a) Nick
McNabb <s 9(2)(a) Wayne Anderson <s 9(2)(a)
Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a) Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY] (Guest)
<s 9(2)(a) Daniel White [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)
Amanda Wilson [TSY] (Guest) <s 9(2)(a) Conor McBride [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a) Jeanne Barnard [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)
Lara Hu [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)

Subject: Welfare reform/social housing material for sign-out

Importance: High

[SEEMAIL][SENSITIVE]

Kia ora koutou

Please find attached, for your sign-out, the final version of the joint report and slide pack for Monday's Ministers meeting on welfare reform and social housing.

I have cc'ed Lara Hu, our team assistant, who can incorporate e-signatures – grateful if you could arrange for your e-signatures to be sent to Lara once you have given your OK.

Thanks everyone for your efforts on this one.

Ngā mihi
Alex

Alex Harrington (he/him) | Principal Advisor, **Welfare and Oranga Tamariki Team**
| Te Tai Ōhanga **The Treasury**

tau waea phone: <s 9(2)(a) | imēra email: <s 9(2)(a)

From: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)
Sent: Tuesday, 7 October 2025 10:41 am
To: Alex Harrington [TSY] <s 9(2)(a) Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a) Daniel White [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a) Amanda Wilson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)
Shelley Robertson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a) Conor McBride [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a) Jeanne Barnard [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)
Cc: Samantha Fitch <s 9(2)(a) Jason Raven
<s 9(2)(a) Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a) ^HUD: Nick
McNabb <s 9(2)(a) Wayne Anderson <s 9(2)(a)
Jeremy Steele <s 9(2)(a) ^MSD: Julia Bergman
<s 9(2)(a)
Subject: RE: Draft material for Ministers' meeting for your input/review

IN-CONFIDENCE

Hey Alex

From: [Lorenzo Malavisi \[TSY\]](#)
To: [Jemima de Lacey](#); [Geraldine Wilkins](#)
Cc: [Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly \[TSY\] \(Guest\)](#); [Alex Harrington \[TSY\]](#); [Amanda Wilson \[TSY\] \(Guest\)](#)
Subject: BUDGET SENSITIVE: Ministers welfare reform/social housing meeting (13 Oct) - TSY read out
Date: Tuesday, 14 October 2025 11:22:46 am
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[TSY read-out from Ministerial meeting on welfare reform and review of social housing.docx](#)

[SEEMAIL][SENSITIVE]

Kia ora Jemima and Geraldine,

Thanks again for the discussion yesterday, it was great to meet you both and the broader team to hear a bit more about the work!

Please find attached a short **read out** from yesterday morning's Ministers' meeting on welfare reform and RoSH (prepared for Treasury colleagues by Alex, who attended in person).

We are sharing with yourselves primarily as policy leads – let us know if you both remain the best contacts – but this read out can be shared with others from yesterday's call as appropriate noting the *Budget Sensitive* classification.

We note the read out is not comprehensive – there were plenty of other points discussed that it doesn't capture – but capture the key points of the discussion from Treasury's perspective, including that Minister Willis was clear that she is looking for some fiscal savings to come back to the centre through Budget 2026, with agreement that officials will prepare options that achieve this.

We're happy to discuss in further detail – and would welcome readouts from respective HUD and MSD attendees if you're able to share, including any additional decisions that were taken as they relate to the next phase of work.

Next steps: It was great to chat through the options package yesterday - we think things are shaping up well (noting there is still much to be worked through before Ministers are in a place to make decisions).

It was mentioned we could expect to see a draft in November. On reflection, we're wondering if it would be possible to get earlier oversight? We think this work is really important and are keen to be engaged as it's developed. Happy to see stuff in quite draft form, and set up ad hoc conversations as useful.

Happy to discuss.

Ngā mihi,

Lorenzo Malavisi (he/him) | Te Tai Ōhanga – The Treasury
Kaitātari - Analyst, National Infrastructure Unit, Public Sector Performance
Phone: s 9(2)(a) | Email: s 9(2)(a)
<https://treasury.govt.nz/> | [LinkedIn](#)



TE TAI ŌHANGA
THE TREASURY

READ-OUT FROM MEETING ON WELFARE REFORM AND REVIEW OF SOCIAL HOUSING AT 10:30AM ON 13 OCTOBER 2025

Meeting between the Minister of Finance (Hon Nicola Willis), the Minister of Housing (Hon Chris Bishop), the Minister for Social Development and Employment/Minister for Child Poverty Reduction (Hon Louise Upston), and the Associate Minister of Housing (Hon Tama Potaka), with officials from the Treasury, the Ministry of Housing and Urban Development and the Ministry of Social Development.

Briefing material for the meeting is available here:

- A joint report with an annotated agenda: [Meeting on welfare reform and Review of Social Housing.docx](#)
- A slide deck prepared by MSD and HUD that gives an overview of the Review of Social Housing and where Housing Ministers are getting to: [RoSH slidepack for Ministers Willis, Bishop, Upston and Potaka mtg.pptx](#)

Fiscal savings target

- Minister Willis noted the fiscal savings target set for welfare broadly through Budget 2026 (welfare, Working for Families and social housing) s 9(2)(f)(iv) [REDACTED].
- Minister Willis said that, while she understood that Housing Ministers were looking to recycle savings back into the social housing system, she was looking to get some cost out of the system, and to reduce spend over time, given recent spending trends in welfare and social housing.

Review of social housing

- Minister Bishop took Ministers through the slide pack, and Ministers discussed where the review is getting to and the proposals that Housing Ministers are considering.
- There was general agreement to the approach of focusing social housing on barriers to access, improving the flow out of social housing, and reducing the gap between AS and IRR (i.e. by increasing IRR to 30% or 35%), with more work to be done around the detail of proposals.
- A couple of points of interest:
 - Minister Bishop said that officials are keen on a shift to a single demand-side subsidy, but there would be issues with getting there, hence the option to bring the subsidies closer together by increasing IRR. Minister Willis said the single subsidy could still be a longer-term aim used to frame shorter-term changes.
 - Minister Willis asked about potentially capitalising AS payments. Officials noted that work had been done on this in the past, and could be touched on in the next set of advice on November. Ministers discussed the new Flexible Fund and how this could work alongside these proposals.

Next steps

- Ministers want options developed for Budget 2026 that would involve some savings being returned to the centre. Ministers did not agree to either (a) all savings being recycled back into the social housing system, or (b) all savings returning to the centre.
- Ministers briefly discussed distributional analysis. While they noted that distributional analysis would help in assessing options, Minister Willis was hesitant about commissioning more until we have a clearer sense of what Ministers want to do.

From: [Jemima de Lacey](#)
To: [Lorenzo Malavisi \[TSY\]](#)
Cc: [Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly \[TSY\] \(Guest\)](#); [Alex Harrington \[TSY\]](#); [Amanda Wilson \[TSY\] \(Guest\)](#); [Geraldine Wilkins](#)
Subject: Re: BUDGET SENSITIVE: Ministers welfare reform/social housing meeting (13 Oct) - TSY read out
Date: Friday, 17 October 2025 5:16:50 pm
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[Actions following meeting between MoF Bishop Upston and Potaka.msg](#)

Kia ora Lorenzo,

Nice to meet you too. Thanks for sending through the read out. I have attached a summary that was shared with both Bishop and Upston's offices (again noting the Budget sensitivity).

We have a series of 3 weekly-meetings with Treasury that we've been running for most of the year on RoSH. I've set out below how we plan to use the upcoming meetings with you ahead of the November advice (noting we are planning to give you earlier oversight than just reviewing a draft of the November paper):

Date	Purpose of meeting
6 November	To share our thinking on the developing advice - a storyline and recs
17 November	Discuss feedback on draft report (you will have from 11 - 14 November for feedback)
8 December	Download on meeting with housing Ministers on the 27 Nov advice and next steps

You'll also note in the attached summary, we are seeking to confirm that RoSH is on the agenda for the 11 Nov Cab Strat Committee meeting and are preparing an updated version of the MoF slide deck for that. The Governance Group will be receiving a draft for review next week along with the storyline and recs for the November advice.

Sing out if you have any further questions. Kia pai tō rā whakatā!

Ngā mihi nui

Jemima de Lacey ([she/her](#))
Principal Advisor | Social Housing and Other Supports
s 9(2)(a) | Phone: s 9(2)(a)

From: Lorenzo Malavisi [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Tuesday, October 14, 2025 11:22 AM
To: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)> Geraldine Wilkins
<s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY] (Guest) <s 9(2)(a)> Alex Harrington [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Amanda Wilson [TSY] (Guest) <s 9(2)(a)>

From: [Jeremy Steele](#)
To: [Bronwyn Lauten](#)
Cc: [Nicole Rennie](#); [Colin Lynch](#); [Jemima de Lacey](#); [Julia Pearce](#); [Nick McNabb](#)
Subject: Actions following meeting between MoF, Bishop, Upston and Potaka
Date: Tuesday, 14 October 2025 3:58:43 pm
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)
[image006.png](#)

Kia ora Bronwyn,

Please see our notes from meeting and a couple of points it'd be good to confirm. MSD have indicated they will put a similar summary up to their Office and seek confirmation on approach.

Notes from meeting with MoF, Upston, Bishop and Potaka

- s 9(2)(f)(iv)
[Redacted]
[Redacted]
- Minister Bishop worked through the slide pack and MoF asked a series of questions.
- There was big discussion around affordability (prompted by the 29% number from HUD analysis) with MoF asking about what level of affordability that was based on. MoF and Min Bishop interested in digging into this, understand their characteristics and underlying assumptions.
- Debbie made point that resonated with MoF around the fact that many more sole parents with kids in private market v SH. Equity and fairness point.
- MoF was supportive of the proposed change to focus SH on housing access needs.
- Incentives to move out of social housing ... smoothing out process. MoF interested in this and will need to see how this is covered in upcoming advice. Noted 40% of people move anyway, so need to consider perverse incentives.
- MoF interested in knowing more about TAS and how that works. s 9(2)(f)(iv)
[Redacted]
[Redacted]
- Minister Upston made the point around aligning expectations between welfare and social housing system.
- MoF interested in how market can provide ... AS capitalization... not in context of home ownership but in context of securing long term leases etc. Spoke about underwriting long-term tenancies and paying some type of top up.
- This led to discussion about the housing investment system and flexible fund. MoF was keen that this broader narrative make it in to Budget templates .. future advice. Keen to stitch the two narratives together... for broader position.
- MoF also indicated that saw value in setting out long term vision (10 years ??) to provide context for short-term changes. Some discussion that this could include moving toward a single subsidy.

- Min Bishop mentioned that plan to take this to Cabinet (need to confirm if Cab STR Committee or just a Cabinet paper)
- Minister Bishop indicated that he was keen to get tighter on numbers and model impacts etc. Some backwards and forwards with MoF about whether there is value in doing detailed modelling now to inform policy choices or making policy choices first. [View that it's too soon to be doing cross portfolio distributional analysis].
- MoF confirmed at end that expectation is that some of any savings generated would come back to the centre but open to options to reinvest in housing.
- MoF noted good work and bold set of options.

Actions

HUD and MSD

- Continue developing options for reinvesting any savings generated in to housing system but assume that some proportion of any savings will need to go back to centre.
- Ensure that future advice and Budget material stitches together narrative around RoSH and Housing Investment System work. Narrative around best use of funding and impact etc.
- Confirm what modelling needed to inform policy decisions in short-term and commission (what can wait until decision taken to progress?)

Ministers Offices

- Confirm that following MoF meeting Ministers continue to want to take item to STR (assuming that they do unless told otherwise)
- Confirm that Ministers comfortable using an updated version of slide pack used at MoF meeting for the STR item.

Ngā mihi nui

Jeremy

Jeremy Steele ([he/him](#))

General Manager | Housing Supports and Supply
Policy Group

s 9(2)(a)

www.hud.govt.nz | Level 8 , 7 WQ, 7 Waterloo Quay, Wellington

[IN-CONFIDENCE]

From: [Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly \[TSY\]](#)
To: [Ally Quatermass](#); [Simon MacPherson](#); [Colin Lynch](#); [Karen Hocking](#); [Julia Pearce](#); [Jason Raven](#); [Shannon Soughtton](#); [Heather Kirkham \[DPMC\] \(Guest\)](#); [Julia Bergman](#); [Jeremy Steele](#); [Viv Rickard](#); [Tina Dellow](#); [Dinanie Abeyesundere](#); [Kuini Vidal](#); [David Shamy](#); [Liam Hanley](#)
Cc: [Geraldine Wilkins](#); [Jemima de Lacey](#); [Alex Harrington \[TSY\]](#); [Lorenzo Malavisi \[TSY\]](#)
Subject: RE: RoSH Governance Group: Papers
Date: Wednesday, 22 October 2025 12:23:11 pm
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

[SEEMAIL][SENSITIVE]

Kia ora koutou,

Thanks heaps for sending this through. I thought I would jot down a few of Tsy's thoughts in advance of the meeting, which I'm happy to speak to then if useful. Appreciate this is all live, and much of our thinking may be covered off in drafts to come.

Slide Deck

- We think the slide deck will support a good discussion and is pitched at the right level
- We wondered if it would be useful to clarify that the three proposed changes are "near term(ish)" or "initial" – ie there may be more to come
- We also wondered if it would be useful to use these three changes as a framework for presenting the rest of the advice, perhaps having them as headings for the discussion of each proposed change
- At the end of each section we think there is a need to be really specific about what we're recommending to achieve the changes (noting there's a myriad of options): ie recalibrating the SAS to support focus on access barriers; investigating upfront duration limits and introducing more active case management and supports; and increasing the IRRS contribution rate
- We also recommend a section summarising what we expect the total cohort and fiscal impacts of these changes to be – for instance, including the savings to Crown of IRRS changes, but noting that a change in the way we allocate SH may mean an uptick in people eligible for/receiving AS

Storyline

- We think this usefully covers all the areas Mins will have an interest in, and need to know about. We wondered if there was merit in making a few changes to framing to be clear about how this all fits together, and what we recommend
 - Recommendations: this section could open with a noting rec around the three initial changes Mins agreed, and which this advice gives effect to, with subsequent recs on *how* we will give effect to these changes and when
 - Upfront Section: We think there could be merit in reiterating that this brief both gives effect to/proposes an approach to implementation the changes Mins agreed *and* provides an overview of next steps and further advice
 - Section 1: Is it true generally that we think SAS overweight affordability barriers? Or is that in the context of the proposed shift in focus? Think

useful to be clear

- Section 3: We weren't totally clear here on what we were recommending in terms of initial tenure duration assessments, ongoing case management, supports, and exemptions – is the idea that further work will explore this? And if so, what time periods are we looking at for that work and for implementing any changes?
- Possible additional section: Following from the latest Mins discussion, we wondered if it would be useful to also include a section on specific changes that we could explore as part of future advice/sequencing – s 9(2)(f)(iv) [redacted], move towards a single subsidy

Thanks,

Caitlin

From: Ally Quatermass <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Monday, 20 October 2025 4:42 pm
To: Simon Macpherson <s 9(2)(a)> ^MHUD Colin Lynch
<s 9(2)(a)> Karen Hocking <s 9(2)(a)> Julia Pearce
<s 9(2)(a)> Jason Raven <s 9(2)(a)> Shannon Soughtton
<s 9(2)(a)> Heather Kirkham [DPMC]
<s 9(2)(a)> ^MSD: Julia Bergman <s 9(2)(a)>
Jeremy Steele <s 9(2)(a)> ^MSD: Viv Rickard <s 9(2)(a)>
Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Tina Dellow
<s 9(2)(a)> Dinarie Abeyesundere
<s 9(2)(a)> Kuini Vidal <s 9(2)(a)> ^HUD: David
Shamy <s 9(2)(a)> Liam Hanley <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: ^MSD: Geraldine Wilkins <s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey
<s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RoSH Governance Group: Papers

You don't often get email from s 9(2)(a) [Learn why this is important](#)

IN-CONFIDENCE

Kia ora koutou,

Please find attached the relevant papers for the upcoming Role of Social Housing Governance Group meeting this Wednesday.

Ngā mihi,

Alexandra Quatermass ([she/her](#))

Kaimātai Kaupapa Here - Policy Analyst | Housing Policy

The Aurora Centre | 56 The Terrace, Wellington Central, Wellington 6011

MSD Purpose:

We help New Zealanders to be safe, strong and independent
Manaaki tangata, manaaki whānau



This email and any attachments may contain information that is confidential and subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this email and attachments is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify the author immediately and erase all copies of the email and attachments. The Ministry of Social Development accepts no responsibility for changes made to this message or attachments after transmission from the Ministry.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

The information in this email is confidential to the Treasury, intended only for the addressee(s), and may also be legally privileged. If you are not an intended addressee:

- a. please immediately delete this email and notify the Treasury by return email or telephone (64 4 472 2733);
- b. any use, dissemination or copying of this email is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

From: [Lorenzo Malavisi \[TSY\]](#)
To: [Liam Hanley](#); [Kuini Vidal](#); [Tina Dellow](#); [Dinanie Abeyesundere](#); [David Shamy](#); [Jemima de Lacey](#); [Geraldine Wilkins](#); [Nick McNabb](#)
Cc: [Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly \[TSY\] \(Guest\)](#); [Alex Harrington \[TSY\]](#); [Nina Shepherd \[TSY\] \(Guest\)](#)
Subject: RE: RoSH November Inflow/outflow advice: TSY feedback
Date: Friday, 14 November 2025 2:01:25 pm
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[DRAFT 10-11 SH inflow and outflow advice \(TSY feedback\).docx](#)

Kia ora koutou,

Thanks for the opportunity to provide feedback – as discussed, this advice is shaping up really well and we are largely comfortable with where things are heading.

Attached is a version with some comments/feedback in the doc, and we've pulled out **key points of feedback** below:

1. **Working definition** – as discussed on Wednesday and noting this may have shifted since then, we want to test this working definition which we are concerned may bias towards assessing eligibility for those currently outside the SH system – by focusing on “current housing suitability”. We think it is important to have one definition across the system for determining need, regardless if someone is in SH, other supports, or yet to engage in the system. An option could be to flip it to something like “without support would be unable to obtain or maintain...” Then the “current” point would maybe not need to be in the definition, but instead considered through priority triaging. Appreciate this is working definition but some further refining would likely support Ministers to get a better sense of how the new system would operate.
2. **Clarity around duration limits and supports as package** – s 9(2)(f)(iv)

3. **AS settings versus other supports** – In general, how much would you naturally incentivise and support movement out of SH if the level of benefit was higher/more adequate? Is there an argument here that lifting AS maxima would support households in better ways than some of the proposals discussed in the briefing (i.e. bridging subsidy for transitioning from SH to private market) which would be less complex to administer. Would be good to test if this option is more expensive, or if in the interest of streamlining and simplifying the system there could be some gains.
4. s 9(2)(f)(iv)


s 9(2)(f)(iv)

5. **TAS, AS and broader system changes interaction** – Noting the proposals being explored for TAS, it seems there is an even stronger argument for reviewing AS settings, with the review and reset explicitly moving to financial tools (AS) as the primary intervention (reducing reliance of physical SH support) – 1.) we know AS hasn't been adjusted for inflation since 2017, and evidence shows it is not adequately meeting its purpose (pushing more people not TAS etc.) 2.) With proposed changes to IRRS and system changes to SH eligibility it's important for adequacy of AS to be looked at, as flow on impacts of those in SH who may have to move across housing continuum and into private market and supported by AS. 3.) with proposed changes to TAS, we know a number of vulnerable households will be significantly impacted and worse off without other supports.

We also note our discussion on TSY representation of the Governance Group – including the desire from HUD and MSD to have TSY representation from both the TSY housing and welfare side – we are still following up with Amanda and Shelley to determine who should be attending moving forward. Nick/HUD team if you have any update from the chat on Thursday with Stacey let us know (Amanda is on leave today so we expect we'll hear any updates next week).

Happy to chat!

Ngā mihi,

Lorenzo Malavisi (he/him)

Kaitātari - Analyst, National Infrastructure Unit, Public Sector Performance

Phone: s 9(2)(a) | Email: s 9(2)(a)

From: Liam Hanley <s 9(2)(a)>

Sent: Tuesday, 11 November 2025 5:43 pm

Cc: Subject: RoSH November Inflow/outflow advice: FEEDBACK DUE COP FRIDAY 14TH - DO NOT SHARE

Some people who received this message don't often get email from s 9(2)(a) [Learn why this is important](#)

Tēnā koutou,

Please find attached the initial draft of the November Social Housing Inflow and Outflow advice, **please do not share with anyone - there is a distribution list for this advice as per previous RoSH advice.**

This advice brings together the workstreams on prioritisation and eligibility, case management and other supports, with work HUD has done on access needs/barriers. Also included is high-level advice on the role of affordable rentals

moving forward. We have included the Annex's with this version of the paper to show the work that has gone on behind the scenes but are unlikely to include all of the annexes in the final version to Ministers and will consolidate some of the detail.

Can we please have your collated feedback by COP Friday 14th.

Could we please request that feedback is collated from your RoSH workstream/team or area , to help us manage volumes. Please send your feedback to everyone in the CC line.

Dinarie, Kuini, Tina and I would be happy to meet to discuss your initial thoughts before receiving your formal feedback,

Please reach out to us if you would like to do so.

Aku mihi nui ki a koe to the RoSH data team and other contributors for your work so far.

Upcoming Timeline:

- Friday 14th Send draft Nov advice to CEs,
- Week of 17th incorporate feedback and finalise advice,
- Monday 24 GMs + Julia P. review final version,
- Week of 1 December meet with advisers and Ministers.

Ngā mihi,

Dinarie, Kuini, Tina and Liam.

Liam Hanley ([he/him](#))

Senior Policy Advisor

Social Housing and Other Supports | Policy

s 9(2)(a) | Phone: s 9(2)(a) |

[in](#) [t](#) [f](#) www.hud.govt.nz | Level 8, 7 Waterloo Quay, Pipitea, Wellington



[IN-CONFIDENCE]

Disclaimer

This email is confidential and solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you have received this email in error, then any use is strictly prohibited. Please notify us immediately and delete all copies of this email and any attachments. Any opinions expressed in this message are not necessarily those of the Ministry of Housing and Urban Development.

From: [Nick McNabb](#)
To: [Lorenzo Malavisi \[TSY\]](#); [Liam Hanley](#); [Kuini Vidal](#); [Tina Dellow](#); [Dinarie Abeyesundere](#); [David Shamy](#); [Jemima de Lacey](#); [Geraldine Wilkins](#)
Cc: [Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly \[TSY\] \(Guest\)](#); [Alex Harrington \[TSY\]](#); [Nina Shepherd \[TSY\] \(Guest\)](#)
Subject: RE: RoSH November Inflow/outflow advice: TSY feedback
Date: Friday, 14 November 2025 3:02:07 pm
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)

Hi Lorenzo

On your final point, the key action from discussion with Stacey and Amanda was for me to follow up with Alex. Which I have now, belatedly done

Nick

[IN-CONFIDENCE]

Note: Remainder of this email chain has been removed as it repeats previous emails

From: [Geraldine Wilkins](#)
To: [Lorenzo Malavisi \[TSY\]](#); [Jemima de Lacey](#); [Tim Garlick](#)
Cc: [Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly \[TSY\] \(Guest\)](#)
Subject: RE: Upcoming AS advice
Date: Tuesday, 18 November 2025 10:05:10 am
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

IN-CONFIDENCE

Hey Lorenzo

Yes [@Tim Garlick](#) is holding the pen on that targeted AS advice and I understand he intends to share this with you for comment in the next couple of days. It is on the same timeline as the Nov advice (due to Ministers on 27 Nov).

The meeting on 25 Nov has been cancelled, and Ministers' offices are still trying to find another time that works post 27 Nov – we're hoping for first week of Dec. The primary agenda item will be the Nov RoSH advice.

Ta,
Gerry

From: Lorenzo Malavisi [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Tuesday, 18 November 2025 9:47 am
To: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)> Geraldine Wilkins
<s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Caitlin Daugherty-Kelly [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: Upcoming AS advice

[UNCLASSIFIED]

Kia ora Jemima and Gerry – hope you are both doing well.

The TAS advice that was sent to Min Upston at the start of the month has been shared with us – as discussed at our last catch up we understand that advice on AS changes is now being developed. Do you have any updates on this AS advice, or able to share with us once it's finalised?

The TAS briefing also recommends Min Upston “*discuss this paper with Housing Ministers at your meeting on 25 November 2025*”. Can we confirm this meeting is still going ahead and if there is currently an agenda that can be shared?

Happy to chat.

Ngā mihi,

Lorenzo Malavisi (he/him) | Te Tai Ōhanga – The Treasury
Kaitātari - Analyst, Infrastructure, Security and Government, Public Sector Performance
Phone: s 9(2)(a) | Email: s 9(2)(a)
<https://treasury.govt.nz/> | [LinkedIn](#)



CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

The information in this email is confidential to the Treasury, intended only for the addressee(s), and may also be legally privileged. If you are not an intended addressee:

- a. please immediately delete this email and notify the Treasury by return email or telephone (64 4 472 2733);
- b. any use, dissemination or copying of this email is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

This email and any attachments may contain information that is confidential and subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this email and attachments is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify the author immediately and erase all copies of the email and attachments. The Ministry of Social Development accepts no responsibility for changes made to this message or attachments after transmission from the Ministry.

From: [Lorenzo Malavisi \[TSY\]](#)
To: [Jono Arrell \(Guest\)](#); [Jemima de Lacey](#)
Cc: [Shereen Capper \[TSY\]](#)
Subject: ROSH - April Cabinet paper timing
Date: Friday, 6 March 2026 3:41:42 pm
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

[IN-CONFIDENCE]

Thanks for the quick chat just now Jono.

Once again, thanks for sharing the readout from 2 March Minister meeting, great to see ROSH progressing well.

Note: The readout was verbal.

Confirming Treasury preferred timing for the ROSH Cabinet paper is for it to be considered prior to the Budget 2026 package Cabinet paper (expected to be considered by Cabinet (CAB) on Tuesday 28 April 2026).

Noting the paper will be purely policy decisions on final IRR changes (with fiscals taken through the Budget paper) there is potentially a bit of wriggle room if this won't be possible (noting Min Upston travel in April).

Happy to chat!

Ngā mihi,

Lorenzo Malavisi (he/him) | Te Tai Ōhanga – The Treasury
Kaitātari - Analyst, Infrastructure, Security and Government, Public Sector Performance
Phone: s 9(2)(a) | Email: s 9(2)(a)
<https://treasury.govt.nz/> | [LinkedIn](#)



CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

The information in this email is confidential to the Treasury, intended only for the addressee(s), and may also be legally privileged. If you are not an intended addressee:

- a. please immediately delete this email and notify the Treasury by return email or telephone (64 4 472 2733);
- b. any use, dissemination or copying of this email is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

From: [Lorenzo Malavisi \[TSY\]](#)
To: [Jemima de Lacey](#); [Jono Arrell \(Guest\)](#)
Cc: [Shereen Capper \[TSY\]](#)
Subject: RE: RoSH Cabinet paper for your review by COP Monday - Tsy feedback
Date: Monday, 16 March 2026 9:53:23 pm
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[Draft ROSH April Cabinet paper 13.3.26 - Tsy comments.docx](#)

Hi Jemima and Jono,

Well done on pulling together this draft – the narrative is looking good and overall seems to be shaping up well. Thanks again for the chance to provide early feedback- noting we will get another chance to formally review in the coming weeks.

I've attached a version which has just a few comments, and some tracked changed suggestions for the recs. We unfortunately haven't had time for a more thorough review given the short timeframes and other competing priorities.

For the **Financial Implications** section, suggest this should cover in high level detail something like:

- The total cost and savings of each change (plus overall total impact combined) of Shift Three changes as confirmed through Budget (i.e. The cost of AS maxima increases is \$X.)
- A line to confirm the fiscal impacts are being taken through the Budget 2026 package, and subject to final confirmation.
- Outline of Shift 1 and Shift 2 expected fiscal impacts/estimates ... noting that decisions on funding are not being sought at this stage, however flagging likely to come through Budget 2027/2028/future Cabinet paper.
- Perhaps a line to confirm costs to deliver ongoing work of the Review of Social Housing in 2026/27 will be met within HUD and MSD baselines.

Happy to discuss any of the above!

Ngā mihi,

Lorenzo Malavisi (he/him)

Kaitātari - Analyst, Infrastructure, Security and Government, Public Sector Performance

Phone: s 9(2)(a) | Email: s 9(2)(a)

From: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Friday, 13 March 2026 4:07 pm
To: Adrienne Meikle <s 9(2)(a)> Rochelle Neho (Guest)
<s 9(2)(a)> Simon Macpherson
<s 9(2)(a)> Iain Cossar <s 9(2)(a)> ^MSD:
Viv Rickard <s 9(2)(a)> Jeremy Steele <s 9(2)(a)>
^MSD: Hayley Hamilton <s 9(2)(a)> Karen Hocking
<s 9(2)(a)> s 9(2)(a) Heather
Kirkham [DPMC] <s 9(2)(a)> Amanda Wilson [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Jason Raven <s 9(2)(a)> ^HUD:
Nick McNabb <s 9(2)(a)> Julia Pearce <s 9(2)(a)>

^HUD: David Shamy <s 9(2)(a)> ^EXT: Tim Garlick
 <s 9(2)(a)> ^MSD: Jayne McKendry
 <s 9(2)(a)> Alex Gunn <s 9(2)(a)> Wayne
 Anderson <s 9(2)(a)> Ed AblettHampson
 <s 9(2)(a)> Tina Dellow (Guest)
 <s 9(2)(a)> Kuini Vidal <s 9(2)(a)> Lorenzo Malavisi
 [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Shereen Capper [TSY]
 <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Jono Arrell (Guest) <s 9(2)(a)> Amanda Lewis
 <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RoSH Cabinet paper for your review by COP Monday

Kia ora koutou,

Please find attached the draft RoSH Cabinet paper for your review. Given the paper is due to offices Wednesday 18 March at 3pm, we need any feedback by **COP Monday**.

Also attached is a draft 3 year timeline as well. We are still developing the annex with data to support the case for change. There are also a couple of placeholders in the paper which we will work to fill early next week.

We have an included a timeline for the paper below. Please note we do not yet have a confirmed SOU or Cabinet date from Offices - they are actively discussing this, given Minister Upston's travel. Currently they are looking at whether we could go Direct to Cabinet on 20 April a week before Budget, or Direct to Cabinet on 28 April, alongside Budget.

Step	Date
Draft Cabinet paper goes to Ministers offices	3pm, Wednesday 18 March
B26: SH Bilateral	Monday, 23 March
Updated draft Cabinet paper to Ministers for approval to consult	Thursday, 26 March
Agency and Ministerial consultation opens	Monday, 30 March
Agency and Ministerial consultation closes	Friday, 10 April
Final Cabinet paper to Ministers	Wednesday, 15 April
(If going to SOU) Lodge for SOU	Thursday, 16 April
(If going to SOU) SOU discussion	Wednesday, 22 April
Cabinet discussion	Tuesday, 28 April (or Monday, 20 April)

Ngā mihi nui

Jemima de Lacey ([she/her](#))

Principal Advisor | Social Housing and Other Supports

s 9(2)(a) | Phone: s 9(2)(a)

 www.hud.govt.nz | Level 8, 7 Waterloo Quay, Wellington 6011



[SEEMAIL][SENSITIVE]

Disclaimer

This email is confidential and solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you have received this email in error, then any use is strictly prohibited. Please notify us immediately and delete all copies of this email and any attachments. Any opinions expressed in this message are not necessarily those of the Ministry of Housing and Urban Development.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

The information in this email is confidential to the Treasury, intended only for the addressee(s), and may also be legally privileged. If you are not an intended addressee:

- a. please immediately delete this email and notify the Treasury by return email or telephone (64 4 472 2733);
- b. any use, dissemination or copying of this email is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

From: Jono Arrell
To: Lorenzo Malavisi [TSY]; Jemima de Lacey
Cc: Shereen Capper [TSY]; Alex Harrington [TSY]
Subject: RE: RoSH Cabinet paper for your review by COP Monday - Tsy feedback
Date: Wednesday, 18 March 2026 11:53:30 am
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)

IN-CONFIDENCE

Hi Lorenzo,

We'd also appreciate guidance on the financial implications section for the Cabinet paper. Currently we've included the below:

- The financial implications of the proposed changes to Income Related Rent contribution rates and the Accommodation Supplement maxima will be presented to Cabinet for final decisions in the Budget Cabinet paper on 28 April 2026.

Thanks,

Jono Arrell (he/him) | Principal Policy Analyst – Housing Policy

Mobile: s 9(2)
The Aurora Centre | 56 The Terrace | PO Box 1556 | Wellington | New Zealand



From: Jono Arrell
Sent: Wednesday, 18 March 2026 10:29 am
To: 'Lorenzo Malavisi [TSY]' <s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Shereen Capper [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Alex Harrington [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: RoSH Cabinet paper for your review by COP Monday - Tsy feedback

Thanks Lorenzo. Yes, that's correct. We can provide updated recs for the Budget Cabinet paper, but that is the gist of it.

Jono Arrell (he/him) | Principal Policy Analyst – Housing Policy

Mobile: s 9(2)
The Aurora Centre | 56 The Terrace | PO Box 1556 | Wellington | New Zealand



From: Lorenzo Malavisi [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Wednesday, 18 March 2026 10:27 am
To: Jono Arrell <s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Shereen Capper [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Alex Harrington [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: RoSH Cabinet paper for your review by COP Monday - Tsy feedback

Thanks Jono –

Just confirming you'd be looking to included something like what the recs you had originally in the ROSH paper through Budget 2026 paper instead:

Income-Related Rent Subsidy (IRRS) [tbc add the detail on the TH and EH changes]

- 8 **agree** that the Income Related Rent contribution rate is increased from 25 percent to 30 percent for all social, emergency and transitional housing tenants from 1 April 2027
- 9 **authorise** the Minister of Housing and the Minister for Social Development and Employment to make further detailed policy decisions to give effect to the change, including transitional arrangements, to the Income Related Rent contribution rate as outline at recommendation 8 above

Accommodation Supplement (AS)

- 10 **agree** to increase the Accommodation Supplement maximum weekly payment for areas three and four from 1 April 2027
- 11 **authorise** the Minister for Social Development and Employment, and other Ministers as appropriate, to jointly make final decisions on the policy details of the change outlined at recommendation 12 above

And then just a noting rec in your ROSH paper to say , “final decisions through Budget 2026 package”?

I'll touch base with the internal teams to confirm we are okay with that approach and get back to you.

Happy to chat.

Ngā mihi,

Lorenzo Malavisi (he/him)
Kaitātari - Analyst, Infrastructure, Security and Government, Public Sector Performance
Phone: s 9(2) | Email: s 9(2)(a)

From: Jono Arrell <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Wednesday, 18 March 2026 9:16 am
To: Lorenzo Malavisi [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Shereen Capper [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: RoSH Cabinet paper for your review by COP Monday - Tsy feedback

IN-CONFIDENCE

Hi Lorenzo,

Thanks for your feedback. We've discussed internally and would like to put the policy recommendations on Budget 26 changes for IRR/AS in the Budget Cabinet paper, alongside the financial recommendations, rather than being taken separately in this paper. This Cab paper would include information on the proposals with a noting rec that they will be submitted for Cabinet approval on 28 April as part of Budget 2026. This is consistent with the approach being taken for the proposed 'welfare package' Cabinet paper being prepared.

Let me know if you would like to chat through this approach and any implications.

Thanks,

Jono Arrell (he/him) | Principal Policy Analyst – Housing Policy

Mobile: s 9(2)(a)

The Aurora Centre | 56 The Terrace | PO Box 1556 | Wellington | New Zealand



From: Lorenzo Malavisi [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Monday, 16 March 2026 9:53 pm
To: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)> Jono Arrell <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Shereen Capper [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: RoSH Cabinet paper for your review by COP Monday - Tsy feedback

Hi Jemima and Jono,

Well done on pulling together this draft – the narrative is looking good and overall seems to be shaping up well. Thanks again for the chance to provide early feedback- noting we will get another chance to formally review in the coming weeks.

I've attached a version which has just a few comments, and some tracked changed suggestions for the recs. We unfortunately haven't had time for a more thorough review given the short timeframes and other competing priorities.

For the **Financial Implications** section, suggest this should cover in high level detail something like:

- The total cost and savings of each change (plus overall total impact combined) of Shift Three changes as confirmed through Budget (i.e. The cost of AS maxima increases is \$X.)
- A line to confirm the fiscal impacts are being taken through the Budget 2026 package, and subject to final confirmation.
- Outline of Shift 1 and Shift 2 expected fiscal impacts/estimates ... noting that decisions on funding are not being sought at this stage, however flagging likely to come through Budget 2027/2028/future Cabinet paper.
- Perhaps a line to confirm costs to deliver ongoing work of the Review of Social Housing in 2026/27 will be met within HUD and MSD baselines.

Happy to discuss any of the above!

Ngā mihi,

Lorenzo Malavisi (he/him)

Kaitiaki - Analyst, Infrastructure, Security and Government, Public Sector Performance

Phone: s 9(2)(a) | Email: s 9(2)(a)

From: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Friday, 13 March 2026 4:07 pm
To: Adrienne Meikle <s 9(2)(a)> Rochelle Neho (Guest) <s 9(2)(a)> Simon Macpherson <s 9(2)(a)>
Iain Cossar <s 9(2)(a)> ^MSD: Viv Rickard <s 9(2)(a)> Jeremy Steele <s 9(2)(a)> ^MSD: Hayley Hamilton
<s 9(2)(a)> Karen Hocking <s 9(2)(a)> s 9(2)(a) Heather Kirkham [DPMC]
<s 9(2)(a)> Amanda Wilson [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)> Jason Raven <s 9(2)(a)> ^HUD: Nick McNabb
<s 9(2)(a)> Julia Pearce <s 9(2)(a)> ^HUD: David Shamy <s 9(2)(a)> ^EXT: Tim Garlick <s 9(2)(a)>
^MSD: Jayne McKendry <s 9(2)(a)> Alex Gunn <s 9(2)(a)> Wayne Anderson <s 9(2)(a)> Ed AblettHampson
<s 9(2)(a)> Tina Dellow (Guest) <s 9(2)(a)> Kuini Vidal <s 9(2)(a)> Lorenzo Malavisi [TSY]
<s 9(2)(a)> Shereen Capper [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Jono Arrell (Guest) <s 9(2)(a)> Amanda Lewis <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RoSH Cabinet paper for your review by COP Monday

Kia ora koutou,

Please find attached the draft RoSH Cabinet paper for your review. Given the paper is due to offices Wednesday 18 March at 3pm, we need any feedback by **COP Monday**.

Also attached is a draft 3 year timeline as well. We are still developing the annex with data to support the case for change. There are also a couple of placeholders in the paper which we will work to fill early next week.

We have an included a timeline for the paper below. Please note we do not yet have a confirmed SOU or Cabinet date from Offices - they are actively discussing this, given Minister Upston's travel. Currently they are looking at whether we could go Direct to Cabinet on 20 April a week before Budget, or Direct to Cabinet on 28 April, alongside Budget.

Step	Date
Draft Cabinet paper goes to Ministers offices	3pm, Wednesday 18 March
B26: SH Bilateral	Monday, 23 March
Updated draft Cabinet paper to Ministers for approval to consult	Thursday, 26 March
Agency and Ministerial consultation opens	Monday, 30 March
Agency and Ministerial consultation closes	Friday, 10 April
Final Cabinet paper to Ministers	Wednesday, 15 April
(If going to SOU) Lodge for SOU	Thursday, 16 April
(If going to SOU) SOU discussion	Wednesday, 22 April
Cabinet discussion	Tuesday, 28 April (or Monday, 20 April)

Ngā mihi nui

Jemima de Lacey (she/her)

Principal Advisor | Social Housing and Other Supports

s 9(2)(a) | Phone: s 9(2)(a)
www.hud.govt.nz | Level 8, 7 Waterloo Quay, Wellington 6011

[SEEMAIL][SENSITIVE]

Disclaimer

This email is confidential and solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you have received this email in error, then any use is strictly prohibited. Please notify us immediately and delete all copies of this email and any attachments. Any opinions expressed in this message are not necessarily those of the Ministry of Housing and Urban Development.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

The information in this email is confidential to the Treasury, intended only for the addressee(s), and may also be legally privileged. If you are not an intended addressee:
a. please immediately delete this email and notify the Treasury by return email or telephone (64 4 472 2733);
b. any use, dissemination or copying of this email is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

This email and any attachments may contain information that is confidential and subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this email and attachments is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify the author immediately and erase all copies of the email and attachments. The Ministry of Social Development accepts no responsibility for changes made to this message or attachments after transmission from the Ministry.

This email and any attachments may contain information that is confidential and subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this email and attachments is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify the author immediately and erase all copies of the email and attachments. The Ministry of Social Development accepts no responsibility for changes made to this message or attachments after transmission from the Ministry.

From: Jemima de Lacey
To: Diego Martinezcamargo (PONEKE); Jono Arrell (Guest)
Cc: Cheryl Chaplin (PONEKE); Matthew Huddleston (PONEKE)
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Review of the Social Housing system – draft Cabinet paper for agency consultation
Date: Monday, 13 April 2026 3:45:24 pm
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image007.png](#)
[image008.png](#)
[image009.png](#)
[image010.png](#)
[image011.png](#)

Thanks very much Diego.

Ngā mihi nui

Jemima de Lacey ([she/her](#))
Principal Advisor – Social Housing and Other Supports
s 9(2)(a) Phone: s 9(2)

[IN-CONFIDENCE]

From: Diego Martinezcamargo (PONEKE) s 9(2)(a)
Sent: Monday, 13 April 2026 3:41 pm
To: Jono Arrell (Guest) s 9(2)(a) Jemima de Lacey s 9(2)(a)
Cc: Cheryl Chaplin (PONEKE) s 9(2)(a) Matthew Huddleston (PONEKE) s 9(2)(a)
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Review of the Social Housing system – draft Cabinet paper for agency consultation

Kia ora Jono and Jemima,

Thank you for sharing the Review of the Social Housing System for feedback. Corrections has no major comments on the paper.

Corrections notes that the review represents the starting point of multi-year work programme to reform the social housing system, with more detailed policy and operational implications expected to be developed over time. We therefore welcome the opportunity to engage further as this work progresses.

In relation to the proposed changes, we observe that the shift toward identifying and addressing barriers to access reflects challenges commonly experienced by people under Corrections management. Further consideration may be needed regarding how “persistent or ongoing barriers” will be defined, measured, and assessed in practice.

We also note the proposed approach to strengthening support for people and whānau in social housing, alongside setting clearer expectations regarding tenancy duration and obligations to support transitions toward housing independence. As the work develops, it may be valuable to understand how these settings interact with the four barriers outlined in the proposed assessment framework, including any related funding or implementation considerations.

Content shared with:

- Cheryl Chaplin: s 9(2)(a)
- Bronwyn Morrison: s 9(2)(a)
- Anita Edmonds: s 9(2)(a)

Noho ora mai

Diego Martínez
Policy Advisor – Strategic Policy
a: Mayfair House – Level 13, Wellington.



From: Jono Arrell s 9(2)(a)
Sent: Tuesday, 7 April 2026 5:48 PM
To: s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)
s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) Kat Douglas (PONEKE) s 9(2)(a) Matthew Huddleston (PONEKE) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) Jasmine Lindsay
s 9(2)(a) Celia Painter s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)
s 9(2)(a) George Minton s 9(2)(a) Alex Cliffe s 9(2)(a) Deborah Tucker s 9(2)(a)
s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) Andy Doube s 9(2)(a) Erena McAllum
s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)
Cc: Jemima de Lacey s 9(2)(a)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Review of the Social Housing system – draft Cabinet paper for agency consultation

Some people who received this message don't often get email from s 9(2)(a) [Learn why this is important](#)

SENSITIVE

Kia ora koutou,

We are seeking agency feedback on the attached draft Cabinet paper: “Reviewing the social housing system: delivering better housing support to those who need it”. Please send your feedback to s 9(2)(a) and s 9(2)(a) by **COP Monday 13 April 2026**.

This document includes redactions due to Budget sensitivity. Please do not share this more widely. If you need to share this with your colleagues, we request that you pass on their names and email addresses.

If you would like to discuss the content in the attached or have questions about the Review of Social Housing system (RoSH), please don't hesitate to reach out to us. We'd be more than happy to discuss.

Note that Ministerial consultation is being undertaken simultaneously with agency consultation.

The final Cabinet paper will be considered at Cabinet committee in the week of 20 April and by Cabinet on 28 April.

Ngā mihi nui,

Jono Arrell (he/him) | Principal Policy Analyst – Housing Policy

Mobile: **s 9(2)**

The Aurora Centre | 56 The Terrace | PO Box 1556 | Wellington | New Zealand



This email and any attachments may contain information that is confidential and subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this email and attachments is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify the author immediately and erase all copies of the email and attachments. The Ministry of Social Development accepts no responsibility for changes made to this message or attachments after transmission from the Ministry.

External Comms.

The information in this message is the property of the New Zealand Department of Corrections. It is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain privileged or in confidence material. Any review, storage, copying, editing, summarising, transmission, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, by any means, in whole or part, or taking any action in reliance upon, this information by persons or entities other than intended recipient are prohibited. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from all computers.

This document includes redactions due to Budget sensitivity. Please do not share this more widely. If you need to share this with your colleagues, we request that you pass on their names and email addresses.

If you would like to discuss the content in the attached or have questions about the Review of Social Housing system (RoSH), please don't hesitate to reach out to us. We'd be more than happy to discuss.

Note that Ministerial consultation is being undertaken simultaneously with agency consultation.

The final Cabinet paper will be considered at Cabinet committee in the week of 20 April and by Cabinet on 28 April.

Ngā mihi nui,

Jono Arrell (he/him) | Principal Policy Analyst – Housing Policy

Mobile: s 9(2)

The Aurora Centre | 56 The Terrace | PO Box 1556 | Wellington | New Zealand



This email and any attachments may contain information that is confidential and subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this email and attachments is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify the author immediately and erase all copies of the email and attachments. The Ministry of Social Development accepts no responsibility for changes made to this message or attachments after transmission from the Ministry.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

The information in this email is confidential to the Treasury, intended only for the addressee(s), and may also be legally privileged. If you are not an intended addressee:
a. please immediately delete this email and notify the Treasury by return email or telephone (64 4 472 2733);
b. any use, dissemination or copying of this email is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

From: [Jemima de Lacey](#)
To: [Lorenzo Malavisi \[TSY\]](#); [Jono Arrell \(Guest\)](#)
Cc: [Jason Raven \(Guest\)](#); [Alana Roughan](#); [Nick McNabb](#); [Shereen Capper \[TSY\]](#); [Alex Harrington \[TSY\]](#); [Nina Shepherd \(Guest\)](#); [Amanda Wilson \(Guest\)](#)
Subject: Re: Review of the Social Housing system – draft Cabinet paper for agency consultation (Tsy feedback)
Date: Monday, 13 April 2026 5:56:08 pm
Attachments: [Image001.png](#)

Thanks very much for the feedback Lorenzo. We've taken it on board and made the changes you suggest.

On your question - I checked with our office and yes the Cab paper was sent to two of MoF's advisers during the concurrent Ministerial consultation.

Noting we'll come back separately on the detailed recs you want for the Budget paper once this paper has gone.

Ngā mihi nui

Jemima de Lacey ([she/her](#))
Principal Advisor | Social Housing and Other Supports
s 9(2)(a) | Phone: s 9(2)

[IN-CONFIDENCE]

From: Lorenzo Malavisi [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Monday, 13 April 2026 3:56 pm
To: Jono Arrell (Guest) <s 9(2)(a)>; Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Jason Raven (Guest) <s 9(2)(a)>; Alana Roughan <s 9(2)(a)>; Nick McNabb <s 9(2)(a)>; Shereen Capper [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>; Alex Harrington [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>; Nina Shepherd (Guest) <s 9(2)(a)>; Amanda Wilson (Guest) <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Review of the Social Housing system – draft Cabinet paper for agency consultation (Tsy feedback)

[SEEMAIL][SENSITIVE]

Kia ora Jono and Jemima + team,

Thanks again for sharing this draft with us- the proposal is shaping up really well!

From our view, what you've included in relation to the B26 welfare package initiatives (IRR increase, AS maxima increase and TAS formula changes) looks fine, recognising there are a few placeholders still. We are comfortable with the approach for these significant policy and fiscal decisions being transacted through Budget paper.

You hopefully have also heard that the Budget 2026 Cab date has been pushed out as of the end of last week – meaning the Budget paper will not be considered until early May. The date hasn't yet been set, but likely 4 May. This might not change any timeframes for your paper, but flagging to be conscious of for sequencing and any references to this date.

Some specific minor feedback on this draft:

- Para 8: we suggest you may want to update to "intended to be **broadly** fiscally neutral", or something similar, to acknowledge these two initiatives might not completely offset each other.
- Para 16: As there are still no final decisions yet for this initiative, we recommend updating to be more generic – potentially something like "**Budget 2026 intends to take decision on the future of the Flexi Fund**", which will complement the improved social housing utilisation this Review is seeking to deliver." Otherwise this should be updated with final decisions if they are available in time before lodgement (at this stage seems unlikely if lodgement is on track for original date).
- Para 60: needs an update of the old Budget cabinet paper date, suggest something like: "Budget Cabinet paper on **28 April 2026-early May 2026**"
- Appendix One: Also has the old 28 April date which will need updating.
- Rec 7: we suggest an update, and replace the old date, to "**note** that changes to the minimum Income Related Rent contribution rate (for social housing, emergency housing, and transitional housing), the Accommodation Supplement maxima and Temporary Additional Support, **including fiscal implications**, as outlined in this paper, will be submitted for Cabinet approval in **early May 2026** as part of Budget 2026".

On a related note, it would be good to confirm you have commenced drafting the significant recs for these 3 initiatives (IRR increase, AS maxima increase and TAS formula changes) that will be included in the Budget 2026 paper – and when we can expect to see draft recs? Noting the timeframes for finalising these significant financial recommendations for all Budget 2026 initiatives are very tight this year, getting early visibility will be really key to ensure everything is covered off correctly. Happy to discuss further as needed.

Can I also confirm this was sent around for Ministerial consultation simultaneously – we checked in with our Ministerial team but nothing was received from the office yet (we are following up again with them directly now).

Happy to discuss any of the above further.

Ngā mihi,

Lorenzo Malavisi (he/him)
Kaitiātan - Analyst, Infrastructure, Security and Government, Public Sector Performance
Phone: s 9(2)(a) | Email: s 9(2)(a)

From: Jono Arrell <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Wednesday, 8 April 2026 8:11 am
To: Lorenzo Malavisi [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>; Shereen Capper [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>; Alex Harrington [TSY] <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>; Jason Raven <s 9(2)(a)>; Alana Roughan <s 9(2)(a)>; ^HUD: Nick McNabb <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: FW: Review of the Social Housing system – draft Cabinet paper for agency consultation

SENSITIVE

Kia ora Lorenzo, Shereen and Alex,

Passing on the full, unredacted version for Treasury review and feedback. As noted in the email below, this is also out for Ministerial consultation and feedback is due back to myself or Jemima by COP Monday 13 April.

An updated version will be provided to Ministers on Tuesday 14 April, alongside advice on the cumulative impacts of the proposed package. You'll notice that there are several placeholders in the attached as we await modelling results.

Please reach out if you have any questions or would like to discuss.

Ngā mihi,

Jono Arrell (he/him) | Principal Policy Analyst – Housing Policy
Mobile: s 9(2)
The Aurora Centre | 56 The Terrace | PO Box 1556 | Wellington | New Zealand



From: Jono Arrell

To: s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)
s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)
s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)
s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)
s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)
s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) Jasmine Lindsay s 9(2)(a) Celia Painter
s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)
s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) George Minton s 9(2)(a) Alex Cliffe s 9(2)(a)
Deborah Tucker s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)
s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) Andy Doube s 9(2)(a) Erena McAllum
s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)
Cc: Jemima de Lacey s 9(2)(a)
Subject: Review of the Social Housing system – draft Cabinet paper for agency consultation

We are seeking agency feedback on the attached draft Cabinet paper: "Reviewing the social housing system: delivering better housing support to those who need it". Please send your feedback to § 9(2)(a) — and § 9(2)(a) — by **COP Monday 13 April 2026**.

If you would like to discuss the content in the attached or have questions about the Review of Social Housing system (RoSH), please don't hesitate to reach out to us. We'd be more than happy to discuss.

Note that Ministerial consultation is being undertaken simultaneously with agency consultation.

The final Cabinet paper will be considered at Cabinet committee in the week of 20 April and by Cabinet on 28 April.

Jono Arrell (he/him) | Principal Policy Analyst – Housing Policy
 📞 Mobile: s 9(2) [REDACTED]
 The Aurora Centre | 56 The Terrace | PO Box 1556 | Wellington | New Zealand



This email and any attachments may contain information that is confidential and subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this email and attachments is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify the author immediately and erase all copies of the email and attachments. The Ministry of Social Development accepts no responsibility for changes made to this message or attachments after transmission from the Ministry.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

The information in this email is confidential to the Treasury, intended only for the addressee(s), and may also be legally privileged. If you are not an intended addressee:

- a. please immediately delete this email and notify the Treasury by return email or telephone (64 4 472 2733);
- b. any use, dissemination or copying of this email is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

From: Jemima de Lacey
To: Harris, Lison; Jono Arrell (Guest); White, Michael; Johnston, Anna
Subject: Re: Review of the Social Housing system – draft Cabinet paper for agency consultation
Date: Tuesday, 14 April 2026 9:02:38 am
Attachments: image002.png

Thank you.

Just to note the paper has to go to Ministers' offices at 12pm so any final text from you would be needed by 10:30am at the very latest.

Ngā mihi nui

Jemima de Lacey ([she/her](#))
Principal Advisor | Social Housing and Other Supports
s 9(2)(a) | Phone: s 9(2)

[IN-CONFIDENCE]

From: Harris, Lison <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Tuesday, 14 April 2026 8:43 am
To: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>; Jono Arrell (Guest) <s 9(2)(a)>; White, Michael <s 9(2)(a)>; Johnston, Anna <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: Re: Review of the Social Housing system – draft Cabinet paper for agency consultation

Response from the HR team - noting they don't provide the HR comment for cab papers
My apologies for the delay – we have been really stretched.

I provide some preliminary comments below but given the complexity of the proposed changes and the need to fully consider the impacts across a wide range of groups, if possible would like to supplement these by close of play tomorrow.

The focus on providing more targeted social housing to those in greatest need is a positive step in terms of fulfilling the right to housing as articulated in the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights to which New Zealand is a party. When considering the extent to which an initiative realises an economic, social and cultural rights including the right to housing, four key factors are relevant:

- *Affordability*
- *Availability*
- *Accessibility*
- *Adequacy*

These elements need to be considered equally and one should not be prioritised over the other.

We welcome the increased focus on availability which will go some way to addressing gaps in the realisation of the right to housing in New Zealand.

However, we note that there is a proposed shift away from the other core elements including affordability (change in criteria for access) and adequacy (limits on tenancies).

s 6(a)

We also note, as highlighted in the paper, that these proposals will have a disproportionate effect on particular groups (both positive and negative). Due consideration needs to be given to whether these impacts are discriminatory and if so whether they can be justified

From: Harris, Lison <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Tuesday, April 14, 2026 7:47 AM
To: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>; Jono Arrell (Guest) <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Review of the Social Housing system – draft Cabinet paper for agency consultation

I'm sorry I didn't hear back from them yesterday, and will try again now.

From: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Monday, 13 April 2026 11:06 am
To: Harris, Lison <s 9(2)(a)>; Jono Arrell (Guest) <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: Re: Review of the Social Housing system – draft Cabinet paper for agency consultation

Thanks again Lison.

It would be great if you can follow up with your Human Rights team today as we'll need something to put in that section of the Cab paper (and it has to go final to offices midday tomorrow).

Ngā mihi nui

Jemima de Lacey ([she/her](#))
Principal Advisor | Social Housing and Other Supports
s 9(2)(a) | Phone: s 9(2)

[IN-CONFIDENCE]

From: Harris, Lison <s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Friday, 10 April 2026 2:42 pm
To: Jono Arrell (Guest) <s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Jemima de Lacey <s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Review of the Social Housing system – draft Cabinet paper for agency consultation

Kia Jono

Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper. We have no substantive comments. My operational colleagues noted:

We haven't been able to identify any major impacts that these proposals would have on the courts, although the extent of our analysis is somewhat limited by the volume of redacted material.

If someone is directly affected by the changes (for example, their tenancy ends as a result) and they are able to challenge that decision through the Tenancy Tribunal, there may be some flow-on impacts on legal aid and case volumes. However, we would expect these impacts to be minimal.

Given the short timeframes for response and limited information, we have not been able to fully engage with all relevant business units in OSD [courts operations]. When further detail becomes available, we would be in a better position to carry out a more comprehensive scoping exercise.

Similarly, the offences and penalty vetting team were unable to identify any relevant provisions but do let us know if the proposals contain any new or amended offences or penalties.

I haven't heard from the human rights team, so will check in with them on Monday.

As requested, I've listed below the people who accessed the document. Their emails are s 9(2)(a)

Ngā mihi nui

Lison Harris
Policy Manager, Victims and Harm Reduction
Criminal Justice Unit, Policy Group
Ministry of Justice | Tāhū o te Ture



Ms 9(2)(a)
Justice Centre | 19 Aitken Street
DX Box SX10125 | Wellington
www.justice.govt.nz

MacKenzie, Hayley - DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER

Johnston, Anna - POLICY MANAGER, HUMAN RIGHTS

Flay, Katy - PRINCIPAL ADVISOR, commissioning and service improvement (courts operations)

Takurua, Patrick - Offences and penalty vetting

Roche, Jessica - PRINCIPAL ADVISOR, LAW ENFORCEMENT

White, Michael - SENIOR POLICY ADVISOR, HUMAN RIGHTS

Iti, Rochelle - SENIOR ADVISOR, commissioning and service improvement (courts operations)

From: Jono Arrell <[redacted]>
Sent: Tuesday, 7 April 2026 5:48 pm
To: [redacted] s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)
[redacted] Shereen.Capper <[redacted]> s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)
[redacted] Nic Hill <[redacted]> s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) HUDDLESTON, Matthew (PONEKE) <[redacted]> s 9(2)(a)
Jasmine Lindsay <[redacted]> s 9(2)(a) Celia Painter <[redacted]> s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)
[redacted] Harris, Lison <[redacted]> s 9(2)(a) George Minton <[redacted]> s 9(2)(a) Alex Cliffe <[redacted]> s 9(2)(a) Deborah Tucker
[redacted] s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)
[redacted] Erena McAllum <[redacted]> s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)
Cc: Jemima de Lacey <[redacted]> s 9(2)(a)
Subject: Review of the Social Housing system – draft Cabinet paper for agency consultation

SENSITIVE

Kia ora koutou,

We are seeking agency feedback on the attached draft Cabinet paper: "Reviewing the social housing system: delivering better housing support to those who need it". Please send your feedback to [redacted] s 9(2)(a) and [redacted] s 9(2)(a) by **COP Monday 13 April 2026**.

This document includes redactions due to Budget sensitivity. Please do not share this more widely. If you need to share this with your colleagues, we request that you pass on their names and email addresses.

If you would like to discuss the content in the attached or have questions about the Review of Social Housing system (RoSH), please don't hesitate to reach out to us. We'd be more than happy to discuss.

Note that Ministerial consultation is being undertaken simultaneously with agency consultation.

The final Cabinet paper will be considered at Cabinet committee in the week of 20 April and by Cabinet on 28 April.

Ngā mihi nui,

Jono Arrell (he/him) | Principal Policy Analyst – Housing Policy

Mobile: [redacted] s 9(2)
The Aurora Centre | 56 The Terrace | PO Box 1556 | Wellington | New Zealand



This email and any attachments may contain information that is confidential and subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this email and attachments is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify the author immediately and erase all copies of the email and attachments. The Ministry of Social Development accepts no responsibility for changes made to this message or attachments after transmission from the Ministry.

Disclaimer

This email is confidential and solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you have received this email in error, then any use is strictly prohibited. Please notify us immediately and delete all copies of this email and any attachments. Any opinions expressed in this message are not necessarily those of the Ministry of Housing and Urban Development.