

The Treasury

Budget 2024 Information Release

September 2024

This document has been proactively released and is available on:

- The Budget website from September 2024 to May 2025 only at: <https://budget.govt.nz/information-release/2024>, and on
- The Treasury website from later in 2024 at: <https://www.treasury.govt.nz/publications/information-release/budget-2024-information-release>

Information Withheld

Some parts of this information release would not be appropriate to release and, if requested, would be withheld under the Official Information Act 1982 (the Act).

Where this is the case, the relevant sections of the Act that would apply have been identified.

Where information has been withheld, no public interest has been identified that would outweigh the reasons for withholding it.

Key to sections of the Act under which information has been withheld:

- [1] 6(a) - to avoid prejudice to the security or defence of New Zealand or the international relations of the government
- [23] 9(2)(a) - to protect the privacy of natural persons, including deceased people
- [25] 9(2)(b)(ii) - to protect the commercial position of the person who supplied the information or who is the subject of the information
- [27] 9(2)(ba)(ii) - to protect information which is subject to an obligation of confidence or which any person has been or could be compelled to provide under the authority of any enactment, where the making available of the information would be likely otherwise to damage the public interest
- [31] 9(2)(f)(ii) - to maintain the current constitutional conventions protecting collective and individual ministerial responsibility
- [33] 9(2)(f)(iv) - to maintain the current constitutional conventions protecting the confidentiality of advice tendered by ministers and officials
- [34] 9(2)(g)(i) - to maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through the free and frank expression of opinions
- [35] 9(2)(g)(ii) - to maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through protecting ministers, members of government organisations, officers and employees from improper pressure or harassment;
- [36] 9(2)(h) - to maintain legal professional privilege
- [37] 9(2)(i) - to enable the Crown to carry out commercial activities without disadvantage or prejudice
- [38] 9(2)(j) - to enable the Crown to negotiate without disadvantage or prejudice
- [39] 9(2)(k) - to prevent the disclosure of official information for improper gain or improper advantage
- [40] 18(c)(i) - that the making available of the information requested would be contrary to the provisions of a specified enactment

Where information has been withheld, a numbered reference to the applicable section of the Act has been made, as listed above. For example, a [23] appearing where information has been withheld in a release document refers to section 9(2)(a).

Copyright and Licensing

Cabinet material and advice to Ministers from the Treasury and other public service departments are © **Crown copyright** but are licensed for re-use under **Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)** [<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>].

For material created by other parties, copyright is held by them and they must be consulted on the licensing terms that they apply to their material.

Accessibility

The Treasury can provide an alternate HTML version of this material if requested. Please cite this document's title or PDF file name when you email a request to information@treasury.govt.nz.

Treasury Report: Initiative-level information for Budget Ministers 4

Date:	2 April 2024	Report No:	T2024/874
		File Number:	BM-2-4-2024

Action sought

	Action sought	Deadline
Hon Nicola Willis Minister of Finance	<p>Indicate your decisions on individual initiatives in Annex 1.</p> <p>indicate your decisions on the outstanding Climate Emergency Response Fund funding as outlined in Annex 3.</p>	3 April 2024

Contact for telephone discussion (if required)

Name	Position	Telephone	1st Contact
Chris Brunt	Senior Analyst, Budget	[39]	[35] ✓
Keiran Kennedy	Manager, Budget		

Minister's Office actions (if required)

Return the signed report to Treasury.

Note any feedback on the quality of the report

Enclosure: No

Treasury Report: Initiative-level information for Budget Ministers 4

Background and Purpose

1. This report provides you with:
 - a responses on initiative level queries you had following advice provided to you over the Easter weekend (T2024/823 refers). These responses are included in Annex 1, which also seeks your decisions on how these initiatives should be treated in the draft BM4 package. **It has not been possible to follow up on all outstanding queries in the time available. We will provide another report on this later this week, as we work towards finalising Budget Ministers 4 material on 5 April.**
 - b An overview of the workforce implications of the current Budget package with a Vote level breakdown provided in Annex 2.
 - c An overview of remaining and uncommitted Climate Emergency Response Fund (CERF) funding.
2. This report has been prepared under tight timeframes and consequently subject to limited to QA. Any follow up can be addressed at Budget Matters on 3 April.

Workforce Implications

2. The current Budget 2024 Baseline Savings package for Budget Ministers 4 shows a reduction in FTE of approximately ^[33] across the core public service and wider public service. This is largely driven by the reduction in back-office FTE in Ministry of Primary Industries, Police, Department of Corrections, Ministry of Social Development and the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (MBIE).
3. The current Budget 2024 New Spending and Cost Pressures package includes a mixture of retaining existing FTE and/or hiring new FTE across the core public service and wider public service.
 - ^[33]
 -
4. While we expect these FTE impacts to materialise, we note that the reductions and increases to FTE numbers are based on agency expectations and may not accurately reflect actual changes following Budget decisions. ^[33]

PSC continues to monitor agency FTE changes and forecasting through Quarterly Surveys and will advise you on ongoing changes in the public service ahead of Budget Day.

We consider there is a level of risk around attrition assumptions used by agencies but consider this can be managed

5. A number of agencies have signalled they will manage the net FTE decreases and uninvited cost pressures through attrition, closing vacancies and redundancies. While we do not have visibility of the attrition assumptions used by agencies, there is a risk that this is overstated in the current environment and requires redundancies, which

may need additional funding. This has been factored into the discount rate across baseline savings to recognise that not all baselines savings will be fully realised.

6. To ensure that the need for redundancies to realise savings and manage uninvited cost pressures does not result in out-of-cycle funding requests, we suggest that you make it clear to portfolio Ministers that any additional funding required for redundancies is managed within agency's baselines both in this financial year and going forward.

The Budget 2024 package takes a step towards realising your contractor and consultant spending reduction commitments

7. Several agencies have noted that their baseline savings incorporates reduction to back-office functions and contractor and consultant spend in line with your direction for savings at Budget 2024. ^[33]

However, this quantum includes savings in back-office efficiencies and FTEs so are likely to represent the upper bound of contractor and consultant savings possible through Budget 2024.

8. To ensure the Government's target of a reduction of \$400m per annum in contractor and consultant spending across the public service, we suggest that you reiterate to portfolio Ministers your expectations. PSC continues to monitor actual contractor and consultant spending by agencies and will provide further updates to you on your target.

Savings from the Climate Emergency Response Fund

9. You have asked for information about uncontracted and uncommitted funding remaining in initiatives funded from the Climate Emergency Response Fund (CERF), and whether this funding is aligned with the Government's priorities. The Treasury has reviewed this funding with a view to identifying further savings. A full overview of the remaining CERF funding is attached as Annex 3.

10. Many of the CERF initiatives sit within four key agencies, which affects how any potential savings could be taken forward.

- a The Treasury requested further information from the **Ministry for Primary Industries** (MPI) as we do not hold agency management data on levels of contracted and uncontracted spend. ^[33]

- b A number of initiatives relate to departmental capability for **the Ministry for the Environment** (MFE). MFE has provided detailed information on savings already proposed for these initiatives, and alignment with Government priorities. MFE also indicated that if Ministers do wish to make further savings, it would appreciate an opportunity to provide advice on which activities to target. We have provided this information to the Independent Rapid Reviewer for MFE. ^[33]

but should you wish to make further reductions at Budget 2024, he will identify some candidates to explore. Annex 3 includes an overview of the existing funding and uncontracted amounts. We will reconcile this with the Independent Reviewers report due to you on 3 April 2024 and provide advice at that point on whether further opportunities could be explored for Budget 2024.

- c The Independent Rapid Reviewer for the **Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment** has also been provided with information on previous CERF initiatives and may make recommendations on these. In particular, we have noted in Annex 3, that the initiatives 'Enhancing Energy Resilience for New Zealand Communities through Distributed Renewable Energy' ^[33]

could yield savings in Budget 2024. As above, we recommend taking these forward through your decisions on the Independent Rapid Review report, due 3 April 2024.

11. Majority of the remaining uncommitted CERF funding is already planned to be returned via agencies baseline reduction submissions. This means options for more CERF savings are limited, and significant further savings are not possible without reconsidering programmes the Government has indicated it wishes to continue (e.g., some parts of Warmer Kiwi Homes which Budget Ministers have already ruled out).

Next Steps

12. We are available to discuss this report with you at Budget Matters on the morning of 3 April.
13. We will include the decisions you take in this report into the draft Budget Ministers 4 (BM4) slides that we plan to provide to you on 4 April 2024.
14. We will provide you with further advice on remaining CERF funding as part of the Independent Rapid Review reports due 3 April 2024.

Recommended Action

We recommend that you:

- a **indicate** your decision regarding the initiatives in Annex 1;
Agree/Disagree
- b **note** we can discuss this advice further with you at Budget Matters on 3 April 2024;
- c **note** the workforce implications of the Budget 2024 package including an overview of by Vote in Annex 2; and
- d **indicate** your decisions on the outstanding Climate Emergency Response Fund funding as outlined in Annex 3, noting that further advice will be provided on the Ministry for the Environment and the Ministry of Business Innovation and Employment, through the Independent Rapid Reviews.

Agree/Disagree

Keiran Kennedy
Manager, Budget

Hon Nicola Willis
Minister of Finance

_____/_____/_____

Annex 1: Responses to initiative level queries

Vote	ID	Title	Follow up question raised	Treasury response	Minister of Finance decision	BM4 package if Treasury recommendation accepted (\$m)		Variance from BM3 package (\$m) Less savings / (More savings)	
						Average operating p.a.	Total capital	Average operating p.a.	Total capital
Business, Science and Innovation									
Business, Science and Innovation	15809	Regional Infrastructure Fund	[33]		<p>Agree to not make further changes to the BM4 package (i.e. keep the initiative as is per BM3). <i>Agree/Disagree.</i></p> <p>Note that you will receive further advice on policy settings for Regional Infrastructure Fund ahead of Cabinet consideration.</p>	2	400	-	-
Business, Science and Innovation	15610	Economic Development: Auckland Pacific Skills Shift (Alo Vaka) - return of funding	Following advice last week (T2024/823 refers), you sought further information on the Auckland Pacific Skills Shift savings initiative.	The Auckland Pacific Skills Shift programme supports Pacific workers, families, and communities to shift into jobs aligned with the Future of Work strategy. We recommend returning the funding for the programme as it does not align with key government priorities and is not critical or urgent. The key risks in closing Alo Vaka early are relationships with delivery partners for the programme and Pacific communities impacted by the programme, particularly in relation to work-based micro-credential programme components. However, these can be mitigated by MBIE working proactively with partners and communities to identify opportunities to continue the programme outside of the current funding model.	<p>Agree to retain this saving initiative in the BM4 package. <i>Agree/Disagree.</i></p>	(4.7)	-	-	-
[33]									

Vote	ID	Title	Follow up question raised	Treasury response	Minister of Finance decision	BM4 package if Treasury recommendation accepted (\$m)		Variance from BM3 package (\$m) Less savings / (More savings)	
						Average operating p.a.	Total capital	Average operating p.a.	Total capital
[33]									
Business, Science and Innovation	15709	Commerce Commission – discretionary savings, return of financial reserves, and new revenue options	At your bilateral meeting with Hon Seymour, you requested that MBIE provide advice on how the Commerce Commission would achieve these savings of [33]	<p>MBIE have provided the following detail regarding where the savings would be realised from within the Commerce Commission functions: [33]</p> <p>MBIE proposes reducing savings to \$3.437 million per annum, to exclude its Competition, Consumer and Grocery functions from savings. [33]</p>	<p>EITHER:</p> <p>Agree to retain this saving initiative in the BM4 package (Treasury recommended).</p> <p><i>Agree/Disagree.</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p>Agree to reduce the savings from Commerce Commission to \$3.437 million per annum (MBIE recommended).</p> <p><i>Agree/Disagree.</i></p>	[33]	-	-	-

Vote	ID	Title	Follow up question raised	Treasury response	Minister of Finance decision	BM4 package if Treasury recommendation accepted (\$m)		Variance from BM3 package (\$m) Less savings / (More savings)		
						Average operating p.a.	Total capital	Average operating p.a.	Total capital	
Business, Science and Innovation	15786	Science, Innovation & Technology portfolio: fiscal savings	Following advice last week (T2024/823 refers), you sought an itemised breakdown of this initiative.	The total savings for this initiative consist of savings from the following areas:	<p>Note the itemised breakdown of the initiative.</p>	92.4	533.5	-	-	
				Operating expense category						Savings (\$m average per annum)
				Departmental Output Expenses						
				Policy Advice and Related Services to Ministers MCA - Science, Innovation & Technology						1.100
				Digital Technologies Industry Transformation Plan MCA - Delivery and Management of Digital Technologies Industry Transformation Plan						0.250
				Wellington Science City Operating expenses						0.850
				Non-Departmental Output Expenses						
				National Science Challenges						43.345
				Strategic Science Investment Fund MCA - Strategic Science Investment Fund - Programmes						4.438
				Endeavour Fund, Health Research Fund, Marsden Fund						4.438
				R&D Project Grant 2023-2028 (MYA Expense)						0.500
				Targeted Business Research and Development Funding MCA – Student Grant						0.750
				Non-Departmental Other Expenses						
				In-year payments fair value write-down and impairment (MYA Expense)						36.750
Total (\$m)	92.420									
Capital expense category										
In-year payments loans (MYA expense)	533.500									
Corrections										
Corrections	15477	Corrections Service Delivery Optimisation and Scaling	You asked for advice on whether these savings could be scaled so support for the Hikitea mental health service is retained.	<p>It is possible for the savings to be scaled such that they exclude savings from Hikitea. This would reduce the savings by \$12 million per annum.</p> <p>We understand these savings relate to scaling back the culturally enhanced mental health and addictions service planned for the Waikeria Redevelopment, to instead align with services currently provided at Intensive Supervision Units. On the basis that Corrections was comfortable with this option, we supported the initiative in full.</p> <p>However, if retaining full funding for Hikitea is desired, we recommend scaling reducing this initiative by \$12 million per annum.</p>	<p>EITHER:</p> <p>Agree to retain this initiative in the package as is.</p> <p><i>Agree/Disagree.</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p>Agree to reduce these savings for the BM4 package.</p> <p><i>Agree/Disagree.</i></p>	(29.1)	-	12.0		
Defence Force										
Defence Force	16086	Services to veterans – ensuring effective and timely delivery	Following a request from the Minister for Veterans' Affairs, you invited this as a late initiative for Budget 2024. We have now assessed it.	We recommend funding this initiative at a scaled amount (which was proposed in the letter sent by the Minister for Veterans' Affairs). Any further funding can be considered as a cost pressure at B25 or later budgets.	<p>Agree to include this initiative in the BM4 package.</p> <p><i>Agree/Disagree.</i></p>	1.0	-	1.0		

Vote	ID	Title	Follow up question raised	Treasury response	Minister of Finance decision	BM4 package if Treasury recommendation accepted (\$m)		Variance from BM3 package (\$m) Less savings / (More savings)		
						Average operating p.a.	Total capital	Average operating p.a.	Total capital	
Defence Force	15544	Non-Operational (Back-office) functions including contractors and consultants savings'	As part of T2024/823, you indicated that you wanted to remove the initiatives referred to by Hon Collins in her later dated 28 March from the BM4 package.	Part of this initiative relates to '[33]'. You wish to remove this sub-component from the package to address concerns raised by the Minister of Defence. This reduces the savings by '[33]' over the forecast period (from \$89.650 million to '[33]')	Agree to include a scaled version of this initiative in your BM4 package, subject to your follow-up meeting with Hon Collins. <i>Agree/Disagree.</i>	[33]			-	
Defence Force	15545	New Zealand Defence Force - Reduction in lower value programmes and activities	As part of T2024/823, you indicated that you wanted to remove the initiatives referred to by Hon Collins in her later dated 28 March from the BM4 package.	This initiative is not currently included in the package. Savings were proposed from across a range of lower value programmes and activities, including insurance, '[33]', further reductions in travel, '[33]'. The Minister of Defence has only raised concerns regarding the sub-component relating to '[33]'. It is therefore possible to achieve a higher level of savings than the current package and still mitigate the Minister's key concerns by including a scaled version of this initiative.	Agree to include a scaled version of this initiative in your BM4 package, subject to your follow-up meeting with Hon Collins. <i>Agree/Disagree.</i>				-	
Defence Force	15553	Depreciation expense arising from Asset Revaluation	As part of T2024/823, you: 1. Indicated you wish to provide additional funding (on top of the BM3 package) of approximately \$50 million operating funding per annum, across these four initiatives.	<p><u>Question 1</u> [33] operating funding over the forecast period was included in the BM3 package for NZDF's remuneration cost pressure. [33] operating funding and [33] capital funding were included for new spending initiatives.</p> <p>A suggested breakdown to achieve your desired [33] uplift is provided here. You may wish to test this breakdown with the Minister of Defence at the second bilateral meeting.</p> <p><u>Question 2</u> This has not been confirmed either way, however defence officials believe other agencies will be unable to contribute.</p>	Agree to include this initiative in your BM4 package, subject to your follow-up meeting with Hon Collins. <i>Agree/Disagree.</i>	31.9	-	31.9	-	
Defence Force	15548	Defence Force Remuneration	2. Asked whether other agencies have agreed to support initiative 15508 – Improving Protection Against Maritime Threats.		Agree to increase funding for this initiative in the package, subject to your follow-up meeting with Hon Collins. <i>Agree/Disagree.</i>	[33]				
Defence Force	15508	Improving Protection Against Maritime Threats	2. Asked whether other agencies have agreed to support initiative 15508 – Improving Protection Against Maritime Threats.		Agree to include this initiative in your BM4 package, subject to your follow-up meeting with Hon Collins. <i>Agree/Disagree.</i>					
Defence Force	15505	NH90 Helicopter Upgrade: Navigation and Secure Radios	2. Asked whether other agencies have agreed to support initiative 15508 – Improving Protection Against Maritime Threats.		Agree to include this initiative in your BM4 package, subject to your follow-up meeting with Hon Collins. <i>Agree/Disagree..</i>					

Vote	ID	Title	Follow up question raised	Treasury response	Minister of Finance decision	BM4 package if Treasury recommendation accepted (\$m)		Variance from BM3 package (\$m) Less savings / (More savings)				
						Average operating p.a.	Total capital	Average operating p.a.	Total capital			
Education												
Education	15799	Partnership Schools (Charter schools Kura Hourua)	At Budget Matters on 28 March, you requested additional information on this initiative.	<p>Summary of scaled option</p> <p>Our recommended scaled option reduces funding for the initiative from [33] over the forecast period to \$137 million over the forecast period. [33]</p> <p>. We note that the cost estimates and assumptions for convertor schools in particular are uncertain. If there is scope to consider further the mix of new and convertor schools, we recommend prioritising new schools at this stage, given that there is a tested blueprint for their implementation from the previous Charter School programme.</p> <p>Depending on levels of demand from sponsors and schools, that level of funding would still enable a number of new schools to open similar to the level achieved under the previous Charter Schools initiative (under which 17 schools had been approved when the programme was closed). It would also enable the opening of a first wave of existing schools converting to Charter School status, which is a new model for New Zealand.</p> <p>The scaled level of funding does not include provision for the costs of a potential Departmental agency to oversee the programme, and the additional staff sought by MoE for the programme (which we set out in more detail below).</p> <p>Rationale for scaling</p> <p>Our scaled option balances giving momentum with a need to fund other Government priorities. It also reflects the uncertainties around potential levels of demand for the programme, where MoE has not yet undertaken detailed market testing, and the context that work on policy development and oversight arrangements is being taken forward at pace in parallel with Budget decision making.</p> <p>At a more detailed level:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our scaled option removed the provision and cost for the 45 additional FTE sought for the initiative at \$8.3 million across the forecast period (this was sought by MoE for staff with specialist skills around performance/contract management). • This assessment was based on the high bar for recommending additional FTE and the need for key decisions to be made on the management and oversight arrangements of the programme that would define the number of FTE required. • Since the bid was submitted and assessed, the Associate Minister has taken forward a paper recommending the creation of a Departmental Agency to oversee the programme. • If this is agreed by Cabinet, we recognise that additional funding above our scaled option may be required to meet the cost of these staff. In the first instance, we recommend trading off those costs against the number of schools that could be funded. <p>Tagged contingency recommendation</p> <p>Given the uncertainties around potential levels of demand for new and converting schools, there is a strong case for funding from 2025/26 to be placed in a tagged contingency. Year 1 priorities in 2024/25 require funding certainty and activity from the beginning of the financial year and we recommend providing 2024/25 funding without a contingency. However, the benefits of a contingency approach for subsequent years outweigh the risks and enable funding decisions to be made based on clearer evidence of demand and more certain costing data.</p>								
Education	15851	Kura Whanau Reo	At your bilateral meeting with Hon Stanford, you agreed to transfer funding for this initiative	MoE has begun discussions with Te Mātāwai, which aims to promote the use of te reo in homes and the community, to take over this initiative. We understand the Minister of Education's office is looking to initiate a similar discussion with the Minister of Māori Development's office. The Treasury has advised MoE that, if agreed between agencies and relevant Ministers, this transfer can occur at the next baseline update.	Note Ministers agreed at the Education Bilateral discussion that funding for this initiative should be continued, but should	-	-	(2.2)	-			

Vote	ID	Title	Follow up question raised	Treasury response	Minister of Finance decision	BM4 package if Treasury recommendation accepted (\$m)		Variance from BM3 package (\$m) Less savings / (More savings)	
						Average operating p.a.	Total capital	Average operating p.a.	Total capital
			(currently in Vote Education) elsewhere, rather than reprioritising it and stopping this initiative. In response to T2024/863 you asked Treasury to follow up on where this initiative would be transferred to.		<p>move out of Vote Education.</p> <p>Note Kura Whanau Reo will therefore not be included as a reprioritisation initiative in Budget 2024</p> <p>Note MoE has begun discussions with Te Mātāwai, to take over this initiative, and the Minister of Education's office is looking to initiate a similar discussion with the Minister of Māori Development's office</p> <p>Note that, if agreed between agencies and relevant Ministers, the Minister of Education can transfer responsibility for this programme at the next baseline update.</p>				
[33]									
Education Review Office									
Education Review Office	15530	Independent Children's Monitor - Aroturuki Tamariki savings of 6.5%	You noted that the Minister of Education needs to consult with the Minister for Social Development and the Minister for Children and	<p>The Minister of Social Development has reviewed and approved this savings initiative.</p> <p>The Minister for Children has not been consulted on this savings initiative. We understand that it is not common for the Minister for Children to be involved in decisions regarding the Independent Children's Monitor (the ICM), to allow for separation within the monitoring system.</p> <p>This savings initiative does not create significant risks to the oversight of Oranga Tamariki. The ICM is expected to be able to meet their statutory requirements while still meeting their 6.5% baseline savings.</p>	<p>Note that the Minister of Social Development has reviewed and approved this savings initiative.</p> <p>Note that the Minister for Children has not been consulted as is common to</p>	(0.7)	-	-	-

Vote	ID	Title	Follow up question raised	Treasury response	Minister of Finance decision	BM4 package if Treasury recommendation accepted (\$m)		Variance from BM3 package (\$m) Less savings / (More savings)	
						Average operating p.a.	Total capital	Average operating p.a.	Total capital
			be satisfied that this savings initiative doesn't create significant risks to the oversight of OT.		maintain separation within the monitoring system.				
Health									
Health	16085	Tax only smoked tobacco products (Remove duty from heated tobacco products)	Cabinet agreed to consider this late initiative on 18 March [CAB-24-MIN-0084 refers]. Following advice last week (T2024/823 refers), you sought further advice on this initiative.	<p>Our advice is to not support this initiative. If you do wish to progress, a partial excise reduction would reduce fiscal risk and better reflect likely heated tobacco product (HTP) harm.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no clear independent evidence supporting HTPs as a smoking cessation tool. HTPs do contain toxicants at lower levels than cigarettes in some cases, but also contain some toxicants that cigarettes do not. Evidence is clear that HTPs are more harmful than vaping. Philip Morris is currently the sole HTP provider to the New Zealand market. It is not clear Philip Morris will pass through the full excise reduction (and if so, for how long). If it did, this initiative would reduce a 20 pack of heated tobacco sticks to ^[33] relative to ~\$40 for an equivalent pack of 20 cigarettes. Modelling the impact of excise removal has been rapidly undertaken across the Ministry of Health and Treasury. HTPs are a relatively new product and there is little published evidence to inform modelling. Estimating how the market will respond to the relative pricing of HTP devices and sticks is challenging and involves guesswork. Officials have drawn from Japan as the closest comparator noting its previous favourable tax treatment of HTPs (now being phased out) with the caveat of reduced access to vapes. A deflator has been applied to the observed rate of HTP adoption in Japan to create a best estimate of ^[33] over the forecast period. If HTP use accelerated at the same speed as Japan, the cost of this initiative would be ^[33] across the four year forecast period. The size of tobacco excise revenue (forecast to decline to \$1,370 million in 2027/28 in the status quo) means that any major policy change, particularly an intervention with limited international evidence, would produce material fiscal risk. 	<p>Agree to not support this initiative. <i>Agree/Disagree</i></p> <p>Note that if you do wish to progress this initiative, the current cost estimate is ^[33] across the forecast period ^[33]</p>	-	-	-	-
Regulation									
Regulation	15734	Ministry for Regulation	Following advice last week (T2024/823 refers), you sought further information on the Ministry for Regulation Budget 2024 initiative.	<p>There is currently \$14.3 million operating of new funding from Budget 2024 in the draft package. It sits alongside reprioritised funding for Productivity Commission, Treasury and MBIE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Productivity commission: \$5.9M per annum. Treasury: \$1.7M per annum. MBIE: Complex to calculate, approximately \$300k of MBIE baseline funding. <p>Therefore, the total budget for the Ministry for Regulation is ~\$12 million per annum.</p> <p>Hon Seymour sought funding for 60 FTE. The scaled amount will provide for 42 (compared to the Productivity Commission's 23).</p> <p>If Budget Ministers are wishing to scale up this initiative, then an additional \$1 million per annum operating could provide for an estimated additional 6 FTEs (including corporate overhead). This has been calculated based on the costings submitted by PSC for the full initiative and would bring the total headcount for the new standalone Ministry to approximately 48.</p>	<p>Agree to not make further changes to the BM4 package. <i>Agree/Disagree.</i></p>	3.8	2.0	(3.8)	(2.0)

Vote	ID	Title	Follow up question raised	Treasury response	Minister of Finance decision	BM4 package if Treasury recommendation accepted (\$m)		Variance from BM3 package (\$m) Less savings / (More savings)	
						Average operating p.a.	Total capital	Average operating p.a.	Total capital
Oranga Tamariki									
Oranga Tamariki	15455	Costs for services to high needs children	As part of T2024/823, you indicated that: 1. Your priority was to fund the initiative for "Costs for services to high needs children", [33] 2. You inquired whether these two initiatives would be sufficient to achieve a net uplift at Budget 2024.	[33] <u>Question 2</u> After further engagement with Oranga Tamariki, it is clear that from: • an additional \$52.2 million total operating for "Costs for services to high needs children", and • [33] There will be a net uplift in funding for Oranga Tamariki of \$26.9 million total over the forecast period.	Note we have included this initiative in this BM4 package.	11.9	-	(11.9)	-
[33]					[33]				
Social Development									
[33]									

Vote	ID	Title	Follow up question raised	Treasury response	Minister of Finance decision	BM4 package if Treasury recommendation accepted (\$m)		Variance from BM3 package (\$m) Less savings / (More savings)	
						Average operating p.a.	Total capital	Average operating p.a.	Total capital
[33]									
Transport									
[33]									

[33]

