



26 March 2026

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for your request made under the Official Information Act 1982 (OIA), received on 24 March 2026. You requested the following as a follow up to the published OIA responses about Inland Revenue's use of AI:

- 1. During the proof of concept in late 2024, IRD documents record several faults with the tool, including the generation of words that do not exist in English (such as "schedolar", "customer'd" and "daughter'd"), and instances where the AI reversed the roles of the customer service officer and the customer in its summaries. Cases were raised with Genesys in November 2024 and were recorded as still under investigation at the time the PoC documents were produced. Have these faults been resolved? If so, when were they resolved and what was the fix?*
- 2. IRD documents record that the tool reached the 10-word limit for "sounds like" dictionary entries for the term GST. Has this limitation been resolved, and if so how? If not, how does IRD manage the risk of GST-related transcription errors in customer call summaries?*
- 3. What accuracy rate has IRD established for the conversation summarisation tool since its full adoption in April 2025? Is there a minimum accuracy threshold that must be maintained for the tool to remain in use?*
- 4. A February 2025 ministerial briefing says that AI-generated conversation summaries are not retained. But another August 2025 briefing says the tool was fully adopted with summaries copied into START. Can you clarify when the retention policy changed and whether customers were notified?*

### **Question 1**

Genesys conversation summarisation has not reversed the roles of customer service officer and customer in its summaries. It has however used the term "agent" for the Inland Revenue staff member speaking.

Inland Revenue raised a case with Genesys on 15 November 2024 with regards to some words being transcribed that do not exist in English. This issue has since been resolved. Genesys continually updates their tools as part of ongoing maintenance, and Inland Revenue does not hold details on the date of the fix, or the nature of the fix. Therefore, your request for this information is refused under section 18(g)(i) of the OIA, as it is not held by Inland Revenue and we do not believe it is held by another agency.

### **Question 2**

Inland Revenue manages any errors in the conversation summaries through the review undertaken by the Inland Revenue staff member, following the conclusion of the call. As discussed in my previous response to you dated 12 March 2026, the AI-generated summary is a first draft for Inland Revenue staff, who then review the summary, make edits as appropriate, ensure completeness and then lodge this into the customer record in START.

With regards to "sounds like" limits, this limitation has not changed. The Inland Revenue staff member can amend any mis-transcribed terms in their post-call summary review.

**Question 3**

Inland Revenue does not have an established accuracy rate or minimum accuracy threshold that must be maintained by Genesys conversation summarisation. Accuracy of what is captured as the official record sits with the Inland Revenue staff member. Therefore, your request for this information is refused under section 18(g)(i) of the OIA as this is not held by Inland Revenue, and we do not believe it is held by another agency.

Inland Revenue continues to monitor after-call work time and has a feedback mechanism for staff following each call's conversation summary.

**Question 4**

The 27 August 2025 ministerial briefing you reference (available on our website at <https://www.taxpolicy.ird.govt.nz/publications/2026/ir-use-of-ai>) does not state summaries are copied into START. The briefing states "conversation summarisation has been fully adopted in the Individuals Segment contact centre since April 28, 2025". For the avoidance of doubt, Inland Revenue does not retain AI-generated conversation summaries and has never made any process changes relating to their retention.

**Right of review**

If you disagree with my decision on your OIA request, you have the right to ask the Ombudsman to investigate and review my decision under section 28(3) of the OIA. You can contact the office of the Ombudsman by email at: [info@ombudsman.parliament.nz](mailto:info@ombudsman.parliament.nz).

**Publishing of OIA response**

We intend to publish our response to your request on Inland Revenue's website ([ird.govt.nz](http://ird.govt.nz)) as this information may be of interest to other members of the public. This letter, with your personal details removed, may be published in its entirety. Publishing responses increases the availability of information to the public and is consistent with the OIA's purpose of enabling more effective participation in the making and administration of laws and policies and promoting the accountability of officials.

Thank you again for your request.

Yours sincerely



Patrick O'Doherty  
**Enterprise Leader, Digital**