WORKSHOP NOTES

SUBJECT	**Whaitua Te Whanganui-a-Tara workshop notes**
WHEN	Wednesday 24 February 2021, 9.30am-5pm
WHERE	NZ Deerstalkers Association (33 Collina Terrace, Thorndon)
ATTENDEES	Louise, Sam, Ros, Pat, Pete, Jonny, Anya, Hikitia, Zoe, Tui (on Zoom), Gabriel (from 12.30)
APOLOGIES	Kara, Roger, Sean, Tim
PROJECT TEAM	Phill, Emily, Denise, John, Kat, Mark, Glen, Te Rangimārie, Mike, Dave, Matt, James, Emily T., Onur

Agreements in principle and actions

KEY

D = decision.

A = action.

PT = project team.

R = idea for drafting a recommendation.

Meeting opening

A: Add to the 20 January workshop notes where is says that "UHCC has mapped the extent of the Mangaroa peatland" that it's UHCC's view of the extent.

A: PT to circulate Whaitua PowerPoints presented at recent workshops with councils.

Project timeline

D: Committee does not believe the timeline and 27 May date for GW Council to receive the WIP is sufficient given current progress. Request to extend timeline to allow time for important decision-making discussions and to complete more engagement with communities. Request to be considered by GW management.

A: Committee members to complete targeted and meaningful engagement with communities to test draft recommendations.

A: PT to highlight key dates for intended Natural Resource Plan changes in the project timeline.

A: Co-chairs and PT to confirm the topics and decision areas to be covered in upcoming workshops.

FMU discussion

D: Committee agreed that FMUs are administrative units, which might be different from spatial areas used for engaging with the community. FMUs still to be finalised.

A: PT to propose how FMUs and place-based spatial areas can be woven together. Consider approach where the Te Awa Kairangi catchment could be the unit of communication with multiple monitoring points for target attribute states that correlate to FMUS.

Draft WIP structure

D: Draft WIP structure introduced by Te Rangimārie for consideration for version 2 of the draft WIP – incorporated by Committee.

D: Committee agreed that a WIP document and an electronic version with an interactive map would be needed. If the electronic product cannot be delivered alongside the WIP, it will become a recommendation for implementation as a tool for community engagement. PT to explore feasibility of an electronic version.

A: PT to include Zoe in discussions about WIP products.

D: All recommendations to be listed in one place in the WIP, grouped thematically. Key recommendations (maybe the top 10) to be included at the front of the WIP. Rationale for recommendations to sit in chapters with the issues or FMUs.

D: Recommendations to include a graphic representation for short/medium/long term and linkage to other issues such as climate change, biodiversity or health. WIP recommendations to include a graphic representation to 'tag' them based on timeframes (short/medium/long term), costs, and co-benefits (for climate change, biodiversity, health etc.)

A: PT to explore options for incorporating wayfinding language and imagery, in contrast to roadmap and planning language.

D: Rename the "Ngā kawa" section for environmental outcomes so that it's not confused with the Committee's kawa.

R: Recommendation for mana whenua attributes to continue to be developed after the WIP is completed. WIP to include a placeholder for the attributes that have been identified.

D: Add a section in the WIP about expectations for implementation and reporting progress.

D: Add a section in the WIP about "Managing ourselves" for the thematic grouping of recommendations and their rationale.

D: PT to provide supporting evidence and information in updated versions of the draft WIP for remaining workshops.

D: TKT material to be provided alongside the draft WIP to support decision-making discussions.

A: PT to provide draft WIP version 2 as a SharePoint document for Committee members to add comments only, at this stage.

Recommendations structure

D: Format of recommendations rationale to be short paragraphs with consistent headings. Some recommendations may be grouped if the same rationale applies to them.

D: First rationale point should be how the recommendation gives effect to kawa.

D: Rationale to include roles and responsibilities for implementation.

D: 'Who is impacted?' changed to 'Who needs to take action?' when structuring the rationale.

D: Include some cost information, perhaps a graphic representation or narrative. James to add his summary of cost information to the draft WIP.

D: In target attribute tables, need to note where the reference state is not A.

A: Committee to define what 'A' state means to them.

D: Target attribute states to show clearly whether the trend is improving or declining.

Discussion

Meeting opening

Ros opened with a karakia.

Co-chair updates:

- The co-chairs acknowledged Quentin's resignation from the Committee and his contributions to the process. Potential to offer him the opportunity to review the draft WIP.
- Denise has resigned and will be returning to Taranaki as a planner for NPDC.
- Mark has resigned and will be starting as a freshwater consultant at Aquanet.
- GW has a new land management advisor in this whaitua, Catherine McManus.
- Amend 20 January workshop notes as per the actions below.

Council workshops:

- Recent Whaitua workshops with Councils have been well received, support for the kawa based approach.
- Questions related to costs and timeframes, and how Whaitua recommendations can be incorporated into their work programmes or influence district plans and LTPs.
- Committed to another series of workshops with TAs and Wellington Water later on to test key recommendations.
- Point raised that 100 year vision might not seem ambitious enough, careful how it's used in communications and perhaps focus on short term targets and tangible change in the next 10 years while also keeping long term change in mind.
- Wellington Water raised concerns about financial implications for Councils and misalignment with current LTP funding.
- Encouragement for HCC and UHCC to adopt recommendations on WSD from the WCC Mayoral Taskforce report.
- Committee members to let Emily know if they would like to attend future Council workshops in advance to ensure they are able to participate in person or online.

A: Add to the 20 January workshop notes where is says that "UHCC has mapped the extent of the Mangaroa peatland" that it's UHCC's view of the extent.

A: PT to circulate Whaitua PowerPoints presented at recent workshops with councils.

Project timeline

- Addressed concern raised by Committee members about the need for more time for discussions about important topics, recommendations, costs and timeframes.
- The Committee has spent the past two years learning about the many problems to address and they don't want their deliberations and decision-making phase to be rushed.
- Need to see Te Mana o te Wai integrated throughout the WIP.
- Discussed constraints of completing Te Whanganui-a-Tara, Kāpiti and Wairarapa Hills Whaitua before 2022 and 2024 plan changes and challenge for GW to service more than one Whaitua Committee at a time with current resourcing.
- GW plan change team to focus on three waters and water allocation recommendations in the 2022 plan change with another tranche in 2024.
- Suggestion for a smaller project team to support the completion of Te Whanganui-a-Tara and the remaining or additional staff to begin the Kāpiti Whaitua.
- Aim for Councils to be aligned and supportive of Whaitua recommendations. Some Committee members will not want to compromise aspirations for what is feasible under current funding arrangements and will expect that Councils can weigh against other priorities later.
- Additional time would allow an opportunity to build on meaningful community engagement. Content has been sufficiently developed to bring ideas to communities, but events will require strong Committee leadership to sponsor and organise them.
- Te Kāhui Taiao engagement with mana whenua has been scheduled for 16 and 18 March in Lower Hutt and Wainuiomata.
- Important for engagement to target young and older people in order to effect cultural change. Zoe connected with students and university contacts.
- Engagement should be focussed on empowering communities and testing challenging issues for the Committee's decision-making.
- Consultation is another opportunity for interested individuals to have their say but is not sufficient for meaningful engagement.
- Key questions to ask the community: What mechanisms do you need? What will it take to achieve recommendations?

D: Committee does not believe the timeline and 27 May date for GW Council to receive the WIP is sufficient given current progress. Request to extend timeline to allow time for important decision-making discussions and to complete more engagement with communities. Request to be considered by GW management.

A: Committee members to complete targeted and meaningful engagement with communities to test draft recommendations.

A: PT to highlight key dates for intended Natural Resource Plan changes in the project timeline.

A: Co-chairs and PT to confirm the topics and decision areas to be covered in upcoming workshops.

FMU discussion

- Challenge between delineating FMUs based on catchment areas or land use for the purpose of setting target attribute states and monitoring.
- When FMU areas are decided, detail can be nested within them at any scale and places that are special to mana whenua can be identified.
- The expert panel tested scenarios on 6 spatial units split into a subset of 30 units based on land use types.

- Committee needs to use spatial areas that the community can relate to and that councils can give effect to.
- FMUs are administrative units but are not the best method for engaging with communities. They trigger actions for councils, which means that fewer FMUs are easier for councils to implement.
- A catchment that has different water quality states from headwaters to sea could have multiple monitoring sites with different target attribute states. Resource consents would need to consider how an activity would effect the monitoring site and meet the targets.
- Modelling would need to be used where monitoring is not available. Councils could play a role in encouraging community connection and training citizens to do more active monitoring. Needs to address Council resourcing and their approach to implementation.
- Prioritise good water quality at headwaters and protect it as it moves downstream to inspire and encourage communities.

D: Committee agreed that FMUs are administrative units, which might be different from spatial areas used for engaging with the community. FMUs still to be finalised.

A: PT to propose how FMUs and place-based spatial areas can be woven together. Consider approach where the Te Awa Kairangi catchment could be the unit of communication with multiple monitoring points for target attribute states that correlate to FMUS.

Draft WIP structure

- Te Rangimārie shared a draft WIP structure prepared for TKT, which formed the basis of the Committee's discussion.
- The structure is framed by values that mana whenua and the community hold in relation to FMUs, to ensure that the values are reflected through the environmental outcomes, attributes, target states, limits and monitoring.
- FMU chapters to include related kawa, issues and a plan for addressing them, actions and recommendations in the catchment area. Interactive GIS map feature for accessibility.
- Whakatupuranga section for the 'waters of a generation.' Describing what the water looks like now and aspirations for our children and grandchildren.
- Mana whakahaere, or mana whenua involved in governance, is to be reflected as a key value for achieving outcomes across all FMUs.
- Other values, including kawa, TMOTW and mai uta ki tai will be included at the front of the document. Add Māori water cycle, which informs mana whenua values.
- There is likely to be a lot of duplication if issues and recommendations are included in all FMUs where they are relevant. This may not be problematic if it enables individuals to read only the chapter about their local catchment, especially if it is accessible online. Not expecting members of the public to read the full WIP.
- The WIP needs to be direct and to the point with specific costs and timeframes with evidence to support. Put the sections that most people will be interested in (e.g., key recommendations) at the top.
- Most recommendations appear to be applicable across all catchments. Some recommendations may be specific to an FMU.
- All recommendations to be listed in one place. Recommendations to be repeated through FMU chapters with rationale and discussion on issues.
- List of top 10 recommendations to come at the front to highlight the urgency. Committee to choose these from the full list when complete.

- Whakapapa story to be included for whole whaitua and individual FMUs to help mana whenua and communities connect to local awa.
- Interactive map could be recommended as a tool for community engagement after the WIP document is produced.
- Not all mana whenua attributes will be developed by the completion of the WIP. Recommendation that the work to develop mana whenua attributes continues.
- Te Mana o te Wai will require a shift in how governance is structured, partnership with mana whenua will need to carry through from management to implementation.
- Committee wants information to be provided for future workshops within the draft WIP. Discussion points from small group meetings will be reflected in the content.
- Discussion on water quantity to be continued once TKT have had an opportunity to meet on this topic.
- WIP should be as pictorial as possible to make it compelling and accessible, communicate in other ways besides text.
- Use wayfinding imagery to get out of a step-by-step policy framework/ roadmap thinking.
- Kawa is the foundation for everything in the WIP, followed by the mana whenua and community values, there will be some overlapping values and others that are distinct.
- Need a section focussed on accountability and reporting progress to keep on track.
- Need to include actions that community members can take, and how they can help hold councils accountable. A section on 'Managing Ourselves' will change the narrative of ownership to sit with communities.
- Show that improvements for water quality have co-benefits for climate change, biodiversity and human health.
- Discussion about criteria for prioritisation to be picked up when more information and recommendations have been added to the draft WIP.
- Committee members to add their comments to the next version in SharePoint for discussion during workshops.

D: Draft WIP structure introduced by Te Rangimārie for consideration for version 2 of the draft WIP – incorporated by Committee.

D: Committee agreed on a WIP document and an electronic version with an interactive map. If the electronic product cannot be delivered alongside the WIP, it will become a recommendation for implementation as a tool for community engagement. PT to explore feasibility of an electronic version.

A: PT to include Zoe in discussions about WIP products.

D: All recommendations to be listed in one place in the WIP, grouped thematically. Key recommendations (maybe the top 10) to be included at the front of the WIP. Rationale for recommendations to sit in chapters with the issues or FMUs.

D: Recommendations to include a graphic representation for short/medium/long term and linkage to other issues such as climate change, biodiversity or health. WIP recommendations to include a graphic representation to 'tag' them based on timeframes (short/medium/long term), costs, and co-benefits (for climate change, biodiversity, health etc.)

A: PT to engage a communications professional to incorporate wayfinding imagery and language in contrast to roadmap/ planning language.

D: Rename the "Ngā kawa" section for environmental outcomes so that it's not confused with the Committee's kawa.

R: Recommendation for mana whenua attributes to continue to be developed after the WIP is completed. WIP to include a placeholder for the attributes that have been identified.

D: Add a section in the WIP about expectations for implementation and reporting progress.

D: Add a section in the WIP about "Managing ourselves" for the thematic grouping of recommendations and their rationale.

D: PT to provide supporting evidence and information in updated versions of the draft WIP for remaining workshops. TKT material to be provided alongside the draft WIP to support decision-making discussions.

A: PT to provide draft WIP version 2 as a SharePoint document for Committee members to add comments only.

Recommendations structure

- Some narrative is useful but most people will prefer to read bullet points. Use a consistent structure, recommendations with the same rationale can be grouped together.
- Need to be explicit about how recommendations give effect to kawa.
- Include who is responsible for taking action, monitoring and compliance.
- James has prepared a summary of cost information from Wellington Water that compares costs to 5 other main cities in NZ, to be shared with the Committee.
- Need to include available cost-benefit information.
- A few key principles to consider regarding cost: water supply relates to sustainable use, preventative work is better than reactive, there are other benefits for social/economic health, and there are mandates in the NPS-FM to meet bottom lines.
- Timeframes to be determined, idea to build on generational theme to show change for children and grandchildren.
- Vision to get waterbodies back to their natural state, could be 'A' or reference state.
- Define 'A' state and what good looks like. Show trend information so it's clear if intervention is needed to stop water quality from declining.
- WIP needs to acknowledge where people are doing good work, using a strengths based or appreciative inquiry approach. The online version could include links to organisations or groups for people to get involved in and help them take action.
- D: Format of recommendations rationale to be short paragraphs with consistent headings. Some recommendations may be grouped if the same rationale applies to them.
- D: First rationale point should be how the recommendation gives effect to kawa.
- D: Rationale to include roles and responsibilities for implementation.
- D: 'Who is impacted?' changed to 'Who needs to take action?' when structuring the rationale.
- D: Include some cost information, perhaps a graphic representation or narrative. James to add his summary of cost information to the draft WIP.
- D: In target attribute tables, need to note where the reference state is not A.
- A: Committee to define what 'A' state means to them.
- D: Target attribute states to show whether the trend is improving or declining.

Gabriel closed the workshop with a karakia.