

26 August 2026

s9(2)(a)

Tēnā koe s9(2)(a)

Thank you for your email, received on 9 August 2026, to Oranga Tamariki—Ministry for Children (Oranga Tamariki) requesting information on receipt and use of surveillance information by Oranga Tamariki. Your request has been considered under the Official Information Act 1982 (the Act).

I have responded to each part of your request below.

Part One Data Sharing and Continuous Intimate Surveillance

- 1. It is standard public practice that agencies exchange information to perform official duties. Do you confirm Oranga Tamariki actively receives, accesses, or relies upon personal information supplied by New Zealand Police, GCSB, or other state intelligence agencies when conducting assessments, deploying response teams, or making decisions affecting children and families?*

Oranga Tamariki does receive some personal information from the New Zealand Police.

This personal information is in the form of recorded crime offender statistics (RCOS) which is used to monitor our progress with Government Target 3 (reduced child and youth offending). The RCOS data Oranga Tamariki receives is only for statistical and research purposes.

Oranga Tamariki is also a party to the Gang Harm Insights Centre (GHIC) Approved Information Sharing Agreement. Police is the lead agency for this agreement.

Oranga Tamariki has a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with the New Zealand Police, which states that any information shared between the two agencies will be shared in compliance with relevant legislation, including the Oranga Tamariki Act (1989), the Policing Act (2008), the Official Information Act (1982), and the Privacy Act (2020).

IN-CONFIDENCE

In particular, section 66C of the Oranga Tamariki Act permits the sharing of information about a child or young person for specified wellbeing and safety purposes.

You can find out more about information sharing here:

- [Sharing information | Practice Centre | Oranga Tamariki](#)
- [Information sharing | Practice Centre | Oranga Tamariki](#)
- [Office of the Privacy Commissioner | Sharing to protect a child or young person's wellbeing and safety \(OT Act\)](#)

We do not receive or share any other data with intelligence agencies.

- 2. Does the information you receive and act upon include continuous, real-time biometric identifiers, precise location tracking, and detailed physical or behavioural profiles of individuals? State clearly and specifically the nature and scope of this data.*
- 3. State clearly and specifically which agency, department, or external body is the primary source supplying this level of intimate, continuous personal data to your organisation.*
- 4. State clearly and specifically how this granular, up-to-the-minute personal data is distributed directly to frontline social workers, SAM team members, and field staff during home visits and direct interventions.*

Oranga Tamariki does not receive biometric information, precise location tracking, detailed profiles, or surveillance information from any other agency, nor do we collect this information ourselves.

The only biometric information utilised by Oranga Tamariki is for the purpose of authentication on Oranga Tamariki devices – that is, to allow staff members to log on to their laptops or phones using face ID.

As such, these parts of your request are refused under section 18(g)(i) of the Act, on the grounds that the requested information is not held by Oranga Tamariki, nor is it held by another department.

Part Two: Timing Expose Coordination

- 5. State clearly and specifically: can you confirm or deny that instances of increased intervention, escalated urgency, or formal attempts to seek custody of children align precisely with independently verified periods of high-intensity targeted radiation and surveillance activity at individuals' residences?*
- 6. State clearly and specifically: did the frequency, intensity, and urgency of Oranga Tamariki and SAM team involvement escalate sharply during the exact same periods that heightened monitoring and elevated recorded radiation levels were documented at affected properties?*
- 7. State clearly and specifically: is it a matter of internal record that this marked increase in official intervention activity aligned precisely with*

these documented periods of intensified data collection and monitoring targeting those residences?

8. *In repeated documented instances, this escalation aligns precisely with events that objectively constitute clear attempts to seize children, take control of property, and culminate in targeted harm rising to the level of attempted murder.*
 - a. *State clearly and specifically: do you deny that in these recorded instances, official intervention escalated to extreme levels exactly when high-intensity radiation peaked, coinciding with life-threatening harm and overt attempts to remove children and seize property?*
 - b. *If denied, explain how this precise, repeated alignment of welfare action, intensified targeting, and life-threatening outcomes can be anything other than coordinated misuse of state power disguised as legitimate care and protection work.*

Oranga Tamariki does not undertake surveillance or utilise equipment that uses high-intensity targeted radiation. As noted above, we also do not receive the type of surveillance information you refer to.

As such, these parts of your request are refused under section 18(g)(i) of the Act.

Oranga Tamariki adheres to the National Care Standards in all engagements with tamariki and whānau, including when undertaking needs assessments and in cases where tamariki are brought into the care of Oranga Tamariki. More information about the National Care Standards can be found on the Oranga Tamariki website [here](#).

Part Three: Reject Excuses and Demand Lawful Justification

9. *This matter concerns unlawful interference with private life, family rights, and physical safety a core public interest issue. State clearly and specifically can you justify using continuous, intimate surveillance data in welfare decisions, given that independent technical evidence confirming unlawful emissions and unlicensed transmissions has already been formally lodged with MBIE, RSM, and regulatory bodies?*
10. *As a taxpayer-funded public service bound by the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990 Section 21 and the Privacy Act 1993: State clearly and specifically the exact statutory section, regulation, or written legal authority that permits your agency to receive, rely upon, or act upon this level of continuous, intimate biometric and physical surveillance data in family welfare matters.*
11. *State clearly and specifically: do you acknowledge that any use of covert, unregulated, or unlawfully obtained surveillance data to trigger interventions, shape care decisions, or pursue custody breaches fundamental legal rights and renders those official actions without lawful authority regardless of agency claims or vague justifications?*

As noted previously, Oranga Tamariki does not receive or produce the kind of surveillance information you refer to in your request.

As such, these parts of your request are refused under section 18(g)(i) of the Act.

Part Four: Formal Document Requests

- 1. All information sharing agreements, protocols, or memoranda of understanding between Oranga Tamariki and New Zealand Police, GCSB, MBIE, RSM, or LINZ regarding the sharing of biometric, precise location, or surveillance-related personal data.*
- 2. All records, reports, or data received from New Zealand Police, GCSB, or any intelligence or security agency regarding affected individuals, covering the period 2020 to present.*
- 3. All internal assessments, briefings, case notes, or decision records that relied upon surveillance-derived data or continuous monitoring information when making care or protection decisions for those individuals or their families.*
- 4. All policy documents, legal advice, or guidance setting out the lawful basis for collecting, receiving, or using biometric, location, or surveillance data in care and protection decision-making.*

As noted previously, Oranga Tamariki does not receive or produce the kind of surveillance information you refer to in your request.

As such, these parts of your request are refused under section 18(g)(i) of the Act.

- 5. The formal Joint Protocol governing the sharing of personal information between Oranga Tamariki and the New Zealand Police.*

Oranga Tamariki does not hold a formal Joint Protocol as you have requested. As such, this part of your request is refused under section 18(e) of the Act, on the grounds that the document alleged to contain the information requested does not exist.

While Oranga Tamariki does not have a formal Joint Protocol with Police, in our response to part 1.1 of your request we refer to the Memorandum of Understanding in place with Police.

Oranga Tamariki may make the information contained in this letter available to the public by publishing this on our website with your personal details removed.

I trust you find this information useful. If you wish to discuss this response with us, please feel free to contact OIA_Requests@ot.govt.nz.

IN-CONFIDENCE

Alternatively, you are advised of your right to also raise any concerns with the Office of the Ombudsman. Information about this is available at www.ombudsman.parliament.nz or by contacting them on 0800 802 602.

Nāku noa, nā

A handwritten signature in grey ink, appearing to read 'Emma Powell'.

Emma Powell
Deputy Chief Executive
System Leadership