MINISTRY OF SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT
TE MANATŪ WHAKAHIATO ORA

11 JAN 2018

[redacted]

Dear [redacted]

On 17 November 2017, you emailed the Ministry requesting, under the Official Information Act 1982, the following information:

- [...] *any briefings, communications, advice, or any relevant documentation about the financial costs or any other impact of the removal of the obligation to name the father of children of beneficiaries.*

Following correspondence with you on 17 November 2017, your requested refined to information provided to the new Government.

Please find attached the following three documents in scope of your request:

- '*Repeal of Section 70A and the Families Package*', report dated 10 November 2017.
- '*RE: Aide memoire for Minister Sepuloni on the Families Package meeting tomorrow*', email correspondence dated 14 November 2017.
- '*Section 70A – request one pager*' attachment to email correspondence dated 14 November 2017.

You will note that some information is withheld under section 9(2)(f)(iv) of the Official Information Act as it is under active consideration. The release of this information is likely to prejudice the ability of government to consider advice and the wider public interest of effective government would not be served.

The names and details of some individuals are withheld under section 9(2)(a) of the Official Information Act in order to protect the privacy of natural persons. The need to protect the privacy of these individuals outweighs any public interest in this information.

Please note that one piece of advice prepared in relation to the repeal of section 70A of the Social Security Act 1964 is withheld under section 9(2)(g)(i) of the Official Information Act. This advice was prepared to inform the background of an oral parliamentary question and is withheld in order to protect the effective conduct of public affairs through the free and frank expression of opinions. The Ministry believes

The Aurora Centre / 56-66 The Terrace / Wellington 6011
PO Box 1556 / Wellington 6140 / New Zealand
Phone: 64 4 916 3300 / **Fax**: 64 4 918 0099 / **www.msd.govt.nz**

the greater public interest is in the ability of individuals to express opinions in the course of their duty.
The principles and purposes of the Official Information Act 1982 under which you made your request are:

- to create greater openness and transparency about the plans, work and activities of the Government,
- to increase the ability of the public to participate in the making and administration of our laws and policies and
- to lead to greater accountability in the conduct of public affairs.

This Ministry fully supports those principles and purposes. The Ministry therefore intends to make the information contained in this letter and any attached documents available to the wider public shortly. The Ministry will do this by publishing this letter and attachments on the Ministry of Social Development's website. Your personal details will be deleted and the Ministry will not publish any information that would identify you as the person who requested the information.

If you wish to discuss this response with us, please feel free to contact OIA_Requests@msd.govt.nz.

If you are not satisfied with this response regarding documents concerning the repeal of section 70A of the Social Security Act 1964, you have the right to seek an investigation and review by the Ombudsman. Information about how to make a complaint is available at www.ombudsman.parliament.nz or 0800 802 602.

Yours sincerely

Fiona Carter-Giddings
General Manager, Employment and Income Support Policy

MINISTRY OF SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT
TE MANATŪ WHAKAHIATO ORA

Report

Date: 10 November 2017 **Security Level:** IN CONFIDENCE

To: Hon Carmel Sepuloni, Minister for Social Development

Repeal of Section 70A and the Families Package

Purpose of the report

1 In your manifesto you committed to repealing section 70A of the Social Security Act 1964 (the SSA). This section applies a reduction to the benefit rate of a sole parent who does not identify the other parent of their child in law and/or apply for Child Support, subject to some exemptions.

2 There is an opportunity to repeal this provision as part of the legislative changes for the Families Package. Repealing section 70A aligns with the goal of the Families Package to increase incomes of low- and middle-income families. Section 9(2)(f)(iv)

section 9(2)(f)(iv) Active consideration

3 We ask you to indicate your interest in repealing section 70A alongside the Families Package. If you do wish to proceed, this option will need to be discussed with the Minister of Finance and your other Ministerial colleagues involved in the Families Package, given the significant fiscal implications.

4 There are consequential impacts for the Child Support Act 1991 (the CSA) and for Inland Revenue if section 70A is repealed. If you are interested in progressing this work further consultation with, and advice from, Inland Revenue will be sought.

Recommended actions

It is recommended that you:

1 **note** that it is unclear whether section 70A of the Social Security Act 1964 meets its policy objective of encouraging sole parents to establish paternity and apply for Child Support

2 **note** that repealing section 70A would maintain the obligation to apply for Child Support, but remove the benefit reduction for failure to do so

3 **note** that officials will provide you with further advice on allowing Inland Revenue to administer exemptions to Child Support obligations

4 **note** that repealing section 70A would cost at least $25 million per year which could increase depending on any decrease in compliance with Child Support obligations

5 **note** that the Ministry of Social Development considers it feasible to implement the repeal on 1 October 2018

EITHER

6 **indicate** your interest repealing section 70A alongside the Families Package

Agree / Disagree

OR

7 Section 9(2)(f)(iv) Active Consideration

8 **raise** this option at the Families Package Ministers' meeting on Tuesday 14 November at 5pm

Yes / No

9 **forward** this report to the Ministers of Finance, Housing and Urban Development, Revenue, and Children

Agree / Disagree

Simon MacPherson
Deputy Chief Executive Policy

15/11/17
Date

Hon Carmel Sepuloni
Minister for Social Development

14/11/17.
Date

The Ministry has previously considered the effectiveness of section 70A

5 In your 2017 election manifesto, you committed to repealing section 70A of the SSA. Section 70A applies a reduction to the benefit rate of a sole parent who does not identify the other parent of their child in law and/or apply for Child Support, subject to some exemptions.

6 The benefit is reduced by $22 for each dependent child for whom the client refuses or fails to meet their Child Support obligations. After 13 weeks a further $6 a week reduction may be applied once only per client, regardless of how many of that client's children the $22 reduction applies to.

7 The policy's intent is to encourage the establishment of paternity and applications for Child Support. This ensures the other parent takes responsibility and contributes to the cost of raising their child.

8 An exemption to the benefit reduction is applied if the Ministry is satisfied that:

- there is insufficient evidence available to establish who is in law the other parent
- the client is taking active steps to identify who in law is the other parent
- the client or their child(ren) would be at risk of violence if the client carried out or took steps to meet their Child Support obligations
- there is another compelling circumstance for the client's failure to meet their Child Support obligations and there is no real likelihood of Child Support being collected, or
- the child was conceived as a result of incest or sexual violation.

9 As at March 2017, 13,268 working-age Sole Parent Support and Jobseeker sole parents have a benefit reduction in place, affecting 16,842 children. Note that we can provide updated numbers if requested.

It is unclear whether section 70A meets its policy objective

10 In October 2016, advice was provided to the previous Minister for Social Development on whether section 70A meets its policy objective to encourage the establishment of paternity and applications for Child Support. The advice concluded that:

- The Ministry does not have sufficient evidence to confirm if the benefit reduction is achieving the policy's intent. In 2004, a review of the policy identified a lack of knowledge of the policy amongst clients and case managers as a significant problem. A team of interview specialists were tasked with interviewing every client with a benefit reduction, which led to a significant increase in compliance with Child Support obligations. This practice has ceased since 2009.
- Compared to other sole parents, clients affected by a reduction have a higher likelihood of long-term welfare receipt and hardship. However, clients with a benefit reduction are no more likely to access hardship assistance than other sole parent beneficiaries.
- Sole Parents consider applying for Child Support in the context of the best interests of their children. If the parent decides to sever all contact with the other parent, and not apply for Child Support, the benefit reduction can penalise them for making a choice they view as being in the best interests of their child.
- Research from the mid-2000s identified several problems with the administration of this policy, which meant that many clients did not understand the policy. Anecdotal evidence suggests this has continued.
- Work and Income offices do not provide the most appropriate environment for discussing the sensitive subject matter of exemptions from a reduction. However, the number of exemptions granted has increased every year since 2006.

11 The Ministry recommended undertaking further research to inform future policy decisions.

There is an opportunity to repeal section 70A alongside the Families Package

12 The Government has committed to passing legislation for the Families Package within the first 100 days of being in Government. This includes amending the SSA.

13 The goal of the Families Package is to increase incomes of low- and middle-income families. Repealing section 70A would increase the incomes of the 13,268 low-income sole parents who currently have a benefit reduction in place. This aligns with the goals of the Families Package.

14 While your broader legislative priorities would also be likely to align with the aims of the Families Package, the repeal of section 70A is the only one that is feasible to progress in the timeframe of the Families Package process. Repealing this section of legislation is relatively simple as it does not require any significant changes to other legislation. Advice on the costs and potential implementation date is provided in paragraphs 25 and 26 below.

15 Section 9(2)(f)(iv) Active Consideration

Repealing section 70A would keep the obligation to apply for Child Support, but remove the benefit reduction

16 The obligation for beneficiaries to apply for Child Support is in section 9 of the CSA. The CSA also outlines a number of exemptions to this obligation, similar to those in the SSA. However, only the Ministry of Social Development (MSD) can administer the exemptions. Inland Revenue cannot apply an exemption, even if a client provides information suggesting they are eligible for one. Anecdotal evidence suggests clients have provided such information to Inland Revenue staff.

17 Section 70A of the SSA states that the rate of benefit for a sole parent shall be reduced if they do not apply meets their Child Support obligations, and do not meet one of the exemption criteria. There is no discretion for MSD to stop the practice. This is in contrast with other sanctions, which have a higher degree of discretion. This means that legislative change is required to stop the benefit reductions.

18 Repealing section 70A of the SSA would remove the benefit reduction, but keep the obligation to make a Child Support application. The exemptions from the obligation would still be in place. Currently, clients in receipt of Unsupported Child's Benefit are treated like this; they have an obligation to apply for Child Support, but do not receive a benefit reduction if they do not.

19 MSD staff will still have conversations with clients about establishing paternity and applying for Child Support, as the Child Support obligation still remains. Child Support forms will be provided alongside benefit applications for sole parents. This provides the opportunity to support sole parents to meet their Child Support obligations. However, there would be no benefit reduction as a result of the conversation.

20 Consequential changes will be required to the CSA to remove reference to the benefit reduction, which would be passed with the repeal of section 70A. This is an opportunity to consider whether Inland Revenue can apply exemptions as well as MSD. Officials will provide you with further advice, after consulting with Inland Revenue, on whether this is appropriate and how it could be operationalised.

Repealing section 70A would cost at least $25 million per year

21 The direct cost of repealing the policy would be approximately $25.5 million in its first year, and $100 million over four years. This is the amount of extra benefit that would be paid as a result of not applying the reduction.

22 The Child Support collected by Inland Revenue is retained by the Crown to offset benefit costs. In 2016, $186.5 million was offset. As we were unable to conclude whether the policy was achieving its policy objective, we cannot predict the likely behavioural change of repealing section 70A. Repealing section 70A could provide an incentive for clients not to apply for Child Support and establish private Child Support arrangements with the other parent. This is because clients would retain their full benefit rate and receive the child support paid privately.

23 A decrease in compliance would reduce the amount of Child Support retained by the Crown to offset benefit costs, increasing the total cost of repeal potentially considerably.

24 You may wish to consider the cost of the repeal in relation to any other priorities you may wish to progress in the short term. Section 9(2)(f)(iv) Active Consideration

Section 9(2)(f)(iv) Active Consideration

Operational costs and implementation date

25 Repealing section 70A requires changes to MSD's operational practices and IT systems. MSD would also communicate the changes to affected clients and provide information to MSD staff. Operational and IT changes will be a one-off cost of between $500,000 and $1 million. This does not include costs for any communications material. There would also be some minor operational and system impacts for Inland Revenue.

26 MSD does not recommend delivery of the section 70A changes alongside the 1 April or 1 July Families Package due to the size and complexity of that work. MSD is also implementing the Orphan's and Unsupported Child's Benefit Clothing Allowance on 1 July 2018, requiring operational and IT changes. It is feasible to implement the repeal of section 70A on 1 October 2018.

Next Steps

27 If you indicate an interest in repealing section 70A alongside the Families Package, you will need the agreement of your Ministerial colleagues. If you do wish to repeal section 70A as part of the Families Package, we recommend:

- forwarding this report to the Families Package Ministers, including the Ministers of Finance, Housing and Urban Development, Revenue and Children
- discussing the option at the Families Package Ministers' meeting on Tuesday 14 November at 5pm.

Section 9(2)(f)(iv) Active Consideration

Author: Policy Analyst, Employment and Income Support Policy.

Responsible Manager: Section 9(2)(a), Principal Analyst, Employment and Income Support Policy.

Elly Amiri

From: Section 9(2)(a) Privacy of natural persons
Sent: Tuesday, 14 November 2017 10:55 a.m.
To: Section 9(2)(a) parliament.govt.nz
Cc: Simon MacPherson; Fiona Carter-Giddings; Section 9(2)(a) Fiona Carter-Giddings; Section 9(2)(a)
Subject: RE: Aide memoire for Minister Sepuloni on the Families Package meeting tomorrow
Attachments: Section 70A - requested one-pager.docx

This time with attachment! Apologies

From: Section 9(2)(a)
Sent: Tuesday, 14 November 2017 10:46 a.m.
To: Section 9(2)(a) parliament.govt.nz
Cc: Section 9(2)(a) Simon MacPherson; Fiona Carter-Giddings; Section 9(2)(a) Fiona Carter-Giddings; Section 9(2)(a) Section 9(2)(a)
Subject: RE: Aide memoire for Minister Sepuloni on the Families Package meeting tomorrow

Hi Section 9(2)(a)

As discussed – here is some material from the Report on the repeal of Section 70A (sent on Friday), condensed into a one-pager as requested.

Cheers

Section 9(2)(a)
Principal Policy Analyst
Ministry of Social Development
56 the Terrace, Wellington
Section 9(2)(a)

Please note that I am out of the office on Fridays.

From: Section 9(2)(a) @parliament.govt.nz]
Sent: Tuesday, 14 November 2017 8:12 a.m.
To: Section 9(2)(a)
Cc: Section 9(2)(a) Simon MacPherson; Fiona Carter-Giddings
Subject: RE: Aide memoire for Minister Sepuloni on the Families Package meeting tomorrow

Hi Section 9(2)(a)

Thanks for this.

Just on the Section70A repeal, you may or may not have seen/heard an RNZ article about this today
http://www.radionz.co.nz/news/political/343738/govt-to-scrap-benefit-cuts-for-mums-who-don-t-name-father

I've just had the Minister for Children's Office visit asking about this and wanting to know about it to keep their Minister in the loop – I indicated that it may be raised tonight and they were keen on something to inform the Minister about it.

Could we pull maybe a one pager or less on Section 70A and what evidence there is/isn't for it that we would circulate if the Minister confirms she wants to raise it this afternoon?

Give me a call and discuss if you'd like.

Cheers
Section 9(2)(a)

Section 9(2)(a) Private Secretary, Social Development | Office of the Hon Carmel Sepuloni
Minister for Social Development, Minister for Disability Issues, Associate Minister for Pacific Peoples, Associate Minister for Arts, Culture and Heritage
Parliament Buildings |Wellington Section 9(2)(a)

From: Section 9(2)(a) @msd.govt.nz]
Sent: Monday, 13 November 2017 5:44 PM
To: Section 9(2)(a) @parliament.govt.nz>
Cc: MSD_REPORT_NUMBER_REQUESTS (MSD) <MSD_REPORT_NUMBER_REQUESTS@msd.govt.nz>; Section 9(2)(a) Section 9(2)(a) @msd.govt.nz>; Simon MacPherson <Simon.MacPherson004@msd.govt.nz>; Fiona Carter-Giddings <Fiona.CarterGiddings006@msd.govt.nz>
Subject: Aide memoire for Minister Sepuloni on the Families Package meeting tomorrow

Hi Section 9(2)(a)

Please find attached an aide memoire for Minister Sepuloni for the Families Package meeting tomorrow at 5pm.

Please call me if you have any questions.

Cheers

Section 9(2)(a)

Principal Policy Analyst
Ministry of Social Development
56 the Terrace, Wellington
Section 9(2)(a)

Please note that I am out of the office on Fridays.

Repealing Section 70A of the Social Security Act 1964

1 In your 2017 election manifesto, you committed to repealing section 70A of the SSA. Section 70A applies a reduction to the benefit rate of a sole parent who does not identify the other parent of their child in law and/or apply for Child Support, subject to some exemptions.

2 The policy's intent is to encourage the establishment of paternity and applications for Child Support. This ensures the other parent takes responsibility and contributes to the cost of raising their child.

3 As at March 2017, 13,268 working-age Sole Parent Support and Jobseeker sole parents have a benefit reduction in place, affecting 16,842 children.

It is unclear whether section 70A meets its policy objective

4 In October 2016, advice was provided to the previous Minister for Social Development Section 70A. The advice concluded that:

- The Ministry has insufficient evidence to confirm if the benefit reduction achieves its policy intent. A team of interview specialists were tasked with interviewing every client with a benefit reduction, which led to a significant increase in compliance with Child Support obligations. This practice has ceased since 2009.
- Compared to other sole parents, clients affected by a reduction have a higher likelihood of long-term welfare receipt and hardship. However, clients with a benefit reduction are no more likely to access hardship assistance than other sole parent beneficiaries.
- Sole Parents consider applying for Child Support in the context of the best interests of their children. If the parent decides to sever all contact with the other parent, and not apply for Child Support, the benefit reduction can penalise them for making a choice they view as being in the best interests of their child.
- Research from the mid-2000s identified several problems with the administration of this policy, which meant that many clients did not understand the policy. Anecdotal evidence suggests this has continued.
- Work and Income offices do not provide the most appropriate environment for discussing the sensitive subject matter of exemptions from a reduction. However, the number of exemptions granted has increased every year since 2006.

5 The Ministry recommended undertaking further research to inform future policy decisions.

Repealing section 70A would keep the obligation to apply for Child Support and cost at least $25 million per year

6 The obligation for sole parent beneficiaries to apply for Child Support is in the Child Support Act 1991. Repealing section 70A would maintain the obligation, but repeal the benefit reduction for failing to do so.

7 The direct cost of repealing the policy would be approximately $25.5 million in its first year, and $100 million over four years. This is the amount of extra benefit that would be paid as a result of not applying the reduction.

8 The Child Support collected by Inland Revenue is retained by the Crown to offset benefit costs. In 2016, $186.5 million was offset. As we were unable to conclude whether the policy was achieving its policy objective, we cannot predict the likely behavioural change of repealing section 70A.

9 A decrease in compliance would reduce the amount of Child Support retained by the Crown to offset benefit costs, increasing the total cost of repeal potentially considerably.