



# Proposals for regulation of shooting clubs and ranges

Analysis of submissions from consultation

27 May 2022



**ALLEN + CLARKE**

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

*Allen + Clarke* wish to thank all those people and organisations who gifted their time to attend consultation meetings and to make thoughtful and often extensive submissions.

**Ehara taku toa I te toa takithi, engari taku toa he toa takitini**

*We can achieve much together*

*Allen + Clarke* has been  
independently certified as  
compliant with ISO9001:2015  
Quality Management Systems



# OVERVIEW OF SUBMISSIONS AND KEY MESSAGES

## Key Statistics

Number of  
submissions



1080 submissions

Type of  
submitter

Demographic category	Number of submitters	Approximate % of submitters
Member of a shooting club	732	69%
Member of a shooting club committee	406	38%
Firearms licence holder	745	69%
Range user	739	68%
Range operator	202	19%



# Application for approval of shooting club

---

## Submitter Data



- 533 supported proposed manner of application
- 471 thought some supporting information should be removed
- 542 disagreed with the list of information required for approval
- 355 considered information should be removed from the list

## Volume of information required is unnecessary and overly burdensome



- Changing club name or amalgamation should be a separate process
- Register of firearms license numbers not required
- Minutes of AGM unnecessary
- Audit requirements impose unreasonable expense

## Information could be added – substitute otherwise unnecessary information



- Registered address of the club
- Address of any range/s used and/or operated by the club
- Description of the club's shooting activities
- Copies of club's shooting rules and safety procedures

## Information required for approval as a Pistol clubs considered broadly appropriate



- 202/413 agreed with the information proposed
- Aligns with current requirements
- Duplication must be avoided
- Status quo is working

# Conditions relating to membership

---

## Submitter Data



- 393 considered that there should be no requirement for members of a club (non-pistol) management committee to be licence holders
- Of the two options proposed, 297 preferred the proposal that the majority of club management committee members be licence holders
- 241 submitters considered there should be no requirement for members of a pistol club management committee to be licence holders
- Of the two options proposed, 182 submitters preferred the proposal that the majority of pistol club management committee members be licence holders

## Decreased diversity and expertise on Committees



- Committees will be shaped by the demographics of licence holders only
- Unlicensed members hold valued skills
- External expertise often required

## No safety benefit and may force clubs to close



- Rules already exist to keep people safe
- Committee members often volunteers who may not shoot
- Detrimental impact on the safe use of firearms
- Status quo should remain and clubs should decide for themselves

## No requirement for committee members to hold licence unless they are directly handling firearms



- Only certain positions should be required to hold a firearms licence:
  - Armourer
  - Trainer
  - Any member holding or selling firearms and ammunition

# Restrictions on participation in club organised shooting activities

---

## Submitter Data



- 507 said there should be no additional restrictions
- Of the two options proposed, 275 submitters preferred that a person between the age of 10 and 16 years be able to participate in club activities under the direct supervision of a license holder and with specific permission of their parent or guardian

## It is safer to teach youth to shoot in a controlled environment



- Training young people to responsibly use and respect firearms is a benefit to safety
- Education leads to safer communities
- Would lead to an increase in unsafe practices
- Good safety record – no evidence base for change

## Benefit to community



- Provides a safe environment to engage in sport
- An important part of many young peoples' lives
- Teaches confidence, discipline, respect and responsibility

## Maintain the status quo



- Status quo is sufficient for safety purposes and should be kept
- Young people should not be discriminated against
- Young people should be encouraged to join clubs

# Fees

## Submitter Data



- 319 opposed the recovery of costs for a shooting club approval certificate
- Of the two options proposed, 300 submitters indicated that they preferred the lesser amount of 50%.
- 342 considered any fee should be reduced by 10% for clubs using agreed templates
- 206 opposed the recovery of costs for an application to approve a shooting range
- Of the two options proposed, 353 preferred partial cost recovery
- 400 opposed recovery at 80% or 90% and recommended it be set closer to 25-50%

## Clubs and ranges will be forced to close



- Any cost is unsustainable for small clubs and ranges
- Shooting clubs and ranges have limited financial means
- Will have unintended consequences on safety

## Cost should lie with Police as a public benefit



- Cost recovery principles are not reflected in the proposals
- Purpose of regulations is to increase safety, a public good
- Proposals provide no benefit to clubs and ranges

# Certification of a shooting range

## Submitter Data



- 481 supported the proposed manner of application
- 329 agreed that some or all of the proposed information to accompany an application should be removed

## Volume of information required is onerous and unnecessary



- Formal written permission from landowners to operate a Range not necessary
- Territorial Authority requirements should be removed
- Range Standing Orders and Range Inspection Reports not required at time of application



# CONTENTS

<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b>	<b>II</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1. Background	3
1.2. Structure of report	4
<b>2. METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1. Overview of how the submissions were received and coded	4
2.2. Stakeholder workshops	5
2.3. Limitations	5
2.4. Quantifying submitters	5
<b>3. SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS</b>	<b>7</b>
3.1. Number and type of submission	7
3.2. Demographic information	7
<b>PART A: SUMMARY OF KEY THEMES AND COMMENTS</b>	<b>8</b>
3.3. Overarching comments from submitters	8
3.3.1. Safety	8
3.3.2. Lack of problem definition	8
3.3.3. Not fit-for-purpose	8
3.3.4. Undue administrative burden	8
3.3.5. Process and style of consultation	9
<b>4. THEMATIC ANALYSIS OF KEY PROPOSALS</b>	<b>10</b>
4.1. Age restrictions on club shooting activities	10
4.1.1. Impact on school sport	10
4.1.2. Youth learning to use firearms in a controlled environment	10
4.1.3. Alternative options	11
4.2. Membership of club committees	11
4.2.1. There are skilled committee members that don't hold firearms licences	11
4.2.2. Armourers and training officers should be required to hold a firearms licence	11
4.2.3. Treat all committees consistently	11
4.3. Secure storage of firearms and ammunition	11
4.3.1. Storage arrangements recorded on the conditions of certificate of approval	12
4.3.2. Quantity of information to be recorded	12
4.4. Fees (both for clubs and ranges)	12
4.4.1. Costs will cause some shooting clubs and ranges to close	12
4.4.2. Public benefit of shooting clubs and ranges	12
4.5. Ranges	12
4.5.1. Record of time officer on duty is responsible for range	12
4.5.2. Range operator	13
<b>PART B: SPECIFIC RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>SHOOTING CLUBS</b>	<b>14</b>
Proposed manner of application – questions 1 to 4	14
Information required for approval – question 5A to 6B	20
Applications for newly-formed or newly-amalgamated clubs after 24 June 2022 before undertaking club-organised shooting activities – question 7	22
Information required for application of new pistol clubs – question 8 to 9	23
Conditions applied to all certificates – question 10	25

Conditions relating to membership – questions 11 to 30	25
Conditions relating to secure storage of firearms and ammunition in relation to shooting clubs – question 31	42
Conditions relating to sales of firearms or ammunition – question 32 to 33	43
Annual reports of shooting clubs that are not pistol shooting clubs – question 34	45
Annual reports of pistol shooting clubs – question 35	46
Assessing individual circumstances – question 36	46
Application fees – question 37 to 38	47
Auditing club compliance – question 39	49
<b>SHOOTING RANGES</b>	<b>51</b>
Proposed manner of application – question 40	51
Proposed contents of application – question 41	52
Supporting information to accompany an application – question 42	53
Proposed manner of application to renew a range certificate – question 43	54
Contents of renewal application – question 44	55
Supporting information of renewal application – question 45	56
Endorsement for officers on duty – question 46	57
Training for duty officers – question 47	58
Register of duty officers – questions 48 to 50	59
Conditions of shooting range certification – other matters – questions 51 to 54	62
Range Standing Orders – question 55	67
Notification of RSOs and changes of RSOs to all range users – question 56 to 59	68
Conditions relating to secure storage at a range – question 60	72
Inspection of ranges – question 61 to 63	73
Cancellation of certification – question 64	74
Fees for application to approve a shooting range – question 65 to 66	75
Publicly available list of approved clubs and certified ranges – question 67	77

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

New Zealand Police, Ngā Pirihimana o Aotearoa (New Zealand Police) commissioned *Allen + Clarke* to support the analysis of submissions received on proposals for regulations for shooting clubs and ranges. The consultation period ran from 23 March to 4 May 2022. This report summarises views submitted on the proposals in the discussion document. New Zealand Police received 1080 submissions. 42 of those submissions were late, duplicates, blank, or otherwise unreadable.

There was significant opposition to the proposals from submitters. Most submitters welcomed the purpose of the proposals to increase safety but considered that there was no evidence of the proposals achieving this in their current form. Many submitters referred to the impeccable safety record that ranges and clubs have and questioned the evidentiary base for the scope and breadth of the proposals. Submitters were concerned that the proposals would place a significant burden on clubs and ranges and would do little to increase safety. Rather, the burden imposed would result in some clubs and ranges closing and individuals being forced to undertake shooting activities in less safe environments outside the framework of these organisations.

*[T]his will not improve public safety, rather the opposite as opportunities for safe firearm handling and shooting will be lost to communities.*

Submitters consistently voiced concern about how the proposals had been developed. They considered that they had been developed without context and based on a particular model of a club or range. Many said that one size does not fit all and any regulations need to allow flexibility to accommodate the different contexts and environments that clubs and ranges operate in.

**Most submitters thought that the administrative requirements proposed were cumbersome and overly burdensome.** Many suggested using existing sources for information and ensuring only that which is absolutely necessary is required to fulfil application and certification processes.

**Almost all submitters opposed age restrictions on shooting activities.** They were seen by many as penalising the sport and removing a safe way for youth to learn about firearms. Most believed that children over the age of 10 should be able to participate in shooting activities under immediate supervision without further regulation. A couple of submitters supported age restrictions and questioned why a child should be able to access and use firearms.

**Almost all submitters opposed any restriction on the membership of committees.** They saw this requirement as unnecessary and impractical. It was noted that many committee members bring particular skills to the club but do not actually participate in shooting activities. This concern related particularly to technical roles such as Treasurer and Secretary. It was suggested by some submitters that the only committee members who should be required to hold a firearms licence are training officers and armourers.

**Most submitters agreed that there should be secure storage requirements for firearms and ammunition held for the benefit of the club.** They also agreed that this should be codified in legislation. One submitter queried whether this aspect of the proposals could be extended to firearms parts.

**Many submitters opposed the introduction of fees.** Most felt that the benefit was to the public not to clubs and ranges or firearms users. Therefore, they suggested that the cost should lie with New Zealand Police – there was no justification for cost recovery.

**Three submitters supported the proposals and asked that controls on the use and possession of firearms be further strengthened.**

**Most submitters requested further involvement in the co-design of the regulations.**



# 1. INTRODUCTION

## 1.1. Background

New Zealand Police engaged *Allen + Clarke* to support the analysis of submissions received on proposals for regulations for shooting clubs and ranges. The purpose of the proposed regulations is to strengthen safety, security and oversight of shooting clubs and ranges in New Zealand, to ensure responsible use of firearms, and provide a safe, controlled space for target shooting.

The Arms Legislation Act 2020 makes a number of changes to the Arms Act 1983, including provisions relating to the regulation of shooting clubs and shooting ranges in Part 6 of that Act. These provisions come into force on 24 June 2022 and strengthen the oversight framework by creating an approval and certification regime for shooting clubs and ranges. Regulations must be made to support the administration of those provisions.

On 23 March 2022 New Zealand Police released a discussion document setting out proposed changes to the Arms Regulations 1992 relating to clubs and ranges in relation to:

- The new requirement for approval of shooting clubs by the Police Commissioner
- The new requirement for certification of shooting ranges by the Police Commissioner
- Associated provisions that support these changes

Consultation closed on 4 May 2022. In addition, New Zealand Police held three workshops with stakeholders to discuss the proposals.

New Zealand Police sought feedback on proposed regulations relating to:

- The approval of shooting clubs, including
  - Application
  - Conditions of approval
  - Reporting by clubs
  - Fees
- The certification of shooting ranges, including
  - Application
  - Conditions of certificate
  - Storage of firearms and ammunition
  - Fees
- A public register of shooting clubs and shooting ranges,

The consultation received 1080 submissions. 42 were late, duplicates, blank, or otherwise unreadable. 1038 submissions were analysed. Most submissions were made using the submission form, but some were received as emails or documents with general comments. Some submissions included the submission form and supporting documents or a covering letter. New Zealand Police also received 25 documents in hard copy by post. There were a total of 78 handwritten submissions. A total of 160 submissions were received from organisations and the remainder from individuals. Some organisations had multiple submissions from different individuals. Where this is the case, the organisation has been counted once and the remainder of the submissions have been treated as submissions from the individual. The vast majority of organisations were

shooting clubs including rifle clubs, pistol clubs, NZ Deerstalkers Association (NZDA) branches and clay target shooting clubs.

## 1.2. Structure of report

The report is structured to reflect the framework set out in the discussion document and questions. There are two parts;

- **Part A** sets out overarching themes and comments from the consultation feedback and summarises key themes including age restrictions on club shooting activities, membership of club committees, secure storage of firearms and ammunition, and fees. It also summarises general comments received relating to ranges.
- **Part B** provides an overview of responses to the specific questions in the discussion document.

*Allen + Clarke* have sought to present views without interpretation or assessing their validity against the Act. The terminology used by respondents in their feedback has been used.

## 2. METHODOLOGY

### 2.1. Overview of how the submissions were received and coded

Submissions were received by New Zealand Police by email to its consultation inbox and by post to Police National Headquarters in Wellington. Submissions were reviewed and duplicate and blank submissions were removed. Duplicates were only removed if they were identical. The following types and numbers of submissions were received:

- Most submissions were received by email to the New Zealand Police consultation inbox.
- 25 received by post to Police National Headquarters in Wellington.
- 78 handwritten submissions (received both by post and scanned and emailed) which were transcribed into electronic format.

Submissions		
Type of submission	Subtotals	Totals
Submissions received		1,080
Late	2	
Duplicate	23	
Out of scope		
Blank form	5	
Form won't open/unreadable form	3	
Noise complaints	3 (all the same person)	
Nothing attached	3	
Error submission	1	
No name	2	

<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>42</b>	
<b>Submissions analysed</b>		<b>1,038</b>

Most submitters used the submission form provided. There were a number of submitters, however, that submitted in an alternative format. These submissions were analysed but tended to be more general in nature. Submissions were uploaded into NVivo 12 qualitative data analysis software and coded against a framework based on the questions in the discussion document and relevant themes. From this, specific reports by question and theme were exported from NVivo and used to inform this report.

Any submissions received after the consultation period closed were excluded from this report.

## 2.2. Stakeholder workshops

*Allen + Clarke* facilitated three workshops with stakeholders to discuss the proposals. Over 50 individuals and organisations attended these workshops. The workshops focused on key themes and issues identified with participants. Feedback from these workshops were collated and analysed and included in this report.

## 2.3. Limitations

There were some limitations on the information collected through the consultation process. For example, the type of club that a submitter is a member of has not been identified in this report as many submitters identified being a member of clubs with multiple disciplines.

In some instances, a submitter's initial answer to a proposal would contradict their following response. This may result in the statistics (in Part B) not accurately reflecting the proportion of submitters who agree or disagree with the proposal. These statistics should be read in light of the contextual comments to ensure a clear understanding.

As submissions were received in a range of formats (including Word, PDF, and email), there were some formatting errors in the submissions. Most submissions were reformatted to be analysed. However, there is a risk that some information may have been missed due to unretrievable formatting issues.

## 2.4. Quantifying submitters

When referring to submitters, the report quantifies support for positions based on the classifications in Table 1 (below). In relation to Part B of this report, these classifications relate to the number of responses received for that question. For example, whether a question received several hundred responses or less than 100, the same terms are used relative to the proportion of responses to that question.

**Table 1 Submission classification**

Classification	Definition
Few	Fewer than 10% of submitters
Some	10%-25% of submitters
Many	26% to 50% of submitters
Most	More than 50% of submitters



### 3. SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

#### 3.1. Number and type of submission

A total of 1080 submissions were received as part of the consultation on regulation of shooting clubs and ranges. Of these submissions, 160 were submitted by organisations, equating to approximately 15% of the total number of submitters. The remaining submissions were made by individuals.

*Note:* This report does not provide any identifiable information about individual submitters. Quotes or submissions have not been attributed to an individual submission. Many submitters explicitly stated that they did not want their personal information to be publicly available or released under the Official Information Act 1982. The submission form did not provide the ability for submitters to consent to their information being released so it is recommended that no information that is attributable to an individual submitter is made publicly available.

Demographic category	Number of submitters	Approximate % of submitters
Member of a shooting club	732	68%
Member of a shooting club committee	406	38%
Firearms licence holder	745	69%
Range user	739	68%
Range operator	202	19%

*Note:* this information includes submissions on behalf of an organisation.

#### 3.2. Demographic information

Demographic category	Number of submitters
Male submitter	714
Female submitter	119
Identified as of Māori ethnicity	31

*Note:* some submitters chose not to provide their demographic information.

## PART A: SUMMARY OF KEY THEMES AND COMMENTS

Many submitters made general comments that were relevant to a range of proposals, or related to the whole discussion document and/or consultation process. While some of these submissions are not within the scope of the consultation questions, they provide context to the answers to the consultation questions, and represent the sentiment from a large number of submissions.

### 3.3. Overarching comments from submitters

#### 3.3.1. Safety

Many submitters expressed an opinion that the proposals in the consultation document would not contribute to improving safety for shooting clubs or shooting ranges.

It was also often submitted that shooting clubs and shooting ranges are the safest place to use firearms, and that the proposed measures would create barriers to safe firearms practices. One submitter said, “[t]his will not improve public safety, rather the opposite as opportunities for safe firearm handling and shooting will be lost to communities.”

There was a large amount of anecdotal evidence relating to safety received through submissions. Some submitters noted that there is a low injury incidence on shooting ranges and shooting clubs and stated that they had not witnessed any firearms “accidents” during their time participating in shooting club activities.

#### 3.3.2. Lack of problem definition

There was a general concern that there is no clear evidence of a problem that needs to be solved by regulation. Some submitters stated that the consultation document should have included evidence or data relating to safety practices at shooting clubs and ranges to support the proposals. This further reflected a lack of understanding for why the proposals are a legislative requirement.

Through the process, some submitters asked for clarity on the problem and stated that they could provide better feedback if they had a better understanding of the problem.

#### 3.3.3. Not fit-for-purpose

A number of submitters stated that they did not believe the proposals were ‘fit for purpose’ and that the proposals demonstrated a lack of understanding of how a shooting club or range operates in practice.

#### 3.3.4. Undue administrative burden

Most submitters raised concerns about the high administrative burden that the proposals will place on shooting clubs and shooting ranges. Many submitters explained that clubs are run by volunteers with limited time and the proposed administrative requirements will overburden scarce volunteers.

### 3.3.5. Process and style of consultation

Submitters found the discussion document too long and the submission form challenging to use. Some submitters mentioned that the submission form should have been available online and lamented the inability to complete the consultation on a mobile device. Other submitters found the small number of available options too limiting. One submitter said, *“I am not using the online “consultation” form as it appears to fetter the discretion of police by severely limiting considerations and scope of the subject.”*

Some submitters noted that the discussion document could have been clearer.

## 4. THEMATIC ANALYSIS OF KEY PROPOSALS

### 4.1. Age restrictions on club shooting activities

Most submitters that responded to this question disagreed with both options that were presented in the discussion document. Of the submitters that chose between the two options, a vast majority chose option D(ii) – that for shooting clubs firing rifles or shotguns, a person between the age of 10 years and 16 years may participate under the immediate supervision of a licence holder with the specific permission of their parent or guardian. For pistol shooting, or multidisciplinary clubs offering pistol shooting, a person under 16 years is not able to participate in shooting pistols in a club organised shooting activity, even under immediate supervision.

#### 4.1.1. Impact on school shooting sport

Many submitters expressed concern about the impact that both options relating to age restrictions would have on shooting sports. Some submitters stated that the education process for shooting sports should begin at a young age and supported either no minimum age for participation in shooting sports or relying on the minimum age of 10 years that is currently in the Act.

Some submissions provided personal examples of young people using shooting sports to participate in a school activity and find a community. Coaches also submitted that participation in shooting sports fosters a positive attitude toward school and life.

Some school students also submitted with personal anecdotes about taking up shooting sports, with one student stating that they are *“finding it helpful with concentration and self-discipline”* and *“meet[ing] people and build[ing] friendships who become part of your life not just at shooting”*.

Many submitters stated that if option D(i) was chosen, secondary school students would no longer be able participate in shooting sports.

Many submitters also stated that if option D(ii) was chosen, it would severely limit the ability for secondary school students to participate in shooting sports as many parents and guardians will not be firearms licence holders. It was stated in the submission form that, under option D(ii), people aged 16 years and younger may not participate in club organised shooting activities without immediate supervision and the consent of a firearms licence-holding parent. This statement in the submission form is inconsistent with the consultation document and may not have been the intended proposal.

#### 4.1.2. Youth learning to use firearms in a controlled environment

Some submitters disagreed with both options as it would limit the ability for children (under the age of 16) to participate in club organised shooting activity, and therefore miss out on the *“safe, fun and educational environment for the instruction in safe firearm handling.”* Some submitters said that they believe a club or range is the best place for a child to learn to safely use a firearm.

Some submissions expressed concern that creating a strict regulatory environment for shooting clubs and ranges would result in young people learning to shoot on private land and therefore result in unsafe firearms handling practices.



#### **4.1.3. Alternative options**

Most submitters, who recommended an alternative, suggested that the Act should be relied upon, and children over the age of 10 should be able to participate in shooting activities under immediate supervision without any further regulation. Many submitters did not see any safety benefit from creating stricter rules for shooting clubs and ranges.

### **4.2. Membership of club committees**

For all three questions that relate to the membership of shooting club committees, most submitters disagreed with the proposed options. The rationale for this was generally the same, or similar, across all three questions. Very few submitters thought that all committee members should be required to hold firearms licences.

#### **4.2.1. There are skilled committee members that don't hold firearms licences**

It was often stated in submissions that there are roles on a shooting club committee that do not require a person to hold a firearms licence. The role of Treasurer and Secretary were often provided as examples. It was often stated that the partners of club members would take up these roles to assist, rather than participate in shooting activities.

Some submitters expressed concern that requiring committee members to hold firearms licences would prevent those with specific expertise from joining a club committee. This concern is held acutely for some more technical roles, such as the Treasurer.

#### **4.2.2. Armourers and training officers should be required to hold a firearms licence**

Some submitters stated that the committee members who should be required to hold a firearms licence are training officers and armourers. Submitters said that these roles require the handling of firearms so, there would be a safety benefit in requiring this.

#### **4.2.3. Treat all committees consistently**

A number of submitters answered the questions about the different types of committees (all clubs, multidisciplinary clubs, and pistol-only clubs) with exactly the same response, or explicitly stated that they thought all three 'types' of committees should be treated in the same way. With regard to pistol clubs, some submitters said that they do not think a pistol endorsement (holding a B-endorsement on a New Zealand firearms licence) is required to be involved with a committee of a pistol club.

### **4.3. Secure storage of firearms and ammunition**

Most submitters agreed that there should be secure storage requirements for firearms and ammunition held for the benefit of the club. They also agreed that this should be codified in legislation.

#### **4.3.1. Storage arrangements recorded on the conditions of certificate of approval**

A number of submitters disagreed that the secure storage arrangements should be recorded on the conditions of the certificate of approval. Submitters explained that this could present a security risk given the certificates of approval are public documents.

#### **4.3.2. Quantity of information to be recorded**

Some submitters commented that the information collected relating to the secure storage of firearms and ammunition would be a “significant record of information.” Some submitters raised privacy concerns with the collection of personal identifiable information (particularly focused on the personal information of unlicensed participants).

It was also submitted that the detailed information should not be required in regulation, and it should be the responsibility of the club to ensure that the appropriate information is collected and retained for safety purposes.

### **4.4. Fees (both for clubs and ranges)**

Most submitters generally disagreed with any fees being imposed on shooting clubs or shooting ranges.

#### **4.4.1. Costs will cause some shooting clubs and ranges to close**

Some submitters disagreed with both cost recovery options as they stated that the costs were too high and may result in small shooting clubs and ranges having to close. Submitters often said that shooting clubs and ranges do not have the financial means to cover the proposed fees and will therefore have to close. This was generally illustrated through anecdotal evidence, although a few organisations that submitted provided their annual financial reports as a supplement to their submission.

#### **4.4.2. Public benefit of shooting clubs and ranges**

Most submitters considered that there should be no cost recovery or the least possible cost recovery because the purpose of the proposed regulations is to increase safety, a public good. Therefore they argued that the cost associated with administering the proposed regulations should fall where they lie. Many submitters did not believe that regulation would provide benefit to a shooting club or shooting range and submitters often stated that shooting clubs and ranges provide a public benefit and therefore the Government should not seek to cost recover the administration of the proposals. One submitter described shooting clubs and ranges as a “net benefit to society” and equated investment in shooting clubs and ranges to investment in other sports or the arts.

### **4.5. Ranges**

#### **4.5.1. Record of time officer on duty is responsible for range**

While this was a small aspect of the proposals relating to shooting ranges, most submissions stated that keeping a record of the time (of day) that an officer on duty was responsible for the range was unnecessary and should not be required.

#### **4.5.2. Range operator**

A number of submitters sought more clarity regarding the term “range operator.” They said that there are often range owners, range officers, and officers on duty and the term “range operator” could encompass one or more of these roles. It was also often stated that multiple clubs would use a single range, often for different disciplines, in a single day or over an extended period. The clubs therefore, share the range operator role based on their use of the range.

## PART B: SPECIFIC RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS

*Note:* There are some questions where submitters did not give a definitive answer based on the options available. In these cases, the answer has not been recorded as “yes” or “no”, but they have been included in the total number of submitters that responded to the question.

### SHOOTING CLUBS

#### Proposed manner of application – questions 1 to 4

##### Question 1: Do you agree with the proposed manner of application?

A total of 734 submitters answered this question.

Yes	533
No	187

##### Agreement with the proposed approach

Most submitters agreed with the proposed manner of application. A few of these submitters considered that this requirement or provision already existed, and the question was unnecessary.

Other comments agreeing with the proposed manner of application included:

- All applications should have a “*paper trail*”, whether physical or electronic
- Email applications are a good option, and cover the limitations of web portals (which may have issues) and physical applications
- The proposed approach provides organisations with options
- The proposed approach is practical and sensible
- Minor vetting or moderation of clubs to ensure they are fit for purpose is acceptable
- The proposed approach allows for clubs that do not have internet access to send applications.

Some submitters agreed with the proposed approach, but provided caveats, including:

- Allowing online applications is acceptable, but clarity is required as to what constitutes an acceptable signature when submitting online
- Smaller clubs would need to have at least 10 members to meet the requirements of an incorporated society (note that this was also mentioned by a few submitters who disagreed with the proposed approach below)
- The application process should recognise that incorporated societies and clubs are formal legal entities that are making applications in their own right, so should not require a person’s signature or evidence of authority
- A letter of approval or copy of meeting minutes from the club and a copy of the current incorporated societies registration should be sufficient.

## **Disagreement with the proposed approach**

Some submitters did not agree with the proposed manner of application. Some of these submitters disagreed with the concept of the applications overall, while most of these submitters stated that there should be an application process, but disagreed with the proposed manner. Some submitters considered the proposed approach to be rushed and not well thought out while a few considered the proposed manner of application to be *“taking away personal liberties.”*

## **Disagreement with application in general**

Some submitters expressed that the entire process of requiring clubs to be approved was unnecessary, and that the proposals were attempting to *“fix a problem that does not exist”*, and therefore would not have a benefit to public safety. A few of these submitters commented that this approach would reduce public safety, as it would lead to a reduced number of ranges, increase shooting activities away from approved ranges, and take Police resource away from more important responsibilities.

In addition, some submitters noted that requiring ranges to be licenced and certified would make it more difficult for people to become safe and confident using firearms. According to these submitters, further regulation would inhibit the growth of clubs or ranges due to the extra time required, which would limit the time for current firearms licence holders and new shooters. Some submitters explained that these changes would shift the focus of clubs to administration rather than the basic principles of range safety, and that clubs should be able to continue self-regulating as they already are. Some submitters noted that essential components of firearms use (safety, fitness for purpose, clear standing range orders) were already addressed with the current periodic inspection regime, and a new approach was not required.

## **Disagreement with the proposed manner of application**

Most submitters explained that the proposed manner of application would be unnecessary and overly burdensome, involving complicated paperwork for clubs. Some submitters expressed that the process had been made deliberately unwieldy so as to result in less clubs and ranges overall.

Some submitters stated that if there was a requirement for application, it should be *“as easy as possible”* for clubs and ranges to gain certification and take minimal time to complete. Some submitters noted that most clubs would use volunteers to fill out applications, and that this seemed like an overly *“longwinded application process.”* A few submitters explained that adding more requirements would *“reduce the pool of people”* who might take on volunteer roles, and would potentially cause smaller clubs to close, leading to a *“loss of a safe community environment for shooters.”*

A few submitters stated that there should not be a limit on how the application can be made (hard copy, online portal or email). Submitters also noted that using email or an internet portal would speed up the application process and allow for timely requests by Police for supporting information. A few submitters noted that the proposed approach was a barrier for those who did not have good literacy, or computer hardware and requisite skills.

A few submitters commented that the proposed approach would prohibit new members from accessing shooting. A few submitters explained that the proposed approach would *“discriminate”* against young and non-firearms licence holders. Further, a few note that the proposed approach

could make clubs unsustainable, while also ignoring the fact that many shooting clubs are well-established and have been operating safely for a long time. A few submitters considered that the proposal should have been developed in partnership with existing clubs, to ensure a more time and resource-efficient process and document.

A few submitters noted that it may be difficult to identify the ‘owner’ of a rifle range for application purposes, where the range is part of a community facility (e.g. community hall).

### **Existing affiliations**

Some submitters noted that many clubs are already affiliated to the National Rifle Association of New Zealand (NRANZ), Target Shooting New Zealand, Pistol New Zealand or other associations, which have a constitution, governance and rules. For example, NRANZ already oversees the activities of clubs and gives them safety directives. A few submitters stated that clubs which are already affiliated should not have to lodge applications. One submitter suggested that applications should be made to the parent body (for example, Target Shooting New Zealand), and the parent body should choose the manner of application.

### **Out of scope**

A few submitters noted that these proposals seemed to be unfairly targeted, and mentioned that Police should instead focus on “*unregulated*” and “*illegal*” users of firearms (for example gangs).

### **Clubs as incorporated societies**

*Note:* The Arms Legislation Act requires pistol clubs to be incorporated societies. Many other shooting clubs chose to be incorporated societies. This analysis is provided as context to represent the views of submitters, despite being largely out of scope of regulations.

Despite being out of scope, as the regulations cannot override the Act, some submitters explained that the process was appropriate, but the requirement for a club to be an incorporated society was unnecessary. Some submitters stated that requiring clubs to be registered incorporated societies was “*bureaucracy for its’ own sake*” and would provide little practical value, while putting extra burden on clubs. A few submitters noted that smaller clubs would need to be amalgamated in order to meet the 10-member limit for Incorporated Societies Act requirements. There may have also been a misunderstanding amongst submitters regarding which clubs are required to be incorporated.

On the other hand, some submitters argued that most clubs are already incorporated societies, and there was no need for the Police to “*run a separate system.*” A few submitters agreed that applications should be submitted electronically, but did not agree with the requirement to provide evidence that the club is an incorporated society, and explained that the Police could access the existing database for this information.

### **Alternative approaches from the submissions**

Some submitters offered alternatives to the proposed approach for application.

For example, one submitter suggested that in place of submitting an application for approval, a registration process could be introduced. They explained that this would be a low-cost exercise and would provide the Police with the relevant information about the clubs while taking away



much of the accountability that the Police would have should they become ‘approvers’ (approving applications based purely on paper).

Some submitters noted that the application process should be broken into categories:

- New clubs/ranges and those that have been unregistered for five years
- Clubs that are currently operating and moving to the new process, and those that are amalgamating
- A supplementary application for those clubs that sell/wish to sell firearms and ammunition.

One of these submitters also suggested having a separate pistol club application, and a few submitters explained that new clubs should have to submit applications, but not existing clubs.

Another issue noted by a few submitters was that there were no proposed timeframes for the Police and the Commissioner to undertake the authorisation and certification process for clubs and ranges. Submitters noted that Police would be unlikely to undertake this work in a timely manner, which would slow down the process for clubs and ranges.

### **Consultation process**

Some submitters used this question to provide comment on the consultation process stating:

- The proposal was “*poorly publicised*” and the short time frame for responses would not result in a full and considered response
- The response template was biased towards certain outcomes
- Questions should have an ‘other’ option to avoid assuming a particular option
- The submission process was hard to follow, and would lead to incomplete submissions, and bias in the end result
- The submission process was inaccessible to everyone, requiring people to “*print out 190 pages*” or have multiple screens available to view all documents easily
- The discussion document was too long with too many questions
- The submission process was deliberately difficult
- In person, verbal and video submissions should have been allowed
- Residents and land owners next to gun clubs should also have had a chance to participate in the consultation.

### **Question 2 – Should any information be removed from the list of supporting information? If yes, what information should be removed?**

A total of 660 submitters answered this question.

Yes	471
No	177

## Information should be removed

Most submitters agreed that some aspects should be removed from the list of supporting information. Most of these submitters provided detail on the information that should be removed.

Many of these submitters commented that the entire list should be removed, as the process was unnecessary. Some submitters noted that club volunteers had too much work to do, but did not specify which information they would want to see removed from the list.

Other information that submitters thought should be removed from the list included:

- Record of incorporation (the Police should check the Incorporated Societies Register for this information, if the club is incorporated)
- Evidence of authority (as there is no reason for someone to apply without club knowledge)
- The requirement to obtain Council approval
- Duplication of information that is in club documents
- Information that is required for governance by national bodies
- Copy of constitution (for incorporated clubs)
- Evidence of financial records (for incorporated clubs)
- List of members holding firearms licences, particularly the address of individual licence holders
- Information regarding the club's storage facilities, as this would be a "*ready-made list of what's required to enter and remove firearms and ammo* [if it] *gets into the wrong hands.*" The submitter stated that all that should be required is acknowledgement of secure storage that has been inspected by police
- Existence of an authorising body and its approval for application
- The club's purpose or constitution, which sets out administration rules rather than rules for safe shooting activity.

## Information should not be removed

A few submitters answered 'no' to this question, but their supporting comments indicated that they did think that some information should be removed. The aspects that the submitters thought should be removed were the same as in the section above, for example, financial information of an incorporated society.

### Question 3: Should any information or documents be added to the list of supporting information? If yes, what other information should be required? Why?

A total of 593 submitters answered this question.

Yes	34
No	556

Most submitters who answered this question indicated that it was not necessary to add or remove information from the 'supporting information' list. Very few of these submitters provides further comment. Most of these submitters that did comment stated that the proposed list was enough information.

A few submitters indicated that some information should be added or removed. The following suggestions were made by submitters regarding information or documents that should be added to the list of supporting information:

- A copy of the club's constitution and/or range standing orders
- Incorporation Number or New Zealand Business Number (NZBN) instead of "evidence of being an incorporated society"
- The physical location/address of the club
- A register of incidents that have occurred at the club
- Proof of affiliation to a national shooting organisation (if applicable) with all other information requirements removed if affiliated, and
- A copy of the club's policies and procedures relating to the Privacy Act 2020.

Some submitters used this question to suggest that the entire consultation document should be overhauled and made general suggestions relating to the approval process, establishing timeframes for the approval process, and an appeals process for clubs or ranges who disagree with decisions made by Police relating to authorising shooting clubs or licencing ranges.

**Question 4: Do you have any alternative suggestions as to the documents that could show that a person is authorised to make applications? If yes, what? Why?**

A total of 547 submitters answered this question.

Yes	162
No	398

Some submitters who responded "yes" to this question used the question to make comments about how they did not agree with any approval processes, and explained they should all be removed.

One submitter suggested the members of the committee should sign the application (physically or virtually) and those members may be randomly contacted for verification. Another submitter suggested that the application should be countersigned by another committee member. Another submitter suggested that RealMe could be used to verify the applicant's identity.

Some submitters suggested using information from the Incorporated Societies register or AGM minutes confirming committee members.

Some submitters referred to their response in question 2 and stated they did not think there should be any requirement to confirm authority to make an application.

## Information required for approval – question 5A to 6B

The analysis for questions 5A, 5B, 6A, and 6B is combined below, as many submitters answered the four questions in an interconnected way.

### Question 5A: Do you agree with the list of information that must be provided in application for approval?

A total of 644 submitters answered this question.

Agree with list	62
Disagree with list	542

### Question 6A: Should any information or documents be removed from this list? If yes, what information should be removed? Why?

A total of 564 submitters answered this question.

Don't remove any information	131
Information should be removed	355
Other information should be added	78

Some submitters gave a fulsome response to question 6A and either referred to that response for question 6B or ignored question 6B. Therefore, the number of submitters that responded to question 6B does not accurately reflect submitter engagement regarding other information that should be required, and the data has not been provided. The substance of the submissions has been summarised below.

### Information that should be removed or amended

Many submitters explained that providing the volume of information that is proposed to be required for approval will place a significant administrative burden on shooting clubs and compliance will impose further costs on clubs.

#### ***(ii) Rules regarding the club changing its name or amalgamating with another club***

A few submitters felt that the process for changing a club's name or amalgamating with another club should be a separate process, run by the Police, as part of the regulatory regime. They did not feel that the club should be responsible for the process or providing the process.

#### ***(iii) Evidence that the club maintains a register of members that includes the names, addresses and for licence holders the firearms licence numbers of members***

Some submitters did not think that requiring the firearms licence numbers in a register of members should be a requirement. One rifle club submitted that they sight firearms licences and note the members that are licenced, but they do not hold the licence numbers due to data security risks.

***(v) A copy of the minutes of the most recent Annual General Meeting (AGM) which lists the names of the Chairperson, Secretary and Treasurer***

Some submitters suggested that the names of the Chairperson, Secretary and Treasurer should be provided instead of requiring the minutes from the latest AGM.

***(viii) Information about the club's secure storage arrangements for any firearms or ammunition held by individual licence holders whether held at any of the club's premises or at a shooting range used by the club for their members use or for the use of other clubs' members. This information is to include advice as to the most recent inspection by Police of these storage requirements.***

A few submitters stated that this should not be required for a shooting club's approval given it is the responsibility of the individual firearm licence holder to securely store firearms and ammunition.

***(ix)(i) The ratio of members who are licence holders to non-licenced shooters when non-licence holders are participating in any club-organised shooting activity***

Some submitters stated that it would be extremely challenging to provide this information in advance of any given club-organised shooting activity, and it would not be feasible. Some submitters also said that because non-licenced shooters must always participate under the immediate supervision of a licence holder, they do not see the benefit of recording the ratio of licenced to non-licenced shooters.

It was also noted by a few submitters that there may be different ratios for different types of club-organised shooting events. One example given was of a beginner try-out evening with a ratio of 1 non-licenced holder to 1 licenced holder versus a club Armourer holding a club event where there might be a 1:30 ratio.

***(ix)(q) In accordance with section 38D, because the club intends to sell or supply firearms or ammunition, or both, to club members or on club premises on behalf of the club, evidence that this activity is approved by the club's management committee or a majority vote of club members***

One submitter (which is a rifle club) suggested that there should be a distinction between the sale or supply of firearms and ammunition that is permitted to leave the premises and those that are not.

*Differentiation between "on-sales" and "off-sales" in a similar manner to sale of alcohol. On-sales (by far the majority), where firearms and ammunition supplied are not permitted to leave the premises on which they are supplied, should require less onerous reporting than off-sales.*

***(ix)(r) If the club has been purchasing and selling firearms and ammunition in the previous 12 months, a copy of the most recent audited financial report in sufficient detail to provide a reconciliation of all arms items purchased, held, or sold by the club and evidence the revenue earned has been retained by the club or used for the benefit of the club***

Some submitters noted the significant expense of an audit and the detrimental effect that would have on their club. Some submitters suggested that alternatives to an audit should be included in the information required for approval, such as a reviewed financial report or a certified transaction report.

Some submitters made comparisons between the requirements to be an incorporated society; and suggested that an expenditure threshold could be applied to require audits of shooting clubs.

**Question 5B: Should any other information or documents be required in an application for approval of a shooting club?**

- A number of submitters suggested that, if a club is an incorporated society, the following requirements should not apply to them: (ii), (iii), (v), (viii), and (ix)
- Submitters suggested that the list at (ix) could be replaced by either the club's constitution (if an incorporated society) or a copy of the club's governing rules and relevant constitutional documents.

**Question 6B: Should any information or documents be added to this list? If yes, what other information should be required?**

One organisation submitted that the following information should be added:

- A registered address of the club
- The address of any range/s used and/or operated by the club
- A description of the club's shooting activities and copies of club's shooting rules and safety procedures.

**Applications for newly-formed or newly-amalgamated clubs after 24 June 2022 before undertaking club-organised shooting activities – question 7**

**Question 7: Do you support this proposal? Yes/No? Why?**

A total of 626 submitters answered this question.

Yes	264
No	339

While many submitters who responded to this question supported the proposal, recognising that it is largely already a legal requirement under the Arms Act, there were a few points that prevented submitters from full support.

Many submitters discussed the processing time that Police would need to turn around certification applications. They argued that including statutory processing timeframes to ensure reasonable turnaround time by Police was absolutely necessary to ensure clubs' and ranges' survival. Submitters highlighted that Police struggle to keep up with demand for approving firearms licence applications, which does not give them the confidence that this proposal will be actioned appropriately.

*Extended delays have become a feature of all aspects of firearms licensing [sic] and administration by the NZ Police in recent years. As such, the NZ Police*



*should give assurances that any such application will be approved or rejected in a timely manner to allow the applicant club to begin shooting activities. We suggest that any such application be processed within a 90 day timeframe.*

Some submitters were also concerned with the proposal's inclusion of new disciplines. They recommended that clubs should only be required to make an amendment to their certification when introducing a new discipline, not a whole new application. A few submitters noted that applications for changing disciplines should be managed under the Police shooting range manual to save on processing time and administrative costs.

Some submitters maintained that this proposal would ultimately lead to increased range user costs, therefore reducing range users and the number of ranges around the country – an effect they believed would jeopardise the safe shooting environments clubs and ranges offer.

### **Submissions relating to the transitional arrangements of the Act**

Many submitters supported the proposal but were against the inclusion of clubs that decide to amalgamate – only new and renewing clubs should have to stop all activities while waiting for certification approval. They argued that there should not be a ban on shooting activities if two pre-certified clubs merge who already have their activities permitted, and if the range being used is also certified. A few submitters pointed out that clubs may decide to amalgamate as a result of the new regulatory framework and the associated additional costs, and that this proposal needs to recognise this. Some submitters may not have understood the transitional arrangements in the primary legislation.

*The impact of these proposed regulations may force existing Clubs to amalgamate or re-form so curtailing their current practices is unfair and illogical.*

### **Information required for application of new pistol clubs – question 8 to 9**

#### **Question 8: Do you agree with the information a new pistol shooting club is required to provide with an application for certification?**

A total of 413 submitters answered this question.

Yes	202
No	184

In response to this question, many submitters recognised that the information requested is aligned with current practice, although much of the information is held by the club only with no requirement to share with a regulator. Submitters were concerned about duplication of information and additional overhead costs in time and money for a club to provide everything that is being asked for, maintaining that the process will become too complicated for most volunteer-run pistol clubs.

Many submitters expanded on this point by highlighting that the existing Letter of Agreement between Police and the governing body, Pistol New Zealand, is a proven comprehensive system that serves clubs and users well. Most of these submitters argued that recreating all of this data

for Police, as well as the extra information beyond the Letter of Agreement included in this proposal, is unnecessary and only serves to put extra hurdles in the way of people wanting to set up legal sporting ranges.

*I agree in principle as this information is already required by Pistol NZ as a governing body. I don't understand the rationale of duplicating this info apart from increased bureaucracy.*

A few submitters pointed out that most of the information requested is already dealt with through the regulation of the Incorporated Societies Act, which most pistol clubs are registered with currently and are required to be registered with under the new Act. These clubs must file annual reports with Police and the Companies Office, therefore this would amount to another duplication of the process.

Some submitters discussed the requirement to define all pistol-related disciplines that the club intends to undertake, with many noting that this may be limiting for clubs who may not know all the disciplines they want to participate in. This provision would also be restrictive if the clubs need to reapply in the future as things change. Submitters maintained that this would be unfair as there is no way to predict how many new members will partake in all available disciplines.

A few submitters raised privacy concerns around how the information requested will be utilised and stored. There was an expectation that Police would provide security for such information while it is in their care – more information about how this would work in practice was requested.

*Once again I am concerned about the storage of all this information. Data breaches around the storage of pistols and ammunition would not be good.*

#### **Question 9: Should any additional information be required?**

Most submitters who responded to this question did not think any additional information about pistol clubs should be required, outlining the same reasons expanded on in the previous question. Many did not think the requirements would do anything to improve safety; the process would only soak up Police time and add unnecessary cost. Submitters who were against the level of requested information maintained that requiring clubs to fill in endless paperwork will not make anyone safer, with a few calling it a superfluous exercise.

*The pistol club rules/regulations have worked very well over the years – Don't fix what isn't broken.*

Out of the submitters who supported the provision of information from pistol clubs to Police, a few noted that this was similar to the status quo and would not amount to too much work for the clubs to administer the extra information.

## Conditions applied to all certificates – question 10

### Question 10: Do you agree that these conditions should apply to all certificates for approval of all clubs?

A total of 611 submitters answered this question.

Yes	222
No	361

It should be noted that this question was interpreted in different ways by submitters – some submitters said that they “agree” and commented that they only partially agreed, and some submitters said that they “disagree” because they partially disagreed.

Most submitters agreed that the first two proposed conditions should apply to all certificates for approval (secure storage at club premises and records demonstrating that the sale of any firearms or ammunition is done for the benefit of the club). A large number of submitters stated that the third condition, relating to records of pistol-endorsed licence holders, should be the responsibility of the individual and not a condition of certification for the club.

Based on submissions, it appears that some submitters believe that the conditions of certification for approval, including the details of secure storage of firearms and ammunition, will be publicly available, and do not support that information being in the public domain.

Many submitters said that they believe the Act provides sufficient regulation of the secure storage and sale of firearms and ammunition and do not think additional conditions on the licence are necessary.

## Conditions relating to membership – questions 11 to 30

Many submitters commented that they had the same feedback relating to the membership of shooting club committees, regardless of whether it is a pistol club, multi-disciplinary club, or a non-pistol club. There is, therefore, a significant amount of duplication in the analysis of question 11 – 16.

Some submitters stated that they did not see the rationale for treating the membership of shooting clubs differently based on the discipline that they practice, as the discipline is largely unrelated to the administrative functions of a shooting club.

### A: Members of the club management committee: non-pistol clubs

#### Question 11: Do you prefer option A(i) or Option A(ii)?

A total of 704 submitters answered this question.

A(i)	14
A(ii)	297
Neither option	393

## Option A(i)

*Option A(i) That all members of the club management committee are licence holders.*

Few submitters preferred this option. For those who gave reasons, they centred around safety and consistency. Submitters said that if all committee members were required to hold licences, no further vetting of committee members would be required as they would be presumed to be responsible. Other submitters said that committee members making decisions on behalf of club members should be required to have been through the same process and experience as the people they are managing.

*If all members are firearms licence holders, then no further documentation is required as they're already required to act responsibly.*

## Option A(ii)

*Option A (ii) That the majority (more than half of the members) of the club management committee are licence holders. In the clubs selling ammunition or firearms for the benefit of the club the Treasurer must be on the management committee and must be a licence holder.*

Many submitters preferred this option. For those who gave reasons for choosing option A(ii), their concerns focussed on the viability and future of the clubs. Most of these submitters agreed that committee positions handling firearms (such as Armourer) should require a firearms licence, and that licence holders on a committee should make up a majority, with some suggesting a minimum majority requirement of 50%.

However, most submitters who commented said that in most shooting clubs there are committee roles that require particular skills (such as Treasurer, Secretary, or President) that do not require the handling of firearms or ammunition. Should all committee members be required to hold a firearms licence, this would have significant and detrimental impacts on the running of the clubs (especially smaller, volunteer-run organisations). This would exclude from committees:

- Unlicensed members who hold valuable skills required for club management (such as accountancy)
- External expertise a club may wish to have on their committee (such as legal)
- Unlicensed members of a shooting club who do not need a firearms licence (such as air guns or bowhunters) but still require representation on a committee
- Unlicensed club members who have shooting skills and experience to offer, but who have surrendered their licence (due to age, ill health or other)
- People interested in joining committees but are restricted by the current wait time to obtain a licence
- Spouses/partners of club members who contribute to the management of the club
- Diversity of voices such as youth representation and equal gender representation.

Submitters said that excluding unlicensed committee members means there is a greater burden on those who are licensed, and on club running costs. This is not feasible and consequently may mean clubs have to close. This would also prevent the democratic process of electing committee members who are most suitable for the position by barring their candidacy.

*By limiting committees to licence holders only you will have less diverse committees shaped by the demographics of licence holders only. I am sure that that limits gender, cultural and age diversity from committees and will result in the challenge which has been faced by many company Boards that they are stale, pale and male.*

Other comments on this option included:

- This option is preferable out of the two, but is not ideal
- There is no safety issue or other problem that exists that this requirement solves. It may in fact be detrimental to safety.

*...having regulations that detrimentally impact the ability of a club to sustain itself in a management context is contrary to the public interest of safe firearms usage.*

## **Neither**

Most submitters who responded to this question preferred neither option. Of the submitters who stated why, most gave the same reasons as above for option A(i) - should all committee members be required to hold a firearms licence, this would have significant and detrimental impacts on the running of the clubs (especially smaller, volunteer-run organisations). This could lead to club closures. Submitters considered that this reasoning was applicable under option A(ii) as well.

Submitters also often noted that there was no safety benefit to either option, with concerns that proceeding with either option could push people out of participating in safe environments.

*I do not support either option - there should not be a restriction on non firearm [sic] licence holders being a committee member as this could exclude valuable expertise/knowledge and skill set whether professional, business or administrative from a committee member position. There is no safety benefit in this.*

Other comments were:

- Clubs should be allowed to make their own decisions about how they are run, and regulators do not understand the community
- Rules already exist to keep people safe, therefore there is no problem so the status quo should remain.

*Every person, whether holding a licence or not must comply with the Arms Act. There are only a couple of club roles that must hold a firearms licence and these roles are not necessarily members of the committee.*

**Question 12: Do you have another suggestion for club-committee membership? If yes, what?**

Many suggestions for this question were similar to the comments given to question 11, with some providing unique suggestions. The three most common answers to this question were:

- There should be no requirement for shooting club committee members to hold firearms licences, unless they are directly handling firearms.
- Regulation is not necessary, and the status quo should remain. Clubs should be trusted to decide for themselves.
- Only certain positions on a shooting club committee should be required to hold a firearms licence. Submitters suggested that these positions could include:
  - All, a combination of, or one of the following: Armourer, Club Captain, Range President, and Vice President
  - The above and any member holding or selling firearms and ammunition
  - The above plus one non-executive member
  - A minimum of 2 committee members.

*Only those persons carrying out duties under the Arms Act need to be current Firearms Licence holders.*

Unique suggestions to this question were:

- It should be up to the Club President to decide who on the committee needs to have a firearms licence
- It would be more efficient to give appointed committee members an online test and have them sign a form
- This type of regulation should be focussed on range operation rather than club operation. If a club is also a range operator (not using a commercial range, for example) then the committee members should be licenced, however, this should be covered by range approval and not club approval
- Committee members should have at least three years club membership
- Committee members should not have a criminal history or gang affiliations
- NZ Police should be working together with clubs to find solutions. These regulations only serve to ostracise NZ Police, including their members who are also shooting club members.

**B: Club management committee membership: pistol clubs**

**Question 13: Do you prefer Option (B)(i)? Or Option (B)(ii)?**

A total of 437 submitters answered this question.

B(i)	14
B(ii)	182
Neither option	241



## Option B(i)

*Option B(i) That all management committee members are required to:*

- a) Be target shooting pistol-endorsed licence holders, and*
- b) Include the persons (i) responsible for the training of new or probationary members, (ii) responsible for holding pistols on behalf of the club (armourer), and (iii) if selling ammunition or providing firearms for the benefit of the club, must include the Treasurer.*

Of submitters who responded to this question, few chose this option. Reasons given were that the committee should lead by example, and pistol-endorsed licence holders are more likely to be experienced.

*B endorsed licence holders are more likely to be experienced in running a pistol club.*

## Option B(ii)

*Option B (ii) that the majority (more than half) of the management-committee members must:*

- a) Be pistol-endorsed licence holders, and*
- b) Include the persons (i) responsible for the training of new or probationary members, and (ii) responsible for holding pistols on behalf of the club (armourer) – both of whom must be target shooting pistol-endorsed licence holders, and (iii) if selling ammunition or providing firearms for the benefit of the club, must include the Treasurer.*

Many submitters who responded to this question preferred this option. Most of these submitters provided further comments, explaining that most clubs have committee roles which require particular skills (such as Secretary) but do not require the handling of firearms or ammunition. Should all committee members be required to hold a pistol-endorsed licence (as in option B(i)), this would have significant and detrimental impacts on the running of the clubs (especially smaller, volunteer-run organisations). This would exclude from committees:

- Unlicensed members who hold valuable skills required for club management (such as accountancy)
- External expertise a club may wish to have on their committee (such as legal)
- Members of a pistol club who do not need a pistol-endorsed licence as they are not active shooters, but still require representation on the committee (such as spouses or retired shooters).

A few submitters gave comments in support of option B(ii). These included:

- It is more inclusive than Option B(i)
- Having a pistol-endorsed licence shooter on a committee makes sense for multi-disciplinary clubs
- If a majority of the committee are required to hold pistol-endorsed firearms licences, this means the majority of the committee will have the appropriate knowledge and experience in order to properly manage club affairs.

Some submitters indicated that they preferred option B(ii) but also stated objections or suggested amendments. These included:

- The majority requirement goes too far and would be unachievable for a lot of clubs. It would be more efficient to place requirements on prescribed roles and this would maintain the intent of the proposed regulations
- Neither option is acceptable but of the two, B(ii) is preferable
- Clubs are often run by volunteers and this regulation would serve to increase the difficulties they already experience
- There should be no requirement for a person responsible for training to be on a committee as they may not have the capacity to do so
- These regulations will discourage people to join clubs and will force clubs to close
- There is no safety benefit to these regulations, there is no evidence to support the need, and there are existing requirements in place that are sufficient.

*You do a disservice to Clubs in terms of their management and administration if this is to become a requirement. Option B(i) should not be applied. Not all clubs have access to voluntary assistance with roles such as Secretary or Treasurer as there needs to be some level of expertise with these roles. Option B(ii) is a better approach but requiring the Treasurer to be a licence holder does not make any sense.*

## Neither

Most submitters who responded to this question stated that they did not prefer either option, and many gave reasons why. Of these responses, there were three main concerns most commonly mentioned. These were:

- There is no safety benefit to either option as current safety requirements are sufficient.
- The status quo of committees is sufficient and further restrictions are not necessary. The Armourer and Trainer will already have endorsed licences and it should be left up to clubs to decide how their committees are made up. Additionally, many submitters said there should be no requirement for the Trainer to be on the committee as they may not have the capacity.
- Either option severely restricts the diversity of skills amongst a committee. it is not necessary for committee members who do not handle firearms to hold a pistol-endorsed licence. This is placing greater burden on committees.

*All Clubs are run by volunteers who have a limited amount of time to perform their roles. We should avoid adding a greater burden to our current volunteers. Police should allow Clubs to operate as best as they can with their current limited resources without restriction. Any requirement for any committee member to hold a Firearms Licence does not contribute to the safe running of the Club. Shooting only is done on a prescribed range and in a controlled environment with trained/certified Range Officers in control, and, with unlicensed shooters under immediate supervision. This clearly meets all necessary safety conditions, while the Committee members are responsible for the Club organisation and its sound financial management.*

Few submitters agreed with the intent of the proposed regulations, however, not with the proposed percentage requirements.

**Question 14: Do you have another suggestion for club committee membership of pistol clubs?**

126 submitters responded to this question. Most of the suggestions echoed the same themes as stated for question 13. The unique suggestions for this question were:

- Committee positions should be held by club members only. There should be no outsourcing
- Police should trust clubs to manage themselves, and should only suggest and seek changes if there is a demonstrable problem
- Armourers should not be required to be on a committee because sometimes there is more than one Armourer
- Pistol NZ should oversee the management of pistol clubs.

**C: Club committee membership: multidisciplinary clubs including target pistol shooting**

**Question 15: Do you prefer Option (C)(i)? Or Option (C)(ii)?**

A total of 454 submitters answered this question.

C(i)	14
C(ii)	178
Neither option	262

**Option C(i)**

*Option C(i) that all management committee members are required to hold a firearms licence and more than half of them should be:*

- *Pistol-endorsed licence holders, and*
- *Should include the persons (i) responsible for the training of new or probationary members, (ii) responsible for holding pistols on behalf of the club (armourer), and (iii) if selling ammunition or providing firearms for the benefit of the club, must include the Treasurer.*

Few submitters chose this option. Those who provided further comments generally noted that option C(i) was sensible and followed existing practice.

**Option C(ii)**

*Option C(ii) that the majority (more than half) of management committee members must be licence holders and must include the persons (i) responsible for the training of new or probationary members, and (ii) responsible for holding pistols on behalf of the club (armourer) – both of whom (as*

*a minimum) must be target shooting pistol-endorsed licence holders, and (iii) if selling ammunition or providing firearms for the benefit of the club must include the Treasurer.*

Many submitters who responded to this question preferred option C(ii). Submitters often repeated the same themes as discussed in questions 13 and 14. For example, many stated that this option was preferable because the requirement for all committee members to be licenced would exclude anyone who had other skills to offer (such as administrative) and who might be more appropriate for a committee position. This would also exclude members who did not hold a firearms licence for various reasons, such as age. Many submitters said Option C(i) is not feasible and will result in the closure of clubs.

A few submitters provided comments in support of option C(ii). These comments included that:

- Option C(ii) is more realistic for, and reflective of, multi-disciplinary clubs
- It is the most workable, inclusive, flexible, manageable, balanced, logical, or sensible option
- The majority requirement would mean that the committee would have the necessary knowledge and experience to manage the club
- It covers the required licence holders but does not exclude experienced shooters who may no longer have a licence.

Many submitters who indicated their preference for option C(ii) also added caveats, such as that:

- Option C(ii) is the best of two bad choices
- It would be unlikely that smaller clubs would be able to fulfil even a 50% or majority minimum requirement
- It is unnecessary for the Treasurer to be required to be on a committee and/or hold a firearms licence as this is excessive
- This requirement does not solve any indefinable problems
- There are already adequate rules in place – Police should not be regulating committees
- Introducing these requirements would not increase safety
- This is focusing regulation in the wrong place – it should be directed at range operation rather than club operation.

*A pistol club that is a component of a small multidiscipline club such as ours is unlikely to be able to garner the required 50%+ endorsed committee members, therefore this proposal would be unachievable for most clubs in our situation.*

A few submitters raised a concern regarding Navy clubs, stating that the requirements would not be possible to meet due to the nature of their profession.

*...the RNZN Pistol Club is required to have a serving Navy person as the Treasurer. What do Police propose if that person does not have a licence given that nearly 40% of our military members do not have a firearms licence? Having a civilian firearms licence is not possible for many of our Serving Members – they have no residential abode they can secure firearms in, often living in barracks or rented accommodation. They are posted overseas, sometimes without long notification, so cannot ensure there is always security in their absence.*

## Neither

Most submitters who responded to this question stated that neither option were appropriate to proceed with. Those who provided reasons for their response generally reiterated the same caveats for Option C(ii), above.

...prescribing the proportions of committee make up is not required. The correctly licenced members will carry out the functions of the club within the Arms act requirements. For instance all training for Pistols must be carried out by endorsed members as its required within the Act. All firearms training will be carried out by licenced shooters as required by the Act.

### **Question 16: Do you have another suggestion for club-committee membership of multidisciplinary clubs (including target pistol shooting)?**

A total of 169 submitters responded to this question. Most of these responses echoed responses and suggestions given to previous questions. For example, submitters recommended:

- keeping the status quo as there is no clear problem the requirements are addressing
- that committees do not require regulation (as there is no basis in the Arms Act for this) and it should be up to clubs to decide management practices
- that certain positions (such as Treasurer) should not be required to hold licences or endorsements, and the ability for a person to serve on a committee should be defined by their appropriate skills, not their licence status.

A few submitters provided unique suggestions in response to this question. Comments were varied and included the following:

- Due to the multidisciplinary nature of the club, the 50% requirement should be removed to allow for an emphasis on proportional representation
- Positions like Treasurers and Trainers do not need to be on the committee or hold licences (unless required in the course of their duties under the Arms Act), however there should still be a requirement that they report to the committee
- In multidisciplinary clubs, each discipline should be represented by one person appointed to the committee and only be required to hold a licence if relevant to their discipline
- The proportion requirement for pistol-endorsed licence holders should be lower (for example, a quarter of total committee members)
- Rather than be required on a committee, the regulation should require there be enough pistol-endorsed licence holders present at club events at all times, to ensure decisions are consistent with pistol shooting requirements
- Armourers should not be required to be members of the committee, as they often have the experience, knowledge and facilities appropriate for this role but do not wish to be on a committee.

*I agree with the sentiment that multidisciplinary clubs require stronger oversight, whilst also allowing for the best people on the committee regardless of firearms licence status. I suggest that Option C(ii) is amended to require 2/3 of management committee members to be licence holders, instead of 50%/more than half.*

## **D: Age restrictions on participation in club organised shooting activities**

### **Question 17: Do you prefer Option D(i) or Option D(ii)?**

A total of 785 submitters answered this question.

D(i)	2
D(ii)	275
Neither option	507

#### **Option D(i)**

*Option D(i) that a person under the age of 16 years, and who cannot therefore apply for a firearms licence, is not able to participate under immediate supervision in a club organised shooting activity. This includes pistol clubs.*

Two submitters selected option D(i) as their preference. However, one submitter suggested the age be adjusted to under 14 years, while the other submitter considered that there be no age restriction.

#### **Option D(ii)**

*Option D(ii) that for shooting clubs firing rifles or shotguns, a person between the age of 10 years and 16 years may participate in those club activities under the immediate supervision of a licence holder and with the specific permission of their parent or guardian. For pistol shooting, or multidisciplinary clubs offering pistol shooting, a person aged under 16 years is not able to participate in shooting pistols in a club organised shooting activity, even under immediate supervision.*

Some submitters who responded to this question selected option D(ii) as their preference. Those who supported this option generally described how the ages of 10-16 were ideal for teaching young people about firearm safety in a controlled environment. They noted that teaching young people firearm safety at an early age would help instil good safety practices and respectful firearms use. These submitters agreed that close supervision by a licence holder is necessary for safety and training, and reflects current practice.

*It is important to encourage [sic] and develop firearms safety and skills from a young age. Kids need to understand what firearms are capable of in order to respect firearms and learn and adopt safe and sensible behaviours around*



*firearms and firearms use. Safe and responsible behaviours can easily be taught and monitored in these controlled environments.*

However, many submitters also noted caveats and concerns with the options more broadly, or recommended further adjustments to the proposed options as part of their response.

*Note:* the submission form stated that option B(ii) would require the permission of a firearms licence-holding parent or caregiver. The consultation document did not reflect this and some submitters asked for clarity regarding this proposal.

Many of these submitters were concerned that the requirement for parents to hold a firearms licence would unfairly exclude many young people from participating in shooting activities. This would likely result in the end of school and youth club shooting activities (such as Scouts), greatly reducing the options for controlled environments where young people can learn firearm safety. Submitters explained that parental permission and supervision under an appropriately licenced person should be sufficient for participation.

*Option D(ii) would be preferred but remove the requirement for the parent to hold a FAL. This becomes too restrictive for youngsters who are keen to take up the sport but do not come from a shooting background.*

Young people who responded to this question were concerned that they would lose an important part of their lives because their parents were not licenced. They said their extracurricular activities at shooting clubs or shooting lessons at school had taught them confidence, discipline, respect, and responsibility.

*Clay target shooting is important to me because it is fun. I meet people and build friendships who become part of your life not just at shooting. I am a lot more confident now that I am part of a team [...] If this programme was cancelled, I would not be motivated to go to school. It would be the worst thing to happen to me. I live for this programme as I know it will shape me into a well-grounded, confident, responsible adult.*

Other comments:

- Some submitters considered these requirements to be detrimental to shooting sports as it will force young people out of the sport, limiting a new generation of shooters by greatly reducing the pool of young people able to learn
- Some submitters questioned the exact problem that these regulations are intended to solve, and noted that the status quo, and what is required under the Arms Act, is sufficient
- A few submitters noted that those under 10 years of age also need a safe, controlled environment to learn in
- A few submitters described how being unable to participate in clubs could result in unsafe practices, or young people who have an interest in shooting sports seeking out illegal or unsafe environments to shoot in
- A few submitters noted that there is a lack of consideration of other shooting environments that may have less restrictions, such as farms. They stated that clubs are some of the safest environments to learn in, with many licenced supervisors available, and do not require further restrictions.

## Neither

A large majority of submitters who responded to this question considered that neither of the proposed options were appropriate to proceed with. Many of these submitters provided comments explaining their response. These comments often reflected similar themes as discussed under option D(ii) above, such as:

- Many submitters explained that neither option was appropriate because training young people to responsibly use and respect firearms is a benefit to safety. Introducing age restrictions could exclude young people from learning firearm safety in safe and controlled environments. They generally indicated that age restrictions should be removed. A few further elaborated that young people should be encouraged to use clubs and ranges, not be restricted from them
- Many submitters rejected the requirement for parents to hold a firearms licence before their child can participate in shooting activities. They recommended that close supervision by any licenced individual, with parental permission, should be sufficient
- Some submitters reiterated that the status quo under the existing Arms Act is sufficient and should remain without further restrictions on clubs
- Many submitters considered that introducing either of these requirements would be detrimental to the sport as a whole, potentially forcing the closure of youth shooting/school clubs and limiting the skill development of young people interested in shooting.

*No to both. Arms act allows non licence holders to participate under supervision. Under proper supervision, youth participation and education in firearms safety is a positive thing at any able age.*

## Question 18: Do you have another suggestion?

Most submitters who answered this question echoed the above comments, suggesting that age restrictions should not be imposed on shooting activity participation, that the status quo under the Arms Act is sufficient for safety purposes and should be kept, and that the requirement for parents to hold a firearms licence should be removed from the proposed regulations.

*Club members strive for the highest level of safety and security and provide close supervision to the unlicensed. There seems to be no case to regulate the age at which a child can learn to shoot in a supervised environment.*

A few submitters provided additional or unique suggestions in response to this question. These included:

- Clubs should have the ability to allow exemptions for young people under the age of 10 to participate in shooting activities, provided there is appropriate direct supervision and parental permission
- Regulators need to connect with the shooting community to see what is already happening in the space of youth safety and training
- Clubs and ranges should have autonomy to enact their own youth policies
- A new government entity should be formed in order to oversee the Arms Act rather than the Police
- Ensure that any regulations include mention of guardians or caregivers as well as parents to be inclusive of different family structures.

## **E: Participation in club-organised activities of non-licence holders 16 years or older (excludes pistol clubs)**

### **Question 19: Do you support this approach?**

A total of 770 submitters answered this question.

Yes	35
No	705

A few submitters supported this proposal. Some of those submitters said that this would align with their own club rules relating to membership, and others said that it was a good way to encourage those who wish to use a firearm to get a licence.

One submitter said:

*People without firearms licences, but using firearms under supervision, represent a risk because they have not been vetted for a firearms licence. In particular, we are concerned that people who have been rejected for a firearms licence may become very proficient in firearms use by learning under supervision at a club. We are aware of at least one far-right activist (with a firearms licence) seeking to build community and indoctrinate others by encouraging people to join him in shooting activities.*

*Three months seems a reasonable period for someone to try out shooting activities before deciding if they wish to pursue it further and apply for a licence.*

Most submitters did not support the proposal to allow non-licence holders to participate in club-organised activities for a maximum of three months before having to apply for a firearms licence.

A few submitters identified financial and security reasons for club members not wanting to apply for a firearms licence. Some club members are students or live in rental accommodation and cannot meet the requirements for secure storage of firearms and ammunition. They therefore use the facilities at shooting clubs to participate in shooting activities. A few submitters stated that some club members cannot afford to apply for a firearms licence.

Many submitters stated that shooting clubs and ranges are a safe place for non-licence holders to participate in shooting activities under immediate supervision and learn safe shooting practices.

One submitter said that their club runs an annual family day where non-licensed family members participate in shooting activities under immediate supervision. The submitter asked if this would mean that they could only participate once. Others submitted that there are a range of non-licensed people who are interested in intermittent participation.

Some submitters said that three months is an insufficient period of time to assess some shooter's ability.

One submitter provided a number of examples of people who may wish to participate intermittently in club-organised shooting activities but would not intend to apply for a firearms licence, or would not intend to apply within the three-month period. These examples included: people living overseas and visiting New Zealand (who are not eligible to hold a licence), life and honorary members who no longer hunt but wish to participate in club activities, family and junior club members, researchers, and photographers.

Many submissions stated that it would take much longer than three months' for a firearms licence to be processed and may not have understood that the proposal would only require an application for a firearms licence after the three month period. Some submitters agreed with the proposal that, where a non-licenced person provided proof of an application for a firearms licence, they should be able to continue participating in shooting activities.

#### **Question 20: Do you have any other suggestions?**

It was frequently suggested that the immediate supervision provisions in the Act should be relied upon, and there should be no time limit on the participation of non-licenced persons in club organised shooting activities.

#### **F and G: Participation in a pistol club where a person has not previously been refused or had an endorsement to possess pistols revoked**

#### **Question 21: Do you support option F(i) or option F(ii)?**

A total of 408 submitters answered this question.

F(i)	106
F(ii)	41
Neither option	261

#### **Option F(i)**

*Option F(i) This option provides a route for a non-licence holder to fire a pistol under immediate supervision before becoming a probationary or full member of a club as follows: a person having reached the age of 16 years, and not yet having obtained a firearms licence may participate for up to three occasions in a pistol club organised shooting activity under immediate supervision of a club member who holds a pistol-endorsed licence. After these three occasions they must: (i) apply for a firearms licence and (ii) apply to become a probationary member to continue participation in pistol club organised shooting activities under immediate supervision. Once their firearms licence is issued, they must, within six months, become a full member of that pistol club and apply for a target shooting pistol endorsement on their licence.*

Submitters who supported option F(i) stated that it is largely the status quo and strikes a balance between safety and being overly restrictive. One pistol club said:

*Option F (i) is largely the current status quo which has been working well for many decades without incident. However, we feel very strongly that those aged 10-16 should (with the permission of their parent or guardian) be*

*permitted to participate in a pistol club shooting activity under immediate supervision of an endorsed member. [...]*

*We allow visitors to the club to try pistol shooting under strictly controlled conditions and rigorously adhere to the requirement that only three visits to engage in shooting activities are permitted before membership must be applied for (along with the application for a standard 'A' licence if one is not already held). Applicants are always made aware that membership of the club is dependent on the successful application for a standard firearms licence.*

## **Neither**

Most submitters did not support either proposed option. Generally, submitters made similar arguments to the responses to questions 19 and 20. They noted that those who wished to participate intermittently require immediate supervision and that the amount of practice required for safe and proficient firearms use exceeds the proposed number of times that non-licenced persons (or those without a pistol endorsement) may participate.

Many submitters also stated that the pistol clubs have their own membership requirements that cover non-licence holders who wish to participate in club activities. Some submitters referenced the Letter of Agreement between the New Zealand Pistol Association (PNZ) and New Zealand Police, stating that this agreement currently works well and should not be changed.

There were also a few submissions from members of the New Zealand Defence Force that are unable to hold a pistol-endorsed firearms licence due to deployment offshore but undertake marksmanship practice at the club when they return. These submitters disagreed with both proposed options; stating that both options would result in those deployed overseas being unable to remain part of the club.

One organisation submitted that junior members currently participate in club organised shooting activities under immediate supervision until they reach 16 years old and are eligible to apply for a firearms licence, and both proposals would prohibit this practice.

## **Question 22: Do you have another suggestion?**

- Many submissions suggested that the decision about the participation of non-licenced persons (or those without a pistol endorsement) should be left to the clubs.
- Some submitters suggested that there could be a “basic checklist” or other criteria for the clubs to use when determining the appropriate timeframe that a person can participate without being licenced and/or pistol endorsed.
- Others suggested that the ‘fit and proper’ test to hold a firearms licence (or something similar) could be used to determine whether someone may participate in pistol club activities under immediate supervision without a licence or pistol endorsement.

## Probationary pistol club members

### Question 23: Do you support option G(i) or option G(ii)?

A total of 352 submitters answered this question.

G(i)	116
G(ii)	55
Neither option	181

#### Option G(i)

*Option G(i) A probationary member of a pistol club, having obtained a firearms licence but yet to have obtained an endorsement to possess target shooting pistols on their licence, and not having been previously refused an application for an endorsement to possess a pistol, must within their first six months of being a probationary member of a pistol club:*

- *Sit and pass an examination based on the Pistol New Zealand Manual, or equivalent manual where the club is not affiliated with PNZ.*
- *Actively participate in club shooting activities under immediate supervision on at least six separate occasions (as confirmed by the club committee). A probationary member of a pistol club must apply to be a full member of that pistol club and apply for endorsement of their licence after completing a six-month probationary period. If an application is not made, or an application is unsuccessful, the probationary membership will cease.*

Many submitters that supported option G(i) stated that this is the current practice and of those that said that, often said that it is working well.

Some submitters partially supported option G(i), stating that the time limit of six months should be removed (and a minimum probationary period be introduced). They noted that it should be managed on a case-by-case basis to make allowances for learning speed or other disruptions.

Some submitters partially supported option G(i) but stated that the word “must” should be removed to make the six-month probationary period a minimum and allow for flexibility.

Those submitters that supported option G(ii) thought it provided more flexibility and would be less administratively burdensome on clubs, particularly those already affiliated with PNZ.

Most submitters that did not support either option said that the time restriction would be detrimental and does not take into account the speed that it takes different people to learn how to safely use pistols. Some submitters suggested that the club is best placed to determine when a person is ready for their pistol endorsement. Other submitters support the current process that PNZ has in place.

### Question 24: Do you have any other suggestions?

- It was repeatedly suggested that the time limit of six months should be removed from option G(i).
- It was also suggested that the six-month timeframe should be a minimum, rather than a deadline.

- Many submitters stated that the club (specifically the club trainer) should make the decision as to when a new shooter can safely apply for a pistol endorsement.

### **H, I and J: Pistol club to support pistol-endorsed licence holding members compliance with requirement of their endorsement conditions**

*H: Condition of approval to maintain a record of visitor, probationary, and full member participation in pistol club organised activities*

#### **Question 25: Do you support this requirement?**

A total of 400 submitters answered these questions.

Yes	298
No	76

Most submitters supported this proposal and noted that this is the status quo.

Some submitters that disagreed with this proposal submitted that, because it is current practice, it does not need to be codified in legislation. Other submitters supported maintaining the status quo but disagreed with the proposal if it resulted in increased administrative burden on clubs.

A few submitters disagreed with the proposal; suggesting that the individual should be responsible for recording their visits to the club.

Those who neither agreed nor disagreed generally were not pistol club members and stated that they did not have an opinion on the proposal.

#### **Question 26: Do you have another suggestion?**

- One pistol club stated that they sight and record photo identification, “it gives an advantage in traceability, if they don’t want their details recorded there’s usually a reason why.”
- Most other submissions suggested that the status quo be maintained.

*I: Condition of approval that participation in pistol shooting activities (by any pistol-endorsed licence holder) on any one day will be recorded as a single activity*

#### **Question 27: Do you support this requirement?**

A total of 374 submitters answered these questions.

Yes	264
No	87

Most submitters supported this proposal. Most submitters who supported the proposal said it is current practice.

Some submitters that opposed this proposal stated that members may shoot twice in a day, and that should be counted as two separate activities.



A few submitters said that some shooting events will occur over a multiple day period and should be counted as a single activity.

#### **Question 28: Do you have another suggestion?**

A few submitters suggested that this proposal should be amended to record any pistol shooting activity in a half day (instead of a full day) as one single activity. Submitters stated that different shooting events may happen in the morning and in the afternoon or evening.

*J: Condition that a pistol shooting club advises the regulator that a pistol-endorsed member has resigned from the club, or failed to attend or renew their subscription in the past 12 months.*

#### **Question 29: Do you support this requirement?**

A total of 354 submitters answered these questions.

Yes	137
No	195

Most submitters support this proposal. Some pistol clubs submitted that it is current practice to report this information to PNZ.

Most of the submitters that did not support this proposal said that the individual should be responsible for meeting their firearms licence and endorsement obligations and it should not fall to the club.

#### **Question 30: Do you have another suggestion?**

- Some submitters suggested that this information should be collected from the individual as part of an annual process relating to an individual's firearms licence.
- A few submitters suggested that this would form part of the annual report and does not need to be duplicated.

### **Conditions relating to secure storage of firearms and ammunition in relation to shooting clubs – question 31**

#### **Question 31: Do you agree with this proposal?**

A total of 624 submitters answered this question.

Yes	272
No	314

Some submitters who responded to this question indicated support for the proposal. Some of these submitters agreed with this proposal, but did so with the proviso that the conditions would only apply to storage outside of operational hours. Others noted that this proposal reflects existing practice or requirements under existing legislation.

Many submitters that disagreed with the proposal stated that their club does not store firearms or ammunition on site. Most of these submitters stated that it is the responsibility of an individual firearms licence holder to securely store firearms and ammunition, rather than the club.

Many submitters also opposed any details of secure storage being documented on the certification certificate, as it would be publicly available. Submitters expressed concerns that these details would be a security risk for the club.

*Yes to appropriate secure storage for firearms or ammunition at a club as this is law anyhow. No to having the storage arrangements listed anywhere as this opens up security issues.*

Some submitters felt that the secure storage standard for dealers would be too high for some clubs, where the quantity of firearms or ammunition stored is small. Others felt that the standard would require a significant upgrade for some clubs. Some submitters also felt that requiring clubs to adhere to the same secure storage standard as dealers would impose high compliance costs (some examples given were the cost to build, get consent, and insurance).

### Suggestions

- One rifle club suggested that part of this should be delegated to the range approval and that it should be sufficient for the club to state that storage is at a specified approved range.
- Many submitters suggested that the requirement to adhere to secure storage arrangements should remain, but the requirement to record the secure storage information should be removed.
- Many submitters suggested that secure storage of firearms and ammunition should be the responsibility of an individual firearms licence holder, rather than a club.

## Conditions relating to sales of firearms or ammunition – question 32 to 33

**Question 32: Do you agree with the list of information required to be recorded regarding the sale, loan, hire, or supply of firearms or ammunition?**

A total of 591 submitters answered this question.

Yes	83
No	497

### Disagree

Majority of submitters indicated that they did not agree with the proposed list of information. Most of these submitters said that the amount of information required is unnecessary and will place a heavy administrative burden on clubs to collect this information.

Many submitters said that they do not see the safety benefits of collecting this information. For example, where firearms are supplied for use under immediate supervision, they can only be used for a short time while they are shooting under immediate supervision. Others suggested that records should only be kept where ammunition is sold or firearms are stored onsite. Some

submitters questioned the benefit of recording specific details (for example, about the make, model, and identification number of firearms being lent to a visitor).

One organisation provided an example of a regular Friday night shoot to illustrate the burden that collecting this information would place on a club.

*On a Club night, we may have 8 – 12 Club members attending and often 2 – 4 new shooters (who have been to the Club previously) and new visitors. Our trained Club Instructors will meet the new visitors and introduce them to the Club, key members, our safety rules and our target rifles. We have approximately 15 Club rifles of different makes and models. The Club instructor will select an appropriate rifle to suit the visitor's size and stature. The new shooters who have been trained and no longer need a personal coach will also select one of the club rifles that is the best fit for them. Given a limited number of Club rifles, they are shared, and the selected rifle may differ from previous use.*

*The Club Secretary or Treasurer typically will organise the required ammunition (normally 10 - 13 rounds) for the new and unlicensed shooters to use when they shoot. When it is time to shoot, the shooters/coaches will take the rifle and ammunition from the preparation area into the range where the Range Officer will check the shooters and targets and then manage the shooting process.*

*On completion, the Range Officer ensures the safety flags are in all rifles then allows the shooters to leave the range area. Club rifles are then returned to the rack where a different shooter may select it for their shoot. Each shooting detail typically takes 15 minutes from start to finish. We would have 6 – 8 details shot per night with shooters shooting on 2 – 3 details a night.*

Many submitters referenced the firearms register that will be in place in June 2023. Many submitters said they felt that the information being required of clubs would duplicate the information collected for the firearms register.

## **Agree**

Some submitters agreed, in part, to the list of information required. Many submitters that agreed stated that there should be an exception for the supply of firearms and ammunition to a non-licensed participant for the sole purpose of temporarily participating in club shooting activities (and not leaving the premises).

### **Question 33: Should any information be added or removed from the list of what should be recorded regarding the sale, loan, hire, or supply of firearms or ammunition?**

A total of 258 submitters responded to this question.

A few submitters did not see the need to add or remove information from the proposed list.

Conversely, many submitters considered that it would take an unnecessary amount of time and effort to record all the proposed information. Submitters made the following suggestions to remove or amend the proposed information to be recorded:

- Remove the information relating to price and/or fees. Some submitters did not think that there is a connection between price and safety. If the club is selling firearms or ammunition, they must be an incorporated society and therefore, much of this information is duplicated in the requirements associated with being incorporated.
- Remove the requirement to record the non-licence holder if they are shooting under immediate supervision (which they are required to do).

A few submitters expressed privacy concerns about holding names and addresses of non-licensed visitors. If clubs are required to record this information, they are also required to adhere to the Privacy Act 2020 in relation to any personal identifiable information.

Many submitters thought that information relating to sale or supply of firearms and ammunition should only be recorded if it is being removed from the club. Many submitters also stated that they do not think there needs to be a record of a non-licence holder borrowing a firearm to participate in shooting events under immediate supervision.

## **Annual reports of shooting clubs that are not pistol shooting clubs – question 34**

**Question 34: Should any information be added or removed from this list of requirements for a shooting club's (other than a pistol shooting club) annual report?**

A total of 518 submitters answered this question.

Yes	286
No	200

Many submitters who indicated 'no' in their submission also provided comments that implied that they did think that information should be removed. The above statistics may not truly represent the intent of the submissions.

Most submitters felt that requiring some of this information was unnecessary duplication with the requirements of being an incorporated society or other affiliation obligations. Most submitters suggested that any information duplicated by incorporated society requirements should be removed, and Police should ensure they have access to the information collected from relevant incorporated societies.

### **Submissions relating to the Act**

Some submitters said that none of the information should be required. They did not refer to the requirements to provide an annual report in Part 6 of the Arms Legislation Act 2020 and may not have been aware of the annual reporting requirements in primary legislation.

### **Suggestion:**

- One submitter suggested that the regulations should require all shooting clubs to become an incorporated society, as many are already, and therefore avoid duplication of reporting requirements. Another submitter, however, stated that the requirement for an incorporated society to have a minimum of ten members could prevent some small shooting clubs from becoming incorporated.

## Annual reports of pistol shooting clubs – question 35

### Question 35: Should any information be added or removed from this list of requirements for annual reports of pistol shooting clubs?

A total of 322 submitters answered this question.

Yes	164
No	120

Many submitters that indicated ‘no’ in their submission also provided comments that implied that they did think that information should be removed. The above statistics may not truly represent the intent of the submissions.

Many submitters stated that all pistol shooting clubs must be incorporated societies and submitted that the proposals that duplicate incorporated society requirements should be removed.

Many submitters said that (v)<sup>1</sup> should be removed as it would be challenging to list the ranges intended for use in the upcoming year, and recording the ranges used in the previous year is duplication with the “Current Range Certifications” that clubs hold.

One organisation also submitted that, in relation to (ix),<sup>2</sup> information relating to breaches of safety (namely events requiring medical assistance as a result of projectile injury) are notified to NZ Police in accordance with the letter of agreement between NZ Police and PNZ and expressed concern that requiring this for annual reporting would prevent the timely notification of breaches of safety.

Other submitters suggested that the phrase “breaches of safety” was too vague and would prefer a more specific definition, such as “events requiring medical assistance as a result of projectile injury” or align to a WorkSafe definition.

Of the submitters that answered “no”, many said that this was the status quo.

## Assessing individual circumstances – question 36

### Question 36: Do you agree with this proposal?

A total of 534 submitters answered this question.

Yes	432
No	94

---

<sup>1</sup> v. A list of the certified range or ranges the club has used in the previous financial year, and intends to use in the coming financial year, for club shooting activities – to enable the recording of endorsement holder’s participation in club shooting activities and annual general meeting to meet the conditions on their endorsement as provided for by regulation 22 of the Arms Regulations 1992.

<sup>2</sup> ix. A report of any investigation into breaches of safety during club organised shooting activities.

Most submitters agreed with this proposal. Some of these submitters stipulated that there will be factors outside of the club's control and the timeframes for full compliance with an improvement notice should be reasonable and take into account the individual circumstances of the club. Others said that they could not give a detailed answer without the timeframe being established. Some submitters who disagreed with the proposal had a similar response; stating that the lack of clarity regarding the timeframe could result in indefinite delay.

Of the submitters that disagreed with this proposal, some submitters thought the proposal lacked clarity and others expressed concern that NZ Police is not sufficiently resourced to undertake this function.

## **Application fees – question 37 to 38**

**Question 37: What do you consider the level at which partial cost recovery for a shooting club approval certificate should be set at: 75% (\$207)? Or 50% (\$138)?**

A total of 637 submitters answered this question.

75%	18
50%	300
Neither option	319

Most submitters who responded to this question were strongly against the application fee proposal altogether, with many expressing disappointment that the question did not provide a lower percentage cost recovery option or an option for no fees at all.

Many submitters maintained that the 50 percent cost recovery option was still too high – they were strongly opposed to the assertion in the consultation document that the bulk of the benefit of regulations is for private benefit. In their view, the benefit was either equally shared with or solely concerning the public, therefore costs should be borne by Police or through some form of public funding.

Submitters argued that increasing the financial strain on shooting clubs and ranges would not only have little impact on public safety but would actually have the opposite effect. Many believe the application fee would most likely push people to carry out shooting as a hobby in isolation instead of within the safe conditions and supervision of a shooting club or range. These submitters argued that it would be unfair to charge people who want to practice their sport in a safe and controlled environment, and that making compliance less costly would encourage operators and users to abide by the new rules.

*Most of those shooters will not give up shooting, but they will now do it in unregulated environments such as rural properties without the safety features of ranges.*

*Cost should not be a barrier to compliance. The application fees should be small enough to prevent underground societies from operating.*

Many submitters discussed the precarious financial situation that a large number of clubs already find themselves in; often running at a loss and relying solely or heavily on volunteers. Many clubs may not be able to afford the higher costs or might see membership decreasing, particularly for smaller clubs, who submitters strongly believed should be supported to continue to provide supervision and a safe place for members to enjoy their chosen sport. Because of this, some submitters recommended taking the size of the club into account by installing a pro-rata application fee instead of a one size fits all approach. The proposition for a two-tier fee regime was referenced a few times by submitters as an effective alternative approach.

## Suggestions

- A few submitters recommended that the fees be capped at \$100 as otherwise the actual cost to the club, especially for smaller establishments, would be disproportionately high.
- Some submitters thought that the 50 percent proposal, provided it is a one-off fee, seemed reasonable. A few argued that the clubs and ranges should cover the entire cost, as Police would actually be providing a service for them. One submitter said:

*We actually support 100% cost recovery. We don't see any argument that shooting clubs deserve a public subsidy. They have little public good and should not receive any taxpayer subsidy.*

**Question 38: Do you agree that the application fee for a shooting club approval certificate should be reduced further for all clubs using agreed templates? Do you think the application fee should be reduced by a further 5% (\$13.75) or 10% (\$27.50) of the full cost?**

A total of 547 submitters answered this question.

5%	29
10%	342
Neither option	176

*Caveat: it appears that a few submitters misread or misinterpreted the question as many chose 5% as their preferred option but also stated that shooting clubs should pay as little as possible or nothing at all. The following analysis should be read in light of this.*

Most submitters who responded to this question stated that even the higher discount of 10 percent was still not enough. They argued that any financial incentive needs to be worthwhile, with some submitters supporting a 50 to 80 percent discount option – the greater the discount, the greater uptake of standardised templates. The goal of the regulations should be to keep as many clubs open as possible in order to provide safe environments for shooting. Therefore, anything that is going to alleviate the financial burden of the regulations should be encouraged.

*These are generally non-profit organisations run by volunteers who in all instances will be providing competent, extensive free safety training and practise with firearms by generally law abiding people for the betterment and safety of the New Zealand public. They are to be commended and supported, not eroded by mandatory bureaucracy and costs.*

Some submitters supported the use of templates and the associated discount, stating that anything that will make compliance easier will have an applied benefit across the board. Templates would



help reduce workloads for all parties by streamlining processing time and allowing all information to be in one format. Some submitters also pointed out that conformity between all clubs will be easier for the Police to administer and monitor.

Some submitters noted that if templates are used, then the cost of processing and auditing them would naturally be reduced. If costs are kept down because of this, these submitters argued that savings should be passed onto the application fee in order to reduce the burden on clubs and members.

A few submitters did not support the discount for using an agreed template, maintaining that the use of templates should be the expectation built into any regulatory changes. One organisation said:

*We support no discount for using an agreed template. The regulations should merely prescribe the use of a template.*

As mentioned in the above caveat, many submitters answered the question by saying that no fees should be placed on clubs whatsoever, and because there is no private benefit associated with the changes, any cost incurred as part of the proposed regulations needs to be funded publicly.

**Auditing club compliance – question 39**

**Question 39: Do you agree to the setting of an annual fee to cover the cost of New Zealand Police’s compliance activities?**

A total of 597 submitters answered this question.

Yes	43
No	542

Most submitters who responded to this question argued that all forms and costs associated with new compliance requirements should be covered by the Police themselves, under their mandate to administer the Arms Act and its regulations. As many submitters did not think there would be any private benefit to these audits, they said the funding Police already receive should cover these extra costs.

*This regime has been introduced for the benefit of public, the public are the beneficiaries of this regulation as the purpose of the ACT is to protect the public, therefore all costs should come from public funds.*

Many submitters spoke about the audit fee as an unnecessary administrative and financial penalty for shooting clubs and ranges, most of which are run by volunteers. These submitters maintained that additional costs would create barriers to the sport and that since Police already conduct spot checks on clubs, they are continually encouraged to ensure compliance is up to date.

Some submitters pointed out that there is not typically a large amount of compliance required to run a shooting club, therefore five-year audits should be sufficient. A few suggested that if there are no changes to compliance, there should be no cost at all. Others recommended that a fee should

only apply when clubs are found to be non-compliant, but no cost should be associated with the audit itself.

A few submitters recommended that instead of conducting individual audits, Police could set up a suitable online system or club register whereby clubs can update their records themselves, which would reduce administrative costs when changes do occur.

A few submitters were supportive of the audit fee as long as annual compliance administration will be processed in a timely and effective manner. These submitters commented that it seems like good value for money considering the amount of paperwork that will need to be processed as part of this new system.

*Yes, but, it is important that clubs can be sure these funds are used properly and receive a service accordingly. The Police should establish time limits in which they will complete the processing of these certificates (in the same way councils must for planning applications). The Police should also be transparent about the use to which these funds go. This should be done in a public annual report.*

## SHOOTING RANGES

### Proposed manner of application – question 40

#### Question 40: Do you agree with the proposed manner of application for a shooting range certificate?

A total of 600 submitters answered this question.

Yes	481
No	112

#### Agree

A large majority of submitters who responded to this question agreed that a shooting range certificate application should be made in writing and submitted either by hard copy through the post, or electronically via an email or web portal.

Some of these submitters provided additional comments that reiterated their support of the proposal. These submitters agreed that the proposed manner made sense and noted that having both online and hard copy options would make the application process accessible for all members, including those who do not have access to internet or a computer. Web-portals were referred to as easing administrative burden, but potentially being costly to develop and maintain.

*These manner of applications are consistent with other official processes such as voting, electoral roll registration, vehicle forms etc. It allows equal access for urban and rural, those with and without access to internet and computer, and those with and without technical literacy.*

#### Disagree

A few submitters disagreed with the proposed manner of application, however, most of these submitters did not provide further comments on why they disagreed.

Most of the additional comments received in response to this question were outside the scope of the question. These submitters expressed a range of ideas including:

- Disagreeing with the overall need for ranges to be certified (*Note: this has been provided as context of the submissions, despite it being a requirement in primary legislation and out of scope of this consultation*)
- Noting that changes to regulation of ranges are not needed as some activities, such as inspections and certification of members, are already undertaken by national associations or local councils.

*Shooting ranges are currently certified by the National governing bodies of the various disciplines as are the certification of range officers, a process which is funded through the current fees paid by shooters to those bodies. Range certification under these regulations is almost certainly going to be carried out by the same people that currently do this work yet it is proposed to charge clubs for this. Surely the most efficient way to do*

*this is simply ensure that these bodies do conduct the process properly.  
This would cost very little.*

- Noting the need for a clear distinction between Range Owner, Range Operator, and Club Officer on Duty roles, given that these roles are present at a range at different times and for different purposes. These submitters observed that a one-size-fits all approach may not be appropriate.

## **Proposed contents of application – question 41**

### **Question 41: Should any information be added or removed from the ‘contents of application’?**

A total of 551 submitters answered this question.

Yes	326
No	210

#### **Information does not need to be added or removed**

Most submitters who responded to this question stated that they did not think that any information should be added or removed from the proposed ‘contents of application’ list. Very few submitters provided further comments regarding their response. Those that did generally agreed that the list was sufficient and that it reflected existing processes.

*This covers everything that needs to be known about a range.*

#### **Information should be added or removed**

Conversely, some submitters indicated that information should be added or removed from the ‘contents of application’ list, with a large majority of these submitters suggesting that information be removed. In particular:

- Many submitters stated that it was not necessary to list all possible types and calibres of firearms as the RSO would sufficiently cover all firearms used onsite

*The RSO’s will sufficiently cover all firearms that could be used on the range so listing all possible types and calibres of firearms is unnecessary.*

- Some submitters argued that it was not necessary to provide the Range Operator’s firearms licence status as the operation of a range does not necessarily involve the use of firearms, and it is not possible to provide this information when the Range Operator is a club rather than a specific individual
- A few submitters disagreed with the requirement to provide the range location and information on number and types of ranges. One submitter suggested that this could be replaced with an indicator of whether the range is indoors or outdoors and urban or rural
- A few submitters suggested removing the need for a declaration regarding the need to mitigate against hearing loss. This was described as an established safety practice and is something already captured within RSOs

- A few submitters explained that there should not be a requirement to inform the Police of all proposed amendments to an RSO as clubs require the flexibility to modify RSOs and quickly address risks as they arise
- A few submitters considered that all of the information proposed in the ‘contents of application’ was unnecessary to provide and should be removed.

While not directly in scope of the question, some submitters sought clarity of the definition of the term ‘Range Operator’ as it is not defined in legislation and may have different meanings to different people.

## Supporting information to accompany an application – question 42

### Question 42: Should any information be added or removed from the ‘supporting information’?

A total of 496 submitters answered this question.

Yes	329
No	153

#### Information does not need to be added or removed

Some submitters stated that they did not think that any information should be added or removed from the proposed ‘supporting information’ list. Very few submitters provided further comments regarding their response. Those that did generally agreed that the list was sufficient.

*I think that covers the bases well and involves everyone who needs to be involved.*

#### Information should be added or removed

Conversely, most submitters who responded to this question indicated that some information should be added or removed from the ‘supporting information’ list. A few of these submitters noted that the ‘supporting information’ list was generally onerous and unnecessary, and that providing such documents would not contribute to improved safety at the range. They suggested removing all proposed supporting information requirements.

Other submitters suggested that some requirements should be removed from the ‘supporting information’ list. In particular:

- Many submitters disagreed with the requirement to obtain written permission from landowners to operate a range. They considered that formal, written permission is not necessary, and that many ranges successfully operate through, and rely on, the goodwill of landowners and neighbours without formal agreements. Including this requirement could be particularly onerous for smaller ranges, and could result in ranges closing unnecessarily.

*Many ranges are established on farms with the approval of the farmer based on a handshake. Many are likely to recoil from this level of involvement. Also, their approval can be implied, as it seems very unlikely that anyone will get*

*away with establishing a range on someone's property without that person's knowledge.*

*Adds nothing to safety or otherwise. Most rifle ranges are there by the goodwill of the landowner and surrounding neighbors [sic]. If this is all formalized and liability acknowledged in documents then most landowners will simply withdraw permission for the clubs to use their land. Thus reducing the number of ranges where safe shooting and firearms handling processes are taught.*

- Some submitters suggested the requirement for Territorial Authority confirmation be removed or amended. They explained that not all Territorial Authorities include the mention of shooting ranges in their district plans, which can make demonstrating compliance difficult. Submitters indicated that such a requirement could result in many ranges closing unnecessarily.

*... iii is complex – many local authorities do not have rules around ranges, and therefore it is difficult to get them to confirm it is lawful.*

- A few submitters noted that RSOs and Range Inspection Reports (RIRs) should be a condition of the Police Commissioner accepting a club's application, but that they should not be required at the time of application. Submitters explained that the development of RSOs and RIRs require a substantial amount of work to prepare and that this would be overly burdensome. One submitter noted that clubs are not the ones who write the RSO, but rather this is completed by a Range Certifier/Inspector as part of the certification process.

## **Proposed manner of application to renew a range certificate – question 43**

### **Question 43: Do you agree with the proposed manner of application for renewal of a range certificate under section 38T(4)?**

A total of 542 submitters answered this question.

Yes	468
No	71

#### **Agree**

A large majority of submitters agreed that an application for renewal should be made in writing and submitted either by hard copy through the post, or online via email or web portal.

Many submitters provided additional comments as part of their response to this question. The majority of these submitters suggested that where a renewal requires no substantive changes to the range since approval, then there should be a reduced fee for that renewal. Other comments generally agreed with the proposed manner of application.

*If renewing and there are no changes from previous approval then have a streamlined and cheaper renewal process.*

## Disagree

A few submitters disagreed with the proposed manner of application for a renewal. A few of these submitters provided additional comments explaining their response, including:

- Varied views were shared on appropriate approaches for submitting renewal applications. A few submitters commented that hard copies are not appropriate and that all applications should be completed online or via electronic methods. Another submitter suggested that a phone call to the Arms Office should be sufficient for a renewal.

## Out of scope

Some submitters disagreed with requirements in the Act, such as:

- A few submitters suggested that a renewal is not required
- A few submitters further clarified that a renewal should not be required unless major changes are made to the range
- A few submitters suggested that regulations are not necessary and that the status quo is working well.

## Contents of renewal application – question 44

**Question 44: Should any information be added or removed from the ‘contents of application’ list?**

A total of 498 submitters answered this question.

Yes	96
No	394

### Information does not need to be added or removed

A large majority of submitters stated that they did not think that any information should be added or removed from the ‘contents of application’ list for a renewal application. Very few submitters provided additional comments. Those who did provide additional comments generally noted that the ‘contents of application’ list appeared to be appropriate.

### Information should be added or removed

Conversely, a few submitters suggested that some information should be added or removed from the ‘contents of application’ list for a renewal application.

Other submitters suggested that, where there have been no changes to a range since approval, then a simple declaration stating that no changes have been made could be sufficient for a renewal application.

*Where there have been no changes to a range or RSO's in the last 5 years, the application need only be a simple declaration to that effect, signed by a quorum*



*of the club committee. In these cases, which are probably the majority, a range inspection is a waste of time and resource.*

### **Out of scope**

In response to this question, a few submitters reiterated their view that certification of ranges in general should not be required, or that a renewal application should not be required where there are no significant changes to the range since it was approved.

## **Supporting information of renewal application – question 45**

### **Question 45: Should any information be added or removed from the ‘supporting information’ list?**

A total of 484 submitters answered this question.

Yes	73
No	404

### **Information does not need to be added or removed**

The majority of submitters did not see the need to add or remove any supporting information from the list for renewal applications. Very few submitters provided additional comments. Those who did, generally stated that the list was reasonable.

*This is necessary to ensure that the range still complies and is fit for purpose.*

### **Information should be added or removed**

A few submitters stated that some information should be added or removed from the ‘supporting information’ list for a renewal application, with most of these responses suggesting that supporting information be removed. In particular:

- A few of these submitters suggested that supporting information should not be required if there are no changes to the circumstances of the range since it was last approved
- A few of these submitters opposed the requirement for a new inspection of the range to be conducted, especially where there are no or minimal changes. These submitters noted that this requirement would add costs to the range without material benefit where there are no or minimal changes to report. Submitters also noted that Range Inspectors are limited, which could affect the range’s ability to complete an inspection in a timely manner.

### **Out of scope**

A few submitters, again, did not support any requirement for renewal. While it is out of scope of the consultation, it provides useful context for renewals generally.

*There should be no requirement for a Renewal of Range Certification Inspection Report for a range if there are no material changes within the preceding period. To demand this of clubs or ranges imposes additional*

*unnecessary cost with no benefit to safety. Inspection for renewal should only be a requirement where changes have been identified by the range operator.*

## Endorsement for officers on duty – question 46

### Question 46: Do you agree with this proposal?

A total of 569 submitters answered this question.

Yes	199
No	360

#### Agree

Some submitters indicated that they supported the proposal for officers on duty to only supervise the use of firearms for which they hold the appropriate endorsement to possess. Very few submitters provided additional comments regarding their response, with most of these comments noting that the proposal made sense and would follow current practice.

*This is just plain common sense! Someone without a pistol endorsement should not be able to supervise another person using a pistol.*

One submitter further noted:

*Yes BUT Class A licences have no endorsements so this only applies to pistol shooters and should be regulated separately.*

#### Disagree

Many submitters opposed the proposal that officers on duty must hold the same endorsement of the firearm in use in order to supervise activity. Most of these submitters provided additional comments to explain their response. In particular:

- Some submitters noted that this requirement would not be necessary to improve safety at a range. They explained that the safety principles and practices should remain the same regardless of the type of firearm in use. Therefore, it would not be necessary for a Duty Officer to hold a specific endorsement in order to ensure safe operation of a range.

*Why should a range officer should need a specific endorsement to supervise the use of a range. Range safety is not dependent on being legally able to own a specific type of firearm, it is about the ability to ensure and maintain safe shooting conditions for range users.*

- A few submitters did not consider supervision of firearm use to be a core responsibility of the Duty Officer.

- Many submitters further elaborated that it would be unnecessary for a Duty Officer to be required to hold a relevant endorsement as the firearm licence holder is the one responsible for operating the firearm in a safe manner.

*The individual using their firearms is responsible for their safety and the safety of those around them and the general public. That individual is also lawfully allowed to use the firearm they are endorsed to possess and use. The Duty Officer ensures adherence to the rsos and opens and closes the range to shooting activities and generally oversees the range's operation. The Duty Officer should not be responsible for individual firearms and their type because it is not the purpose of a Duty Officer.*

- A few submitters noted that requiring a Duty Officer or other Range Officer to be present at the range for any instances of shooting would be onerous and unnecessary.

## Training for duty officers – question 47

### Question 47: Should any information be added or removed from the 'minimum training for officers on duty' list?

A total of 517 submitters answered this question.

Yes	128
No	373

#### Information does not need to be added or removed

Most submitters who responded to this question did not see a need to add or remove any information from the 'minimum training for officers on duty' list. Very few submitters provided additional comments on their response. The majority of these comments noted that the proposed list appeared to be sufficient and that nothing further needed to be added.

*That covers the bases quite well and is [in] affect anyway at ranges I attend.*

*This appears to be a comprehensive list*

#### Information should be added or removed

Some submitters indicated that information should be added or removed from the 'minimum training for officers on duty' list. Submitters provided a broad range of views and comments in relation to their response. Suggestions included:

- Specifying whether training would be part of a standard curriculum administered by a third party, or whether clubs and ranges would have the autonomy to deliver training
- Ensuring that existing training courses, such as those provided by the NZCTA, are recognised as appropriate for the purposes of this regulation
- That safety briefings be reiterated to all range users prior to the commencement of shooting
- That an Officer on Duty or other individual should be able to shoot on their own at the range. If shooting alone, an individual should be trained in the safe use of the range,

however, would not necessarily need to be extensively trained according to the Officer on Duty of Range Officer requirements

- Removing all proposed training requirements as they are unnecessary and all users of ranges are aware of the safety procedures.

## Register of duty officers – questions 48 to 50

**Question 48: Should regulations prescribe that range operators must keep a register of members or employees who have completed the minimum standard of training to act as an officer on duty?**

A total of 529 submitters answered this question.

Yes	273
No	235

### Agree

Just over half of all submitters who responded to this question agreed that regulations should prescribe that range operators keep a register of members or employees who have completed the minimum standard of training to act as an officer on duty.

Some of these submitters provided additional comments in support of the proposal. These comments generally indicated that it would be useful to have a list of members able to operate the range, particularly to ensure a safe environment, or noted that this proposal is current practice.

*Good practice for any organisation to list trained and competent people.*

*We support this requirement and as a club we hold records of all trained and qualified range officers.*

### Disagree

The remaining (almost) half of submitters disagreed that this requirement should be prescribed in regulations. A majority of these submitters provided additional comments explaining their response. In particular:

- Some submitters agreed that having a list of trained range officers is helpful, but did not agree that it is necessary to prescribe this in regulations. A few submitters further explained that many ranges already successfully operate voluntary systems, such as rosters of trained range officers, without needing this prescribed in regulations.

*Most clubs have a record of qualified RSOs and it seems unnecessary to regulate this.*

- A few submitters stated that prescribing the requirements in regulations would not improve safety at ranges

- A few submitters suggested that there needs to be a clearer definition and distinction between 'Officer on Duty' and 'Range Officer' as this would affect the interpretation and feasibility of the proposed regulation.

#### Question 49: Do you prefer Option A or Option B?

A total of 568 submitters answered this question.

Option A	37
Option B	299
Neither option	232

#### Option A

A few submitters preferred Option A; that a range operator must keep a daily record of officers on duty when a range is in use by name, date, time and range. Very few of these submitters provided additional comments, with most indicating that recording time is helpful in report writing in the event of an incident, or that Option A follows existing practice in some ranges.

#### Option B

Many submitters preferred Option B, which notes the same requirements for Option A, except that time would not need to be recorded. The majority of submitters who preferred Option B noted that recording time was unnecessary and would not contribute to improved safety, but rather would be an extra administrative burden that would distract officers on duty from monitoring safety.

*Recording the time is putting a requirement to gather information that has limited value. How will the addition of time significantly reduce the risk of issues around safety on the range? There should be an approach to collect what data is needed to satisfy that the range is well managed and used safely and no more, rather than just a list of all the possible data that could be collected.*

#### Neither

Some submitters stated that neither Option A nor Option B were appropriate options to proceed with. Submitters provided additional comments explaining why neither option was appropriate. In particular:

- Some submitters argued that neither Option A nor Option B provide any value, and that both options are unnecessary as they would create overly burdensome administrative duties that would distract an officer on duty from their key task for maintaining range safety.

*I don't support either option as there doesn't appear to be any value for either of them.*

- A few submitters noted that some ranges have multiple officers on duty who rotate between shooting and acting as an officer on duty throughout the day. They explained that

recording the proposed information each time there is a change to the officer on duty would be onerous and impractical.

- A few submitters noted that daily records for who attended the range on any given day already exist as part of current practice, and that further record keeping is not necessary.

*Neither really, what's the point? Most clubs have published and managed shoots, individuals sign in their attendance, all shooting is done under the control of an RO. Why add more complexity for no gain?*

**Question 50: Are there other record keeping options that would enable a range operator to demonstrate that an officer has always been on duty when a range has been in use?**

A total of 300 submitters answered this question.

Yes	58
No	242

Most submitters who provided a response to this question indicated that there are no other appropriate record keeping options to explore.

A few submitters noted that all club/range members with a firearms licence are trained appropriately, and therefore act as officer on duty when onsite. Submitters also reiterated that range sign-in sheets are already in use at most ranges, therefore further record keeping was not necessary. Others reiterated that no other records are necessary to be kept regarding range use, and that required record-keeping would be administratively burdensome.

*There should be no requirement for the club to keep a daily record of officer on duty. Many clubs, ours included, are private and provide full members the ability to visit and use the range at any time (including outside of organised events). All members are trained as Officers on Duty as part of their probationary membership training. Maintaining a specific daily record is unwarranted and extraneous where all range users are qualified.*

A few submitters noted additional record keeping options or conditions that could be included as part of demonstrating that an officer on duty has been on duty while a range has been in use. Suggestions varied and included:

- Taking reasonable steps to appropriately train all licenced members as officers on duty, particularly on ranges where recording keeping is not practice, such as outdoor ranges where access cannot be fully controlled for:

*We need to use the expression "authorised use" as many outdoor ranges would not be in a position to fully control out of hours or trespasser/illicit use. This therefore means that operators must take reasonable steps to advise and train duty officers for their ranges and record their processes where a list of names is not practical.*

- Ensuring officers on duty are identifiable by clothing or badges so that members using the range on that day can attest to the presence of the officer on duty

- Recording a 'projectile count' per shooting lane so that officer on duty can closely monitor for 'bullet catcher deformation and contamination'
- Ensuring that an attendance book or other record includes who visited the range, what time they left, and what range they used (in the case of multi-discipline ranges)
- Using electronic recording, such as electronic login/logout systems or 'smart lock' recording. However, it was noted that this approach would likely be costly and prohibitive for smaller ranges.

## Conditions of shooting range certification – other matters – questions 51 to 54

**Question 51: Do you agree that regulations prescribe that for each range, a condition of certification is that the range operator must comply with the range's RSOs?**

A total of 525 submitters answered this question.

Yes	419
No	83

### Agree

A large majority of submitters who responded to this question agreed that regulations should prescribe that complying with the range's RSO is a condition of certification.

*The RSO's have been written to ensure that the range operation is safe for all parties. These need to be followed to ensure the safety of participants.*

A few submitters provided additional comments relating to their response. These comments largely noted that compliance with RSOs is standard practice and is necessary for maintaining safety at the range.

A few submitters added that regulations should state that NZ Police must also abide by the rules of the RSOs when using a range. One submitter explained that historically, NZ Police have not always followed RSOs, leading to a poorer safety record compared to civilian use of ranges.

### Disagree

A few submitters did not agree that regulations should prescribe compliance with the range's RSO as a condition of certification. For some of these submitters, while they generally agreed that compliance with RSOs is necessary, they did not agree that such a requirement be prescribed in regulations or included on the compliance certificate.

*Compliance with the RSO is all that is required. NO – this does not need and should not need to be included on the certificate.*

A few other submitters cautioned prescribing this requirement into regulations as it could result in unintended consequences such as potential loss of certification where any non-compliance with RSOs occurs.

*Not every single range activity / action is foreseeable and able to be recorded in Range Standing Orders. This regulation implies that for ANY non-compliance*



*with self imposed range standing orders, the range or club will have breached its conditions of certification and therefore be at immediate risk of loss of certification. This approach is not supported.*

**Question 52: Do you think that specific detail on the conditions under which a range has been certified:**

- **Should be detailed on the range certificate itself, or**
- **May be provided on the range certificate and in the RSO's?**

A total of 478 submitters answered this question.

Detailed on the range certificate itself	162
May be provided on the range certificate and in the RSOs	234
Neither option	82

#### **Should be detailed on the range certificate itself**

Many submitters who answered this question indicated that the specific conditions should be detailed on the range certificate and provided their rationale. The main reasons for choosing this option were:

- Keeping RSOs and range certification separate would reduce confusion and maintain clarity and transparency
- Keeping detailed conditions on the certificate only keeps it simple
- Duplication of information is unnecessary and extra paperwork
- The details of conditions on the certificate should directly reflect the RSOs
- Range certification is an operational matter and should not be included on RSOs - especially as RSOs can change.

*Keep it in one place to reduce the risk of confusion. The certificate should say What, the RSO's say How.*

However, many submitters who chose to comment also gave reasons why they disagreed with this option or provided other suggestions. Reasons for disagreement and other suggestions were:

- Neither option including range certificates was acceptable, an independent Firearms Authority option needs to be explored
- Certification of ranges should not be required
- Specific detail on a range certificate is not necessary because:
  - The RSOs dictate safety conditions for each range and are sufficient as long as they are complied with
  - When on the range, Range Officers only need to know the details of the RSOs, not specific details on the certificate

*Specific detail does not need to be included on the certificate as long as RSO are complied with.*

### **Should be detailed on the range certificate itself and RSOs**

Most submitters who responded to this question chose this option and many gave reasons why. The main reasons for choosing this option were:

- This is already the current practice at pistol clubs
- RSOs impact conditions of certification, so it is sensible that the conditions are accessible and available to all
- This makes sense as it would increase rule awareness and provide clarity if any changes need to be made.

*RSOs will give effect to the conditions of the certificate so it is sensible that those conditions are available and accessible to range officers and users.*

Some submitters chose this option, however, their comments reflected that they preferred conditions on the RSOs only, with no need for this information on the range certificate. Reasons for this included:

- The RSOs consolidate all rules and regulations pertaining to ranges. All the relevant information should only be in one defining, guiding document. This is especially necessary in a complex with multiple ranges
- Details on RSOs can be amended and updated as necessary which makes overly detailed certificates redundant
- The certificate should be kept simple with minimum detail as it is on display, and the RSOs should hold all the important details as this is the appropriate place
- Information on the RSOs is more likely to be accessed by all members of the range, whereas the certificate is not
- RSOs contain a lot of information relevant to certification already. There is no need to duplicate information from RSOs onto certificates.

*Specific detail pertaining to individual ranges or multiple ranges within a range complex should be detailed in the Range Standing Orders only. The RSO should be the defining document.*

However, many of those submitters who chose to comment gave reasons why they disagreed with this option or provided other suggestions. Reasons for disagreement and other suggestions were:

- Neither option including range certificates was acceptable, an independent Firearms Authority option needs to be explored
- Neither option, because they do not improve safety but could cause confusion about where to find information
- It depends on the conditions
- Duplication is not a good idea
- Clubs are running fine with a degree of autonomy and further regulations are not necessary
- Providing details on the RSOs should not compromise the security of the club or members

- Conditions should only be on the range certificate if they are not already mentioned on the RSOs
- The certificate should state that people should refer to RSOs for range conditions.

*In the RSO's with a brief summary on the range certificate. The specific detail can be quite involved, and it is important that the Range certificate is 1 page and easy for the range user to read and understand. A brief summary of the range requirements (ie: calibre, distances, what can be used (steel targets, soft targets)) could be on the certificate but further information should be in the RSO's.*

## Neither

Most submitters who responded to this question chose neither option. Many of the reasons echoed answers given in the above two sections. Submitters also mentioned:

- Privacy and security concerns
- Neither of the options were necessary and RSO compliance should be enough
- The question is unclear or confusing.

**Question 53. Should regulations prescribe that, if a range operator wishes to make changes to the safe design, construction, or shooting activities of a range, they must, prior to making changes, check with Police whether new certification would likely be required?**

A total of 514 submitters answered this question.

Yes	201
No	284

## Agree

Many submitters who responded to this question said indicated agreement with the proposal. However, many of these submitters also added the caveat that this should only be for significant or major changes and that there should be a clear definition of what this means. Small changes that do not affect the safe operation of a range should not have to follow this requirement. Some submitters commented that this requirement made sense.

Other comments and suggestions were:

- Range operators should be able to check with the original range certifier first before going to Police, as it may be sufficient to amend RSOs without requiring recertification. This would reduce administrative burden. Range certifiers and inspectors would be good resources to collaborate with
- This proposal would be acceptable if the process was able to be completed in a timely fashion, ranges were not held up by Police, and it was done in an amicable way by both parties
- There should be an option to go through the local Arms Office
- If a change is sufficient enough to require recertification, Police should indicate this before changes are made so clubs and ranges can make informed decisions.

*Yes, but with limitations. Minor changes should not require police notification. Police are already short of resource for dealing with firearm related safety. This is only going to get worse under new proposals. Changing minor items in a range should not require police notification or police will get drawn into unnecessary consultation.*

## **Disagree**

Most submitters who responded to this question disagreed with the proposal. Many objections echoed the reasons given above – that ‘changes’ need to be more clearly defined as the proposed requirement could be unnecessary and impractical, and should only be applied to major or significant changes that affect safety or possible recertification. Because of this, some submitters said the proposal was too vague and there was too much scope for interpretation. Some submitters echoed the suggestion that it would be beneficial to consult range inspectors and certifiers before going to Police, as they have greater knowledge of the ranges.

Other suggestions and comments included:

- There should be allowances for necessary urgent changes to ranges that are for safety reasons – the changes can be made first then reported
- There are already standard procedures in place for pre-approving changes
- This should be left to the judgement of range operators, clubs and committees
- The proposal is burdensome and bureaucratic and will be subject to already lengthy process delays
- The range design manual is publicly available, anyone can check requirements without consulting Police.

*Police are not range inspectors, only certifiers. A more appropriate requirement is for consultation with a Range Inspector... The premise of the question assumes that any changes being made will impact the safe design of the range, and this is a false assumption as minor changes will be possible without impacting safety. This question also suggests clubs and ranges check with police before (for example) replacing a target stand, or changing any shooting activity on a range. This is bureaucratic nonsense that imposes administrative burden and costs on the club / range, its volunteers and Police.*

The interdependency of this proposal with the requirement at section 38Q(3) of the Act to request the Commissioner’s review if a range departs from conditions of certification was not often referenced by submitters.

## **Question 54: Are there any other scenarios where the ability to amend the conditions of certification for a range would be appropriate?**

A total of 438 submitters answered this question.

Yes	100
No	331

Submitters suggested the following scenarios where the ability to amend the conditions of certification would be appropriate:

- When the range is owned by the Crown (for example, New Zealand Defence Force ranges)
- When changes are made to improve safety
- When the range is affected by a significant weather event or other natural disaster (for example, a slip onto the range or an earthquake)
- Change in landowner
- Change in local government bylaws, and
- Addition of a new discipline on the range.

One submitter said:

*Where appropriate templating has been carried out post original certification, or if requirements change in the published NZ Police range manual(s) or any other associated manual(s), allowing a possible change to a particular range to enhance the user experience or income-earning capability of the range operator with no reduction in safety.*

## Range Standing Orders – question 55

### Question 55: Do you prefer Option A or Option B?

A total of 523 submitters answered this question.

Option A	229
Option B	190
Neither option	104

*Note:* Some submitters that chose Option A included additional comments stating their preference is for more information to be prescribed in regulations (despite Option A **not** requiring this), with many submissions making the following comment:

*The contents need to be set out in regulation, noting that consultation will be required on the detail of these contents before it is set out.*

### Option A

Some submitters that supported Option A said that providing the contents for RSOs in the New Zealand Police Shooting Range Manual provides more flexibility and prevents missing “crucial details” by summarising the requirements in regulations.

Most submitters chose Option A with the caveat that the contents relating to RSOs in the New Zealand Police Shooting Range Manual should be consulted on before being incorporated. One submitter suggested that the contents should be co-developed with the firearms community.

A few submitters said that having the prescribed requirements in one document may prevent misunderstandings or error.

### Option B

Many submitters said that having a summary in the regulations will be more succinct and therefore have a greater chance of being read and understood by users. Some submitters felt that

a summary in regulations was more likely to be flexible to different disciplines as it will not have specific details that suit some ranges better than others.

Many submitters said that RSOs should be simple and easy to read and easy to administer, and therefore supported having a summary of RSO requirements in the regulations.

## Neither

Some submitters chose neither option. Many of these submitters did not think that referencing RSOs in regulations was necessary. The submitters that did not choose either option had a wide spectrum of reasons for their submission; some submitters stated that ranges (or relevant clubs) should be responsible for their own RSOs and other submitters stated that all RSO content should be in regulation for clarity and transparency. Some submitted that the contents for RSOs should only be in the New Zealand Police Shooting Range Manual.

## Notification of RSOs and changes of RSOs to all range users – question 56 to 59

### Question 56: Should regulations prescribe that the range operator must ensure all regular range users receive a copy of the RSOs?

A total of 557 submitters answered this question.

Yes	175
No	362

While some submitters supported this proposal, commenting that familiarity with range requirements is of upmost importance, most submitters pointed out that RSOs are already sufficiently incorporated into club and range environments.

Many submitters spoke about the different ways RSOs are provided or made available at ranges, for example, they are normally displayed at the range on notice boards, covered in the range inductions for new members and users, and at events or club days. Most submitters stated that it would be sufficient to ensure RSOs continue to be easily accessible at the range itself and that individual members should be responsible for familiarising themselves with them.

*The RSO's should simply be made available to all. Those who want to read them will do so. Providing a copy to all regular users does not ensure they have been read and understood, therefore provides no value.*

Some submitters argued that it would be hard to define who is a 'regular' range user and pointed out that no guidelines have been provided for this yet. The NZDA membership was used as an example by a few submitters – as they have roughly 10,000 members, they should not be obliged to ensure all of them have received, read, and understood RSOs. These submitters believed this would be overly burdensome or borderline impossible for clubs and ranges to ensure.

Some submitters maintained that access to an online copy through each range's website would be sufficient. Range users could then be advised of any changes directly through email or the club newsletter, which could save on administrative costs and excessive paperwork. It would also mitigate the risk of users inadvertently referring to outdated RSOs or making their own interpretations of the material.

*There may be an element of risk involved with excessive identification with RSO's as the most important rule in most cases should be to listen to the range officers at all times and not be one where people look to circumvent the range officers by arguing semantics in RSO's.*

A few submitters highlighted that mandating that all range users read the full RSOs, which contain information that is not always applicable to individual members, might result in fewer people reading and understanding them.

*Full RSOs contain much that is relevant to Range Officers and OODs but not to normal shooters. Provision of just the information that is relevant to the individual in question will provide better safety outcomes – it is far more likely to actually be read and understood if it contains only the pertinent information.*

Out of the submitters who agreed with the proposal, some spoke about enacting some kind of system where proof of delivery or receipt of understanding could be recorded. However, many commented that there needs to be flexibility with the method for how RSOs are sent and received, with most favouring an online option as opposed to individual paper copies.

**Question 57: Should regulations prescribe that the range operator must take all reasonable and practicable steps to ensure all range users are made aware of any changes to the RSOs and have access to the most up-to-date version of the RSOs?**

A total of 531 submitters answered this question.

Yes	466
No	57

### **Agree**

Most submitters agreed that Range Operators must ensure all users have access to RSOs and are made aware of any changes made since previous copies were distributed. These submitters thought this proposal amounts to common sense and should be part of best practice guidelines. Ensuring accessibility in reaching all range users was seen as particularly important by some submitters.

*This is a matter of safety and ensuring that the range is continued to be used safely for all parties. Up-to-date versions must be available at all times within the club, and electronic updates could be sent to club members – noting of course that not all members have access to internet in rural areas.*

Many submitters agreed that the bulk of responsibility should sit with Range Officers to ensure RSOs are available, and that changes are communicated, however some discussed the role of individual members in making sure they are across and fully understand the RSOs, reach out to the officer on duty if they have questions, and are responsible for their own behaviour while on the range.



## Disagree

Some submitters believed that mandating this requirement will not have a huge effect on safety but will only add more administrative work for clubs. These submitters spoke about the range of adequate rules that are already in place at clubs and ranges, whereby RSOs are displayed for everyone to see and incorporated into induction processes for new users.

Some submitters argued that this requirement should not be mandated or enshrined in the regulations, especially if there are going to be penalties for non-compliance. They did not think this needed to be a legal requirement as it might result in volunteers not wanting to sign up as Range Operators in order to avoid the risk.

A few submitters expressed concern for the mention of “all practicable steps” in the discussion document – they highlighted that this is currently undefined and therefore unclear and hard to meet without any guidelines.

*Word “practical” introduces a weighty legal responsibility that unnecessarily and perhaps duplicitously overburdens clubs. Not everyone understands the implications of “practical”, and “reasonable” steps would suffice.*

A few submitters highlighted that this proposal is already covered under the *Health and Safety at Work Act 2015* and its regulations.

**Question 58: Should regulations prescribe that each range has a sign listing a summary of the relevant criteria and safety rules, including any relevant safety rules specific to that range, and contained in RSOs?**

A total of 536 submitters answered this question.

Yes	185
No	335

## Agree

Most submitters pointed out that the club or shooting range they belong to already has safety signage around their facilities.

Some submitters acknowledged that making sure safety signs are put up in each club or range would be useful for visiting users or non-regular members to be able to quickly familiarise themselves with the relevant rules, or if rules differ from their home club. A few submitters also highlighted that this would make sense for ranges that often host inexperienced or non-trained users, such as in a military environment where recruits or personnel are using the facilities.

## Disagree

Some submitters were against mandating this as it does not allow for flexibility in communication of safety rules. They maintained that this should be left to the club or range to determine so that the most effective method for their facility is able to be chosen.

*This is unnecessarily specific and is likely to just incur more cost without an increase in safety. The requirement that the operator makes all range users aware of the RSO is sufficient. For some a sign will be best; others will use other forms of communication.*

Other submitters were concerned about the cost clubs and ranges would incur as part of this proposal and thought that RSOs already have all the information users need. Additional signage might take attention away from existing signs such as exit signs, protection requirements, and lead management. A few submitters also argued that any summary of the RSO rules would have a negative impact as they would be watered down, and users might end up neglecting the full details.

Some submitters maintained that clear and simple messaging of primary risks to be aware of and managed by users would have a positive effect on clubs and help boost a culture of safety. These submitters maintained that safety *should* be placed in users' faces, which they likened to road signs that are repeated along a stretch of road.

*Common sense. Also, safety signage demonstrates that the club has safety in mind, especially when the club has created that signage itself. Off the shelf signs have much less impact.*

A few submitters were supportive of the signage provided, noting that it is in line with the same requirements under health and safety regulations to avoid replication.

**Question 59: Should regulations prescribe that proposed amendments to RSOs should be submitted to Police for review against the original range certification prior to the change to RSOs being made?**

A total of 510 submitters answered this question.

Yes	119
No	364

The majority of submitters who responded to this question argued that it should only be restricted to significant changes or amendments that will have a significant impact on the shooting club or range.

*If the amendment is cosmetic (eg the car-park has changed, the entry to the complex from the road has changed, the toilets have been moved etc) – then no need. If the actual shooting lanes and anything to do with the space in the danger area has changed then yes – initially consult with the Police before going to the effort of amending RSOs – to confirm you are on the right track and haven't missed anything.*

Some submitters noted that if the Police were to be approached every time a change was to be submitted, they would become swamped with processing and answering all queries. However, submitters noted that if clubs are ever unsure about a change, then a query is justified.

A few submitters who supported this proposal pointed out that many national organisations and disciplines have trained Police Shooting Range Inspectors who could take on this function. Utilising Range Inspection Officers by approaching them prior to making any changes would avoid taking up unnecessary Police time and delays to the process.

*This should be a function of the Range Inspection Officers. They currently work with clubs to make RSO amendments. RIO's are all approved by Police, therefore they should be authorised to approve or decline any proposed amendments.*

A few submitters were concerned that this proposal would cause delays in applying new RSOs, which could be detrimental to the safety of the club or range. There might be cases where a safety problem is identified that requires immediate action, such as if a particular type of ammunition performs in a dangerous manner and needs to be banned immediately. Submitters argued that this must be possible without prior approval from Police.

*More paperwork from both sides. Judging from the current delays in processing Firearms Licence applications and renewals this is only going to bog the NZ Police down further.*

Some submitters recommended incorporating the review of RSOs into the annual range certification renewal process to save Police time and administrative costs.

## Conditions relating to secure storage at a range – question 60

**Question 60: Do you think that a condition of certification granted under section 38P is that where firearms or ammunition are stored at a shooting range, the conditions regarding storage will be based on those that apply to firearms dealers (with wording tailored to be specific to a shooting range)?**

A total of 498 submitters answered this question.

Yes	105
No	370

Most submitters disagreed with this proposal. The reasons for this included:

- The need for significant security upgrades. Some submitters said that meeting this requirement would mean costly upgrades that ranges cannot all afford (eg, strongroom structure)
- That storage is the individual responsibility of firearms licence holder
- Storage arrangements should be tailored to the range.

Of the submitters that agreed, their reasons included:

- This is appropriate for when the firearms and ammunition are stored on the range when is not in use
- This is a reasonable and appropriate storage standard
- This requirement appropriately takes into account safety considerations.

## Inspection of ranges – question 61 to 63

### Question 61: Do you think the reasons to undertake inspections are appropriate?

A total of 530 submitters answered this question.

Yes	269
No	235

#### Agree

Just over half of all submitters who responded to this question agreed that the proposed reasons to undertake inspections are appropriate. Very few of these submitters provided further comments. Of those that agreed, a few reiterated that it should be with seven days' notice (as required by the Act). One submitter stated that they agreed with the proposal, but the range should not have to pay for an inspection.

#### Disagree

Just under half of all submitters who responded to this question disagreed with the proposal. Of these submitters, many thought that the reasons for inspection were too broad and needed more clarity, or did not think the proposed list of reasons added value to the current provisions in the Arms Legislation Act.

Some submitters did not think that the term 'spot check' should be used given the requirement in the Act to give seven days' notice. Some submitters said that unannounced spot checks would be impractical as ranges are not always in use or it may occur when an event is taking place and committee members are preoccupied.

One organisation submitted that the storage requirements should be analogous to individuals instead of dealers.

### Question 62: Are there any other reasons that it would be appropriate for Police to undertake inspections of ranges under section 38U?

A total of 435 submitters answered this question.

Yes	61
No	349

Some submitters answered 'yes' to this question but did not provide any further suggestions as part of their submission.

Some submitters referenced the requirement for the New Zealand Police to give seven days' notice in section 38U(2) of the Act and sought clarity on whether the proposed reasons for inspection would apply with that rule in place.

Submitters suggested a range of additional suggestions for inspection to occur, including:

- Where there is reasonable belief of suspicious activity occurring
- Where there has been a shooting-related accident or incident
- In response to a complaint, incident, or resignation of a range officer
- Where there is a change in ownership or change in location of the range
- Where a range experiences insolvency, bankruptcy or winding up of the operator.

**Question 63: Does the proposal broadly cover the key steps for producing and providing an inspection report?**

A total of 417 submitters answered this question.

Yes	318
No	80

Most submitters agreed without further comment. Some submitters agreed but said that the regulations should be clear about the status of the report, particularly in relation to what is required for improvement. A few submitters disagreed for the same reason.

Of those submitters that disagreed, a few suggested that an assessment criteria or an inspection report template be provided.

**Suggestions**

- A few submitters suggested that there should be procedure for disputes or independent mediation
- Some submitters suggested that inspections should be undertaken by an independent Range Inspector instead of employees of the New Zealand Police.

**Cancellation of certification – question 64**

**Question 64: Should regulations prescribe that the Commissioner may cancel a range certificate if the range operator voluntarily surrenders the range certification?**

A total of 496 submitters answered this question.

Yes	377
No	109

Most submitters agreed with the proposal without further comment.

Most submitters that disagreed suggested an alternative or supplementary option, or suggested that there may be another range operator who may want to take over the range.

## Suggestions

- It was suggested that the regulations should allow for a period of time before cancelling the range certification to allow the range to reconsider or for another to take over the certification before the certificate lapses
- It was also suggested that regulations should provide for another status, such as 'suspended' or 'on hold' rather than only having active and cancelled certification of ranges
- It was suggested that regulations should provide for:
  - A simplified process if a new operator takes over the range and no changes are made to the range, or
  - Only cancelling the certificate if another range operator does not intend to take over the range and inherit the current certificate.

## Fees for application to approve a shooting range – question 65 to 66

**Question 65: Two options are proposed relating to fees for application to approve a shooting range.**

- **Option A: the actual full cost to Police of all activities taken by Police to certify the range(s).**
- **Option B: Partial cost to Police of all activities taken by Police to certify the range(s).**

**Do you prefer Option A or Option B?**

A total of 592 submitters answered this question.

Option A	33
Option B	353
Neither option	206

There was little support for Option A amongst submitters, many of whom only expressed support if Police can confirm that it would be a one-off cost. Submitters who supported Option A spoke about how it could give small or rural ranges the ability to apply for certification without the disadvantage of being a smaller or less affluent community. Submitters also noted that if Option A is pursued, the processing time for certification needs to be prioritised so as not to cause any clubs to close while waiting for approval.

There was some support for Option B by submitters who considered that the lower the cost incurred by clubs, the better. Submitters noted that there is a wealth of social and public good in having safe ranges available for people to access, and that Option B could help Police work with clubs and seek to get responsible proactive outcomes for all those concerned.

*Although the cheaper the better to encourage compliance, if people do have to pay at least a small fee, it would encourage them to uphold the conditions of the range certification once granted, because they essentially have "skin in the game" when they've paid anything toward it.*

The size of the range and membership base were discussed by many submitters as key considerations when setting certification costs, as they will need to be proportional. Submitters maintained that these new costs for shooting ranges will push club membership out of many peoples' reach, even though supervised shooting should be encouraged. Some submitters recommended putting allowances in place for clubs who belong to an association, where certified range inspections and training is conducted regularly.

*Costs to NZ Police and ranges could be significantly reduced if NZ police worked with ranges parent bodies i.e., Target Shooting New Zealand, Pistol Shooting New Zealand New Zealand National Rifle Association.*

*My club is affiliated to Target Shooting New Zealand and TSNZ already has range inspectors and our range has been inspected recently by TSNZ. We would be happy to pay a fee for the physical inspection but the administration costs should not fall to clubs.*

Some submitters noted that the consultation document wrongly stated that the activities for certificate renewal are the same as a new application – other parts of the document state renewal would require less action. A few submitters suggested that initial applications to approve shooting ranges should be free to encourage compliance; however, if there is to be a fee, renewing certification should be the cheaper cost out of the two.

Most submitters who did not pick either option discussed the effect this proposal would have on shooting clubs and ranges.

**Question 66: If the fee to certify a range should be set at less than the estimated cost, at what level should that be set: 90% or 80% of the cost to Police?**

A total of 540 submitters answered this question.

90%	30
80%	110
Neither option	400

Submitters who responded to this question were almost exclusively against both the 90% and 80% option, arguing that both are far too high.

Many submitters recommended that the amount be set closer to 25-50%, recognising the shared benefit to the wider community and public that shooting clubs and ranges offer. While the cost to Police was acknowledged, submitters argued that the aim of these regulations should be to encourage clubs to survive and continue to provide a safe, structured environment for the sport, therefore any cost recovery needs to recognise the safety aspect of firearms training and safe firearms usage.

*50% or less would be more appropriate. The cost will become prohibitive. This regime may result in slightly safer ranges, however what it will definitely do is reduce the number of ranges around the country due to closures from over regulation and high costs. This will push shooters to shoot in other places, such as setting up a target in a paddock, which will decrease actual safety. Costs and regulations need to be manageable to mitigate this.*



Size was discussed again by submitters, some of which suggested that the costs be limited to \$200-400 depending on the nature and makeup of the range and its membership base. In order to mitigate the risk of range closures and loss of clubs, the regulations will need to recognise that a smallbore indoor range requires significantly less compliance than an outdoor, centre-fire range.

Some submitters supported the NZDA submission recommending to Police that any guidance on the appropriate reduction should be in line with the *Local Government (Rating) Act* which gives rates relief on land used by a society or association for games or sports.

*[we submit] that Police should consider a commercial and not-for-profit fee schedule and that club range which qualify for rates relief of 50% should also get a certification fee reduction of the cost of 50%.*

A few submitters were concerned that without knowing the extent of future costs and hours Police will need to enact these regulations, the full amount might end up being “enormous”, therefore more information regarding what this will look like in practice was often requested.

## Publicly available list of approved clubs and certified ranges – question 67

### Question 67: Do you prefer Option A or Option B?

A total of 559 submitters answered this question.

Option A	276
Option B	138
Neither option	145

Some submitters that supported Option A felt that some ranges will be intended for private use only or the club and/or range may want to limit the number of members. Submitters thought they should be able to choose whether to have their information publicly available.

One organisation said,

*There are two schools of thought within the shooting community. One is that we should “put ourselves out there” and strongly publicise what we do and where we do it. The other is that we should not publicise ourselves, as we become a target for crime if we do so. Many clubs would also not welcome or be able to handle an influx of members. It is for individual clubs and ranges to decide how they feel about this.*

*Making it compulsory for clubs/ranges to be listed provides no benefit; it does not “support the purposes of the Act”, it does not meet any of the criteria for these regulations. Allowing clubs & ranges to be listed if they so desire is appropriate, however.*

Some submitters did state that a mandatory list would “advertise” where firearms are used and could result in clubs and/or ranges being targeted by firearms thieves.

Other submitters felt that Option A would be a better use of New Zealand Police resources and avoid unnecessary data collection.

Some submitters that supported Option B noted that it would be beneficial to have a mandatory public list of clubs and ranges so that members of the public have a trusted information source to access to easily find a safe place to undertake shooting activities.

One organisation submitted that Option B *“would make it easier for members of the public to detect and report illicit activity by uncertified ranges or unapproved clubs”*.

Some submitters stated that a requirement to maintain a publicly available list is a natural result of the proposed regulatory regime and the list should be mandatory to ensure that the public and members of shooting clubs can be satisfied that they are shooting with an approved club or at a certified range. Many submitters that supported Option B felt that clubs, ranges, and NZ Police will have to invest significant time and effort into the approval of clubs and certification of ranges and therefore that effort should be recognised in an accessible and transparent list.