

How to Submit on the Police Discussion Document – Arms Regulations: Review of fees 2022

BACKGROUND

Due to a number of changes made to the Arms Act, Police are now seeking to increase the costs to licensed firearm owners of the licensing framework.

Police are pushing ahead with uninformed and outrageous proposals that will significantly increase cost to firearms owners. Some increase by 2000% on the previous cost. There are new fees as well, and some of these appear designed to punish firearm owners for their choices and interests.

They claim that the fees are to recover the full cost of Police administration and regulatory activity related to your firearms. This includes extraordinary new charges for Police to come to your home or premise if there is a burglary, Police attendance at gun shows, film sets, or re-enactment events, and other compliance measures and inspections.

The law that empowered the Police to charge these fees was claimed to be for public benefit, yet the Police argue in this consultation that it is firearms owners who should, unusually, pay the full cost of this public benefit.

They are wrong, and the fees will discourage firearm ownership and safe and legal participation. We must stand up against this.

It is very important that as many people submit to the Police against these regulations. Write however much or little you can, using your own situation and the suggestions in this document. Encourage others to do so.

COLFO will be making a submission. It will reiterate our strong opposition to the over regulation and targeting of licensed firearm owners. This template provides you with the support on the technical aspects of answering the submission but if you wish to express your frustration with the overall system, please do so. Please just do so respectfully to ensure that your submission is not ignored.

TIPS FOR SUBMISSION

1. The submission document is long. You don't have to submit on everything, just what is most important to you. Pick and choose from the table below. For example, if you only want to submit on firearms licence fees, only answer questions 1 – 5.
2. Be careful with understanding how the Police have stated numbers such as "25, 50 or 75%" cost recovery. This is written from the Police perspective. A "75% cost recovery" means the owner will pay 75% of cost and the general public will pay 25%.
3. Our suggested answers below provide you with bullet points – as much as possible put it in to your own words. If you have an example from your own experience, please add it. Real world experience is important.
4. Some suggested answers repeat other answers. This is because the points are equally relevant but also ensure that if you are only answering some parts that these points are covered off.

The submission form can be completed online here: consultation.police.govt.nz/policy/arms-regulation-review-of-fees

OR

You can download a submission form in word or pdf form here: www.police.govt.nz/consultation-arms-regulations-review-of-fees-2022. From here, you can complete and submit the form through the following channels:

- Complete the form electronically and email the form to armsactfees@police.govt.nz (link sends an email); or
- Print the submission form and write on it by hand, and post it to Policy Group, Police National Headquarters, PO Box 3017, Wellington. Include your name and contact details.

SUBMISSIONS ARE DUE MIDNIGHT 16 FEBRUARY 2023

| | | ISSUES: | What the discussion paper proposes: | QUESTIONS: (the question numbers in these directly refer to the questions in the consultation document) | SUGGESTED ANSWER: |
|--------------|---|----------------------------------|--|---|--|
| LICENCE FEES | Firearms licence (Questions 1-5) | Firearms safety training courses | Proposes fees for safety training courses to be on a full or partial cost recovery basis. This would be set as a separate fee from the licence application fee. | Q1. Should the safety training course fee be set on a full cost recovery basis or a partial cost recovery basis? | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- This should be fully publicly funded. The course trains people in firearm safety. This has significant benefit to public safety.- Completion of the course by people who do not go on to apply for a licence is still of significant benefit to the wider |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|
| | | A fee set at full cost recovery is estimated at \$88. | If you chose partial cost recovery, on what basis should it be set? | community and partial cost recovery will encourage more people to complete it. The separation of the course may encourage those who have no intention to apply for a licence but are around firearms (such as a rural property). This should be supported. - This should not result in “slightly higher cost to obtain a licence”. We need to encourage people to obtain licences. |
| | Fee for 5-year or 10-year firearms licences (excluding the fee for the safety training course) | <p>Proposes three partial cost recovery options which could apply for both 5-year and 10-year licenses:</p> <p>A. 25% of full cost (estimated between \$208.55 [5-year] and \$242.50 [10-year]).</p> <p>B. 50% of full cost (estimated between \$417.10 [5-year] and \$485.00 [10-year]).</p> <p>C. 75% of full cost (estimated between \$625.60 (5-year) and (\$727.50 (10-year)).</p> <p>The current licence fee is \$126.50 for first-time applicants or those who apply for renewal before their licence expires. The fee, if applied for after expiry, is \$241.50. The current fee includes the firearms safety course. In the new proposal it will not.</p> | <p>Q2. Should the fee for either a 5-year or a 10-year firearms licence (excluding the fee for the safety training course) be partially cost recovered at:</p> <p>25% of the costs? OR</p> <p>50% of the costs? OR</p> <p>75% of the costs?</p> <p>If you answered no to all partial cost recovery options above, on what basis do you think a partial cost recovery fee should be set?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Option A - The discussion states that it “is not easy to predict” what may occur at different cost recovery levels. However, there is no evidence that modelling or engagement with licensed firearm owners has been attempted to seek this outcome. - The result is that a series of assertions made without any understanding of the possible outcomes, along with a number of contradicting statements. It is not possible to state that an advantage of Option B is that it “reduces the risk of non-compliance” while also stating that a disadvantage is that “effectiveness of subsidy is difficult to predict as risk of non-compliance”. - The calculation of costs include the costs of compliance. This is incorrect. Firearms licence holders should not have to pay for compliance, in the same way as drivers’ licence holders do not pay for compliance activities as part of their licence fees. - Instalment payments should be available at any level of subsidisation. It will encourage those, particularly on low income to apply. As stated in the discussion, it reduces an immediate financial barrier and reduces the risk of illegal retention of firearms. - The discussion fails to properly identify who the “beneficiary” of the licencing regime is and assumes the only beneficiaries may be current or future licence-holders. The discussion does not take in to account the public safety benefits of licensing. Reducing the number of licences does not reduce firearm use. Instead it just reduces the number that use firearms within a regulated system informed by safety. - Continue to oppose a firearms register but Police have stated that a successful register will have as many firearm users participating as possible. Increasing fees will discourage applicants and decrease the potential information that will be contained in the register. - The discussion states that there is “no clear rationale to increase the level of subsidy for this type of recreational activity over any other”. Without evidence of subsidy levels for other recreational activities, such as rugby or other Olympic sports, it is not possible to make the assertion that an increased subsidy cannot be rationalised. - The discussion implies there is a group of people that apply for a licence because it is cheap but have no |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | <p>intention to use it. There is no evidence that such a group exists. Additionally, this conclusion is at odds with the significant application process required to get a licence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The discussion seeks suggestions to support those who need the licence for their livelihoods. We are concerned that the increased proposed costs across this discussion document discriminate against low income firearm owners. These costs will exclude them from the regulated system. |
| | Payment of fees by instalment | <p>Suggests the option to issue a firearms licence conditional on a specified payment schedule. This would apply if the fee for a firearms licence increases to more than 50% of the cost.</p> <p>The first payment would be the largest payment, and would include an additional cost to cover the administration of paying by instalment.</p> <p>Police have not provided an estimate of the proposed payment schedule.</p> | <p>Q3. If the fee for a firearms licence is increased significantly (that is the fee set at a level at more than 50% of the cost), would you support Police investigating an option to issue a firearms licence conditional on a specified payment schedule?</p> <p>If you selected no, do you have any other suggestions or ideas?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yes, we strongly encourage a system that allows payment instalments. - A condition of licence that a payment schedule is followed is reasonable. - However, given the ongoing issues with Police administration of the licencing system, there should be a warning system and a significant grace period to allow licence-holders to make the required payment. It should not be automatic suspension of a licence if a payment is missed. |
| | Support mechanisms for those on low household incomes | <p>Seeking suggestions on instalment options for payment of firearms licenses.</p> <p>Acknowledges that firearms licence application costs may present a barrier for those on low household incomes, such as those who need to use firearms to supplement their food sources, or require a firearms licence to gain employment.</p> | <p>Q4. Do you have any suggestions for support mechanisms outside the general firearms licensing system?</p> <p>If yes, how might this be done?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The system should be designed to allow all people to have the opportunity to access safe firearm use regardless of the reason they wish to do so or their economic status. - However, there is an existing system to support people of low income to buy the items they need. WINZ provides grants and loans for items such as washing machines and supports people to get their driver's licence. These systems should be used to support people who need a firearms licence. |
| | Discount for prompt renewal of firearms licence | <p>Proposes discount of 10% for people applying for a new licence in sufficient time to be processed before their previous licence expires.</p> <p>The application should not be too far in advance as to minimise the risk for a change in the fit and proper assessment which must be made at the time of the application.</p> <p>A discount would not apply for a licence fee set at 25% of the cost.</p> | <p>Q5. If the fee is set at 50% or 75% of cost, do you consider a 10% discount is sufficient to encourage timely applications before their licence expires?</p> <p>If not, what level of discount would be sufficient?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We agree with a prompt discount system. - As the problem, of significant delays in processing, have been caused by Police, this discount should be higher. - Support a 25% discount for early application |
| Dealer's licence (Questions 6 – 8) | Fee for a dealer's licence application | <p>Proposes that a dealer's annual licence fee be set at full cost recovery between \$2,330 and \$2,570.</p> <p>The current fee for a dealer's licence is \$204 per year.</p> | <p>Q6. Should the annual fee for a dealer's licence be set on a full cost recovery basis?</p> <p>If you selected no, do you have any other suggestions or ideas?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No - Dealers provide a community service by helping regulate the sale and transfer of firearms. They assist in minimising the grey market and provide oversight where Police do not have the resources. - Dealers keep extensive records at their own cost which Police wish to access and use in their investigations. These records are of minimal use to individual dealers. This |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | | | <p>assistance to Police should be reflected in the cost recovery.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The discussion assumes that all dealers are commercial except for museum curators. There are a number of people who are now classified as dealers due to the legislation change. They have been ignored in this consultation. - The legislation refers to a wide range of people, including those who lend firearms and “otherwise supply”. This includes people operating for no or low profit but rather as a service to the firearms community. - The proposed fee represents an over 1000% increase compared to the current fee. This will drive a number of dealers out of business or incentivise them to operate outside the system. A reduced number of dealers in rural areas will create accessibility and delivery issues. It will also reduce competitive trade and drive more trade underground - Dealer applicants are already licensed. It is double dipping to charge additionally for vetting, household checks etc. - There is no acknowledgement of the public benefit of having verified dealers rather than allowing firearms to trade undetected. This should be reflected in the cost recovery. |
| | Fees for first and subsequent applications | <p>Proposes two possible arrangements for how the annual fee for a dealer’s licence may be set:</p> <p>Option A: a fixed annual fee at the same average rate for both first-time and subsequent applicants.</p> <p>Option B: with different average annual fee depending on whether the application is a first-time or subsequent application.</p> | <p>Q7. Should the annual fee for a dealer’s licence be set at the same average rate for both first-time and subsequent applicants? (Option A)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Should the annual fee for a dealer’s licence be set with different rates depending on whether the application is a first-time or subsequent application? (Option B)</p> <p>Please select one</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Option B - Agree that subsequent applications should be charged at a lower rate as this reflects the lower work load. - Annual renewal represents significant over regulation of people that have proven they are fit and proper to act. - Understand that as annual renewal is required by legislation it is not within the scope of this consultation. - However, the significant decrease in risk from renewals means Police can design a system that only undertakes annual significant checks where something has changed. A full vet could occur every 3 or 5 years. - Design of a pragmatic system as suggested would decrease police workload and therefore decrease cost to Police and applicant. |
| | | <p>Proposes two possible arrangements if different annual fees were to be set under Option B:</p> <p>Option B.1: a fixed average with a lower average fee for second and subsequent applications. \$1,760 – \$1,940 a year averaged at full cost recovery.</p> <p>Option B.2: a fixed average base fee plus a variable fee for second and subsequent applications based on the size of the dealer business. \$1,000 - \$1,100 per year as an</p> | <p>Q8. If different rates are set for first-time and subsequent applications for a dealer’s licence, it’s proposed these are set on either a fixed fee (Option B.1) or a variable fee (Option B.2) which would take into account the amount of regulatory effort required.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is fair to use a variable fee (Option B.2) but the calculation for the variation is incorrect - It is incorrect to use employee numbers as a proxy for costs to police. Additional revenue does not necessarily equate to additional costs to Police. Additional tasks by Police are covered by other fees, such as permits to import etc. - The proposal also intends to include people who are not “employees” (such as contractors) as part of this number. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| | | average base, and additional fee from \$190 – \$210 per employee. | <p>Do you agree these should be two set fees, an average first fee with a lower average fee for second and subsequent applications? (Option B.1)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Do you agree that it should be a fixed average base fee set for first-time or significantly changed applications, and a variable fee for second and subsequent applications based on the size of the dealer business? (Option B.2)</p> <p>Do you have any other suggestions or ideas on how to set these different fees?</p> | Employment NZ has clear ruling on this and explicitly states that an independent contractor is not an employee. |
| Museum directors and curators (Questions 9 – 12) | Fee for a museum/curator dealer application | <p>Proposes two possible arrangements for the how the annual fee for a museum/curator dealer application may be set:</p> <p>Option A: set at the same fee as for other dealer applications.</p> <p>Option B: zero, if conditions prescribed in proposed regulation are met.</p> | <p>Q9. Should a museum director/curator dealer application be set at the same fee as for other dealer applications? (Option A)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Should the fee for a museum director/curator dealer application be zero, if conditions prescribed in proposed regulation are met? (Option B)</p> <p>Please select one</p> <p>Do you have any other suggestions or ideas?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Option B. - Option A does not take in to account the beneficiaries of museum collections. They developed for community use and therefore the wider public are the main beneficiary. - The proposal ignores the public benefit of theatrical armourers who are required to be dealers. They largely provide a public benefit, such as providing public displays like armistice celebrations - Additionally, gunsmiths are now required to have a dealers' licence. Many gunsmiths do not carry out the activity for commercial gain. They provide a community service ensuring firearms are safe to use, provide another mechanism of oversight in the community about the transfer and use of firearms. - It is inconsistent to treat static displays in a museum and dynamic displays in re-enactments differently. They both serve the same purpose of preserving the history of firearms and firearm use. Many non-firearm users get more value from a dynamic display as they can better understand the context of the firearm use and its role in our country's story. |
| | | <p>Proposes that the fees for a museum director/curator dealer be set at zero if they fulfil the following conditions:</p> <p>(a) operates as a charitable trust or not-for-profit organisation</p> <p>(b) is a member of 'Museums Aotearoa' and adheres to that organisation's 'Code of Ethics and Professional Practice 2021'</p> <p>(c) acquires arms items through donation, purchase from another museum or on loan</p> | <p>Q10. Do you agree with the conditions for a museum director/curator dealer fee set at zero?</p> <p>If you selected no, do you have any other suggestions or ideas?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is incorrect to put further conditions on the definition of museums. If Parliament wish to define and limit the definition of museums to what is proposed in Option B they would have done so. - A museum is either bona fide (as it is stated in the Arms Act 1983) or it is not. |
| | | | <p>Q11. Should any of the conditions listed in Question 10 be removed?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The requirement for donations of items to only come from donation, purchase from another museum or on loan should be removed. Museums provide an avenue for |

| | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--|---|--|---|---|
| | | | (d) meets prescribed conditions for the disposal of arms items (please refer to page 27 of the discussion document for these conditions) | | removal of firearms from the grey market. This should not be restricted. |
| | Visitor licences | Fees for visitor licences | Proposes that the current fee of \$25 is increased to recover the full cost, which is estimated at between \$420 and \$470. | <p>Q12. Should other conditions be added to those listed in question 10?</p> <p>Q13. Should the fee for a firearms visitor licence be set at full cost recovery? If you selected no, do you have any other suggestions or ideas?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is incorrect to put further conditions on the definition of museums. If Parliament wish to define and limit the definition of museums to what is proposed in Option B they would have done so. - A museum is either bona fide (as it is stated in the Arms Act 1983) or it is not. |
| ENDORSEMENTS ON DEALERS LICENCES | Dealer endorsements (Questions 14 – 17) | Fee increase to reflect increased regulatory activities | Proposes to set the fee for all dealer endorsements to cover the additional cost of regulatory activities (estimated between \$110 and \$130). | <p>Q14. Should the fee for each endorsement held on a dealer’s licence be based on the additional cost of issuing an annual dealer’s licence? If you selected no, do you have any other suggestions or ideas?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Previously, if a person was fit to hold an endorsement on their personal licence, they were fit to do so on their dealer licence. No justification was made for this change. - Therefore there is no justification to ‘double vet’ for endorsements. It should not take 1 – 2 hours of staff time (as assumed from the discussion) to undertake a process that has already occurred. |
| | | Dealer employee endorsements (including theatrical armourers) | Proposes to set the application for a dealer employee endorsement at the full cost of the regulatory activities. The proposed cost reflects whether it is a first application (estimated cost between \$250 and \$270) or a subsequent endorsement (estimated cost between \$110 and \$130). | <p>Q15. Should the fee for one or more endorsements held as a dealer employee be set at full cost recovery? If you selected no, do you have any other suggestions or ideas?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The discussion fails to understand that the vast majority of theatrical armourers undertake activity as part of a community or community display such as Cambridge Armistice Day and Anzac commemorations. - This indicates a ‘double dipping’ as it is already proposed that dealers with additional employees will be charged higher fees (Q8 &9) |
| | | | | | <p>Q16. Should the fee be the same for a first-time endorsement, no matter how many</p> |

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|------------------------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | <p>endorsements are sought as a dealer employee?</p> <p>If you selected no, do you have any other suggestions or ideas?</p> | |
| | | | | <p>Q17. Should the fee be lower for a second and subsequent endorsements, no matter how many endorsements are sought as a dealer employee?</p> <p>If you selected no, do you have any other suggestions or ideas?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agree that subsequent applications are charged at a lower rate. - However, the lower rate should also be charged where an employee changes employment. There is no justification that further work is required by the Police in this circumstance. Additionally, charging the higher fee may be seen as a barrier to a new employer. |
| ENDORSEMENTS ON LICENCE AND PERMITS | <p>Licence endorsements</p> <p>(Questions 18 – 22)</p> | Increase to endorsement fees | <p>Proposes to increase fees to better cover the cost of regulatory activity. Two options are considered:</p> <p>Option A: a fixed average fee for all endorsement types (estimated from \$1,370 – \$1,510).</p> <p>Option B: uses average fees to reflect the different types of regulatory oversight:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - use of a pistol on a certified pistol range (\$1,350 – \$1,490) - possessing a prohibited firearm and prohibited magazine for pest control purposes (\$930 – \$1,020) - possessing a memento or heirloom item (\$930 – \$1,020) - for a bona fide collector a fixed base fee, plus a fee determined by the number of items held on each endorsement (\$1,230 – \$1,360 fixed base fee, plus \$10 for each major item inspected) - For theatrical re-enactment a fixed base fee, plus a fee determined by the number of items held on each endorsement (\$1,230 – \$1,360) fixed base fee, plus \$10 for each major item inspected). <p>The term “major item” means an item that is required to be recorded in the Registry in accordance with the regulations to be in force by 24 June 2023.</p> <p>The current fee for all endorsements is \$204.</p> | <p>Q18. Should the endorsement fee be set at:</p> <p>Option A – the same fixed average fee for all types of endorsements.</p> <p>Option B – for possession of a pistol, or prohibited item for pest control, or a memento/heirloom firearm): a different fixed average fee for each endorsement type.</p> <p>Do you have any other suggestions or ideas?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The calculation of costs include the costs of compliance. This is incorrect. Firearms licence holders should not have to pay for compliance, in the same way as drivers’ licence holders do not pay for compliance activities as part of their licence fees. - We acknowledge that endorsed items are usually of a higher value and more attractive to criminals. This is why these items require significantly higher security. The licence-holder bears all the cost of this security. A person who owns a more valuable car is not charged more for their licence because it is more attractive to criminals. - This discussion fails to meet the requirements of the Act as it does not currently examine who the beneficiaries of each type of endorsement are. It cannot be assumed that pest control, as a commercial activity benefits only the endorsement-holder. - The discussion incorrectly states, “Those people holding pistols and collections do so for sporting and recreational purposes, and personal interest in history”. Without these collectors, significant parts of our history would have been lost as only a limited number of people possess this specific knowledge. - As an example, pest control significantly benefits New Zealand’s wider predator-free goals. Putting such a significant fee on an annual licence is likely to lead to a decreased number of endorsement holders, making it even more difficult for DOC to recruit the pest controllers they need. <p>[Note: if you are an endorsement holder, this is the key opportunity to provide your personal circumstances. It is clear the authors of this document had no understanding of the licensed firearms community when they wrote this.</p> <p>Include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What endorsement you hold - Why you hold it |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Who it benefits – are you holding the heirloom on behalf of wider family, how many re-enactments are you involved in, (who to).] - We note there is a discrepancy in the proposal. For a collector, the discussion document states \$10 will be charged “for each major item inspected”. The submission form states “for each item held”. These are two different proposals. It is not possible to provide an informed answer unless Police clarify which one is proposed. |
| | | | | <p>Q19. Option B – for bona fide and theatrical re-enactment endorsements: Should the endorsement fee for bona fide and theatrical re-enactment endorsements be set at a base fixed fee plus a variable fee (the variable fee being set according to the number of arms items held)?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Understand that it is fairer for those with larger collections to pay for the additional service provided. - However the variable rate stated does not reflect any economies of scale for larger collections. - It should be noted that a significant part of the work, recording the items (either in application or in the future register) would have been undertaken by the collector. The officer will just be checking against this. |
| | | | | <p>Q20. If you think the fee for each endorsement type should not be set at full cost recovery, on what basis should it be set?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The calculation of costs include the costs of compliance. This is incorrect. Firearms licence holders should not have to pay for compliance, in the same way as drivers’ licence holders do not pay for compliance activities as part of their licence fees. - We acknowledge that endorsed items are usually of a higher value and more attractive to criminals. This is why these items require significantly higher security. The licence-holder bears all the cost of this security. A person who owns a more valuable car is not charged more for their licence because it is more attractive to criminals. - This discussion fails to meet the requirements of the Act as it does not currently examine who the beneficiaries of each type of endorsement are. It cannot be assumed that pest control, as a commercial activity benefits only the endorsement-holder. - The discussion incorrectly states, “Those people holding pistols and collections do so for sporting and recreational purposes, and personal interest in history”. Without these collectors, significant parts of our history would have been lost as only limited number of people possess this specific knowledge. - As an example, pest control significantly benefits New Zealand’s wider predator free goals. Putting such a significant fee on an annual licence is likely to lead to a decreased number of endorsement-holders and make it even more difficult for DOC to recruit the pest controllers they need. |

| | | | | | |
|--------------------|---|--|--|---|---|
| | | Additional fee for applications made separately from applications for a firearms licence | Proposes to apply an additional fee when the application for an endorsement is made within the duration of the licence (i.e. rather than coinciding with the application for a firearms licence). The amount is estimated to be from \$590 - \$650. | Q21. Do you agree that an additional fee (or fees) should be set to meet the additional work required when an application for endorsement (or endorsements) is made in the duration of the licence? If you selected no, do you have any other suggestions or ideas? | - It is understood that endorsements applied for during the duration of the licence require further work by Police. However, we should be incentivising people to seek the endorsements as soon as they require it. This high application fee is likely to discourage some people. |
| | | | Proposes the option for renewals of endorsements to be set at a lesser fee than for a first-time application. | Q22. Do you consider that the application for endorsement for a renewal of the same endorsement should be set at a lesser fee than for a first-time application for that endorsement? If you selected no, do you have any other suggestions or ideas? | - Agree. - This reflects the lower amount of work required. |
| | Permit to possess an item needing endorsement | New average fee for permits | Proposes a new average fee based on full cost recovery at \$40 per permit. This is a single fixed fee, regardless of the type of item. Police anticipate that the introduction of the registry will allow for a more cost-effective process, and the \$40 cost is the current estimate of delivering permits to possess. | Q23. Do you agree that a full cost recovery fee should be charged for permits to possess? If you selected no, do you have any other suggestions or ideas? | - The calculation of this fee is incorrect. - The registry will be established shortly after these new fees are proposed to come in to effect. Therefore, the cost recovery cannot be calculated on the current basis. - The legislation requires the fee reflect the costs of the work. The discussion document explicitly states that this will not occur. Therefore to set the fee as stated will not meet the threshold required in the Arms Act. - Regardless, a discount should be provided where a single location is used for application. For example, at auctions as it is efficient for the Police to attend and process all applications at the same time. |
| | | | | Q24. Do you agree that the fee for a permit to possess should be averaged across all permits to possess, irrespective of the type of item being obtained? If you selected no, do you have any other suggestions or ideas? | - Agree. |
| MISCELLANEOUS FEES | Additional place of business | Fee for change of place of business (dealer employing a theatrical armourer) | Proposes to set a new fee for the approval of an additional site involving a theatrical armourer. If set to achieve full cost recovery, the fee would be from \$2,140 - \$2,360. | Q25. Should the fee for a consent to an activity at an additional business site supervised by an on-site theatrical armourer be set at full cost recovery? If you selected no, do you have any other suggestions or ideas? | - The significant fee ignores the theatrical armourers who provide services for organisations at little or no cost, such as air shows, historical re-enactments and ceremonial events. This will prevent these people from doing so. Theatrical armourers who are firearms dealers who work in the film industry will be constantly applying for a change of business location due to the variety of filming locations, and the charges will have to be passed onto a |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | | | <p>film industry that the Government is keen to have use New Zealand as a filming location.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The cost calculation incorrectly includes the cost of attendance after a burglary. No other victim of burglary gets charged by Police for investigation of the crime. This is known as re-victimisation. |
| Fee for consent to hold/attend a gun show or auction | Proposes a two-part fee based on the average estimated full cost to Police: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Approval (estimated at \$1,020 - \$1,120) 2. Attendance cost to Police (estimated at \$1,120 - \$1,240 per Police person per day) <p>This fee can be spread across multiple dealers if more than one is attending a particular gun show or auction.</p> <p>The current fee for holding a gun show is \$50.</p> | <p>Q26.</p> <p>Should the fee for consent for a dealer to display, sell, or supply firearms at a gun show or auction be set at the estimated full cost to Police?</p> <p>If you selected no, do you have any other suggestions or ideas?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This represents a 2600% increase in the cost of holding a one day gun show. This is an unreasonable cost to business and will mean less gun shows. Gun shows are the most public and transparent way of dealing in firearms. They should be encouraged to keep firearms and licensed firearm owners in the open and are a means of educating firearm users. - The discussion fails to take in to account the circumstances of most gun shows held in NZ. The vast majority are held in the same venues and run by the same people, who have all held licences for a considerable period. There is no account for experience or records of safety, which in turn decrease workload for Police. - There is a double dipping, as most of the dealers will have had to apply for an additional place of business at a similar cost. Most of the activities will be the same or can be carried out concurrently once on site. - It also fails to acknowledge that gun shows often include not for profit organisations, such as Deerstalkers Association who provide firearm safety and training. Increasing the show fees so significantly is likely to increase stallholder fees for organisations like this. | |
| | | <p>Q27.</p> <p>Irrespective of your answer to 26, should the fee for the consent for a dealer to display, sell, or supply firearms at a gun show or auction be comprised of a fixed fee and a variable component to cover the cost of Police's site attendance?</p> <p>If you selected no, do you have any other suggestions or ideas?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Variable to reflect the actual additional cost. - The actual additional cost is likely to be minimal as the checks will have already been carried out as part of the dealers annual licence renewal and the approval to hold a gun show. This is another example of double dipping. | |
| | | <p>Q28.</p> <p>Should the variable component referred to in 27 be spread across the number of dealers sharing the service at a specific gun show?</p> <p>If you selected no, do you have any other suggestions or ideas?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agree. | |
| | | <p>Q29.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A one month application in advance would be more practical. | |

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|---|
| | | | <p>If you answered yes to 28 above, should applications be made 90 days in advance of the gun show or auction so as to enable the variable component referred to in 27 and 28 to be spread across multiple dealers?</p> <p>If you selected no, do you have any other suggestions or ideas?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This allows for the dealers to understand whether there is value in attending the show and what stocks they will have on hand. |
| Notification and approval of ammunition seller | Full cost recovery fee for notification and approval | <p>Proposes an average fee of \$560 - \$620 for a notification and approval for a non-dealer to sell ammunition as part of a non-firearms-related business.</p> <p>“There is currently no fee for this regulatory activity, despite the ammunition seller deriving commercial benefit from it.”</p> | <p>Q30. Do you agree that a full cost recovery fee should be set for the regulatory oversight of an ammunition seller?</p> <p>If you selected no, do you have any other suggestions or ideas?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Section 22D of the Arms Act loosely defines anyone who “sells or supplies” ammunition as an ammunition seller. This is the result of poor drafting and means that the requirements are not restricted to only those that do so for commercial gain. - There are many volunteers within firearm clubs and ranges who provide this service as a not for profit. It is completely incorrect to set a fee for this type of person who gains no personal benefit. - The discussion states that the “financial impact on the ammunition seller will be insignificant”. There is no evidence of how this conclusion was made as there is no detail on the commercial or otherwise viability of being an ammunition seller. |
| Mail order and internet sales | No proposed charge for mail order and internet sales | <p>Proposes that there be no fee for mail order and domestic internet sales at this time.</p> <p>Police intends to simplify the mail order and internet approval process after the registry becomes available following 24 June 2023. Police may later review the setting of a fee.</p> | <p>Q31. Do you agree that no fee should be charged for mail order and domestic internet sales?</p> <p>If you selected no, do you have any other suggestions or ideas?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agree. |
| Fee for import permits | Fee for import permit for firearms, firearm parts (including magazines), prohibited magazines, restricted airguns, and restricted weapons | <p>Proposes a new fee through the following options:</p> <p>Option A: a fixed full cost from \$540 - \$590</p> <p>Option B: fixed fee of \$42 - \$45 plus \$5 per each item type and major firearms part as defined in the Arms Regulations 1992</p> | <p>Q32. Do you agree to a fee for import permits set at full cost recovery?</p> <p>If you selected no, do you have any other suggestions or ideas?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is no consideration of the public benefit from firearm use in NZ such as pest control and food production. - Concessions should be available when the item is for a non-profit reason, such as for a museum or collection. |
| | | | <p>Q33. Do you prefer:</p> <p>Option A: a fixed fee</p> <p>Option B: a fixed fee plus a variable fee</p> <p>Do you have any other suggestions or ideas?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Option B - This better reflects the cost for large importers. |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|--|
| | Fee for import permit for ammunition | Proposes a new fee to import any quantity of a specific type of ammunition be set at a full cost recovery of \$540 – \$590. | Q34. Do you agree that a full cost recovery fee should be set for permits to import ammunition irrespective of the quantity or type of ammunition imported? If you selected no, do you have any other suggestions or ideas? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This assumes incorrectly that all ammunition sellers or suppliers are doing so for commercial purposes. Partial cost recovery is required to reflect that public benefit. - There is no evidence provided for the conclusion that the cost of the permit is insignificant compared with the purchase cost of ammunition. | |
| | Fee for import sample | Proposes a new fee for the examination and testing of a sample of an arms item. At full cost recovery it is estimated to be set at \$1,230 - \$1,360 per item or ammunition type. | Q35. Do you agree that a fee for an import sample should be the cost of an assessment of a sample by a qualified Police armourer or equivalent qualified person? If you selected no, on what basis should the fee be set? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There should be partial cost recovery only. It is for public benefit that these items are inspected and we need to incentivise people to bring items in to New Zealand through legal channels. - The Police also use the examination to gather intelligence. A technical report is produced that is not provided to the importer. If full cost recovery is required, Police may not gather an information for their own use. | |
| | Fee for replacement card or permit | Proposes a \$40 fee for the estimated average full cost of production and issue of a new card or permit. Current fee for replacing a card or permit is \$25. | Q36. Do you agree that the fee to issue a replacement firearms licence or permit be set at full cost recovery? If you selected no, on what basis should the fee be set? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agree. | |
| | Fee variation to endorsement – permission to carry | Applications to obtain a permit to carry an endorsed item beyond the dwelling and section | Proposes a new fee for licence holders applying for permission to carry firearms to any place not specified on the conditions of their endorsement. If set at full cost recovery, the proposed fee would be \$1,020 - \$1,100 and an additional fee of \$560 - \$620 if Police attendance at site is required. | Q37. Do you agree that an application to obtain a permit to carry an endorsed item beyond the dwelling and the section in which it sits being set at an average full cost recovery fee? If you selected no, on what basis should the fee be set? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This is a 'make work' scheme by the Police. There was no formal process previously for this and no justification as to why this is needed. The discussion does not outline the new tasks required. - A significant majority of places where firearms will be carried to outside of conditions are places that have had all other required checks like ranges, club events, re-enactments or gun shows. There is no justification for the additional work or fee. - The significant fee ignores the theatrical armourers who provide services for organisations at little or no cost, such as air shows, historical re-enactments and ceremonial events. This will prevent these people from doing so. Theatrical armourers who are firearms dealers who work in the film industry will be constantly applying for a change of business location due to the variety of filming locations, and the charges will have to be passed onto a film industry that the Government is keen to have use New Zealand as a filming location. - Police issued transport secure storage guidelines and licence holders are required to adhere to them so there is no additional work required for Police in the actual movement of the firearms. |

| | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|---|--|--|---|
| | Modification and assembly of firearms | Fee set at full cost to Police of armourer assessment | Proposes a new fee for people who wish to modify their prohibited firearm to a non-prohibited firearm, in order to recover the full cost to Police. The average cost for the examination, report, and return or disposal of the modified firearm is estimated at \$1,230 - \$1,360 per item. | <p>Q38. Do you agree that a full cost recovery fee should be charged for assessment of a modified firearm by a qualified Police-employed armourer?</p> <p>If you selected no, on what basis should the fee be set?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Parliament's clear intent in the significant and rapid changes made to the Arms Act over the last three years was to see list prohibited items in circulation. Accordingly, Police should be incentivising anyone who wishes to modify their firearm. There should either be no charge or only a small charge for the assessment. |
|--|---------------------------------------|---|--|--|---|

DRAFT