Report to the Collaborative Stakeholder Group - For Agreement and Approvals

File No:	23 10 06
Date:	29 March 2016
To:	Collaborative Stakeholder Group
From:	Helen Ritchie, CSG Independent Facilitator
Subject:	**Property Planning Subgroup Update**
Section	**Agreement and Approvals**

Disclaimer
This report has been prepared for the use of Collaborative Stakeholder Group Healthy Rivers: Wai Ora Project as a reference document and as such does not constitute Council's policy.

1 Purpose

The purpose of this report is to provide the Collaborative Stakeholder Group with an update of the property plan subgroup meetings which were held on 18, 23 March 2016. A verbal update will be given on the day about the meeting which will be held on 1 April 2016.

Recommendation:

1. That the report 'Property Planning Subgroup Update'. (Doc #3752915 dated 29 March 2016) be received, and

2. That the Collaborative Stakeholder Group discuss and confirm:
    a) the suggested approach to the Nitrogen rule, as outlined in Sections 6 and 7 of this report;
    b) the suggested direction on the low intensity, off the shelf property plan and tailored property plans rules, as outlined in Sections 3, 4, 5 and 7
    c) whether this approach to managing contaminants via property plans is sufficiently robust and equitable, as outlined in Section 8.

Following the development of the policy mix in March, the Property Planning sub-group was charged with exploring the detail behind the tailored property plan policy approach, and bringing recommendations back to the CSG about how it could work.

The Property Planning sub-group met on 18 and 23 March 2016. Two further meetings are planned on 1st and 12th April. The purpose for the first two meetings focused on who needs to have a plan and what should go into the property plans (guidance for farm planners and WRC implementation staff). Specifically, the group discussed:

- Low intensity threshold (Rule 3, no plan required) – confirm thresholds
- Low risk property (Rule 4,– 'off the shelf' plan) - what PA conditions should be met
- Moderate or high risk properties (Rules 5 and 6 – tailored property plan) – practices expected in these property plans; how to define GMP (Good Management Practice)

- How to apply the '75th percentile' concept for N, and what was expected from those below the 75th percentile; how this relates to benchmarking

Future meetings and topics include:

1 April	How much, how fast: • Prioritising, how this fits with other processes • Sub-catchment approach • What else for lakes and Whangamarino? Assumptions for TLG to simulate the effects of the policy mix
12 April	Aligning dates • Benchmark, property plan, get to 75%ile N, and allocation • Stock rule dates Stock rule details • Slope, activity class Accreditation, auditing and industry schemes • How it works elsewhere (invite other input?) • Understanding audit process • How benchmarking will work • Incentivising group consents Recommendations to CSG

2 Progress to date

The background regarding the property planning sub-group, and the minutes for the first two meeting are attached. A synopsis of where the sub-group has got to is provided below.

3 Rule 3 (low intensity)

- Keep thresholds as they are; include an appendix of how many stock = 8SU/ha for different stock types
- No record keeping for these people; their contributions of contaminants will be estimated
- Need to look at exempting permanent tree crops (look at Tukituki definition)

4 Rule 4 ('off the shelf' Permitted Activity rule):

- 75%ile – Dairy feedback - this is too high for this rule – could be 25%ile to include some low input dairy systems – could be an arbitrary low number for N or a stocking rate proxy. Further discussion – 75%ile does not sit well in this rule - recommend putting it into a separate rule for nitrogen reductions, which will also specify a 'no increase' and 'have GMPs in place' for others, using a 5-year rolling average from the benchmarked 14/15 and 15/16 years
- Slope - Initial suggestion received from drystock sector regarding slope threshold - No more than 25% of farm above 35 degree slope (Class 7). Suggestion that Rule 4 should adopt same slope as Rule 1 (stock exclusion) – further discussion required

- Forage crops – dairy agree, should be none. Drystock – suggest could be 5% of farm in forage crop as this is used to bring stock off hills in winter – beneficial for protecting soils and avoiding run-off of other contaminants.
- These people need to supply basic records so they can be included in benchmarking
- Not sure if this rule is still necessary – who will it apply to? Very few dairy or drystock farms will be able to come under this rule. Intent was to reduce numbers of farm plans that have to be done. Agreed to revisit when we get the numbers from Rob regarding how many farm plans to do. However, it does clearly set the Permitted Activity baseline for setbacks at 3m for grazing and 5m for cultivation.

5 Rules 5 and 6 (Tailored property plans)

- Suggest these be called 'Farm Environment Plans'
- Process put forward for dry stock sector plans (industry-supported, still under Rule 5)
    - Beef & Lamb facilitated LEP workshop with a group of farmers, WRC and an accredited farm planner
    - Farmers get 6 months to submit their LEP plan
    - This triggers a site visit from WRC and if appropriate the LEP is signed off
    - The farmer then pays for a 3rd party audit
- Discussed 'guidance to planners' sitting outside the statutory Plan change and/ or what could be in a schedule to the Plan. Categories/ considerations can definitely be in a schedule. Quality standards/ minimum expectations are more difficult to specify.
- Categories/ considerations that property plans will need to cover
    - Stock exclusion under Rule 1; includes stock crossings/ culverts/ bridges.
    - Setbacks/ Riparian management. What riparian management will occur on all waterways (permanent and intermittent), wetland protection.
    - Grazing management – matched to land class (risk), season, proximity to water, grazing over winter (managing break feeding), wet weather events
    - Cropping and cultivation –cultivation practice, purpose of cropping (e.g. cut and carry/ harvest or forage), setbacks, proximity to waterway, slope. Tillage practices, fallow post-crop, bunds and silt traps, diversion drains, crop grazing
    - Critical source areas – manage sources of contaminants and key pathways i.e. tracks, races, yards, slumping/ actively eroding areas.
    - Nutrient management – P/ soil fertility, N, nutrient budgets. Overseer or equivalent model. Show start point according to 14/15 and 15/16 and that your rolling averages are not going to increase and you have GMPs in place.
    - Irrigation management to avoid loss of contaminants
    - Effluent management (collected effluent)
    - Offal, silage, waste hotspots
    - Erosion control – streambank, hill-slope (planting/retirement), stock management
    - Planned land use change
    - Information - Basic requirement as per the Canterbury example
    - Map showing spatial risks
    - Accurate and auditable records

- Each property plan does its own risk assessment. This starts with a sub-catchment lens i.e. which of the 4 contaminants is high risk for you (sub-catchment, then property scale)

- Industry schemes/ plan templates give sector-specific guidance on what is high, moderate or low risk and actions in the plan will specify how to manage the high risks down on each property – horticulture has a risk assessment template; LEPs provide a risk assessment process; dairy schemes specify GMPs related to risk
- Discussion about how far to go in specifying GMPs – what stakeholders will expect, what Court process might require. Sectors currently have different degrees of specificity in how GMPs are defined; also want to allow the industry schemes to evolve over time (not fixed in a point of time)
- Need to ensure it is not an easier route for farmers to get the consented plan option than the industry scheme option. Suggest a 'mirror rule' to say the same practices are expected from a consented plan and an industry scheme plan
- Discussion about expectation around setbacks - CSG discussed 3m would be expected unless there was a good reason; this approach allows tailoring in the plan. Something to discuss with farm planner. Some national guidance is likely in the future. Some sub-group members want to see minimum setbacks in a rule or clearly outlined in the guidance to planners. Agreed to come back to this.

6 Nitrogen rule

Build this into Rule 7 –

- Required to benchmark
- No increase (hold the line) in 5 year rolling average
- Those over 75%ile must reduce to 75%ile (to be set per FMU)
- 75%ile cap to be set by dairy benchmarking but then apply to all pastoral land users
- Suggested rule "for pastoral use, you must be below x number (75%ile?), and demonstrate reduction in N loss overseer of x% through GMPs"
- Not setting the cap now as a number - 75%ile to be defined using data collection for 14/15 and 15/16 years from dairy, and then apply to all pastoral
- Vegetable/Horticulture– cap, numeric (10%? X%?) reduction in N loss across sector
- Discussion of use of benchmark years and 5-year rolling average to show no increase/ some decrease – drystock request flexibility to increase within a fixed range to reflect that if they switch stock class their number goes up (e.g. dairy grazers)
- Rule must be clearly interim (sunset clause) and linked to allocation based on land suitability principle
- Removing effective hectares (e.g. setbacks, retired areas) – confirmed that if you do this after benchmarking you can intensify on other land within your property

7 Summary of rule suggestions

Rule	Suggestions for this rule	Comments/ discussion points
1 Stock exclusion	No changes discussed yet Desire to see dates and possibly slope thresholds aligned with Rule 4	Will be discussed at 12th April meeting
2 Land use change	Not discussed by this sub-group	
3 Low intensity	Low intensity threshold confirmed Need an appendix of equivalents for 8SU/ha for different stock types No record keeping or benchmarking for this group – loads to be estimated	
4 Permitted Activity 'Off the shelf' property plan	75%ile is too high for this rule – choose an arbitrary low number for N or a stocking rate proxy Slope ideas: <25% of farm >35° (Class 7). Or adopt same slope as Rule 1 Forage crop – should there be 5% of farm allowed in forage for drystock? Supply basic records, include this group in benchmarking, Rule 7 also applies	Not sure if this rule is necessary – who will it apply to? Very few dairy or drystock farms. Intent was to reduce numbers of farm plans that have to be done. Agreed to revisit when have numbers on how many farm plans to do. However, it does clearly set the Permitted Activity baseline for setbacks at 3m for grazing/ 5m for cultivation. Should the forage crop aspect be different for dairy & drystock?
5 & 6 Property plans as controlled activity/ under industry scheme*	To be called 'Farm Environment Plans' Streamlined consent for group LEP work under Rule 5 for drystock Schedule in Plan to state categories/ considerations to cover (see above). Quality standards/ minimum expectations are more difficult to specify - 'Guidance to planners' to sit outside the statutory Plan. Industry schemes will specify minimum standards; Rule 5 will have 'mirror rule' so that FEPs for that sector must meet those standards whether done via industry scheme or via consent. Each property plan does its own risk assessment. This starts with a sub-	How far to go in specifying GMPs – what stakeholders will expect, what Court process might require. Sectors currently have different degrees of specificity in how GMPs are defined; also want to allow the industry schemes to evolve/ not be fixed at a point in time). Expectation around setbacks - CSG discussed 3m would be expected unless there was a good reason; this approach allows tailoring in the plan. National guidance is likely in the future. Some sub-group members want to see minimum

Rule	Suggestions for this rule	Comments/ discussion points
	catchment lens i.e. which of the 4 contaminants is high risk for you (sub-catchment, then property scale). Then use sector-specific templates/ processes for risk assessment.	setbacks in a rule or clearly outlined in the guidance to planners.
7 Nitrogen benchmarking	Expand this rule – 75%ile to come in here as well as benchmarking; + clarify if you are under 75%ile you cannot increase from benchmark years and you make reductions via sector GMPs. Rule must be clearly interim (sunset clause) and linked to allocation based on land suitability principle. Rule should also cover removing effective hectares (e.g. setbacks, retired areas) – if you do this after benchmarking you can intensify on other land within the same property. Build into Rule 7 – • Required to benchmark • No increase (hold the line) in 5 year rolling average • Those over 75%ile must reduce to 75%ile (to be set per FMU) • 75%ile cap to be set by dairy benchmarking but then apply to all pastoral land users • Not setting the cap now as a number - 75%ile to be defined using data collection for 14/15 and 15/16 years from dairy • Vegetable production – cap N + numeric (10%? X%?) reduction in N loss across sector	Dairy request not to set figure now as industry data collected on proviso it would not be used for regulatory purposes – propose to collect data for benchmarking years and then set the 75%ile cap using that. Discussion of use 5-year rolling average to show no increase/ some decrease – drystock request flexibility to increase within a fixed range to reflect that if they switch stock class their number goes up (e.g. dairy grazers). Discussion of appropriate reduction to require of commercial vegetable grower.

*Need to clarify where commercial vegetable production sits – does it need a separate rule as it will be industry scheme but not Permitted Activity?

8 Equity and robustness

- Agreed that any approach we recommend must be robust and equitable, and this needs to be clearly communicated
- Noted feedback from HRWO committee – how will we know we are going to hit our 10% in 10 year target? Concern about a ‘permissive’ approach
- Need to find balance between sufficient detail in guidance to know what rule is requiring without making it constraining and defeating the purpose of tailoring
- Has to survive changes in staff - ‘how to guide’ - non-statutory method

- Needs to be clear which rule your property is under – file a statutory declaration if you are in Rule 4 – keep a register if you are in Rule 3, 4, 5, or 6.

Robustness is built in through the following:

- Power of FEP to get change through creditable person on farm doing risk assessment
- Need moderating process as part of accredited scheme to compare between farm advisors
- Council sign-off OR certified industry sign-off based on a scheme with clear minimum standards specified
- Farmers' actions and timeframes are documented and become consent conditions
- Audit ensures actions occur
- These actions can be aggregated to see if we are on track towards targets – need accounting process to capture this
- This is on top of stock exclusion and no land use change
- Don't forget that this is only for the first 10 years, until allocation of contaminant loads
- Need a schedule of mitigation options to pull into farm plan, if not meeting those standard options, need to promote individual options through a consent process
- A schedule of Codes of Practice that we endorse – need this prior to notification
- Dairy have codified minimum standards in industry scheme; horticulture have specified risk factors and management practices
- Beef and Lamb willing to develop a Waikato-specific template of the LEP
- Over time can work together with industry and Council, could come up with a more prescriptive set of menus to become the basic system for farm planning/ mitigation
- Concern about no minimum setbacks – to discuss further

Summary of robustness:

- Front end (what goes into the plan and ensuring it is sufficient)
  - N rule
  - Codes of practice/ sector guides and menus
  - Certified planner, moderation process
  - WRC sign-off (Rule 5)
  - Accredited scheme sign-off (Rule 6) – accredited scheme has clearly defined GMPs/ minimum standards and mirror rule (same GMPs also apply in Rule 5)

- Back end (once property plan is in place, ensuring it is done)
  - WRC consent (or industry accreditation)
  - Actions and timeframes documented and become consent conditions
  - Audit
  - Actions can be aggregated and effects assessed or modelled against targets.

In ten years, expect to have:

- Stock exclusion
- No land use change (other than under Māori land provisions)
- Farm plans for all
- Tailored actions and timelines – reported and can be aggregated

For industry schemes, this will give:

- Codified minimum standards in industry scheme e.g. dairy, must have stock exclusion, riparian management, must have accredited effluent system, must have nutrient management plan by accredited advisor, must identify actions to reduce N loss, etc (no setbacks included here)

For drystock, this will give:

- Land class matched to stock class

- Critical source areas identified and actions being taken to manage
- Marginal land identified
- Awareness of when and where to manage stock etc to reduce contaminants from daily farm management

Equity is achieved through:

- Comparative components to the property plans across industries
- Mirror rule to ensure the consent process is not an easier route than industry scheme
- Everyone doing their part, although they may focus on different contaminants because these are higher risk for them
- 75%ile, once set using dairy industry benchmarking, will be applied to all pastoral use (nobody can exceed)
- Drystock will have to work very hard on reticulated water and stock exclusion, erosion and sediment control, critical source areas
- Horticulture to work on sediment and erosion control and nutrient reductions
- Top dairy emitters will have to bring their N down
- Horticulture will have parallel track including capping the hectareage of their land use (Where should they sit under the rules? – refer to plan drafting sub-group)
- When we get to allocation, land use and systems will have to change and be based on land suitability

Helen Ritchie
Independent facilitator, Collaborative Stakeholder Group

Bill Wasley
Independent Chairperson, Collaborative Stakeholder Group

Attachments

Attachment 1: Property Plan Sub-Group background and history

Attachment 2: Property Plan Sub-Group 18/3 DRAFT NOTES DM# 3746673

Attachment 3: Property Plan Sub-Group 23/3 DRAFT NOTES DM# 3751149

Attachment 1:

Property Plan Sub-Group background and history

CSG21 17/18 Dec

Where we got to (discussed at December CSG meeting):

- Could use an online/streamlined process to filter out those who do/don't need one, based on activities, commercial/not, proximity to waterways, low intensity definition
- For larger properties, need template with guidance/practice notes on industry GMP/bare minimum, suggestions on what to prioritise/ timing, recommended buffer per slope (unless you can mitigate), matching land use to land type.
- Needs staff training/certification 3rd party assurance if industry led
- Desirable to have one planner per sub-catchment

Property planning sub-group meeting in January

- Developed thresholds for low intensity and Permitted Activity conditions (off-the-shelf plan)
- Looked at timing

CSG22 in January

- CSG considered whether to set a % reduction for everyone but leaned more towards specifying clearly what GMPs are expected in property plans (noting SMPs achieved about a 7-10% reduction).
- Top 75%ile of N emitters to come down for intensive pastoral and horticultural use – identified need to clarify how this will be set – in theory, a sector-based quartile but what does this mean in practice? Noting that drystock will need to benchmark in the first period of the plan change, and that there are 'sectors within sectors' in drystock.
- We talked about a difference between those in low risk zones and high risk zones and this is what we took out for consultation with our sectors

CSG 23 and Focus Day in February

Discussion on Timeline

- Benchmark by?
- Property plan by? Catchment plans in high risk areas by? High gap catchments 3 yrs/ Middle 6 yrs/ Rest 10 yrs/ All by 2025
- Implement your GMPs/reductions by? Start as soon as have plan/ times for actions in your plan
- Allocation/ sunset clause expires by? No later than 10 years from operative.

Discussion on Benchmarking

- Relates to N & P
- Have talked about last 5 years - Fits well with NPS 2011; V&S 2010. 11-12, 12-13, 13-14, 14-15 = 4 years. Average? Best of?
- Or take
    - Pastoral – Your choice of past 2 yrs
    - Horticulture – Average of past up to 10 years if you have those records (demonstrate)
- Preferred option = your choice of past 2 years but longer rotation for horticulture if can prove via records
- Method – property sub-group to define

Discussion on Prioritisation

- More feedback from TLG on prioritising risk
- Leaning now more towards using the prioritisation of catchments for implementation timing and defining high risk factors related to the farm or to practices, so we can manage risk down everywhere
- Acknowledging there may still be more required for some high risk locations like lakes and Whangamarino

CSG 24 in March

Discussion following input from implementers

- Accredited schemes – drystock industry heading towards consented route. Question is how fast we want this and what we consider to be an "industry scheme", scope for one consent for a group of farmers, other ways to streamline?
- Is there a different scheme for sub-catchment plans? If you're part of a sub-catchment scheme it might help you get your consent/ give you more incentive/ target resources.
- Industry scheme for drystock. Could it be done via Beef and Lamb template? Yes if that was an accredited template/process
- Will require a 'register' holding the property plans/ register of what rule the property is under.
- Low intensity - should it be output based? Pragmatic for this purpose to use input threshold. Add (wintered)? What about dairy wintering off? Averaged over June/July/August
- Exempt permanent crops
- Rule 3 – add a schedule that defines stock units (as per BOP/Rotorua) –
- No info collection for those below the low intensity threshold – develop other ways to estimate their contribution to catchment loads
- Rule 4 – Fill it in online – as a statutory declaration/records provision
- 75th percentile concept, per sector/per FMU - set a number for each sector or sub-sector
- Setback waterways – same definition as rule 1 but not drains
- Clarify where horticulture sits between Rule x and Rule 5

- Note clear protocols to be developed on what info to collect and how it will be held. Across farming sectors
- Benchmarking - current 13.2.4 (first bullet) goes with 75th percentile rule
- 13.2.4 is about ongoing monitoring and submitting records to set ourselves up for future allocation
- Also discussed stock exclusion details – slope and timing, rule class, need to avoid bundling

Matters referred to property planning group

- Align dates – stock exclusion (slopes), plans, benchmarking, allocation
- Accreditation schemes
- Different scheme for sub-catchments/ incentivising group consents/ rewarding compliance (e.g. audit less frequent)
- Lakes/ Whangamarino – do more?

Feedback from Te Rōpū Hautū 11 March

Key points raised at TRH included:

- Rule 1 - Mapping of perennial streams
- Rule 2 – Definition of drystock, how to deal with woodlots, opportunistic vegetable growers (e.g. potatoes), glasshouses
- Property plans – Who checks on if farmers are doing their actions? Ensure intent is clearly provided in the rule guidance/ policy – are we being strong enough? What else will be in place to identify contaminants and bring them down?

Attachment 2:

Property Plan Sub-Group 18/3 DRAFT NOTES

Date: 18 March 2016, 9:30am – 4pm
Venue: The Link, Hamilton

Attendees: James Bailey, George Moss, Phil Journeaux, Graeme Gleeson, Gwyn Verkerk, Sally Millar, Charlotte Rutherford, James Houghton

Apologies:

Staff: Jon Palmer, Jo Bromley, Helen Ritchie (Independent Facilitator), Justine Young, Patrick Lynch, Nicole Botherway, Mark Brockelsby, Alan Campbell

TLG: Mike Scarsbrook

Purpose:

- To further develop the framework for the property plan approach including risk categories:
    - Low intensity (threshold)
    - Low (PA/'off the shelf' plan)
    - Moderate (GMP under PA industry/controlled)
    - High risk (Above and beyond basic GMP and how this relates to the 75%ile)
- And what we expect of people in each category.
- Preferred name for the plans
- What is a property

Future meetings & topics

23 March	• Continue today's work • Aligning dates - Benchmarking - Property plans - Stock rules - Allocation • Stock rule details – slope, activity class
1 April Half day 12:30pm start with lunch at Karapiro	• How much, how fast • Prioritising, how this fits with other processes • What else for lakes/Whangamarino
CSG 4/5 April	
12 April ALL DAY	• Accreditation, auditing • How it works elsewhere • Understanding audit process • How benchmarking will work • Incentivising group consents
CSG 28/29 April	

Meeting Notes

1. **Sector feedback**

Equine	- The equine industry doesn't see that horses are a problem - Overseer doesn't work for them - Every property over 4.1 ha would breach low intensity therefore need a plan - No fert reps/support/no agency to run Overseer - Would be ok to benchmark, worried about allocating - Nobody benchmarked, 75%ile hard to apply - Larger properties would meet PA; smaller lifestylers would not - Not 'grazing' as such (they buy in feed) - Taupo has 8kg PA (Overseer output) - For sectors without benchmarked data the 75%ile can only work with a delayed start or with a proxy
Arable	- Also concerned with 75 kg applied N (low intensity threshold) - Issues with Overseer in arable for benchmarking/property plan - React to market signals - Do have commercial hort in their mix at times and graze stock. - Rotation/fallow beneficial to soil - Want a clear definition of 'what is a winter crop'
Dairy	- Sinking lid in first decade, nobody coming with us - Equity of dairy reducing first, just because they're organised/benchmarking - What is a winter crop - Mixed farms-dairy, maize, veges - Constraint of being able to change land-use - What about rewarding good behaviour of industries and incentivising that
ACRE	Not doing enough and not doing it fast enough
TRH (Te Rōpū Hautū)	Need to clarify intent of rules and good guidance for WRC staff
Sheep & Beef	Sector meeting last night came up with way forward; strong support from leaders in the industry. Will be challenging e.g. stock exclusion, especially for deer farmers – don't know if it can be done in the timeframe. See below for details of discussion on prioritisation and Rules 4 and 6

2. **TLG thinking on interim targets**

TLG approach is to link together; actions on the land, contaminant losses to water and water quality monitoring, through modelling, to demonstrate contaminant reduction by actions taken on the land. Need to ensure farm plan actions are captured to feed into this modelling.

3. **Rules**

Sheep & beef view on Rules 4 & 6	**Prioritisation** - Sediment is the contaminant to manage the most for this sector. This is already happening through the catchment wide rules (fencing of waterways). Within the sector there is a strong discomfort with going too far down the proxy route but acknowledged a proxy may be needed.

	- The LEP identifies risk and is a prioritisation tool.
	- Looking at three steps of prioritisation to achieve up-take and buy in of farmers to achieve the V&S. Suggested approach brings farmers together for knowledge transfer, provides assurance to community with one-on-one farm visits with Council, as well as independent audit.
	  o a) Primary (catchment wide rules) cost and timeframes involved for farmers in the hill country is large, labour and resourcing - may struggle to achieve this in first 4 years
	  o b) Second (high risk catchments)
	  o c) Tertiary – no rule 4 drystock (very few drystock properties will make it through the Rule 4 gateway) and so by default they are being prioritised
	- Rule 4 – Drystock
	  o No more than 25% of farm above 35 degree slope (class 7)
	  o 5% of farm grazed in forage crops – recognising risk in hill country of heavy stock on hills, so put stock onto the flats in winter on a crop; also pasture renewal
	  o Stock exclusion should be linked to timeframes in rule
	- Rule 6 – Dry stock approach to this could be:
	  o B&L facilitated workshop - council staff, accredited farm planner in attendance so people understand the LEP.
	  o After this, farmers have 6 months to work on their plan farm and submit to Council. This provides time for farmers to get external advice etc.
	  o Submitting the plan triggers farm visit from Council, to get one-on-one connection, to give community certainty farmers are doing the right thing and to build relationships between farmers and the Council. Then farm plan is signed off. This gives opportunity to minimise cost and maximise influence by giving initial knowledge transfer in a group setting.
	  o Third party audits – farmer pays.
	
	- May need registration process to enable Council to implement the rules (to demonstrate compliance)
	- Farm Environment Plan – developed by AgFirst and FarmIQ which is a step up from a LEP and could assist Council to demonstrate compliance.
	- Drystock are aware credibility needs to be created with the scheme but also want a chance to demonstrate it.

Dairy view on Rule 4 (note this was put forward for discussion by CSG rep and delegate and hasn't necessarily been fully canvassed with the sector)	- Is it reasonable for a dairy farm to be in rule 4? Initially thought no, but then thought there are some lower intensity dairy farms
	- Assessment every year and provide a nutrient budget.
	  o A low risk farm with annual nutrient budget
	  o No waterways or fenced waterways
	  o Low intensity set by stocking rate figure (proxy) or N threshold 25% or below of the 'bell curve'
	  o No winter forage crops (because if mismanaged its impact on the environment is huge). Purpose of winter forage crops is about building up organic matter. Need some process or thought that highlights this needs to be managed. As it's a short term practice it would be hard to measure compliance but could come into the farm plan.
	  o Have to supply nutrient budget
	  o WOF for effluent system? Where does effluent fit?

	Current effluent rules in WRP cover farm dairy effluent (which is only 10% of all effluent that cows deposit on the farm), rule continues to stand alone and Rule 4 is separate. In practice you may deal with them in an integrated way but from a regulatory point of view would be dealt with separately. Does it send the right message to allow people to slip into Rule 4 and discharge effluent to water (or not having enough storage)? In CSG scope for improvement to PA rules for effluent? It is in scope but as we are out of time it could be picked up in the regional plan review. Numbers of dairy farmers falling into Rule 4 is likely to be small. Remembering that implementation is one consideration, effectiveness is also an important consideration for the policy mix.
Dairy view on Rules 5 and 6	- Moderate = Everyone except top 25% for N - 8 years to get whole package (moderate) and 5 years to get the whole package (high) [Noted this is a departure from CSG current approach which is to prioritise via sub-catchments – possibly the two could run together i.e. priority sub-catchments and high risk emitters everywhere go first] - Dairy leaders group not interested in the catchment by catchment approach – preference is to get everyone talking at the same time. However, if CSG wish to go with the sub-catchment approach, the spatial risk plan could be part of a more organised approach. - If not high risk (too much N) still need to do the GMP packages - High risk – 75%ile (bring N down) **Dairy proposal for what is included in the GMP** • Nitrogen report and XML file • Spatial risk plan to include hot spots, riparian management plan, wintering management plan, stock exclusion, setbacks, planting etc • Farm dairy effluent (how to achieve 365 day compliance) • Aligning with best practice **Set backs** What expectation would we set (for riparian plan guidance)? CSG discussed 3m would be expected unless there was a good reason, this approach allows tailoring in the plan. TLG advice (John Quinn) provided a graph in a previous meeting which showed where you get the different benefits however the primary benefit is exclusion, beyond that it depends on topography. There is no technical justification to set a standard number everywhere. But there is benefit in some sort of buffer between farming activities and a waterway where run-off is in the form of sheet flow and slow enough to allow for contaminants to settle out in the buffer zone. Something to discuss with farm planner. The 3m set back is a guideline not a rule. Some national guidance is likely in the future. Different farming practices exist for different reasons e.g. in peat lands: • Where drains exist on farmed peat land, buffer zones exist between farmed land and the drains. As the peat farmed land sinks, the soil in the buffer zone is removed and used to fill in depressions.

	Reference Charlotte's proposal which guides what you need to do where. Everyone needs to be doing the same practices\, industry scheme is just a process to achieve this. Ideally it would be a PA but could be controlled consent. - The plan has to have detail about what must be covered in a property plan but recognising it has to cater for all land use types, so can't be so detailed that it's irrelevant for large parts of the region, but optimum balance between guidance you give which then gets translated per sector into an accredited scheme. When you are deciding what actions to do, you should be able to pick up the plan change and see what the categories are, considerations, criteria/ quality standards for what a property plan would like. Guidance schedule discussion – what needs to be in it? i.e. here is a list of things to think about and the property plan will be the answer to it. Need to include what are conditions of consent for Rule 5. **ACTION** Mark Brockelsby– circulate an extract from the Environment Canterbury plan, this may indicate what could be in a property plan (completed during the meeting). Why? 1) Consistency of expectations to farmers and farm planners/ across Rule 5+6. (Note, drystock proposal is to achieve this consistency via the workshops, WRC contact, accredited farm planner, sub-catchment approach). 2) Assurance to public/stakeholders we are doing enough 3) So TLG can tell us if our policy mix is likely to meet targets. Robustness is built in through: - Farmers' actions and timeframes are documented - Council signing off OR certified industry sign-off - Audit

4. Categories/considerations for a property plan
Which of the four contaminants are you at risk for? (Subcatchment/property)

- Stock exclusion and how to implement Rule 1; includes stock crossings/culverts/bridges.

- Agreed to have set back as a separate category to stock exclusion. "Riparian management" – planting and setbacks. Riparian management of all waterways (or what's included in the stock exclusion definition), wetland protection.

- Grazing management – matched to land class (risk), season, proximity to water, includes grazing over winter (managing break feeding), wintering & wet weather events

- Cropping & cultivation – includes cultivation practice, purpose of cropping (e.g. cut and carry/ harvest or forage), proximity to the waterway (slope). Tillage practices, fallow post-crop, bunds & silt traps, diversion drains, setbacks, crop grazing (forage)

- Critical source areas – manage sources of contaminants and key pathways i.e. tracks, races, yards, slumping/ actively eroding areas. There is a definition from literature on source management (see TLG)

- Nutrient management – P, soil fertility, N and nutrient budgets. Overseer or equivalent model. Show your start point according to 14/15 and 15/16 and that your rolling averages are not going to increase and you have GMPs in place.

- Irrigation management to avoid loss of contaminants

- Effluent management (collected effluent)

- Offal, silage, waste hotspots

- Erosion control – streambank, hill-slope (planting/retirement), stock management

- Planned land use change

- Information - Basic requirement as per the Canterbury example (emailed to sub-group meetings 18/3)

- Map showing spatial risks

- Accurate and auditable records

5. Discussion on whether the sub-group should set a number for the 75%ile? By sector or across the board?

- To achieve 75%ile needs to set a point in time.
- Noted if we did this it will significantly impact horticulture.
- Concern raised about who would be captured and who wouldn't if this approach would be taken – sector by sector or setting a number to achieve 75%ile.
- Acknowledged that if address one contaminant then other contaminants will likely be reduced.
- For other contaminants instead of a limit we could use standards i.e. practices related to winter grazing can be codified to such an extent it could reduce sediment risk factors. **Agreed provided those practices can be applied region-wide.**
- Discussed what is fair isn't necessarily the most cost-effective method.
- Prioritise nutrient budget/ benchmark roll out i.e. interim time period to get the most intensive parts of the sheep and beef sector benchmarked first
- Need benchmark for every property based on the information from those two years noted in the rule, to find where people are now and to find the 75%ile.
- The allocation process hasn't been defined and where we are now won't form part of the allocation. The intent of the 75%ile is to pick up poor performers compared to their peers and where there is scope to get fast gains for N. For drystock that's saying no dairy grazing or bull beef and that's not workable. Sheep & Beef CSG reps would prefer to put their focus on sediment as the contaminant where they are the highest contributors.
- Allocation won't be based on the benchmarking for 14-15 and 15-16. The purpose of those two years was to get people to hold and then start to reduce via GMPs
- Noting that in the current policy package, we haven't said anywhere that everyone needs to hold N – but were operating on this assumption (hold and then reduce).
- For allocation, two principles are land suitability and to minimise social disruption, element of recognising existing use but moving to sustainable practices over time.
- Is it fair for dairy to hold N but no other sector needs to hold N?
- CSG only hard limit was on the top 25%; but the rest have to make reductions under GMPs – expect this to produce 7-10% reduction based on experience with SMPs.
- In the policy mix report, it states the policy intent is to stop net increase in discharges in the whole catchment.

Agreement – show that you aren't going to increase and have GMPs in place (using a rolling average – a rolling average provides for farming variables over time i.e. a productive lambing year).
Issue: Other sectors are sitting much higher than beef & sheep, this impacts good performers.

Need to tell a story about what actions and contributions each sector are making.
a) What's happening now?
B) What's already been done?
Story has to be complete, and show that everyone is doing stuff, focusing on biggest risk, some actions are more quantifiable than others. Include narrative on what we are doing on the land that takes us in the right direction.

6. **Are we holding?**

For each contaminant we need to go from high risk to lower risk. Looking at each of the categories, farmers may have to consider for each factor are they high, moderate or low and what are the actions to reduce risk.

7. **Intent of property plans?**

In aggregate, to show how losses of the four contaminants will reduced in receiving water using a risk based, tailored approach for each property.

Each plan is to identify the risk of loss for each contaminant on that property and to manage high risk down, in order to achieve the required targets for water quality in the river.

8. **Where to next?**

- Need clearer decisions around how the 75%ile will work
- What will GMPs look like – particularly for industries with less structured processes?
- Is there anything that can be offered further in the farm planning process beyond the categories/ considerations – by way of criteria/ quality standards?

Overarching policy is that the point of the farm plans is to stop an overall increase in contaminants into the waterways. We've sorted wholesale land use but this is where we have to show it at a farm level.

9. **What do we call 'Property Plans'?**

Agreement: Call them 'Farm Environment Plans'
It was noted anecdotally that people understand 'Farm Environment Plan' terminology rather than 'Property Plan'.

10. **Low intensity**

- Issues with small blocks (approx 5000 blocks) – likely need to benchmark in a point in time.
- Add some basic data collection for Rule 3? Depends how significant these are.
- Need to know how many farms are under the 8 stock units/ size threshold

ACTION: Ask Rob for distribution curve on size of small blocks

Attachment 3:

Property Plan Sub-Group 23/3 DRAFT NOTES

Property plan sub-group meeting – DRAFT NOTES

Date: 23 March 2016 9:30am – 4
Venue: The Link, Hamilton

Attendees: Chris Keenan, Gwyn Verkerk, George Moss, James Bailey, Graeme Gleeson, Charlotte Rutherford, James Houghton, Sally Miller, Jason Sebastian, Rick Pridmore

Apologies: Phil Journeaux

Staff/Other: Helen Ritchie (CSG Facilitator), Billy Brough (river iwi technical advisor), Rob Dragten (WRC contractor) Justine Young, Patrick Lynch, Alan Campbell, Jon Palmer, Mark Brockelsby, Chris McLay (part), Nicole Botherway. Jo Bromley.

1. Purpose

Continue from the last meeting:

Consistency

- Low risk factors for Rule 4 ('off the shelf' plan)
- Moderate risk factors (GMPs for them
- High risk factors – what more for them and what guidance we can give planners
- How the 75%ile fits with this framework and how it will be done
- How to prioritise effort across sectors and contaminants.

2. Future meetings

1 April (focus on how much, how fast) and 12 April (how the scheme will work)

3. Overview from 18 March meeting (refer to draft meeting notes from 18 March)

Rule 4

Dairy
Intent – not too many dairy farms
	- Annual nutrient budget
	- Low intensity
	  o 25% of bell curve
	  o Stocking rate proxy or N threshold

Drystock	- 25% of farm >35 degrees (Class 7) - 5% of farm in grazed forage - Stock exclusion – dates line up with rules
Fruit	- On a parallel track to Dairy & Drystock. - Discussed a low intensity system along the lines of Tukituki (permanent tree crops) - Does any tree-fruit growing have high intensity (high quantities of N)? Because the yields (growth of the woody mass) removed are high, this results in low leaching rates of between 5-15. **Suggestion: consider a 'low intensity' definition that deals with permanent crops.**

Question: Does the list need to 'fit' all sectors?

If yes:

- what do we do with N threshold/stocking rate proxy?
- Any forage crops?
- What to do with slope?

Noted questions at TRH related to opportunistic potato growers, how do we manage these?

Rule 3	- Currently those properties within rule 3 (low intensity) don't need to benchmark. - Discussion about record keeping need for those that fall under rule 3. Implementers noted it would be useful for those under rule 3 to record keep. **Rationale:** This would enable the sector and council to see what impact these properties are having. Need to say what is this number, and is it or is it not going to create a problem. Otherwise need to estimate their contribution.
Rule 5 & 6	**Drystock idea for Rule 6** - Beef & Lamb facilitated LEP workshop with a group of farmers, WRC and an accredited farm planner - Farmers get 6 months to submit their LEP plan - This then triggers a site visit from WRC and if appropriate the LEP is signed off. - The farmer then pays for a 3rd party audit. **Dairy** - High (75%ile) need to reduce these discharges from these properties (within 5 years) - Moderate (25-75%ile) (reduce within 8 years) [Noted dairy leaders' preference to prioritise high emitters first is a departure from CSG approach to prioritise by sub-catchments – possibly could run both together i.e. priority sub-catchments and high risk emitters everywhere go first. Or, the spatial risk plan could be part of a more organised sub-catchment approach.] Both groups (high and moderate) have to do GMPs (those in the high category may need to do more to bring it down) - Submit documents to show how GMP will be implemented: N report and Overseer report (XML file), spatial risk plan covering aspects like riparian management/ setbacks, hotspots/ CSAs etc, effluent comply 365 d/year, aligning with best practice. Third party audited through the industry scheme. - Setbacks - CSG discussed 3m would be expected unless there was a good reason; this approach allows tailoring in the plan. Something to discuss with farm planner. Some national guidance is likely in the future. **UNRESOLVED** - **It is the same rules for each sector i.e. 75%ile (is it per sector) OR should each sector focus on the most relevant contaminants and sector-relevant practices** - We have previously said GMPs are likely to be sector specific. - If sectors focus on the most relevant contaminant (while still addressing all of the contaminants) then how do we identify the high risk factors (i.e. 75%ile gives the high risk for N but we don't have a corresponding way of dealing with the other contaminants). If we identify high-risk factors per sector e.g. slope or LUC for drystock, N loss for dairy... Because we have a number for N, it is clear what you have to do; because there is no corresponding number for sediment etc, it is less clear what you have to do.

	- Suggestion on utilising ecosystem resourcing and priorities identified according to the load, but need to bring it back to the farm. - What are the proxies for each contaminant? How do you do the risk assessment??Horticulture has a series of risk profiles. For cultivation you'll have a higher level of risk with a high slope o o Horticulture uses slope for cultivation. o Consider also if there is a stream boundary adjacent to the cultivation. Agreed that any approach we recommend must be equitable, and have a complete story with it.
	For 1 April sub-group meeting - how frequently will people be audited, it was noted the audit component needs to be consistent across all the rules while incentivising good practice.

Robustness is built in through:
- Farmers' actions and timeframes are documented
- Council signing off OR certified industry sign-off
- Audit

When you are deciding what actions to do, you should be able to pick up the plan change and see what the categories are, considerations, criteria/ quality standards for what a property plan would like. i.e. here is a list of things to think about and the property plan will be the answer to it.

Why do we need this guidance?
1) Consistent expectations to farmers/ planners/ across Rule 5+6.
2) Assurance to public/stakeholders we are doing enough
3) So TLG can tell us if our policy mix is likely to meet targets.

4. Messages from Healthy Rivers Wai Ora Committee, 22 March 2016

- Want to know we'll achieve 10% in 10 years (what assurance can CSG provide the plan change will achieve this)
- Clarify interim targets
- What is the on-going co-governance of the river (governors want to see regular progress)
- Iwi are concerned about permissiveness of the plan (what can CSG build in to show that we can make progress)
- A range of implementation concerns were raised i.e. concern about setting it up for failure if people don't understand if and how implementation occurs
- Proportionality (reference to policy selection criteria) – relates to setting 75%ile by sector
- Some confusion about property plans (a property plan is a document but there's a process to support that)
- Question regarding implementation of the stock exclusion rules - some confusion on what does it really mean in terms of the consent.

5. Discussion following HRWO committee feedback

- How detailed do these property plans need to be? Focus on the mechanics of farming practices or meeting the target
- Horticulture has a process to develop farm plans based on: a risk assessment completed by an independent advisor, experts look at GMP adoption at what level and make recommendations, reporting (templates) and schedule that outline consent conditions and management actions to be completed by a certain

date, auditing (by an accredited advisor). This is the same for the dairy industry. Actions may change in response due to climatic conditions but the goal stays the same.
- Plan shows what people have already done and compliance with the rules. It is also a way of acknowledging effort completed already and good operators.
- Implementers' question: What's the intention of the permitted activity? What's the expectation of monitoring and compliance and who's going to do it and pay for it?

6. Concerning/promising – about where we're at now?

- Reassuring same thinking re: farm planning is a system with comparative components across industries
- Nailing down what it is will take time and need to be dynamic over time
- Big effort on a regular schedule
- Potential for each sector to look at bringing high emitters down
- Worry about flexibility and not seeing certainty (layperson)
- Ensuring wider community see farm plan is acceptable, without tying up farmer (danger of putting numbers in now)
- Concern 75%ile – how to do it (each sector is coming up with ways to develop their plan but need to temper that with community acceptability)
- Each sector has positive proposals
- How to ensure it will be acceptable to community
- Not clear who's responsible for what?
- If all have own system and council also has one is that effective? What does an audit look like (discussion planned for 12 April)?
- Power of FEP to get change through creditable person on farm doing risk assessment
- Concern wrt resourcing (consistency (can be subjective) within catchment/ auditor)
- Implementation plan timing
- Positives can sit outside the rule (adaptive management)
- Need to find balance between sufficient detail in guidance to know what rule is requiring without making it constraining
- Has to survive changes in staff - 'how to guide' - non-statutory method
- What status are farmers under until they get their consent/farm plan?
- One rule for N (a number or a proxy?) Lowering your N footprint.

7. Rule 4

- What are the concerns? Permissiveness and lack of clarity
- People need to know right away what they need to do
- If don't have 3m set back then need consent - **NOT AGREED.** This is where guidance needs to state need a good reason not to have a 3m set back. Concern is the vagueness to the public.
- Concern on the degree of judgment required currently if farm plan actions not clear – room for arbitrary decisions.
- Suggestion that the rules need to define actions which will achieve the majority of the water quality improvement desired (eg 90% of the 10% improvement in the first 10 years)
- What would those rules look like?
- Key issue about need for section 32 to address the degree of improvement in water quality from the intervention of the proposed regulatory framework. Currently TLG has no ability to measure this, as they don't have the information about current losses.
- Restate need to ensure rule 4 captures low intensity dairy farmers (eg 25%ile for N). Everyone else should be in rule 5 or 6.

Purpose of Rule 4: who is so low risk they don't need a tailored plan?

- Arbitrary low number for N; flat farm means low risk of run-off
- Don't need to have a farm plan to be part of the catchment process if they are low risk.
- Suggestion that rule 4 should adopt same slope as Rule 1 for consistency i.e. 15 degrees.
- 75%ile doesn't belong in here – too high. Take this out and make it its own rule? Suggested Interim rule "for pastoral use, you must be below x number (75%ile?), and demonstrate reduction in N loss overseer of x% through GMPs.

- Rules 5 and 6, commercial farms, lots of interaction discussing/negotiating mitigation measures, Rule 4 not always commercial, or low intensity.
- Question about whether rule 4 even needed.
- Benchmark rule to apply to these people and model inputs from Rule 3 people (they don't need to submit records)
- **Can we do all these farm plans in 10 years? Agreed to revisit need for Rule 4 when we get to the 'how much, how fast' discussion**
- Agreement – need basic registration process for Rule 3 properties, statutory declaration against minimum standards.
- Lots of Rule 3 people are not commercial, hence don't necessarily have records.

8. Acceptability of Farm Plan

- How do you deal with risk assessment between rule 5 and 6.
- Commercial vegetable growing managed via a consent, high court decision that consent required because of high complexity of system and rotation, **QUESTION: does this need a separate rule? To be decided by CSG.**
- Farm planning – difficult to get people to do the difficult stuff. Easy to get them to do the stuff that is positive to the farm business, different matter to get them to do things that may be detrimental to the farm business.
- How do we know if someone has done enough to achieve the catchment contributions? Rely on expert advisor? How else can you do it?
- Auditing process – need moderating process to compare between expert advisors.
- Group workshops – have a council officer present at the workshops for quality. But what if someone doesn't want to go to a group workshop? Require consent, own costs etc.
- Questions about minimum standards, current rules don't set minimum standards. What would this look like? A 3 m setback? Accepted risk mitigations? Eg tracks and races, must install cutoffs to vegetated areas. Put 4 soil conservators on same property, get 4 different proposals to mitigate risk, can't get to the detail of install this species of popular on this class of land, at this density.
- Risk of this being very expensive, highly experienced person covering all parts of large drystock farm.
- Need a schedule of codes of practice that we endorse –need this prior to notification.
- Accredited people are responsible for finding the reductions.
- Don't forget that this is only for the first 10 years, prior to allocation of contaminant loads.
- Remember Councillors want certainty about achieving the 10% target, but need accounting process to track progress towards targets.
- Over the period of a farmer doing their farm plan, they will break their farm into risk blocks, and then assign actions based on risk
- Are we assigning actions based on highest risk, or lowest cost. Need to deal with farms where actions most necessary to achieve water quality targets, irrespective of cost.
- Concern about removing the setback requirements
- Recognising need for staged approach

- Working together with industry and Council, could come up with a more prescriptive set of menus to become the basic system for farm planning/mitigation.
- Schedule of mitigation options to pull into farm plan, if not meeting those standard options, need to promote individual options through a consent process.
- Beef and Lamb will develop a Waikato Specific template of the LEP, streamlining the consent process
- Is Rule 6 needed? Taking this approach either Rule 6 will need to be much more specific, or industry will not choose to go down industry scheme pathway.
- Once a farm plan is set and approved, 3rd party audit of compliance with the farm plan.
- Suggestion of different implementation processes by different sectors.
- Actions in each plan will be checkable, auditable, and achievable.
- Actions come from minimum standards, which need to be expressed in the plan.

9. What are the codes and guidelines that can guide the schedule/implementation of farm plans?

- Hort NZ CoP for nutrient management V1.0 August 2014
- Erosion and sediment control guidelines for vegetable production (v1.1 June 2014)
- HortNZ Farm Plan template v2.0 2016
- Soil Conservation Handbook
- COP effluent systems (as per Canterbury MGM doc)
- COP fertiliser (as per Canterbury MGM doc)
- COP fertiliser application (as per Canterbury MGM doc)
- Waikato menus
- Arable – FAR nutrient management plan & F.E.P
- LUC handbook

(all these need version control – version no. & date)

Discussion on NOT developing a Waikato specific plan.
Rationale: practices we need to adopt will be similar to elsewhere nationally.

- Comply with risk assessment processes and practices in codes
- Farm plan template

In 10 years: (Tailored actions and timelines – reported and aggregated)

- Stock exclusion
- Farm plans for all
- No land use change

For farm plans, this will give:

- Land class matched to stock class
- Critical source areas identified and start to manage
- Marginal land identified
- Awareness of when and where to manage stock etc to reduce contaminants from daily farm management

Codified minimum standards in industry scheme e.g. dairy, must have stock exclusion, riparian management, must have accredited effluent system, must have nutrient management plan by accredited advisor, must identify actions to reduce N loss by a percentage, etc, no setbacks included here.

No reason why you couldn't have mirror rules (i.e. the sector minimum standards that will be used in the industry scheme are repeated in Rule 5, so that Rule 5 is not an easier option).

If all dairy farmers do dairy accord targets, what does this mean in terms of achieving 10% target?

11. Nitrogen

Vegetable/Arable/Horticulture– cap, numeric (10%? X% reduction in root zone N loss across section),

Pastoral – Cap? Dairy 75%ile (per FMU)
Build this into Rule 7 –

- required to benchmark,
- no increase (hold the line) in 5 year rolling average.
- Those over 75%ile must reduce to 75%ile. (per FMU)
- 75%ile cap to be set by dairy but then apply to all pastoral land users

Start point is 2 base years 14-15, 15-16 (everyone start here) – no increase in rolling average over 5 years (until allocation system based on land suitability principle is defined).

Rule needs to be interim measure e.g. put an expiry clause in the plan to ensure that this hold the line policy does not go on past this plan change. Linked to allocation principle - need clear reference in the plan change to put in place an allocation system based on land use suitability. Reinforce CSG's requests to WRC to ensure the development of this allocation system over the next 5 years.

The dry stock sector spoke of the need for flexibility to adjust their systems according to market dynamics which could see some changes in N loss rates due to shift of stock class from year to year. Request for a flexibility range e.g. plus or minus x% or x units of Nitrogen per ha per year. Discussion as to whether the concept of rolling average covered this idea.

Removing effective hectares (e.g. setbacks, retired areas) – confirmed concept would be that if you do this after benchmarking you can intensify elsewhere on other land within your property

GMPs

- Sector based (all 4 contaminants)
- 'Mirror rule' to make sure industry-based system isn't 'harder' than non industry-based system.

12. To come back to:

- Setbacks – what is the minimum guidance to apply in Rule 5/6

13. Robustness/Equity

What can we say about robustness and equity of this approach?

Equity

- Dairy 75%ile per FMU will produce a number that then applies to all pastoral (no one can exceed)
- Sheep & Beef will have to work very hard on reticulated water and stock exclusion, erosion and sediment control, critical source areas
- Horticulture to work on sediment and erosion control and nutrient reductions

When we get to allocation, land use and systems will have to change

Robustness

- Back end (once property plan is in place, ensuring it is done)
    - WRC consent (or industry accreditation)
    - Actions and timeframes documented and become consent conditions
    - Audit
    - Actions can be aggregated and the effects assessed or modelled against the targets.

- Front end (what goes into the plan and ensuring it is sufficient)
    - N rule
    - Codes of practice/sector guides and menus
    - Certified planner
    - WRC sign-off (Rule 5)
    - Accredited scheme sign-off (Rule 6) – accredited scheme has clearly defined GMPs – minimum standards and mirror rule (sector based GMPs also in Rule 5)
    - Setbacks?? – to discuss further