



Collaborative Stakeholder Group (“CSG”) Workshop 3 Notes

(Day one) 5 June 2014, Tokoroa Events Centre, 25 Mossop Road, Tokoroa 9.30am – 6.30pm

Attendees:

CSG: Alan Fleming (Environmental/NGO), Chris Keenan (Horticulture), Garry Maskill (Water supply takes), George Moss (Dairy), Gwyneth Verkerk (Community), Hone Turner (Community), James Bailey (Sheep and Beef), Matt Makgill (Community), Patricia Fordyce (Forestry), Phil Journeaux (Rural Professionals), Rick Pridmore (Dairy), Ruth Bartlett (Industry), Stephen Colson (Energy), James Houghton (Rural Advocacy), Evelyn Forrest (Community), Sally Davis (Local Government), Weo Maag (Māori Interests), Jason Sebastian (Community), Garth Wilcox (Delegate for Horticulture),

Other: Bill Wasley (Independent Chair), Helen Ritchie (Facilitator), Jo Bromley (WRC), Wendy Boyce (WRC), Janine Hayward (WRC), Justine Young (WRC), Emma Reed (WRC), Ruth Lourey (WRC), Will Collin (WRC)

Other (part): Bruce McAuliffe (WRC), Louis Armstrong (Raukawa), Leleina Tolovae (Raukawa), Stephanie O’Sullivan (Raukawa), Vicki Carruthers (Technical Workstream Leader, WRC)

Apologies:

CSG: Alastair Calder (Tourism and Recreation), Brian Hanna (Community), Don Scarlet (Delegate, Tourism and Recreation), Gayle Leaf (Community), Gina Rangī (Māori Interests), Tony Roxburgh (Environmental/NGO’s), Topia Rameka (Māori Interests), Ruthana Begbie (Community)

Item	Description	Action
	Visit to Collaborative Stakeholder Group (CSG) member George Moss’s dairy farm from 9.30am – 11am. The group discussed stocking rates, pasture management and effluent management.	
	Workshop commenced at 11.30 am with a mihi whakatau from representatives of Raukawa Charitable Trust.	
	<p><u>Overview of agenda:</u> The purpose of workshop three:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirm Terms of Reference, decision making process, communications and engagement approaches from CSG workshop two 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand Raukawa perspectives and values • Understand dairy farming perspectives and approaches • Understand the Water Allocation variation to the Waikato Regional Plan • Meet the Technical Leaders Group • Develop a focus question/problem statement 	
	<p><u>Presentation following farm visit from George Moss, CSG Dairy sector representative</u></p> <p>Presentation on ground water nitrogen, local stream nitrogen and the Overseer nutrient budget model.</p> <p>Discussion included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each area has different soils and land structure which has different impacts on water. • Overseer is designed to calculate what a farm utilises, what's left over is called losses. It is not designed to calculate ground water. • The farm payout is very significant to farm profitability. An average dairy farm needs around \$6.00 per kg/milk solids to break even. Farmers are not able to control payout prices. • Decisions people are making are not necessarily just for profit. Approximately 80 per cent of the debt in the dairy industry is with 20 per cent of the people. • Interest in more information on the demographics of farmers in the catchment, to help understand what motivates individual land owners. 	
12.30pm	Lunch	
1.	<p><u>Overview and introduction:</u></p> <p>Welcome to Garth Wilcox (new Horticulture delegate)</p> <p><u>Apologies:</u> Alastair Calder, Brian Hanna, Don Scarlet, Gayle Leaf, Gina Rangi, Ruthana Begbie, Topia Rameka</p>	
2.	<p><u>Chairperson's Opening Statement</u></p> <p>A thank you on behalf of the CSG for Sharon and George Moss's farm visit. One of the key messages received is that developing policy that impacts land use should not be a 'one size fits all' approach. Farm management is complex and impacted by soils, climate, grazing management approaches, as well as debt levels. A strong evidence base will be necessary to assist with plan change provisions and the scrutiny that will occur. Traditional thinking and approaches may not necessarily be the most effective approach. For example, a 'one size fits all' approach is unlikely to be appropriate, given the diversity of farm systems in the catchment.</p> <p>In regards to the operation of CSG workshops going forward</p>	

	<p>there will be a more structured approach to the agenda which will now include a formal approval session. The CSG agendas will include items to be considered and recommendations, and a formal move/second process will be instigated. Discussion may amend recommendations, and a formal record of agreements will be kept.</p>	
3.	<p><u>Raukawa context – Stephanie O’Sullivan</u></p> <p>Presentation on the importance of the Waikato and Waipa Catchments to Raukawa iwi, including a background about Raukawa and some of the challenges and opportunities ahead. Stephanie O’Sullivan is the Environmental Group Manager – Raukawa Charitable Trust and is also a Te Rōpū Hautū member.</p> <p>Discussion on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Iwi authorities and land trusts are separate governance entities. • Every hapū and marae has a relationship with their rivers. If a water body is affected, if the mauri is affected, its people are affected. Everything is interconnected. • 27 June 2014 Raukawa Agribusiness Forum for Raukawa Farming Businesses. Māori trusts to meet. There will be a degree of compromise to discuss at the forum with Raukawa. How much to invest? How soon do we want results? Everyone needs to take responsibility. Focus on ‘Growing Resilient Farming Systems’. • The CSG can incorporate Māori concerns. Everyone is responsible for this process. • There are areas of the Waikato River where you can swim such as Atiamuri. • Discussion also included the role and membership of catchment subcommittees. <p>Raukawa gifted the CSG with two framed photos of the Waikato river from their rohe to assist the CSG on their journey.</p>	<p>Information to be provided on portal regarding role and membership of the subcommittees.</p>
Agreement and Approval Session		
4.	<p><u>Confirm workshop notes from CSG workshop 2 (CSG2)</u></p> <p>The Chair highlighted some suggested amendments to the workshop notes as follows</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Add “some” to first bullet point 2. Section 6/7 under scope - change paragraph discussion on relationship to: <p>‘Some members wish to have the opportunity to raise implications for water quantity arising from the plan change dealing with water quality. It was noted that water quantity</p>	<p>Amend CSG2 workshop notes.</p>

	<p>outcomes are not the subject of the plan change CSG has responsibility for and would need to be dealt with through other processes. However the CSG could make recommendations relating to water quantity for the Council to consider as a result of developing the water quality plan change.'</p> <p>3. Bullet 10: Add Sean Newlands (WRA) discussion regarding the Clean Up Trust.</p> <p>Resolution</p> <p>That the workshop notes be confirmed as amended.</p> <p>Rick Pridmore/Ruth Bartlett Carried</p>	
	<p><u>Report on 'Summary of values collected by the Collaborative Stakeholder Group to date:'</u></p> <p>During discussion of the report the following points were noted by CSG members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This research took a wider focus of values than just river values. A river is defined under the RMA and in settlement legislation to be bank to bank, the bed and tributaries. The survey went past the river itself as it included questions around riparian margins and the catchment, effectively it was asking about a mix of values of the river and values of the land adjacent. It is understood that the project integrates land and water, but there needs to be clarity in CSG discussions and accompanying research about the geographic focus e.g. when values being discussed – do they relate just to the river channel, or the adjacent land/catchment. • Another party noted their organisation had had concerns with the survey questions when it was run in 2012 and had spoken with the council about it at the time. Their view now is that it was done in the past, it is one piece of information that has been given to the CSG and it helped them understand where the community was at in terms of what they thought was important, and that other information will also be fed into the project by sector representatives to complement the CSG's understanding of values. • It was noted that the community cannot assess the value of the river in isolation, just from bank to bank, that it must also consider the setting in which the river sits, i.e. its interaction with the land. <p>Resolutions:</p>	<p>Advise evaluation team when they will be contacted.</p> <p>Add version numbers onto all documents and dates.</p>

1. That the report "Summary of values considered by the Collaborative Stakeholder Group to date" (Doc 3047875 dated 27 May 2014) be received for information.
2. That the Collaborative Stakeholder Group confirms:
 - That the summary is a list of values identified to date and grouped under key themes by the Collaborative Stakeholder Group at their first two workshops.
 - That the list of values is used by the Collaborative Stakeholder Group to assist with writing a problem statement and liaising with the Technical Leaders Group.
 - That the Collaborative Stakeholder Group continues to gather values from their sectors, networks and the community.
 - That the list of values be periodically reviewed, and additional values be included, when the CSG moves into the phase of drafting policy objectives, limits and targets.

Chris Keenan/Weo Maag
Carried

Evaluation Team request for volunteers for pilot online survey:

CSG evaluation volunteers:

- Sally Davis
- Weo Maag; and
- Rick Pridmore

Resolution

That the evaluation update be received and that

- Sally Davis
- Weo Maag; and
- Rick Pridmore

be confirmed to pilot survey

Ruth Bartlett/Rick Pridmore
Carried

Terms of Reference:

The following change recommended to 'How will we make decisions' section under 5c:

Remove the word 'disclosure' so the paragraph reads:

The group sometimes may decide to proceed with the proposal even though there are disagreements. In this case

there would need to be a **clear record** of the identity of those disagreeing, their concerns and the reasons for these concerns. The Chairperson will have a key role in judging when to proceed.

Resolution:

1. That the “Draft Terms of Reference - Collaborative Stakeholder (Doc 2194147 dated 28 May 2014) as amended, be approved.

Stephen Colson/Chris Keenan
Carried

Community Engagement Plan

- Feedback received by Te Rōpū Hautū (TRH) and circulated to CSG.
- Minor typo land users/uses amended.
- Sally Davis would like to be included if the group present on the Healthy Rivers project at the Mayoral Forum.

The Technical Leaders Group (TLG) has now been established and held their first meeting yesterday. The CSG wish to have the ability to review the indicative timeline after receiving advice from the TLG.

Resolutions:

1. That the report “Collaborative Stakeholder Group’s Community Engagement Plan” (Doc 3059420 dated 12 May 2014) be received for information.
2. That the Collaborative Stakeholder Group approves the finalised Community Engagement Plan which will be provided to the Healthy Rivers/Wai Ora committee.
3. That the indicative timeline be reconsidered once advice is received from TLG in respect of research requirements and timing of such.

Sally Davis/Ruth Bartlett
Carried

CSG Membership

Discussion on the membership of the CSG. It was noted that there is interest from other organisations/ individuals to join the CSG. Stakeholders wishing to be more involved in the project have been directed to their relevant sector or community representative.

Discussion on whether community representatives required

	<p>delegates. Community members are an important part of group bringing different perspectives/skill sets/local knowledge.</p> <p>The importance of members attending the CSG in order to keep pace with the information presented was also emphasised.</p> <p>It was noted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change to representation on CSG (robust process at start, late entries, process already begun, not intended to have members representing a single company, consent holder or interest, other parties do still have the opportunity to link through an existing sector delegate if they wish) • Comprehensive Community Engagement process will provide further opportunities. • CSG Independent Chair, staff and community representatives to look at a suite of support options for community representatives and that a process be developed to address the eventuality of a community member resigning. <p>Resolutions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the report “Membership and Selection Process for Collaborative Stakeholder Group be received for information. 2. That the Collaborative Stakeholder Group confirms its current membership. 3. Notes that the comprehensive community engagement process will provide opportunities for engagement of those not represented on CSG. 4. That the CSG Independent Chair, staff and community representatives look at a suite of support options for community representatives and that a process be developed to address the eventuality of a community member resigning. <p>Sally Davis/Stephen Colson Carried</p>	
Facilitation Session		
5.	<p><u>Feedback from decision makers</u></p> <p>There are high level conversations occurring regarding the timing of the project. TRH and the Healthy Rivers Wai Ora Committee are keen to engage more with the CSG. This will help to bring people who will be making decisions along</p>	

	<p>on the journey.</p> <p>The CSG Independent Chair attends the Healthy Rivers Wai Ora Committee and TRH meetings to update the groups.</p> <p>Summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Face to face is a good way for governance to get to know CSG members. • To discuss a particular issue – there will be a more formal invitation. Members will be invited to a specified segment of a workshop – or vice versa. • The Project Sponsor (Tracey May) will attend 'wrap up' sessions. 	
6.	<p><u>Feedback from our networks</u></p> <p>The group noted who they had communicated with/what meetings they had attended in the past few months and any issues arising from these.</p> <p>Discussion on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarification on the role of catchment subcommittees. They contain representatives from local communities and assist in the creation of zone plans and catchment management plans and have the potential to implement the outputs of this project. Membership has recently been renewed, through a public and nomination process. It was noted that the horticulture sector would like to participate in these catchment subcommittees. • The Advisory Committee on the Regional Environment (ACRE) is an advisory committee to council on environmental initiatives. • Discussion on how the CSG should effectively communicates with the public/communities. • It was noted that some people are still not aware of project. CSG members are working to address these information gaps through their own networks. • There will be further opportunities to receive feedback on key outputs of the CSG at the proposed Large Stakeholder Forum (LSF) later this year. • There is a broad project communication's plan which lists project advertorials starting July with Straight Furrow, Waikato Times etc. This is to be circulated to CSG. It was noted that the 'Orchardists' and "Growers' magazines could be useful communication tools. • An e-newsletter and press release comes out after each CSG workshop (4 – 6 weekly) to assist with communicating to individuals/communities. • A feedback template has been set up, CSG to feed information into the template on their portal. It was also noted that individual meetings or events held by CSG members may not be discussed at every 	<p>Names of catchment liaison sub-committee members, ACRE and mayoral forum to be provided to group.</p> <p>Broad project communications plan to be provided to CSG.</p> <p>Sectors to email in names of attendees for LSF if they wish</p>

	<p>workshop.</p> <p>Summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Template for feedback to be in one place. • The template will grow over time as CSG members add to it. Keep the template on the CSG member's portal. Be sure to include dates. • Keep it simple. WRC compile and WRC feedback information prior to next CSG workshop. • E-newsletter will contain items that the CSG agree on at end of each meeting. • Date for Large Stakeholder Forum (LSF) is 23 October 2014. TRH have some concerns regarding potential large numbers and the size of the workshop may need to be fixed to ensure is manageable and within budget. CSG members may wish to send a list of people to attend to WRC, however principle is to keep it open. 	
7.	<p><u>Variation 6 Water Allocation (V6) Presentation – Bruce McAuliffe</u></p> <p>Presentation on water quantity to the group with CSG members feeding in their own perspective/experiences from their sector, including horticulture, energy and local government.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • V6 looked at efficient allocation (is it efficient and how it's used). All aspects of how water is allocated was considered. • The Vision and Strategy and National Policy Statement (NPS) both came in half way through the hearing – had to stop and digest impacts t. • There is a tool called a 'water allocation calculator. Available online www.waikatregion.govt.nz Click on stretch over river and will give information on whether is over or under allocated. • Discussion on the contaminants in water bodies and what is a correlation between the water quality life supporting standard to the human health standards? There are different standards depending on the value you are trying to protect. Life supporting standards that relate to ecological health values, have particular things that are measured. For instance, the Regional Plan has ecological health standards for how much dissolved oxygen is in the water, which affects fish and invertebrate survival. Where water quality standards are related to humans for swimming or drinking, there are different measures. For instance the Regional Plan has a standard related to human health when swimming. This is called the contact recreation standard and includes limits on the amount of microbes (<u>e.coli</u>) in the water 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Water harvesting is where the water flow is greater than the median flow and people can take water and store it for use later but is only available below Lake Karapiro. It is a rare event (2-3 times every 10 – 15 years) for Mighty River Power to spill water through all of the dams in the Waikato Hydro Scheme.• Information on flows available on WRC website.• In general, when the water flow in the Region's rivers and streams is fully allocated, there is the option for people who want water, to buy or lease it off existing consent holders i.e. transfer water permits with neighbour. Transfers can only occur downstream. That means that a person can only sell or lease their right to take water for the life of their resource consent, with someone who is downstream from them (unless both water takes are located within one of the Upper Waikato hydro lakes, which are treated as one 'bucket' of water).• A detailed assessment process is carried out when someone applies for water allocation. There is a long queue of water take applications already lodged with WRC by different people, on Waikato River. <p>Closed 6.15pm by Hone Turner.</p>	
--	---	--



Collaborative Stakeholder Group (“CSG”) Workshop 3 Notes

(Day two) 6 June 2014, Tokoroa Events Centre, 25 Mossop Road, Tokoroa 9am – 3.45pm

Attendees:

CSG: Alan Fleming (Environmental/NGO), Chris Keenan (Horticulture), Garry Maskill (Water supply takes), George Moss (Dairy), Gwyneth Verkerk (Community), James Bailey (Sheep and Beef), Matt Makgill (Community), Patricia Fordyce (Forestry), Phil Journeaux (Rural Professionals), Rick Pridmore (Dairy), Ruth Bartlett (Industry), Stephen Colson (Energy), James Houghton - Part (Rural Advocacy), Evelyn Forrest (Community), Sally Davis (Local Government, Weo Maag (Māori Interests), Garth Wilcox (Delegate for Horticulture),
Other: Bill Wasley (Independent Chair), Helen Ritchie (Facilitator), Jo Bromley (WRC), Wendy Boyce (WRC), Janine Hayward (WRC), Justine Young (WRC), Emma Reed (WRC), Ruth Lourey (WRC), Will Collin (WRC)

Other (part): Jackie Fitchman (WRC), Tracey May (WRC), Stephanie O’Sullivan (Raukawa), Louis Armstrong (Raukawa)

Apologies:

CSG: Alastair Calder (Tourism and Recreation), Brian Hanna (Community), Ruthana Begbie (Community), Tony Roxburgh (Environmental/NGO’s), Gina Rangi (Māori Interests), Gayle Leaf (Community), Don Scarlet (Delegate for Tourism), Hone Turner (Community), Jason Sebastian (Community), Topia Rameka (Māori Interests)

Item	Description	Action
8.45am	Karakia. Waiata (Whakarongo ake ra)	
8.50am	<u>Apologies:</u> Alastair Calder, Brian Hanna, Gaye Leaf, Gina Rangi, Hone Turner, Jason Sebastian, Ruthana Begbie, Tony Roxburgh, Topia Rameka. Delegates in attendance: Garth Wilcox	
8.	<u>Technical learning session</u>	TLG to

	<p>The Technical Leaders Group (TLG) introduced themselves and gave an overview of their backgrounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr Bryce Cooper, General Manager – Strategy, NIWA • Dr Liz Wedderburn, Portfolio Leader Agriculture Policy and Māori Agribusiness Principal Scientist, AgResearch • Mr Antoine Coffin, Principal, Boffa Miskell Limited • Dr Graeme Doole, Associate Professor, University of Waikato • Dr Mike Scarsbrook, Environment Policy Manager, DairyNZ • Dr John Quinn, Principal Scientist Freshwater Ecology; Programme Leader Aquatic Rehabilitation, NIWA • Dr Tony Petch, Group Manager, Resource Information, Waikato Regional Council. <p>The TLG will be chaired by Dr Cooper.</p> <p>Presentation on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing an overview of the rivers and tributaries. • Answering questions that were posed at the last CSG. <p>The Technical Leaders Group met for the first time yesterday and are working through protocols and how best to support the CSG.</p> <p>One of the key challenges will be to communicate the evidence. It is important to reiterate that this is a community process. It's about everyone learning collectively. This will require good articulation of values; this is a challenge for the CSG. It is the CSG's call on what is desirable. The Technical Alliance (TA) will inform the conversation, not necessarily bring solutions. The TA can translate highly technical information into a useable format for the CSG.</p> <p>Summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TLG will provide written answers to the questions the CSG have posed to date. • TLG aim to schedule meetings in the middle of CSG workshop cycle. • CSG should build into workshops time for interaction with the TLG. TLG to come back to next CSG workshop with progress updates/approaches. • Concept of ongoing dialogue to keep going throughout process. 	<p>provide bullet point answers to questions asked by CSG.</p> <p>Presentations to go on portal from CSG3.</p>
10.45am	Morning tea	
9.	<p><u>Understanding farmers decision making. Ruth Lourey, Emma Reed and Justine Young</u></p> <p>The approach presented is called the Kaine Framework. The Kaine Framework (www.geoffkaineresearch.com) is a method for understanding how landholders make choices about</p>	

	<p>practices and technologies. It can provide insights into landholder choices and how these choices may be influenced. Such as where incentives might be an appropriate tool, or when change will only occur in response to some form of compulsory intervention (e.g. a technology standard).</p> <p>Insights from understanding landholders' choices can be used to help to select policy instruments to accelerate uptake or to reduce the potential for counterproductive outcomes.</p> <p>The elements of the farm system that interact with a practice or technology to influence the benefits & cost of adoption is the <u>farm context</u> for that practice or technology.</p> <p>Farm contextual factors influence the benefit or cost of adopting a technology or using a practice. Each farm context is different therefore the relevance and cost of practices or technologies varies from one farm to another. Changing practices or technologies may be extremely difficult, particularly if the elements of the farm that influence the advantages or disadvantage of a practice or technology are fixed. So the adoption of practices and technologies by landholder cannot be treated as basis for making judgements that some landholders are necessarily better manager of their farm business than others. The failure of landholders to adopt a practice or technology might merely mean that the practice or technology is <u>unsuited</u> to their farm context at that point in time.</p> <p>For an article on this approach see the following article, available on the portal:</p> <p>Kaine, G., 2004. Consumer Behaviour as a Theory of Innovation Adoption in Agriculture (Social Research Working Paper 01/04), Social Research Working Paper. AgResearch.</p>	
10.	<p><u>What drives current dairy farmer decision making? Emma Reed, Ruth Lourey and Justine Young</u></p> <p>Presentation covering research by WRC on dairy farming grazing management in the Waikato region, using the Kaine Framework.</p> <p>Purpose of the presentation was to see an example of how the Kaine Framework has been applied to dairy grazing management in the Waikato Region, understand the type of information that is gathered using this approach and start to think about how this information can be useful for policy design</p> <p>Key points from the presentation were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Different farm contexts result in management practice choice based on particular needs • A requirement to implement a particular practice or technology standard would have varying impacts on 	Locate paper by David Panel about elements that drive adoption of practices

	<p>different farms</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reasons for adopting a practice because it will meet a policy outcome may not align with the reasons why farmers currently do, or do not, use that practice • If a farmer is prevented from using a practice or technology they normally use, or is compelled to use one they don't normally use, they may experience significant impacts <p>Discussion following the presentation and from the dairy farm visit yesterday:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk of unintended consequences to farms through poor policy design • Farmers know what suits their farm best • “One shoe won't fit all”, we need to know specifically what and where the problem is. Identify a solution that fits the specific farm context, To achieve change, have to engage hearts and minds otherwise get a minimum standard. • Need a regulatory bottom line • Ensure a range of methods that can be applied in different ways, and a range of tools that can be applied to their farm characteristics. • Need to understand those characteristics on a sub-catchment basis to help us decide how to lump or split them e.g. a GIS exercise. • Would help landowner to feel they were applying the right tool for their situation to meet the regulatory bottom line. • What framework will help land users move to a ‘better fit?’ – within farms as well as between • Sub catchments, not equal to farm context • Look at research on farmer decision making • Consider the length of time to achieve change – more complex longer to get change, no relative advantage • Looking at what's working/not elsewhere • Need to understand forestry drivers • Ownership structures are an important factor in context 	
11.	<p><u>Draft Focus Statement/problem statement</u></p> <p>The group worked on a draft statement to summarise the focus of the project/ the problem the project is trying to solve: :</p> <p>‘To come up with limits, timelines and practical options for managing contaminants and discharges into the Waikato and Waipa catchments to ensure they are safe to swim in and take food from, support healthy biodiversity and provide for social, economic and cultural wellbeing.’</p>	<p>Draft focus statement to go to HR/WO Committee for feedback and be shared with CSG networks for feedback, prior to being</p>

		confirmed at CSG4.
1.15pm	Lunch	
	<p><u>Further questions for Technical Leaders Group (TLG):</u></p> <p>CSG members were asked to formulate questions as individuals then discuss them in groups.</p> <p>Discussion points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need process for receiving questions and feeding back. TLG to have meeting in between CSG workshops. TLG to discuss how they will answer questions and build into workload. • CSG members wanted to be sure the TLG would be exploring questions about the economic impact of policies. • CSG wish to prioritise questions before they go to TLG. Delegates can have access to portal but not to distribute wider. This will ensure effective delegates. • TLG should be aware that questions may come from several people in the CSG; while other questions have come from individuals. • CSG members are responsible for passing on details/information to their delegate (not WRC). • TLG will want this information for their next meeting. CSG to provide feedback on questions by 16 June 2014. 	<p>Questions typed up and put on portal to review and provide feedback. WRC to group questions. High medium and low priority on questions. CSG to provide feedback by Monday 16 June 2014.</p>
12.	<p><u>Wrap up session</u></p> <p><u>Action Points/Decisions:</u></p> <p><u>Representation on CSG:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No change to current membership. - Process to select members was robust - Group already underway now - Members represent sectors (not single companies) - Comprehensive Community Engagement Plan will provide opportunities for input - Interested people can be put in touch with an existing CSG member - Chair, staff and community representatives to look at a suite of support for them and what to do if a community representative resigns. <p><u>Dialogue with decision makers</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Prefer to set up specific times - To meet each other early on (informal) - To discuss particular issues (formal) - Communication to/from community - CSG to see Communications Plan (and give input) - CSG to receive list of members of catchment liaison zone 	<p>Chair, staff and community reps to look at suite of support for them and what to do if a community rep resigns.</p> <p>Add Waiata to portal</p>

	<p>committees, ACRE, Mayoral Forum</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Try to get things in local papers, wider stakeholder forum date is 23 October 2014. <p><u>Template to record feedback:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - From sector/community meetings - Use template developed - CSG members to add to it overtime and keep on secure site - Be sure to include dates - WRC to provide template on portal and send reminder email to CSG members can reply to – WRC staff collate before each CSG workshop. <p><u>Other:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Access Joint Economic Venture Study (Chair to write to minister) so the CSG can understand the methodology - Three volunteers to do survey (evaluation) - CSG to look at technical questions and rate (High, Medium, Low) with comments. - Focus question to go the Healthy Rivers Wai Ora committee for sign off/feedback and then goes public. Can share with communities/networks. <p><u>CSG4</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heading to Maniapoto area Formal Pōwhiri and overnight stay on Oparure Marae 1 and 2 July 2014 <p>Focus for next workshop:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are our people/sectors most fearful of in this process and the Plan change? • Drystock handout • Discuss high level principals and policy selection criteria. • TLG feedback <p><u>Handout:</u> Drystock grazing practises</p>	
13.	<p><u>Chairs closing comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acknowledge milestones yesterday, ToR etc. • 24 June, 1pm at WRC Chambers to HR/WO Committee to report on progress and matters related to CSG. This is a public meeting – CSG members are welcome to attend. • Attendance – encourage people to get to CSG workshops if not, get their delegate to attend. • Contact people who aren't attending. Everyone was appointed on the basis that they could attend. • Staff taking photos during workshop, may be used in publications. Talk to Jackie Fitchman if there are any concerns. jackie.fitchman@waikatoregion.govt.nz 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CSG agreed that the HR/WO Committee would be invited to agreed agenda specific items where they could engage. Cnr Livingston keen to attend. Field trips may also be an opportunity for Wai Ora committee member attendance. <p>Discussion on the resource consent process. Will WRC make sure they align any new consent applications with the policy the collaborative stakeholder group is developing? Are they publicly notified? Need reassurance that people don't see this as opportunity to get in before the plan change.</p> <p>Until the new part of the Regional Plan is publically notified as Plan Change 1 Waikato and Waipa Catchments, WRC has to rely solely on the rules in the existing Regional Plan.</p> <p>The time between developing and public notification of a plan change is a time of uncertainty for people, since they can see something will change, but it is not official and can't be used by the council in formal processes like resource consent applications. However, the Vision and Strategy (V & S) has been put in the overall guiding document (no rules) which is the Regional Policy Statement (RPS). So looking at the V&S becomes part of the consent application process.</p> <p>WRC can't make sweeping assurances until we see particulars. WRC are aware of this issue.</p> <p>It was noted that any new application for a consent must have regard to clause A4 in the National Policy Statement as well as the Vision and Strategy.</p>	
14.	Raukawa karakia/mihi whakamutunga. Meeting closed by Louis Armstrong at 3.30pm	