

Agenda 2022

Council Meeting

Date: Thursday, 17 March 2022
Time: 11:00 AM
Venue: via online access

All visitors to Environment Canterbury buildings are required to provide a current, valid My Vaccine Pass, scan in using the QR codes, and wear a mask.



Membership

Chair	Councillor Jenny Hughey
Deputy Chair	Councillor Peter Scott
Membership	Councillor Tane Apanui Councillor Phil Clearwater Councillor Grant Edge Councillor Megan Hands Councillor Ian Mackenzie Councillor Nicole Marshall Councillor Claire McKay Councillor Elizabeth McKenzie Councillor Craig Pauling Councillor Lan Pham Councillor Vicky Southworth Councillor John Sunckell
Tumu Taiao	Yvette Couch-Lewis Iaeen Cranwell

Council Meeting

Table of Contents

1. Mihi/Karakia Timatanga - Opening	4
2. Apologies.....	4
3. Conflicts of Interest	4
4. Public Forum, Deputations and Petitions.....	4
5. Extraordinary and Urgent Business.....	5
6. Notices of Motion	5
7. Minutes	6
7.1. Unconfirmed Council Minutes - 16 February 2022	6
7.2. Unconfirmed Council Minutes - 24 February 2022	18
8. Report Items	22
8.1. Chief Executive's Report.....	22
8.2. Climate Emergency Update	25
8.3. Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee	28
8.4. Improving Our Environmental Reporting System Submission	31
8.5. Taumata Arowai Submission	54
9. Next Meeting.....	70
10. Mihi/Karakia Whakamutunga - Closing.....	70

1. Mihi/Karakia Timatanga - Opening

The meeting will be opened with a mihi whakatau, followed by a member of the Council Meeting with a karakia.

2. Apologies

At the time the agenda closed there were no apologies received.

3. Conflicts of Interest

Members are reminded to be vigilant and to stand aside from decision making when a conflict arises between their role as an elected representative and any private or other external interest they might have.

4. Public Forum, Deputations and Petitions

There were no requests for public forum, deputations and petitions at the time the agenda was prepared.

5. Extraordinary and Urgent Business

The Chairperson will give notice of items requiring urgent attention not on the agenda as follows.

Matters Requiring Urgent Attention as Determined by Resolution of the Council Meeting:

A meeting may deal with an item of business that is not on the agenda where the meeting resolves to deal with that item and the Chairperson provides the following information during the public part of the meeting:

1. The reason why the item is not on the agenda; and
2. The reason why discussion of the item cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting. The item may be allowed onto the agenda by resolution of the Council Meeting.

Minor Matters relating to the General Business of the Council Meeting:

A meeting may discuss an item that is not on the agenda only if it is a minor matter relating to the general business of the meeting and Chairperson explains at the beginning of the public part of the meeting that the item will be discussed. The meeting may not make a resolution, decision or recommendation about the item, except to refer it to a subsequent meeting for further discussion.

6. Notices of Motion

At the time the agenda closed there were no notices of motion received.

7. Minutes

7.1. Unconfirmed Council Minutes - 16 February 2022

Council Meeting

Date of meeting	Thursday, 17 March 2022
Author	Petrea Downey, Committee Advisor
Endorsed by	Catherine McMillan, General Manager Governance

Purpose

1. The previously circulated minutes from the Council Meeting on 16 February 2022 are to be confirmed.

Recommendations

That the Council:

1. receives the minutes from the Council Meeting held 16 February 2022.

Attachments

1. Unconfirmed Minutes - Canterbury Regional Council Meeting 539th - 16 February 2022 [7.1.1 - 11 pages]

Minutes of the 539th meeting of the Canterbury Regional Council (under COVID-19 Red Traffic Light restrictions) on Wednesday, 16 February 2022 at 11.07am, held online.

Present

Chair Jenny Hughey, Deputy Chair Peter Scott, Councillors Tane Apanui, Phil Clearwater, Grant Edge, Ian Mackenzie, Nicole Marshall, Claire McKay, Elizabeth McKenzie, Craig Pauling, Lan Pham, Vicky Southworth, and John Sunckell.

Ngā Tumu Taiao: Yvette Couch-Lewis and Iaeen Cranwell.

The Chair welcomed all to the meeting.

1. Mihi/Karakia Timatanga - Opening

Tumu Taiao Cranwell opened the meeting with a mihi whakatau, followed by Councillor Pauling with a karakia.

The Chair advised that the meeting was being recorded and that the recording would be made available on the Council website.

12. Acknowledgement and Minute's Silence

Peter Te Rangi Hiroa Ramsden, Member of the New Zealand Order of Merit (MNZM).

Peter was recognised as a highly respected rangatira of Ngāi Tahu whānau whānui and a recipient of the New Zealand Order of Merit (MNZM) for services to conservation. He worked with Environment Canterbury for nearly a decade with the title of Tangata Whenua Facilitator in the CWMS (Canterbury Water Management Strategy) team, during which time he had a wide reaching and profound impact on everyone around him.

Tumu Taiao Couch-Lewis continued to share a few memories of Peter Ramsden.

A minute's silence was observed.

4. Public Forum, Deputations and Petitions

4.1. Public Forum

4.1.1 Public Forum

Sarah Van der Burch spoke regarding increasing bike ridership from Lyttelton to Christchurch.

Resolved CNCL/2022/1

That the Council:

1. receives the public forum from Sarah Van der Burch regarding agenda item 4.1.1 Public Forum.
2. provides a reply to Sarah Van der Burch as soon as practicable.

Chair Hughey/Councillor Scott

CARRIED

4.1.2 Public Forum

Stephen Howard, accompanied by Dot Lovell-Smith, spoke on behalf of Keep Our Assets Canterbury (KOA) regarding transport, and public transport in particular.

Resolved CNCL/2022/2

That the Council:

1. receives the public forum from Stephen Howard and Dot Lovell-Smith of Keep Our Assets Canterbury (KOA) regarding agenda 4.1.2 Public Forum.
2. provides a reply to Stephen Howard and Dot Lovell-Smith as soon as practicable.

Chair Hughey/Councillor Scott

CARRIED

2. Apologies

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Hands.

3. Conflicts of Interest

There were no conflicts of interest recorded.

4. Public Forum, Deputations and Petitions (Continued)

4.3. Petitions

- 4.3.1** Councillor Clearwater tabled a petition on behalf of the Cass Bay community regarding improving the 28 bus route (attached). Jenny Healey, on behalf of Cass Bay residents was in attendance online for this item.

Resolved CNCL/2022/3

That the Council:

1. receives the petition, tabled by Councillor Clearwater, regarding agenda item 4.3 Petitions, on behalf of the Cass Bay Community regarding improving the 28 bus route.
2. provides a reply to the petition as soon as practicable.

Councillor Clearwater/Councillor Edge
CARRIED

Councillor Edge left the meeting at 11.55am.

The meeting adjourned at 11.55am and reconvened at 2pm.

Councillor Scott assumed the Chair for the rest of the meeting.

Councillor Edge returned to the meeting at 2.02pm.

4.1.3 Public Forum

Robin Barraclough spoke regarding the development of a 'cycle to work scheme' which would promote the uptake of cycling through salary sacrifice, making the purchase of a bicycle and safety equipment cheaper for employees.

Resolved CNCL/2022/4

That the Council:

1. receives the public forum from Robin Barraclough regarding the development of a 'cycle to work scheme' which would promote the uptake of cycling through salary sacrifice making the purchase of a bicycle and safety equipment cheaper for employees.
2. provides a reply to Robin Barraclough as soon as practicable.

Councillor Scott/Councillor Southworth
CARRIED

4.2. Deputations

There were no requests for deputations.

Chair Hughey left the meeting at 2.12pm.

5. Extraordinary and Urgent Business

There was no extraordinary or urgent business.

6. Notices of Motion

Notice of motion

Environment Canterbury (the Council) considered the notice of motion submitted by Councillor Scott, seconded by Councillor Apanui.

That Environment Canterbury:

1. supports the following Notice of Motion to be moved at the Canterbury Regional Transport Committee on Thursday 17 February 2022:

That the Canterbury Regional Transport Committee:

1. forms a working group to investigate opportunities to progress passenger rail in Canterbury and provide and spearhead work for the South Island Regional Transport Committee Chairs Group.

Rationale:

- A recent OECD report (Jan 2022) has warned that New Zealand needs to do more than rely on planting trees and carbon credits to meet its emission targets. Transport is responsible for large shares of emissions. This is an opportunity to innovate to address emissions.
- The strategic direction of the RTC includes lowering vehicle kilometres travelled. A working group investigation into passenger rail transport will inform RTC action to progress this direction.
- The RTC has invested in business cases that have indicated that further investigation of passenger rail is required to build off this earlier work.
- Canterbury has the largest population in the South Island, and Greater Christchurch is the largest urban area and is therefore the most logical place in the South Island to spearhead passenger rail.
- There is significant public support for rail transport in Canterbury and the South Island as evidenced by the number of public submissions in favour of rail or further investigation into passenger rail.

Resolved CNCL/2022/5

That the Council:

1. supports the following Notice of Motion to be moved at the Canterbury Regional Transport Committee on Thursday 17 February 2022:

‘That the Canterbury Regional Transport Committee:

1. forms a working group to investigate opportunities to progress passenger rail in Canterbury and provide and spearhead work for the South Island Regional Transport Committee Chairs Group.’

Councillor Scott/Councillor Apanui
CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Tumu Taiao Cranwell left the meeting at 2.27pm.

13. Verbal Update from the Chief Executive

The Chief Executive provided a verbal update on the correspondence written from the Office of the Chief Executive and Chair regarding the public forum participants during the December 2021 meetings.

7. Minutes

7.1. Unconfirmed Council Minutes - 9 & 16 December 2021 Both Open and Public Excluded

Resolved CNCL/2022/6

Staff recommendations adopted without change.

That the Council:

1. confirms the open and public excluded minutes from the Council meetings held on 9 and 16 December 2021.

Councillor Sunckell/Councillor Edge
CARRIED

8. Report Items

8.1. Notification of Items Released from Public Excluded

Resolved CNCL/2022/7

Staff recommendation adopted without change.

That the Council:

1. receives the report as notification that the resolution to appoint Jane Demeter for the role of the Independent Co-chair of the Canterbury Water Management Strategy (CWMS) Committee made at the Council meeting on 6 October 2021 has been approved for release to the public.

Councillor Pham/Councillor Pauling
CARRIED

8.2. Notification of Items Released from Public Excluded

Resolved CNCL/2022/8

Staff recommendation adopted without change.

That the Council:

1. receives the report as notification that the resolution to approve the following appointments to the Canterbury Water Management Strategy (CWMS) Regional Committee, for the six available community representative roles at the Council meeting on 9 December 2021, has been approved for release to the public:

1. Angela Cushnie
2. Dr Andrew Dark
3. Kevin Gallagher
4. Cameron Henderson
5. Ross Millichamp
6. Rima Herber

Councillor Edge/Councillor Mackenzie
CARRIED

Tumu Taiao Cranwell returned to the meeting at 2.40pm during discussion on item 8.3.

8.3. Climate Emergency Update

Resolved CNCL/2022/9
Staff recommendation adopted without change.

That the Council:

1. receives the update on the climate change work programme at Environment Canterbury.

Councillor Southworth/Councillor McKenzie
CARRIED

8.4. Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee

Resolved CNCL/2022/10
Staff recommendation adopted without change.

That the Council:

1. receives the unconfirmed minutes of the Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee meeting held on 10 December 2021.

Councillor Clearwater/Councillor Edge
CARRIED

9. Resolution to go into Public Excluded

The meeting did not go into public excluded, the public excluded minutes were resolved in public meeting.

10. Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held on Thursday, 24 February 2022 at 10.30am.

11. Mihi/Karakia Whakamutunga - Closing

A karakia was provided by Tumu Taiao Cranwell.

Meeting concluded at 2.56pm.

CONFIRMED:

Chair Jenny Hughey
Councillor, Environment Canterbury

Date

https://www.change.org/p/ecan-improve-the-28-bus-route-so-it-meets-the-needs-of-the-cass-bay-community?utm_source=share_petition&utm_medium=custom_url&recruited_by_id=b15d7950-838d-11e7-9049-15d0de9352e8

Improve the 28 bus route so it meets the needs of the Cass Bay Community




 [Cass Bay Residents Association](#) started this petition to ECan

As the bus Review for the 28 and 17 routes will not be implemented until 2023, the undersigned, from the Cass Bay Community, request action before the beginning of the 2022 academic year for the 29-35 students who will be attending Cashmere High School from the 3 Bays.

We also request that the Review considers extending the 28 bus route twice during the day, at approximately 10am and 2pm, to cater for the needs of locals, particularly the elderly, going to the city for doctors, hospital appointments, shopping and the bank. This would also enable people coming to the local beaches to use the bus and reduce traffic congestion and parking problems.

70 have signed. Let's get to 100!



 At 100 signatures, this petition is more likely to be featured in recommendations!

 First name

 Last name

 Email

☐ Please share my name and email address with Cass Bay Residents Association, so that I can receive updates on this campaign and others.

☒ Display my name and comment on this petition

 **Sign this petition**

By signing, you accept Change.org's [Terms of Service](#) and [Privacy Policy](#), and agree to receive occasional emails about campaigns on Change.org. You can unsubscribe at any time.



Start a petition of your own

This petition starter stood up and took action.
Will you do the same?

[Start a petition](#)

Updates

50 supporters

2 months ago

Cass Bay Residents Association started this petition

2 months ago

Reasons for signing



Cathy Lumwebb · 2 months ago

Our tamariki and Bays do not have a convenient school bus service in 2022. Thank you Ecan for the opportunity to speak at the public forum this morning along with support from Rāpaki community, our roopu are the 3 Bays of Rāpaki, Cass and Corsair. I took with me our community minutes from Nov as well.

♡ 0 · [Report](#)



Rachel Shaw · 2 months ago

I want better bus timetable options

♡ 0 · [Report](#)

[View all reasons for signing](#)



[Report a policy violation](#)

Name	City	State	Postal Code	Country
Philip Duggan	Christchurch			New Zealand
Linda de Paor				New Zealand
Pete F	Wellington	6021		New Zealand
Christie Stevens	Christchurch			New Zealand
Jenny Healey	Christchurch	8013		New Zealand
Olga Naum				New Zealand
Maria Catarina Anastacio				New Zealand
Darryl Veale	Christchurch			New Zealand
Scott Thorp				New Zealand
Luca de Paor Duggan				New Zealand
Alison Begg	Christchurch			New Zealand
Karen Baker	Christchurch			New Zealand
Sandie Hodgson	Christchurch	8014		New Zealand
Silke Wilson				New Zealand
Chris McClay				New Zealand
geoff wilson				New Zealand
Vernon Bruce	New Plymouth			New Zealand
Roger Larkins	Christchurch			New Zealand
Isla Grant				New Zealand
Sue Henkel				New Zealand
Nick Tremewan				New Zealand
Rob Gerrard				New Zealand
Monica Jack	Christchurch			New Zealand
Phil Jack				New Zealand
Shane Vickery	Christchurch			New Zealand
Nicole Vickery	Christchurch			New Zealand
Marie Cooke	Christchurch			New Zealand
Lisa Dickson				New Zealand
frank costello	Christchurch			New Zealand
Peter Bratty	Auckland	1010		New Zealand
Breana Chalmers	Christchurch			New Zealand
Jenny Jack				New Zealand
Donna Fendall	Christchurch			New Zealand
Winner Piseth				New Zealand
Jacinta Burton	Christchurch			New Zealand
Helen Barraclough	Christchurch	8062		New Zealand
Paul Wright				New Zealand
Amy Koskela				New Zealand
Madeleine Sheldon	Warwick	CV34 5JG		New Zealand
Taka Kuze	Christchurch	8052		New Zealand
Michael Cope	Swindon	SN14BZ		New Zealand
Roslyn Sutherland				New Zealand
Thyss Liddell				New Zealand
Carl Hayman	Hamilton			New Zealand
John Kowalewski	Wellington			New Zealand
Ben Hayllar				New Zealand
Judith Reid				New Zealand
Nga-Rongamate Hilda Huriana King	Christchurch			New Zealand
Anne Gibson	Hamilton	3200		New Zealand
Charlotte Jarvis	Wellington			New Zealand
Stella Jameson	Christchurch			New Zealand
Philip Smith	Christchurch			New Zealand
Mary Smith	Christchurch			New Zealand
Tracey Adams	Christchurch	8011		New Zealand

Name	City	State	Postal Code	Country
Elizabeth Grant	Lyttelton			New Zealand
Chiharu Kuze				New Zealand
Martin Healey	Christchurch		8140	New Zealand
Sue Winter				New Zealand
Tom Freedman	Lyttelton			New Zealand
Rachel Shaw	Christchurch		8011	New Zealand
Cathy Lumwebb	Christchurch			New Zealand
Ine Schils				New Zealand
Lisa-Quan Webb				New Zealand
James Chadwick	New Plymouth			New Zealand
Rochelle Tremewan	Christchurch			New Zealand
Jeremy Webb	Lyttelton			New Zealand
A T R	Matamata			New Zealand
Mike Ringdahl				New Zealand
Gary Freedman	London		W1F 7TA	New Zealand
Judie Barbour	Christchurch			New Zealand

7.2. Unconfirmed Council Minutes - 24 February 2022

Council Meeting

Date of meeting	Thursday, 17 March 2022
Author	Christina Eaglin, Committee Advisor
Endorsed by	Catherine McMillan, General Manager Governance

Purpose

1. The previously circulated minutes from the Council Meeting on 24 February 2022 are to be confirmed.

Recommendations

That the Council:

1. receives the minutes from the Council Meeting held 24 February 2022.

Attachments

1. Unconfirmed Minutes - Canterbury Regional Council 540th meeting - 24 February 2022 [7.2.1 - 3 pages]

Minutes of the 540th meeting of the Canterbury Regional Council (under COVID-19 Red Traffic Light restrictions) on Thursday, 24 February 2022 at 10:31 am.

Present

Chair Jenny Hughey, Deputy Chair Peter Scott, Cr Tane Apanui, Cr Phil Clearwater, Cr Grant Edge, Cr Megan Hands, Cr Ian Mackenzie, Cr Nicole Marshall, Cr Claire McKay, Cr Elizabeth McKenzie, Cr Craig Pauling, Cr Lan Pham, Cr Vicky Southworth, and Cr John Sunckell.

Ngā Tumu Taiao: Yvette Couch-Lewis and Iaeen Cranwell

via MS Teams

Report writers and other staff were also present.

1. Mihi/Karakia Timatanga - Opening

Councillor Craig Pauling opened the meeting with a mihi whakatau, followed by Councillor Peter Scott with a karakia.

The Chair advised that the meeting was being recorded and that the recording would be made available on the Council website.

2. Apologies

There were no apologies.

3. Conflicts of Interest

There were no conflicts of interest reported.

4. Public Forum, Deputations and Petitions

There were no requests for public forum, deputations and petitions.

5. Extraordinary and Urgent Business

There was no extraordinary or urgent business.

6. Notices of Motion

There were no notices of motion.

7. Report Items

7.1. Draft Annual Plan 2022/23 Consultation

Resolved CNCL/2022/14

Staff recommendations adopted without change.

That the Council:

1. adopts the Submissions Policy (Attachment 1) as recommended by the Regional and Strategic Leadership Committee

Chair Jenny Hughey/Councillor Peter Scott

CARRIED

2. approves that public consultation on the draft Annual Plan 2022/23 be undertaken in accordance with section 82 of the Local Government Act 2002

Chair Jenny Hughey/Councillor Peter Scott

CARRIED

3. adopts for public consultation:

- 3.1. the 2022/23 Annual Plan Consultation Document Mahere ā Tau tuhinga hei ma tapaki (Attachment 2) for public consultation prepared in accordance with section 95A of the Local Government Act 2002

- 3.2. the draft Annual Plan 2022/23 (Attachment 3) prepared in accordance with section 95 of the Local Government Act 2002, on which the consultation document relies

Chair Jenny Hughey/Councillor Peter Scott

CARRIED

Councillors Megan Hands and Claire McKay requested that their vote against this resolution (#3) be recorded.

4. delegates to the Council's Chief Executive the authority and responsibility for agreeing minor editorial changes to the 2022/23 Annual Plan Consultation Document and draft Annual Plan 2022/23.

Chair Jenny Hughey/Councillor Peter Scott

CARRIED

7.2. Council Submission on 'Our future resource management system' consultation proposal

Staff Recommendations:

That the Council:

1. approves Attachment 1 as the Council's submission on *Our Future Resource Management System / Te pūnaha whakahaere rauemi o anamata*.
2. delegates to the Council's Chief Executive the authority and responsibility to make changes to the submission that are minor or have minor effect.

An amendment was moved by Chair Jenny Hughey and seconded by Councillor Peter Scott to include minor corrections to the submission as follows:

Resolved CNCL/2022/15

That the Council:

1. approves Attachment 1, with the minor corrections as shown, as the Council's submission on *Our Future Resource Management System / Te pūnaha whakahaere rauemi o anamata*.
 - *Edit paragraph 1 on page 1 of the RMA submission to replace the words 'Environment Canterbury' with 'Canterbury Regional Council': "1. Canterbury Regional Council ('Environment Canterbury', 'the Council') welcomes..."*
 - *Edit paragraph 37 on page 6 of the RMA submission to replace the word 'identify' with 'identity': "37. Factors that shape the identity of a place include..."*
2. delegates to the Council's Chief Executive the authority and responsibility to make changes to the submission that are minor or have minor effect.

Chair Jenny Hughey/Councillor Peter Scott

CARRIED

8. Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held on Thursday, 17 March 2022 at 11.00am.

9. Mihi/Karakia Whakamutunga - Closing

A karakia was provided by Councillor Peter Scott.

Meeting concluded at 12:04 pm.

CONFIRMED:

Chair Jenny Hughey
Councillor, Environment Canterbury

Date _____

8. Report Items

8.1. Chief Executive's Report

Council Meeting report

Date of meeting	Thursday, 17 March 2022
Author	Anna Puentener, Principal Strategic Advisor to Chair
Responsible Director	Dr Stefanie Rixecker, Chief Executive

Purpose

1. For the Chief Executive to inform Council of the outcome of three public forum presentations and one petition received at the Council meeting on Thursday 16 February 2022.

Recommendations

That the Council:

1. **notes the outcomes of public presentations and one petition.**

Background

2. Members of the public are welcome to present to Council and committee meetings.
3. Time is set aside at the beginning of each meeting for members of the public to address the Council or committee. These usually take three forms.

Public forum – an individual or group speaking to a matter not necessarily on the Council meeting agenda

Deputation – an individual or group speaking to a matter on the Council meeting agenda

Petition – an individual or group presenting to the Council a petition signed by 20 or more people

4. This report summarises the responses to the three public forum presentations, and one petition that Council received at the 16 February 2022 meeting. One response is ongoing; all other items have received a response.

Public Forums

Increasing ridership from Lyttelton to Christchurch

5. Ms Sarah Van der Burch spoke to Council regarding increasing bike ridership from Lyttelton to Christchurch. The Chair responded to Ms Van der Burch on 9 March 2022.
6. As a result of Ms Van der Burch's presentation, analysis was undertaken on cycle rack usage data from the Lyttelton side of the tunnel. Analysis showed that there is sufficient bike rack availability on the buses departing Lyttelton.
7. The recent service review of Routes 17 and 28 will result in improvements to the Lyttelton runs (15-minute frequency during the day, rather than the current 30 minutes). Together with the 3-slot cycle racks as the standard for multi-modal connectivity, these solutions will provide enhanced connectivity for cyclists who wish to travel into Christchurch from Lyttelton.
8. Ms Van der Burch also raised the issue of reduced fares for cyclists, and she was encouraged to submit on the fare options proposals in Environment Canterbury's draft Annual Plan, currently out for consultation.

Public Transport – Local and national

9. Mr Stephen Howard and Ms Dot Lovell-Smith from Keep Our Assets (Canterbury), spoke to Council about the running of public transport, both locally and nationally. The Chair responded on 9 March.
10. The response included a copy of Environment Canterbury's submission to the Ministry of Transport on the effectiveness of the Public Transport Operating Model (PTOM), which focussed on the importance of higher funding levels, greater agency collaboration, and different models of asset ownership and purchasing, as we transition to a better low-carbon future for public transport.
11. Mr Howard and Ms Lovell-Smith raised concerns about the condition of older buses and were assured that a regular programme of checks is undertaken to identify problems and Environment Canterbury works with suppliers to address them. Customers are encouraged to report any concerns so that quality assurance staff can take action.
12. Mr Howard and Ms Lovell-Smith also raised the issue of bus fares, and they were encouraged to submit on the fare options proposals in Environment Canterbury's draft Annual Plan, currently out for consultation.

Cycle to work scheme

13. Mr Robin Barraclough spoke to Council regarding the development of a 'cycle to work scheme' which would promote the uptake of cycling through salary sacrifice, making the purchase of a bicycle and safety equipment cheaper for employees.
14. Staff are in the process of investigating this type of scheme, and a response is currently being prepared.

Petition

15. Councillor Phil Clearwater, on behalf of the Cass Bay community, tabled a petition on improving the number 28 Bus Route. Jenny Healey, on behalf of Cass Bay residents was in attendance online for this item.
16. The Chair responded on 9 March, noting that consultation has recently taken place on routes 17 and 28, and Environment Canterbury is looking at improving service levels along the route to and from Lyttelton by increasing trip frequency.
17. The petition, and feedback from other residents, will provide Council with an opportunity to further consider how we service the area beyond the Lyttelton township and around the Bays. Council will receive a report on the recent engagement process within the next month. The requests that form part of the petition will be dealt with during our deliberations on this matter.

Next steps

18. A response to Mr Barraclough's presentation is underway and will be provided as soon as possible.
19. Council will receive a report on the engagement process for routes 17 and 28, currently planned for the 13 April 2022 Council meeting.

Attachments

Nil

File reference	[SharePoint link for this paper]
Legal review	
Peer reviewers	[Names of two peer reviewers who have reviewed this paper]

8.2. Climate Emergency Update

Council Meeting report

Date of meeting	Thursday, 17 March 2022
Author	Victoria Clare, Strategy Advisor
Responsible Director	Dr Tim Davie, Director of Science

Purpose

1. Environment Canterbury declared a climate emergency on 16 May 2019, ensuring that climate change is at the centre of the organisation's work and the Council's decision making. The Council has identified a transformational opportunity to 'lead climate change resilience' as part of its strategic direction.
2. Councillors have requested a standing item that provides a cross-portfolio update on Environment Canterbury's climate change resilience and response work.
3. This update is focused on the Climate Resilience Programme of Flood Risk Management Projects, a series of projects within the *Leading Flood and River Resilience Programme*.

Recommendations

That the Council:

1. **receives the update on Environment Canterbury's climate change work.**

Background

4. Environment Canterbury is continuing work on climate change under the Long-Term Plan 2021-2031 by progressing the *Climate Change Resilience* programme, along with integrating climate change initiatives across all portfolios.
5. Work within the *Climate Change and Community Resilience* portfolio includes the *Leading Flood and River Resilience* programme, which focuses on building resilience to climate change for Canterbury's river communities.

Climate Resilience Programme of Flood Risk Management Projects

6. In December 2020, Environment Canterbury signed a contract with the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (MBIE) to deliver \$24.2M of river resilience projects to support the COVID-19 Recovery under the Resilient River Communities programme. The funding is via a co-investment arrangement comprising 64% from MBIE and a 36% local share.
7. This is a nationwide programme to reduce environmental, economic, and social damage caused by flooding, and provide stimulation to local economies and social

wellbeing following disruptions due to COVID-19. One of the objectives of the programme is to fund employment opportunities across the country as part of the COVID-19 Recovery.

8. Environment Canterbury is leading six projects across the region. The programme of work started in January 2021 and must be complete by December 2023.
9. Of the six projects listed below, four are underway and two have been completed.
 - a. Ashely River/Rakahuri vegetation clearance
 - b. Halswell/Huritini weed barrier replacement
 - c. Rangitata 2019 flood recovery
 - d. Regionwide planting and berm transition (23 sites across the region)
 - e. Waiau township stopbank remediation and construction (completed)
 - f. McIntosh's Bend flood protection (completed)

McIntosh's Bend Project

10. McIntosh's Bend is a stretch of river berm on the north bank of the Waimakariri River, on Ferry Road east of the Kaiapoi township. It is a popular fishing, inanga/white-baiting, and bird watching spot and has high recreational values.
11. This section of the river is exposed to a number of hazards due to its location on both a coastal and fluvial floodplain which experiences a high number of erosion events.
12. Completed in October 2021, the \$2.7 million project delivered work to strengthen the existing stopbanks network and reduce flooding risk to over 1000 ha of residential and agricultural land. In addition to hard infrastructure work, walking and access tracks have been upgraded, car park enhancements carried out, picnic table and permanent toilet facilities added, and native planting has taken place. This holistic approach to integrated river management has enabled protection of the community while also enhancing recreational and biodiversity values.
13. This project was among the first to be completed nationally under the Resilient River Communities programme.

Waiau Township Stopbank Project

14. Practical completion of this project was achieved in January 2022, with fencing work in its final stages. The project improves the level of flood protection to the Waiau township, located at the confluence of the Waiau Uwha and Mason Rivers in North Canterbury.
15. The Waiau Uwha River catchment is the third largest catchment in Canterbury at over 3300 km². Waiau Township has around 300 residents and a history of flooding from both the Mason and Waiau Uwha Rivers. In the 20th century, a range of stopbanks had been

constructed but were no longer providing the necessary levels of protection. Additionally, some existing stopbanks were damaged in the 2016 Kaikōura earthquake.

16. This project saw the remediation and strengthening of two existing stopbanks on Inland Road and the construction of a new stopbank on the eastern side of the town, along with removing a significant amount of stopbank vegetation.
17. The new and remediated stopbanks are expected to protect the town from flooding in a 1-in-200-year event.

Attachments

Nil

Peer reviewers	Matt Surman; Bridget Lange
----------------	----------------------------

8.3. Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee

Council Meeting report

Date of meeting	Thursday, 17 March 2022
Author	Jesse Burgess, Senior Strategy Manager
Responsible Director	Katherine Trought, Director Strategy and Planning

Purpose

1. For Environment Canterbury (the Council) to receive for information, the unconfirmed minutes of the Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee meeting held on 11 February 2022.
2. These minutes will be presented to the next meeting of the Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee for confirmation.
3. There were no recommendations from the Committee to Council.

Recommendations

That the Council:

1. **receives the unconfirmed minutes of the Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee meeting held on 11 February 2022**
2. **notes that the minutes of the Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee meeting held on 10 December 2021, presented to Council on 16 February 2022, were confirmed without amendment.**

Attachments

1. Unconfirmed minutes - Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee - 11 February 2022 [8.3.1 - 2 pages]

File reference	[SharePoint link for this paper]
Legal review	
Peer reviewers	Sam Bellamy, Principal Strategy Advisor



Greater Christchurch Partnership

Te Tira Tū Tahi

One Group, Standing Together

Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee OPEN MINUTES

Date: Friday 11 February 2022
Time: 9.01am
Venue: Held by Audio/Video Link

Present

Chairperson

Jim Palmer

Members

Councillor Mike Davidson , Christchurch City Council

Councillor Sara Templeton , Christchurch City Council

Chairperson Jenny Hughey , Environment Canterbury

Councillor Phil Clearwater , Environment Canterbury

Councillor Grant Edge , Environment Canterbury

Mayor Sam Broughton , Selwyn District Council

Councillor Malcolm Lyall , Selwyn District Council

Councillor Sophie McInnes , Selwyn District Council

Mayor Dan Gordon , Waimakariri District Council

Councillor Niki Mealings , Waimakariri District Council

Councillor Neville Atkinson , Waimakariri District Council

Dr Te Maire Tau , Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu

Gail Gordon , Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu

Ingrid Taylor (alternate), Christchurch District Health Board

(Non-Voting Member) James Caygill , New Zealand Transport Agency

Principal Advisor

Katherine Snook

Partnership Manager

Tel: 941 5481

Nathaniel Heslop

Committee and Hearings Advisor

941 6444

nathaniel.heslop@ccc.govt.nz

www.ccc.govt.nz

Karakia – Tīmatanga Opening Incantation

The agenda was dealt with in the following order.

1. Apologies Ngā Whakapāha

Committee Resolved GCPC/2022/00001

That the apologies received from Mayor Lianne Dalziel, Jane Huria, and Sir John Hansen be accepted.

Councillor Sara Templeton/Councillor Malcolm Lyall

Carried

2. Declarations of Interest Ngā Whakapuaki Aronga

There were no declarations of interest recorded.

3. Deputations by Appointment Ngā Huinga Whakaritenga

There were no deputations by appointment.

4. Confirmation of Previous Minutes Te Whakaāe o te hui o mua

Committee Resolved GCPC/2022/00002

That the minutes of the Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee meeting held on Friday, 10 December 2021 be confirmed.

Mayor Dan Gordon/Councillor Mike Davidson

Carried

Karakia – Whakakapi Closing Incantation

Meeting concluded at 9.04am.

CONFIRMED THIS 11 DAY OF MARCH 2022

**JIM PALMER
CHAIRPERSON**

8.4. Improving Our Environmental Reporting System Submission

Council report

Date of meeting	Thursday, 17 March 2022
Author	Olivia Cook, Principal Strategy Advisor
Responsible Director	Katherine Trought, Director Strategy and Planning

Purpose

1. Council is requested to approve a draft submission to the Ministry for the Environment on the consultation document [Improving Aotearoa / New Zealand's environmental reporting system / Te whakawhanake i te pūnaha ripoata taiao o Aotearoa](#).

Recommendations

That the Council:

1. **approves the Council's submission on Improving Aotearoa / New Zealand's environmental reporting system / Te whakawhanake i te pūnaha ripoata taiao o Aotearoa (Attachment Two)**
2. **delegates to the Chief Executive the amendment of any minor or clerical errors in the submission, prior to submitting it to the Ministry for the Environment.**

Key points

- The Ministry for the Environment is seeking feedback on the consultation document [Improving Aotearoa / New Zealand's environmental reporting system / Te whakawhanake i te pūnaha ripoata taiao o Aotearoa](#).
- The consultation document sets out options for changing the Environmental Reporting Act 2015 (ERA). The ERA is the legislative framework for environmental reporting at a national scale.
- Staff have developed a draft submission (Attachment 2) based on advice and feedback from the Regional and Strategic Leadership Committee (RSLC). A cover letter to accompany the submission is appended as Attachment 2.
- Council is requested to approve Attachment 2 as Environment Canterbury's submission on the consultation document.
- The closing date for submissions is 18 March 2022.

- Feedback will be used by the Ministry to inform the next phase of the process which involves the promulgation of an amendment Bill. Opportunities to submit on the Bill will be provided after the Bill has been introduced to Parliament.

Background

2. The Environmental Reporting Act (ERA) is the legislative framework that governs New Zealand's national environmental reporting system. Enacted in 2015 as part of the National Party's blue-green agenda, the Act sets out the purpose, coverage and frequency of environmental reporting in New Zealand, and the roles and responsibilities of the Ministry for the Environment and Statistics New Zealand.
3. Provisions in the ERA direct the Secretary for the Environment and Government Statistician to publish reports every three years setting out the state and pressures facing air, atmosphere and climate, freshwater, land, and marine environments, and impacts for ecological integrity, public health, the economy, te ao Māori and culture and recreation. Therefore, while the ERA does not direct functions and roles of local government, changes to the ERA can have implications for the design and implementation of regional-scale environmental monitoring programmes.
4. In 2019 the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment (PCE) initiated a review into Aotearoa's environmental reporting system¹. Issues identified by the Commissioner included insufficient recognition of te ao Māori and mātauranga Māori, knowledge and data gaps, overlaps in roles and responsibilities, lack of funding to integrate reporting at the national and regional scale, siloed domain-based reporting frameworks, and a near-constant "treadmill" of reporting.
5. In response, the Ministry for the Environment has initiated consultation on proposed options for amending the ERA. This is the first step in a more fulsome consultation process that will involve promulgation of an amendment Bill, public submissions and a select committee hearing.

Overview of the Proposal

6. The consultation document [*Improving Aotearoa / New Zealand's environmental reporting system / Te whakawhanake i te pūnaha ripoata taiao o Aotearoa*](#) sets out four objectives to be achieved through amendments to the ERA. These are:
 - a clear purpose for environmental reporting that drives a focus on key issues and desired outcomes.
 - a comprehensive and co-ordinated environmental reporting system that provides a robust evidence base on the state of New Zealand's environment.
 - increased influence of environmental reporting on decisions that affect or relate to the environment.

¹ PCE Report – Focusing Aotearoa New Zealand's environmental reporting system

- meeting partnership responsibilities relating to Te Tiriti o Waitangi and improving recognition of te ao Māori and mātauranga Māori in environmental reporting.
7. These objectives are proposed to be achieved through ten proposals that:
- clarify the purpose of environmental reporting.
 - mandate a government response to synthesis reports.
 - add “drivers” and “outlooks” to the reporting framework.
 - adjust roles and responsibilities for the Secretary for the Environment and Government Statistician.
 - mandate the requirement for a standing advisory panel.
 - replace domain-based reporting with a theme-based reporting system.
 - reduce the frequency of synthesis reports from three-yearly to six-yearly.
 - replace domain reports with one commentary each year.
 - establish a set of core environmental indicators.
 - strengthen the mechanisms for collecting data.
8. For each proposal, the Ministry has identified options (including its preferred option) and prepared a preliminary cost / benefit analysis. Feedback is sought on all ten proposals, with each accompanied by a set of detailed questions.

Process for developing the submission

9. The process used to develop the draft submission aligns with Council policy. Staff provided the Regional and Strategic Leadership Committee (RSLC) with a list of key themes and questions from the consultation document and staff advice.
10. Feedback and guidance from RSLC members has been used to shape the draft submission, appended as Attachment 2 to this paper.

Key submission points

11. The draft submission highlights the challenge with responding to a proposal of this nature given the number of central government proposals out for consultation, short timeframes to respond and capacity constraints.
12. Overall, the intent and objectives of the proposal are supported, but the submission emphasises the need for the Government to address broader, systemic issues that limit the effectiveness of New Zealand’s environmental reporting system. These include the lack of a high level strategic framework to direct research priorities, information and knowledge gaps, competitive, profit-driven funding models that limit the stability of research programmes, inadequate funding to support incorporation of te ao Māori and mātauranga Māori, and the lack of a nationally co-ordinated system for the collection, collation and sharing of data.

13. In addition, the submission highlights the need for implementation matters to be considered early in the design of the framework, with particular areas requiring attention including funding, resourcing, integration of regional and national scale monitoring programmes and sharing of data and information.
14. Feedback has also been provided on each of the ten proposals. Key points made in the submission include:
- strong support for a framework that enables the Crown to meet its partnership responsibilities as envisioned under Te Tiriti o Waitangi.
 - strong support for incorporation of te ao Māori and mātauranga Māori into the environmental reporting framework.
 - support for the establishment of standing advisory panels to advise on the coverage and focus of commentary reports so as to enable timely and informed decision-making.
 - support for a transition away from the current domain-based reporting system to an integrated theme-based reporting framework that takes into account connections between different parts of the environment.
 - support for the inclusion of “drivers” and “outlooks” in the environmental reporting framework to enable an understanding of the drivers of environmental change and potential future trends and outcomes.
 - support for reducing the frequency of synthesis reports from three-yearly to six yearly to allow sufficient time for meaningful interpretation of ecological data and trend analyses.
 - support for the establishment of a set of core environmental indicators and identifying the need for standards and regulations to enable normalisation of data and sharing between agencies.
 - support for strengthening mechanisms for *voluntary* collection and supply of data, and emphasising the need for funding and resources if mechanisms become mandatory over time.
 - identifying the need for the preparation of a robust and comprehensive cost / benefit analysis that takes into account the full impacts and downstream costs for regional councils.

Cost, compliance and communication

Financial implications

15. A preliminary cost / benefit analysis (CBA) accompanies the consultation document which sets out anticipated costs of the ten proposals for different parties.
16. The submission seeks further detail on the underlying assumptions used to inform the CBA and states downstream costs for regional councils appear to have been significantly underestimated. Costs that do not appear to have been accounted for include the purchase of new equipment to enable monitoring of wider range of

attributes, changes to monitoring programmes to align the location, frequency or timing of monitoring with national frameworks, and purchases of new systems and infrastructure to enable collection, reorganisation and sharing of data between agencies.

Risk assessment and legal compliance

17. There are no risks or issues of legal compliance.

Engagement, Significance and Māori Participation

18. Staff have sought advice from the Tuia team on specific matters to highlight in the submission that are likely to be of relevance to iwi, hapū and Māori. While this advice does not, nor should not, substitute for the views of rūnanga or mana whenua, it has enabled staff to draw attention to matters that need further consideration or evaluation.
19. An overarching theme in the submission is support for a framework that enables the Crown to uphold its obligations as a Treaty partner, and changes to the reporting framework to incorporate te ao Māori and mātauranga Māori. The submission also includes an explicit statement regarding the need for the Crown to engage directly with individual iwi and hapū for how the environmental reporting system can best accommodate takiwā and rohe specific needs.

Consistency with council policy

20. The process for development of the submission is consistent with Council policy.

Climate Change Impacts

21. The design of the national environmental reporting system has implications for our understanding of the drivers of climate change and impacts on ecological integrity, public health, the economy, and culture and recreation. Proposals to focus environmental reporting on highest priority issues, and to increase the influence of environmental reporting in decisions affecting the natural and physical environment should help with planning for and adapting to the effects of climate change.

Next steps

22. If Council approve the draft submission it will be lodged with the Ministry for the Environment on or before 18 March 2022.
23. Feedback on the consultation document will be considered by Ministry officials and inform Cabinet decisions on the preparation of an amendment Bill to the ERA.

Attachments

1. Attachment 1 - Cover Letter: Improving our environmental reporting system [8.4.1 - 1 page]
2. Attachment 2 - Improving our environmental reporting system submission [8.4.2 - 17 pages]

17 March 2022

Ministry for the Environment
PO Box 10362
Wellington 6143

Customer Services
P. 03 353 9007 or 0800 324 636
200 Tuam Street
PO Box 345
Christchurch 8140
www.ecan.govt.nz/contact

Tēnā koutou,

Canterbury Regional Council submission on Improving Aotearoa New Zealand's environmental reporting system / Te whakawhanake i te pūnaha rīpoata taiao o Aotearoa

The Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury) welcomes the opportunity to provide feedback on the consultation document - *Improving Aotearoa New Zealand's environmental reporting system / Te whakawhanake i te pūnaha rīpoata taiao o Aotearoa*.

A fit for purpose environmental reporting system that embodies the principles of Te Tiriti o Waitangi, recognises drivers of environmental change and enables timely, integrated decision-making in response is essential to addressing existential and ecological threats. Environment Canterbury is therefore pleased to see many of the proposals in the consultation document are founded on recommendations in the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment's report *Focusing Aotearoa / New Zealand's environmental reporting system*.

However, a key challenge that remains is how best to integrate environmental reporting at a national and regional scale in a way that is cost-effective for taxpayers and ratepayers. We look forward to seeing how this is addressed as proposals are further developed, and the opportunity to submit on the amendment Bill to the Environmental Reporting Act once introduced to Parliament.

Yours sincerely

Jenny Hughey
Chair, Environment Canterbury

Canterbury Regional Council submission on *Improving Aotearoa New Zealand's environmental reporting system / Te whakawhanake i te pūnaha rīpoata taiao o Aotearoa*

Introduction

1. The Canterbury Regional Council ('Environment Canterbury', 'the Council') welcomes the opportunity to provide early feedback on proposals to improve Aotearoa / New Zealand's environmental reporting system.
2. The Council acknowledges the release of the consultation document and preliminary cost / benefit analysis (CBA) is the first step in a more fulsome consultation process that involves promulgation of an Amendment Bill to the Environmental Reporting Act 2015 (ERA) and a select committee hearing.
3. While the Environmental Reporting Act 2015 (ERA) does not in itself direct functions and duties of local authorities, there is a clear intersect between the Purpose and duties carried out under that Act and those in the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA) and Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA). Understanding the relationship and connections between these Acts is important for ensuring robust option evaluation and cost / benefit assessments.
4. Environment Canterbury's preliminary view is some proposals could have significant cost and resource implications for regional councils. The Council has included indicative data on costs associated with implementation of existing environmental reporting functions. While the Council would have preferred the opportunity to quantify cost and resource impacts for these proposals, the combination of a short consultation period, limited details on operational aspects of the proposal, and the need respond to other central government proposals has prevented this from occurring.
5. On this latter point, the Council wishes to highlight the collective challenge Environment Canterbury, mana whenua and communities face in trying to respond to the breadth of central government proposals out for consultation. Material relating to this consultation alone extends to almost 200 pages, covering 45 questions. Furthermore, this consultation is being carried out in parallel to consultations related to the National Environmental Standard for Drinking Water, Future Pathways Green Paper and reform of the resource management system.
6. As a large organisation Environment Canterbury is fortunate to have some capacity to respond to these proposals but is cognisant others do not. For smaller organisations and partners (i.e. mana whenua) hard choices must be made on which proposals to prioritise and respond to and which to defer. In many ways the current conveyor belt of central government proposals mirrors the "never-ending treadmill" of environmental reporting referred to by the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment (PCE) in his report [Focusing Aotearoa New Zealand's environmental reporting system](#). Both demonstrate an almost non-stop cycle of read, review, respond, repeat, with precious little time and capacity for other functions and duties.
7. Finally, the Council wishes to emphasise the need for these proposals to integrate with objectives sought through other Government reform programmes (e.g. resource management reform, three waters, future for local government). Achieving this requires that connections and overlaps between proposals are identified and options formulated that deliver synergistic benefits. This can only occur if adequate time and opportunity is provided to all participants to read, review and assess the impacts and implications of proposals. Consultations that rush this critical first step in the process risk producing a system that is less effective and less integrated, with piecemeal solutions that do little to advance the Government's overall objectives.

Structure of the Council's feedback

8. Environment Canterbury has included overarching comments on general matters regarding this proposal (Part 1) and detailed responses to questions in the consultation document (Part 2).

Part 1 - General comments

Proposal scope and objectives

9. Environment Canterbury supports the overall objective of an improved environmental reporting system. As noted by the PCE, New Zealand's current environmental reporting system is complex, fragmented and multi-layered, with different agencies carrying out similar and different roles and functions. A review of the environmental reporting system provides an opportunity to identify barriers and weaknesses and formulate options that will improve overall effectiveness and efficiency.
10. However, the consultation document focuses almost exclusively on the ERA and the roles functions and duties of the Secretary for the Environment and the Government Statistician. While the Council agrees improvements can be made to the legislative framework, a myopic focus detracts from broader systemic issues underlying the system. Environment Canterbury expands on these matters later in its submission but emphasises the need for a Government strategy that addresses all barriers and limitations in the system.

The role of local government in environmental reporting

11. Environment Canterbury considers the consultation document underplays the intersect between the ERA and RMA and the significant role local government plays in the collection, curation, management and supply of environmental data.
12. For local authorities, requirements to collect, analyse and report on environmental data are founded within the RMA. Section 5 of the RMA imposes a general obligation on all persons exercising functions, powers and duties to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources. This general obligation manifests as a specific duty through s35 of Act, with local authorities required to gather information, undertake research and monitor the state of the environment. For regional councils with their specific functions¹ related to management of *natural* resources, there is a general emphasis on collection, analysis and reporting of biophysical data.
13. Consequently a clear intersect exists between the functions, responsibilities and types of data collected and reported on by regional councils (and the purpose for which it is used) and those of central government under the Environmental Reporting Act 2015 (ERA). For example, requirements for the Secretary for the Environment and the Government Statistician to prepare reports exploring the state of different domains² and impacts for the economy, public health and culture, share commonalities with local authority duties to monitor the state of the environment and report on plan effectiveness³.
14. Environment Canterbury considers there are opportunities to explore how central and local government functions and duties for environmental reporting can be better integrated, and how systems and processes can be improved to enable access and sharing of data. This is

¹ S30 of the RMA

² Air, atmosphere and climate, freshwater, land and marine

³ S79 of the RMA

essential if the environmental reporting system is to be fit for purpose to meet data needs for future reform programmes (e.g. Three Waters, Resource Management Reform, Future for Local Government).

Giving effect to Te Tiriti and incorporating te ao Māori and mātauranga Māori

15. Environment Canterbury strongly supports the objective of strengthened recognition of Te Tiriti o Waitangi, incorporation of te ao Māori and mātauranga Māori, and enhanced opportunities for Māori participation. While the consultation document seeks feedback on how these objectives can be achieved through each of the ten proposals, Environment Canterbury has elected to set out common principles and matters to consider in the design of the framework.
16. First and foremost for the Crown to meet its obligations as a Treaty partner, principles of active partnership, participation and protection and recognition of iwi rangatiratanga over mātauranga Māori must be reflected in the design of the system. Delivering a reporting framework that embodies these principles requires direct engagement between the Crown and iwi and hapū. It is iwi and hapū who hold rangatiratanga to say how treaty settlements can best be reflected in the design of the system and how takiwā and rohe specific needs can be accommodated.
17. Particular matters needing to be contemplated in the design of a framework include:
 - how best to accommodate iwi and hapū differences in te ao Māori (i.e. explicit recognition that there is no singular, universal te ao Māori perspective).
 - how to enable collection and storage of different types of mātauranga Māori, including inter-generational knowledge passed down through oral histories, social and familial connections with place, traditional practices and mātauranga exchange.
 - how best to design a system that keeps mātauranga in the hands of iwi and hapū.
 - how to preserve iwi and hapū rangatiratanga over taonga.
 - how to enable sharing of data and information between agencies without compromising iwi sovereignty over data.
 - how to embed partnership approaches through shared responsibilities and joint functions.
18. Environment Canterbury is already turning its mind to these questions as it embarks on a partnership programme with Papatipu Rūnanga to design and develop a mātauranga Māori monitoring programme. The first step in that programme involves scoping the framework before moving forward together to consider matters related to implementation. There may be opportunities to share learnings and explore opportunities for how the design of the regional mātauranga Māori monitoring framework could integrate with frameworks developed at the national scale.

Implementation

19. Environment Canterbury considers substantial further detail is needed on proposed changes to operational components of the environmental reporting system. While the Council appreciates some details may be clarified later, a high-level outline of key components should be signalled now to enable considered feedback on efficacy, adequacy and efficiency of design. Matters requiring attention include:
 - mechanisms for embedding te ao Māori across the environmental reporting system and systems and processes proposed for the collection and monitoring of mātauranga Māori.
 - the distribution of functions, roles and responsibilities across different agencies.

- information on the types and scale (i.e. temporal / spatial) of data to be collected through the system.
- funding and investment to support iwi and hapū build capacity.
- funding and investment to enable local government and Crown Research Institutes (CRIs) to:
 - align with national monitoring programmes (e.g. funding for new infrastructure and equipment and funding to enable changes to the frequency or location of monitoring)
 - improve integration of different datasets.
 - collect, store and share data.
 - provide data to a national reporting system in an automated manner.

Part 2 – Responses to questions in the

consultation document.

20. Environment Canterbury's has structured its responses to align with the order of the questions in the consultation document. Questions are shown in bold, followed by the Council's response. Where questions cover related matters these have sometimes been collated and a single response provided.

Opportunities and Objectives

Would you add any issues to this list? Why?

21. Environment Canterbury agrees the consultation document identifies the key issues limiting the effectiveness of the ERA as a framework for environmental reporting.
22. However, as outlined in the Council's introductory comments there are broader, systemic issues that undermine the effectiveness of the reporting system and which need to be addressed. These include:
 - the absence of a high-level strategic framework to direct research priorities.
 - competitive, profit-driving funding models that discourage collaboration and data and information sharing between organisations and limit the stability of research programmes.
 - a reliance on philanthropic organisations and educational institutions to backfill data gaps and carry out new research and investigations.
 - the lack of a nationally co-ordinated environmental system for the collection, collation and sharing of data.
 - inadequate funding to support the incorporation of te ao Māori and mātauranga Māori into environmental reporting frameworks.
 - restrictions on access and use of data (including costs associated with access to data).

Which of these issues are the most important to fix? Why?

23. Environment Canterbury considers all issues need to be fixed, including the underlying systemic issues outlined above. Ideally this process would consider connections between

issues, identify barriers and root causes of problems, and result in the promulgation of an overarching strategy in response. The Council remains concerned that addressing issues in isolation risks piecemeal approaches, with band-aid solutions that do little to address underlying systemic problems.

24. With regards to specific issues with the ERA, the Council considers it important to first address issues with the Act's foundational elements (i.e. its deficient Purpose statement and insufficient recognition of Te Tiriti o Waitangi) before addressing operational components (e.g. functions, roles, deficient datasets, reporting systems). Fixing the "building blocks" of the Act will provide the clarity required to inform the design of an efficient and effective environmental reporting system.

Are these objectives the most effective for improving environmental reporting? If not, what should the objectives be, and why?

25. Environment Canterbury agrees the four objectives set out in the consultation document are appropriate.
26. However, the Council cautions some objectives cannot be achieved through changes to the ERA alone. For example, *"increasing the influence environmental reporting has on decisions affecting the environment"* requires changes to other legislation to increase the weight given to environmental reporting when making decisions relating to the natural and physical environment. Examples of statutes that may require amendment include the Climate Change Response Act and RMA, and proposed future statutes including the Strategic Planning Act, Natural and Built Environments Act and Climate Adaptation Act.
27. Similarly, achieving the objective of a *"clearly defined co-ordinated reporting system that gives a robust comprehensive, authoritative evidence base on the state of New Zealand's environment"* requires changes to systems and processes that sit outside the ERA. For example, changes to systems, processes and infrastructure used to collect, store and share data between different agencies, including local government.

Proposal 1: Clarifying the purpose of environmental reporting

Proposal description: Clarify the purpose of the ERA to include why we are reporting on the state of the environment, and what the reports are supposed to achieve.

Do you agree with the proposal to expand the purpose of the ERA to include the reasons why we need environmental reporting? Please explain your answer.

28. Environment Canterbury supports the proposal to clarify the Purpose of the ERA in line with the Ministry's preferred option (Option 1).
29. Clarifying the Purpose of the Act through changes that set out what is sought to be achieved and the reasons why, but which refrain from stating how that will be achieved, accord with legislative principles for the drafting of Purpose statements.
30. In addition, there are sound efficiency reasons for deferring details relating to the mechanics of the reporting system to other parts of the legislation. Keeping these components separate should enable future changes to the provisions relating to design of the framework to be made with relative ease, should they be required.

The initial preferred option for this proposal sets out four points. Are these a suitable basis for a purpose statement? What changes, if any, do you consider are needed to focus, expand or improve them?

31. Environment Canterbury agrees the four points form an appropriate basis for the Purpose statement. However, further attention needs to be given to how these will be worded to ensure the final text aligns with intent. Suggestions for improvement include:
- Bullet Point 1 – consider substituting “authoritative” with “trusted and reliable”. The term “authoritative” could be misconstrued as inferring reports have power or authority to compel action rather than being sources of trusted information.
 - Bullet Point 3 – retain the phrase “culturally inclusive” but consider omitting the example (e.g. “aligning with te ao Māori values and perspectives”). While the intent is supported, the inclusion narrows the Act’s Purpose to a single cultural group and creates a conflict with other obligations in the Act (e.g. s8(2) of the Act) that require broader reporting on culture and recreation.
 - Bullet Point 3 – consider expanding the phrase “meeting the needs of Māori” to “meeting the needs of Māori, iwi and hapū”. This change would acknowledge that Māori, iwi and hapū have different and diverse needs.

In your view, have we overlooked any costs, benefits, risks or opportunities? Please describe these and any mitigations.

32. As outlined above, Environment Canterbury considers a key risk with a reframed Purpose statement is misinterpretation or ambiguity. If a clear Purpose statement is not delivered this will have consequences for the drafting of downstream components of the legislation (e.g. provisions relating to the design of the monitoring and reporting framework) and as a result the Act may fail to deliver on the proposal’s objectives. However, the Council considers this risk should be mitigated through opportunities to review and submit on the Amendment Bill, once introduced to Parliament.

Proposal 2: Mandate a Government response to synthesis reports

Proposal description: Require the Government to formally acknowledge synthesis reports within six months and release an action plan within 12 months.

Do you agree with the proposal to require the Minister for the Environment and other relevant Ministers to release a staged response to synthesis reports? Please give your reasons.

33. Environment Canterbury supports the proposal to mandate a response from Government, to require the Minister for the Environment to co-ordinate the Government’s response, and to stage the process for receiving synthesis reports and preparing responses.
34. A 6-month gap between the Government receiving and acknowledging the report should provide sufficient time for the implications of the report to be discussed and communicated. A further six months to enable the formulation of an action plan should provide sufficient time to consult relevant Ministries, iwi and hapū and develop policy options.

If you disagree, should anyone be required to make a formal response? Who and why?

35. Environment Canterbury has not identified any additional parties that should be mandated to make a formal response. However processes should be kept flexible enough to allow for a select committee hearing on the Government’s response, if required.

36. The Council is pleased to see these proposals do not fetter the PCE's mandate or alter his powers to investigate Government systems and processes related to the management, allocation, use and preservation of natural resources. This preserves an important check and balance on the system and provides the PCE with the opportunity to review and investigate Government responses and action plans, should he choose to do so.

Should the ERA specify the layout and style of a government response? If yes, what should the response include?

37. Environment Canterbury does not support the layout and style of the Government's response being specified in the ERA. The benefits of standardisation (e.g. consistency, efficiency etc) are outweighed by potential costs (e.g. constrained reporting and inflexibility to expand on issues requiring attention). If however, the Ministry considers it necessary to standardise these matters, the appropriate place to do so is in secondary legislation (i.e. regulations and standards) rather than the Act.

If the Government is required by the ERA to respond to a synthesis report's findings, is anything more needed? If so, what?

38. Environment Canterbury considers there may be merit in the ERA specifying mandatory matters to be addressed in the Government's response. This would add a layer of rigour to the process and provide confidence that the response covers all relevant matters. Matters suggested for inclusion:
- a description of the over-arching strategy to be implemented.
 - a summary of the relevant "drivers" that have contributed to the issue which pulls together information from State of the Environment (SOE) and commentary reports.
 - a description of policy options considered, an evaluation of the costs, benefits, efficiency and efficacy of each option, and a concise summary that sets out the Government's preferred option and reasons – akin to an evaluation report prepared under s32 of the RMA.
 - an action plan that sets out key initiatives and pathways proposed in response, including:
 - further research or investigations to be initiated.
 - responses (legislative and non-statutory mechanisms).
 - processes, systems and tools to be established or adapted.
 - investments and funding.
 - timeframes for actions and next steps.
 - processes for reviewing the effectiveness of action plans.
39. In addition, the Council suggests it would be useful for the Government to have discretion to include any other matters it considers relevant in its response. Retaining this flexibility is important to avoid inappropriate and undue constraints on reporting and to enable content to be adapted to the circumstances that apply.

In what way could a formal response adequately address the needs of te ao Māori?

40. Environment Canterbury considers it is challenging to provide a response to this question given the way in which it is framed. Te ao Māori is a concept that acknowledges the interconnectedness and inter-relationship of all living and non-living things, rather than a person or subject with defined "needs". Government responses should be prepared by applying a te

ao Māori lens. In practice this requires recognition of complex interactions within and across systems and implementation of holistic, integrated responses.

41. If however, the question is intended to be framed as *“how could a formal response adequately meet the needs of Māori?”* then the Council considers the preparation of a “formal response” provides an opportunity for the Government to meet its obligations as a Treaty partner. For example, exploring opportunities for Government, iwi and hapū to jointly develop the Government response and shared roles, responsibilities and functions for environmental reporting.

Do you consider a response is necessary for all environmental reports or commentaries specified in the ERA (that is, not just synthesis reports)? If yes, why?

42. Environment Canterbury considers it would be appropriate for the Government to acknowledge receipt of commentary reports and to set out at a high level next steps and actions. This could involve simply noting issues and identifying steps to review and respond to issues at a later stage in the process (e.g. through the Government’s response to a synthesis report). Given the importance of avoiding a ‘treadmill or reporting’, the Council agrees that any response should be proportionate and efficient.

In your view, have we overlooked any costs, benefits, risks or opportunities? Please describe these and any mitigations.

43. Yes. The preliminary cost / benefit analysis estimates costs to CRIs and regional councils at \$0. The Council considers this entirely unrealistic.
44. Costs incurred by regional councils are likely to include time and labour spent collating and supplying information to Government to inform the development of synthesis reports. Examples of types of requests anticipated, include requests for information on council policies and programmes implemented to address issues at a regional or local scale, and environmental monitoring data showing current state and future trends.
45. In addition, depending on the nature of the Government’s response, regional councils could incur significant costs if action plans recommend changes to legislation or policies. Potential costs include those that arise from the need to adjust environmental monitoring programmes (i.e. purchase of new equipment to collect, store and transfer data, or changes to the frequency, timing or location of monitoring) and costs associated with changing planning documents to meet new obligations. By way of example, Environment Canterbury anticipates the combined planning costs associated with development and notification of a new regional policy statement and plan that gives effect to the revised policy framework in the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020 will reach ~\$20 million by 2024. These costs apply in addition to costs related to adjusting the Council’s environmental monitoring programmes to account for the NPSFM 2020’s expanded range of freshwater attributes and changed metrics (annual costs of ~\$900,000 – which apply in addition to base costs for the freshwater monitoring programme of ~\$12 million annually).

Proposal 3: Add drivers and outlooks to the reporting framework

Proposal description: Extend the pressure-state-impact framework to include a requirement for information on drivers (factors that cause the pressures on the environment) and outlooks (how the state of the environment may change in the future, and the likely impact of such changes).

Do you agree with the proposal to add drivers and/or outlooks to the reporting framework? Please give reasons. What benefits or drawbacks do you see in including drivers or outlooks?

46. Yes. Environment Canterbury supports the inclusion of drivers and outlooks in the environmental reporting framework (Option 1).
47. One of the limitations of the ERA's current environmental reporting framework (PSI - Pressure, State, Impact) is it fails to account for "drivers" of environmental change (e.g. human activities, influences and natural events) and causal links to environmental "pressures" (e.g. pollutants). The inclusion of "drivers" rectifies this deficiency and provides a clear line of sight between the drivers of change, pressures, impact and state.
48. The inclusion of "outlooks" is also supported on the basis that these will help foreshadow future outcomes and trends that would arise in the absence of intervention. Ideally these should be accompanied by set of assumptions to ensure transparency and enable quantification of the impacts of different policy options. The inclusion of outlooks is an appropriate precursor to the final exercise of preparing a Government response – an exercise that is appropriate to carry out independently given political considerations and the need for aligned and integrated policy responses.
49. Overall, the proposed changes will result in a framework that more closely aligns to the internationally recognised DPSIR⁴ system, albeit with "reporting" and "response" elements segregated. As a consequence, the framework is likely to contribute to achieving the proposal's overall objectives of a more robust, comprehensive reporting system that enables informed decision-making.

If the expanded DPSIR (plus outlooks) framework is not suitable for reporting, what other framework should be adopted, and why?

50. N/A. Environment Canterbury agrees with the proposal to use a modified version of the DPSIR framework.
51. DPSIR is a tried and tested framework that enables identification and reporting on human-environment connections and the development of policy responses that have a clear intervention logic. While variations of the DPSIR framework have been used (e.g. PSI), these fall short when measured up against the benefits offered by the fuller framework.

In your view, have we overlooked any costs, benefits, risks or opportunities? Please describe these and any mitigations.

52. Yes. Environment Canterbury considers the CBA fails to account for the full range of costs that may arise as a result of the inclusion of drivers and outlooks. Factors likely to influence the scale and distribution of costs include:
 - the types of new or additional data needed to understand drivers and make informed predictions on outlooks.
 - the robustness and completeness of baseline datasets.
 - infrastructure, data and systems needed to enable data collection and sharing of information.

⁴ Drivers, Pressure, State, Impact, Response

- the distribution of responsibilities for data collection (for example, will central government agencies collect data required to prepare drivers and outlooks or will responsibilities be devolved to local government and other agencies?)

Proposal 4: Adjust roles and responsibilities

Proposal description: Adjust the roles and responsibilities for the Secretary for the Environment and the Government Statistician to reduce overlaps and ensure that each organisation uses their expertise, with:

- the Secretary for the Environment as the steward for New Zealand's environment
- the Government Statistician as the leader of the official statistics system.

Do you agree with the proposal to adjust the roles and responsibilities of the Secretary for the Environment and the Government Statistician? Why?

53. Yes. Environment Canterbury supports the proposal to amend the ERA and align the roles and responsibilities of the Secretary for the Environment, the Government Statistician and Stats NZ with recommendations in the PCE's report (Option 1). Clarifying and delineating roles and responsibilities should improve independence, accountability and efficiency of the system.

Should the ERA state that the Secretary for the Environment and the Government Statistician may/must invite Māori to take part in preparing environmental reports? Why? Do you consider there are broader roles and responsibilities for Māori under the ERA?

54. Environment Canterbury agrees the ERA should be amended to provide opportunities for Māori, iwi and hapū to take part in the preparation of environmental reports.
55. However, the Council emphasises any amendments must be drafted in a way that enables, rather than mandates, participation. Māori, iwi and hapū are already under significant pressure to engage and participate in central and local government programmes. Well-meaning but misguided drafting that mandates Māori involvement, risks exacerbating existing capability and capacity constraints.
56. Furthermore, if the Crown is to meet its obligations as a Treaty partner it must go further than simply enabling opportunities for participation through legislative and policy changes. Adequate funding is needed to enable mana whenua to build capacity and capability, and opportunities must be explored for sharing of functions and roles.

Do other agencies have roles and responsibilities related to environmental reporting that in future should be specified in the ERA?

57. No. Environment Canterbury considers the ERA should retain its narrow focus as legislation governing environmental reporting at the national scale, with roles and responsibilities confined to those of the Secretary for the Environment and Government Statistician.
58. While there may be other central government agencies (e.g. DOC) and CRIs (e.g. Manaaki Whenua) who carry out research or contribute knowledge, data and information central to environmental reporting, these should not be specified in the Act. If these matters need to be clarified, the appropriate place to do so is through changes to regulations and standards prepared under relevant principal Acts.
59. Furthermore, if changes to environmental reporting frameworks implemented at the regional or local scale are required, these are best achieved through amendments to other legislation (e.g. through changes to the RMA or through new provisions in the SPA and NBA). Maintaining a

separation between the roles and accountabilities of each arm of government should help to improve clarity, reduce duplication and improve efficiency.

In your view, have we overlooked any costs, benefits, risks or opportunities? Please describe these and any mitigations.

60. Yes. Environment Canterbury considers there are opportunities to clarify and define the responsibilities of the Secretary for the Environment and the Government Statistician.
61. Option 1 proposes both agents retain responsibility for “checking the consistency and accuracy of statistics and indicators used in reporting in conjunction with the Ministry”. In the Council’s opinion, dual responsibilities contribute to reduced accountability and reduced efficiency of the system. Opportunities to split functions and align responsibilities with each role’s specialist area should be explored. For example, making the Secretary for the Environment responsible for checking the consistency and accuracy of information contained in the reports and commentaries, and the Government statistician responsible for checking the consistency and accuracy of indicators and statistics.

Proposal 5: Mandate a standing advisory panel

Proposal description: Require the establishment of a standing advisory panel under the Environmental Reporting Act 2015.

Do you foresee any problems with the proposal to make it a statutory requirement to establish a standing advisory panel under the ERA? Please describe.

62. No, provided the system is able to attract suitable candidates for appointment to the Standing Advisory Panel (SAP). See our response further down on this matter (paras 66 – 67).

What range of perspectives do you think the standing advisory panel needs to include?

63. Given the breadth of subject matter covered by environmental reporting, members of the SAP will need expertise in environmental, social, cultural and economic matters and perspectives from iwi and hapū to enable coverage of te ao Māori and mātauranga Māori.
64. In addition, given the technical basis of the environmental reporting framework, panels should have expertise in, or access to experts familiar with, the application of the DPSIR framework.

What responsibilities should the standing advisory panel have?

65. Responsibilities should include:
 - monitoring international science and data and identifying new / emerging global issues and trends of relevance to New Zealand.
 - making recommendations on areas to focus on for environmental reporting.
 - making recommendations on new / additional indicators and statistics to include in environmental reporting.
 - identifying gaps in environmental reporting, and / or new information needs.

In your view, have we overlooked any costs, benefits, risks or opportunities? Please describe these and any mitigations.

66. Yes. Benefits of legislating the establishment of an SAP include the sense of permanence it creates for panel members and an easier pathway to securing funding through Government Budget rounds. These benefits should help attract a higher number of quality candidates to roles.
67. The greatest risk with legislating for an SAP is it places a binding obligation on the Government which may be difficult to meet if suitable candidates cannot be found. Factors likely to influence a candidate's decision on whether to apply for a role include remuneration, time and amount of participation required, conflicts of interest, and terms of engagement.

Proposal 6: Replace environmental domain reports with cross-domain themes

Proposal description: Replace environmental domains with cross-domain themes that form the basis of synthesis reports and in-between commentaries.

What are some pros and cons of a theme-based approach for both synthesis reports and in-between commentaries? Should another approach be used? If yes, why?

68. Environment Canterbury supports the proposal for a theme-based approach for synthesis reports and commentaries. A benefit of theme-based reporting is that it treats the environment as one interconnected system, thereby embodying practical application of te ao Māori to management of the natural and physical world. This contrasts starkly with the current domain-based reporting where artificial boundaries between air, land, freshwater, and marine environments are used to define the edges and scope of each report.
69. In addition, a theme-based reporting system is wholly compatible with the DPSIR framework. As outlined earlier, the DPSIR framework assumes a chain of causal links between drivers (e.g. urban intensification), pressures (e.g. pollutants), states (physical, biological, chemical) and impacts (e.g. health, ecosystem). As a consequence, the framework should help with the formulation of holistic policy responses that treat the environment as an integrated whole rather than the sum of its parts. The shift from domain to theme-based reporting should assist central and local government to plan and respond to current and future challenges (e.g. adaptation and improved resilience to the impacts of climate change) and support the development of next-generation planning frameworks that implement a ki uta ki tai approach to management of natural and physical systems.

Do you think the themes in Environment Aotearoa 2019 (Table 2), or those proposed by the PCE, or some other themes are the right ones to use? Are they broad enough to give certainty for future environmental reporting?

70. Environment Canterbury notes neither option (Environment Aotearoa / PCE option) is a purist theme-based reporting system. Both are hybridisations of two or more concepts – with the PCE proposal combining environmental indicators (e.g. biodiversity) and domains (e.g. land), and the Environment Aotearoa option combining environmental indicators (e.g. biodiversity) and resource use (e.g. land use).
71. As a consequence, for either option cross-cutting themes and overlaps are likely and there is a risk issues could fall through the gaps if clear guidance is not provided on the scope and boundary of each theme. By way of example, it is unclear whether the “land use” theme would address only impacts on terrestrial environments that relate to the use of land, or whether it would include impacts on connected environments arising from land use (e.g. loss of natural

character in braided rivers systems from encroachment of adjacent land uses, or loss of marine biodiversity as a result of heavy metal pollution from urban land).

72. An alternative approach is to adopt a more purist theme-based system with themes that are agnostic of domain and resource use. For example, themes correlating to key issues or values e.g. “biodiversity and ecosystems”, “climate change and variability”, “landscape and natural character” and “human health and wellbeing”. This approach would score highly against the four criteria in Appendix 3 of the consultation document (effective, certain, independent, cost efficient) and rate higher for ‘certainty’ than Option 1 or 2.

In your view, have we overlooked any costs, benefits, risks or opportunities? Please describe these and any mitigations.

73. No additional costs, benefits, risks or opportunities identified.

Proposal 7: Reduce the frequency of synthesis reports to six-yearly

Proposal description: Move from a three-yearly to six-yearly cycle for synthesis reports.

Is six-yearly reporting an appropriate interval for synthesis reports? Which timeframe do you prefer, and why?

74. Environment Canterbury supports a six-yearly reporting interval for synthesis reports (Option 1).
75. For environmental reporting to offer value and promote informed decision-making, intervals between reporting cycles must take into account environmental and political considerations. Where freshwater reporting is concerned, a minimum of five years’ monitoring data is needed to enable data to be interpreted in a meaningful way and for trends to be analysed and identified.
76. Arguments put forward for a six-yearly reporting cycles are stronger than those put forward for any of the alternatives. While a five-yearly reporting cycle (Option 2) would align the frequency of environmental reporting with that used in most other OECD countries, this option is considered inappropriate given New Zealand’s short electoral cycles (3 years) and the need to fit reporting in between long-term insight briefings. A four-yearly reporting cycle would also be problematic if New Zealand shifts to longer political terms in the future.

In your view, have we overlooked any costs, benefits, risks or opportunities? Please describe these and any mitigations.

77. Environment Canterbury has not identified any additional costs, benefits, risks or opportunities.

Proposal 8: Replace domain reports with one commentary each year

Proposal description: Between six-yearly synthesis reports, replace the six-monthly domain reports with one theme-based commentary each calendar year.

What are some pros and cons of changing the frequency of in-between commentaries to a priority basis, with no mandatory coverage of all themes in a reporting cycle. In your view, have we overlooked any costs, benefits, risks or opportunities? Please describe these and any mitigations.

78. Environment Canterbury supports the proposal to require one theme-based commentary each calendar year and for the Standing Advisory Panel to recommend the sequencing and

timeframes for preparation of each report (Option 1). Benefits include that it enables resource and effort to be targeted at the highest priority theme, thereby enabling timely intervention.

79. While there are some risks⁵ with not mandating coverage of all themes within commentary reports, the Council acknowledges the need for a reporting system that strikes an appropriate balance between efficiency and effectiveness. Overall, the Council considers the proposed changes should help shift the system from one where “reporting occurs for reporting’s sake” to one where reporting has a clear purpose – supporting timely and informed decision-making.
80. There are also risks with making Standing Advisory Panels responsible for advising on the timing and focus of commentary reports. Risks include “panel capture” with SAPs recommending areas of focus that align with areas of interest or importance to the panel rather than highest priority issues. However, these risks can be mitigated through checks and balances in the system that add rigour and transparency to decision-making processes. Suggested mechanisms for achieving this include:
 - mandating a requirement for SAPs to state reasons, and criteria considered, when making recommendations on areas of focus for commentary reports, and reasons for omitting themes (e.g. no change in environmental indicators, less urgency relative to other themes).
 - preserving the role of the Secretary for the Environment as decision-maker for areas of focus for reports, and requiring the Secretary to state reasons for not adopting the SAP’s recommendations (so as to avoid perceptions of political interference or lobbying.)

Proposal 9: Establish a set of core environmental indicators

Proposal description: Define a set of environmental indicators in the regulations, to help achieve the purpose of the Environmental Reporting Act 2015.

Do you foresee any problems with the proposal to establish a set of core environmental indicators? Please describe.

81. With the exception of environmental indicators for mātauranga Māori, Environment Canterbury does not foresee any problems with establishing a core set of indicators.
82. Regional councils have demonstrated agreement on national indicators can be reached as demonstrated through the Environmental Performance Indicator Programme. However, the key challenge is agreeing standardised methods so that data can be shared, combined and compared regardless of the agency collecting it and individual differences in collection and statistical methods.
83. Responding to this challenge requires standards and regulations that normalise data for parameters collected at different scales (i.e. spatial or temporal), or which have been analysed using different statistical methods. Furthermore, for environmental reporting to be meaningful agreements must be reached on how data are sorted, organised and classified (i.e. meta data standards) so as to enable efficient access, retrieval and sharing of data across systems and databases.
84. Finally, the Council also supports the proposal to state core indicator themes in regulations (as opposed to the ERA) and providing flexibility to the Ministry for the Environment and Stats NZ to select appropriate indicators for use in reporting. This approach should provide the greatest

⁵ E.g. incomplete datasets, incomplete understanding of drivers, threats and risks

benefits (e.g. standardisation, faster, easier processes for making changes to indicators) and avoid inefficiencies and cost associated with unnecessary or irrelevant reporting.

What are some pros and cons of publishing updates to environmental indicators outside the reporting cycle?

85. Environment Canterbury considers a benefit of publishing environmental indicators outside the reporting cycle is it enables indicators in environmental reporting carried out by other agencies (e.g. SOE reporting by regional councils) to be aligned in a timely fashion. This should result in a more agile reporting system and easier integration and sharing of datasets between different agencies (e.g. OECD, CRIs, central and local government).

In your view, have we overlooked any costs, benefits, risks or opportunities? Please describe these and any mitigations.

86. The preliminary cost / benefit analysis estimates the combined labour input from regional councils as four full-time-equivalents (FTE) with combined on-going costs of \$830,000 per year.
87. Further details are needed on assumptions that underpin the cost-estimate to enable the Council to assess the validity and distribution of impacts (e.g. individual vs sector costs). At face value, downstream costs to regional councils appear significantly underestimated. For example, while costs associated with the formulation of new environmental indicators have been accounted for, costs arising from the need to change regional council SOE monitoring programmes appear absent from calculations.
88. Depending on the types of environmental indicators specified, and how regulations for standardisation of data are expressed, costs may be incurred in the form of purchases of new equipment to sample and collect data, new systems to enable visualisation, storage, sharing and transfer of data, and changes to the frequency, timing or location of monitoring. It is these consequential, downstream costs that will comprise the bulk of the cost burden for regional councils, and which need to be accounted for in the design of the new framework.

Proposal 10: Strengthen the mechanisms for collecting data

Include new provisions in the Environmental Reporting Act 2015 to set out powers for acquiring existing data for national environmental reporting.

Do you foresee any problems with the proposal to include provisions in the ERA to require the supply of data for national environmental reporting? Please describe.

89. Environment Canterbury considers there are aspects of the proposal that need to be clarified before the Council can respond to this question. While Option 1 is described as a proposal where provisions are inserted into the ERA to enable the collection of data on a voluntary basis, subsequent statements infer this will become mandatory over time. For example, statements in the consultation document include:
- “the first step would be to request the data be supplied on a voluntary basis” (p56)
 - “requesting the supply of data on a voluntary basis would allow for agreements for the supply of data to be developed, which could include requirements to ensure data is fit for reporting purposes” (p57)
 - “option 1 is the initial preferred option. Creating provisions under ERA would give the Secretary or the Government statistician authority to request, and in limited circumstances, require information for reporting.” (p58)

90. Overall, Environment Canterbury prefers Option 1 (relative to other options) provided collection and supply of data remains voluntary. If these become mandatory requirements, additional funds and resource will be needed to enable obligations to be met. Provision of funding will be particularly critical where new regulations are introduced which specify data to be collected using different parameters or formats, or where changes are needed to enable data to be reorganised and reclassified to enable sharing and transfer between agencies.

In your view, have we overlooked any costs, benefits, risks or opportunities? Please describe these and any mitigations.

91. Having reviewed the CBA, the Council considers it is difficult to assess the validity of the cost estimate without a granular breakdown showing costs for each agency. The CBA includes a combined cost estimate of \$1.8 million upfront and \$4.2 million on-going, for “other organisations”. It is not clear from the document who these “other organisations” might be and whether it includes local authorities.
92. Consequently, the Council’s preliminary view is the cost estimates may be too conservative, particularly if data collection and supply become mandatory over time. As outlined above, significant costs could be incurred by regional councils in the purchase of infrastructure and adjustments to environmental monitoring programmes. Furthermore, the CBA states cost estimates for this proposal are presented on the basis that “agencies external to central government will be reimbursed on a full cost-recovery basis”⁶. However, the Council can find no such assurances in the consultation document. This places the Council in the difficult position of being unable assess the accuracy of the cost impacts of this proposal.

Summary of estimated additional funding needs, benefits and risks

Have we correctly noted all the high-level costs and benefits of these proposals? Are there any others?

93. No. Environment Canterbury considers there are other benefits and costs that have not been acknowledged in the consultation document. Please refer to our responses above.

What costs and benefits, if any, would any or all these proposed changes have for you or your organisation?

94. Please refer to our responses above.

We are planning a full benefit-cost analysis after assessing all submissions. What, if any, information should we include in that analysis?

95. Environment Canterbury supports the proposal to prepare a full cost-benefit analysis of the proposals. Matters that should be included or addressed in the analysis include:
- further details on assumptions used to underpin cost / benefit analyses.
 - a detailed breakdown of costs / benefits for different sectors and parties (e.g. central government, regional councils).
 - inclusions and exclusions factored into cost estimates.

⁶ p9 [Preliminary Cost Benefit Analysis - Allen & Clarke](#)

- expectations regarding the extent / timeframes for alignment between national and regional environmental reporting frameworks.

Do you have any further comments?

96. The combined expenditure by the regional sector (16 councils) c.2014 for state of the environment monitoring and reporting was calculated at \$40 million per annum. In 2014, the regional sector identified this per annum cost as part of its business planning for developing LAWA. It is important to note that state of the environment monitoring is not cheap and carries costs beyond the development of a set of indicators (and regulations). Full cost accounting will be needed as a next step to estimate the implementation costs for all agencies involved, including for ongoing provision of indicator data once the national system is operational.

8.5. Taumata Arowai Submission

Council Meeting report

Date of meeting	Thursday, 17 March 2022
Author	Anita Fulton, Senior Strategy Advisor - Water and Land
Responsible Director	Dr Tim Davie, Director of Science

Purpose

1. To gain Council's approval for Canterbury Regional Council's submission to Taumata Arowai on its proposed drinking water documents. Making a submission is important as the Council wants a water regulatory framework that is aligned and delivers quality outcomes.

Recommendations

That the Council:

1. **approves the Council's submission to Taumata Arowai on proposed drinking water documents (Attachment Two)**
2. **delegates to the Chief Executive the amendment of any minor or clerical errors in the submission, prior to submitting it to Taumata Arowai.**

Background

2. Taumata Arowai is the new water services regulator for Aotearoa – they are the regulator of drinking water, with an oversight role in relation to wastewater and stormwater systems. This includes the setting of standards and ensuring drinking water suppliers are satisfying their duty to provide safe drinking water, while they will also monitor and report on the environmental performance of wastewater and stormwater networks from 2023.
3. Taumata Arowai is seeking technical feedback on the following proposed drinking water documents in relation to its regulatory role under the Water Services Act 2021:
 - a. Drinking Water Standards
 - b. Drinking Water Quality Assurance Rules
 - c. Drinking Water Aesthetic Values
 - d. Drinking Water Acceptable Solution for Roof Water Supplies
 - e. Drinking Water Acceptable Solution for Spring and Bore Water Supplies
 - f. Drinking Water Acceptable Solution for Rural Agricultural Water Supplies
 - g. Drinking Water Network Environmental Performance Measures
4. Submissions on the proposed documents close on Monday, 28 March 2022.

5. The proposed documents have been developed in collaboration with sector reference groups from various drinking water supply types from across Aotearoa, along with international experts. The reference groups included representatives from Māori communities, rural agricultural water supplies, Federated Farmers and local authorities.
6. The proposed documents are targeted at drinking water suppliers and contain technical content that will guide the way drinking water is supplied safely to people in Aotearoa.
7. Environment Canterbury is viewing this consultation from the perspective of a regional council, rather than a drinking water supplier.
8. Environment Canterbury supports the overall intent of the proposed documents to lift performance of drinking water supplies so that all communities have access to safe drinking water every day.
9. Taumata Arowai has provided a set of consultation questions for each proposed document. The submission covers only those questions that are relevant to the regional council's role and responsibilities.
10. On 7 March 2022 staff sought comment from Councillors on an early draft of the submission and worked with Natural Environment Committee Co-Chairs to finalise the draft submission. The Co-Chairs have endorsed the draft submission for consideration by Council.

Cost, compliance and communication

Financial implications

11. There are no financial implications from the submission.

Risk assessment and legal compliance

12. There are no legal or risk implications from this submission.

Engagement, Significance and Māori Participation

13. Canterbury territorial authorities are interested in the proposed documents, and most are making their own submission.
14. Advice from Environment Canterbury's Tuia team has informed the submission.

Next steps

15. Subject to Council approval, Environment Canterbury's submission to Taumata Arowai on its proposed drinking water documents will be submitted by 28 March 2022.

Attachments

1. Attachment 1 - Letter to Taumata Arowai [8.5.1 - 1 page]

2. Attachment 2 - Submission to Taumata Arowai ENDORSED BY NEC CO CHAIRS
[8.5.2 - 12 pages]

File reference	[SharePoint link for this paper]
Legal review	
Peer reviewers	Alastair Picken, Mel Renganathan

xx March 2022

Taumata Arowai
P O Box 628
Wellington 6140

Email: korero@taumataarowai.govt.nz

Tēnā koe

Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury) submission

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment to Taumata Arowai on its proposal documents. Please find Environment Canterbury's submission attached.

Environment Canterbury supports the overall intent of the proposed documents to lift performance of drinking water supplies so that all communities have access to safe drinking water every day.

We would welcome the opportunity to work further with Taumata Arowai to strengthen the drinking water standards for Aotearoa.

For all enquiries please contact:

Cameron Smith
Senior Strategy Manager
Phone: 027 429 2739
Email: Cameron.smith@ecan.govt.nz

Ngā mihi

Jenny Hughey
Chair
Te Kaunihera Taiao ki Waitaha

Encl: Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury) Submission to Taumata Arowai on proposed documents

Our ref:
Your ref:
Contact:
Council Meeting 2022-03-17

Canterbury Regional Council ('Environment Canterbury', 'the Council') submission to Taumata Arowai on:

- Drinking Water Standards of New Zealand
- Drinking Water Quality Assurance Rules
- Drinking Water Aesthetic Values
- Drinking Water Acceptable Solution for Roof Water Supplies
- Drinking Water Acceptable Solution for Spring and Bore Water Supplies
- Drinking Water Acceptable Solution for Rural Agricultural Water Supplies
- Drinking Water Network Environmental Performance Measures

Response to general questions	
<p>Email address - this will only be used if we need to communicate with you about your submission, or if you indicate below that you would like to be contacted in the future in relation to drinking water issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • cameron.smith@ecan.govt.nz 	
<p>If your organisation has presence in more than one region – select 'National'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Canterbury / Waitaha 	
<p>Which of the below options best describes you in the context of this consultation?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional Council 	
<p>If you would like to be contacted in the future by Taumata Arowai in relation to drinking water issues, please select the option.</p>	<p>Yes, I would like to be contacted in the future by Taumata Arowai in relation to drinking water issues on the email provided above.</p>
<p>Do you give us permission to proactively publish your submission?</p>	<p>Yes. You may publish this submission, including organisational details (name, organisation and email address).</p>
<p>Official Information Act requests</p> <p>Your submission may be subject to requests made under the Official Information Act (OIA), even if it hasn't been published. Your preference about the release of your submission, including your contact details, will be relevant to our decision on each request. We may be legally required to make your submission available, even if you indicate that you would prefer us not to release it</p>	<p>Yes. You may make my submission available in response to requests made under the OIA, including my personal details (name, organisation, email)</p>

Introduction

1. Canterbury Regional Council ('Environment Canterbury', 'the Council') welcomes the opportunity to comment on the proposed documents that relate to Taumata Arowai's regulatory role under the Water Services Act 2021.
2. This submission is presented in relation to Environment Canterbury's roles, functions, and responsibilities under the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA).
3. This submission covers general comments and comments on some of the proposed documents. Where relevant we have responded to the specific consultation questions.
4. Environment Canterbury welcomes the opportunity to continue to work with Taumata Arowai, particularly in the area of protecting source water.

General Comment

5. Environment Canterbury supports the overall intent of the proposed documents to lift performance of drinking water supplies so that all communities have access to safe drinking water every day.
6. The proposed documents are consistent with what iwi/hapū and marae have long aspired to for safe drinking water. Most, if not all, Iwi Management Plans have clear policies on water quality, the need for security of safe drinking water for current and future generations and the importance of water as a taonga.
7. Environment Canterbury supports the alignment with Te Mana o te Wai and the intent of the proposed documents that will affect all three priorities in the hierarchy of obligations. The overall anticipated outcomes seem well aligned with Te Mana o te Wai.
8. The Council is pleased to note that funding will be available to help marae water suppliers (intended to directly support treatment options), and that funds are available to help marae and non-council suppliers to meet regulatory requirements. We recommend continued assessments of what resourcing might be needed, with a focus on whanau capability and implementation that supports the mana of the marae to do this mahi themselves.
9. The Council supports clarity over the role and responsibility of regional councils, territorial authorities, Taumata Arowai and drinking water suppliers in the management of source water.
10. The Council considers that regional councils should be providing Taumata Arowai with data relating to resource consent compliance, effects on the environment and a number of other

metrics to avoid suppliers providing the same information to two different agencies; Council would welcome the use of a shared data platform.

Drinking Water Standards for New Zealand

Do you agree that the process used to review the MAVs for drinking water standards was appropriate?

11. Yes.

Do you agree that the proposed MAVs will support the objective of ensuring that drinking water suppliers provide safe drinking water to consumers?

12. Yes.

Additional feedback

13. There is little guidance given on sampling or measurement methodologies for chemical contaminants e.g. trace elements, organic contaminants, even though there are a diversity of sampling and measurement methods available. For example, samples might be filtered in the field prior to analysis, or might be filtered in the lab (to measure “dissolved” contaminants) or might not (to measure “total” concentrations of contaminants). We recommend that at least a brief discussion or guidance be included regarding how samples are to be taken and analysed for chemical contaminants.

Drinking Water Quality Assurance Rules

Do you agree that the proposed Drinking Water Quality Assurance Rules support the objective of ensuring that drinking water suppliers provide safe drinking water to consumers?

14. Yes.

The proposed Drinking Water Quality Assurance Rules are structured as ‘modules’ for source water, treatment systems and distribution systems. There are different rules depending on the level of complexity for each module. Do you agree with the proposed Drinking Water Quality Assurance Rules being structured in this manner?

15. Yes.

Section 10 of the proposed Drinking Water Quality Assurance Rules covers the Compliance Rule Modules. Section 10.2 provides the Source Water Rules for the S1 module. Do you agree with the proposed Source Water Rules for the S1 module?

16. Yes, the monitoring set out in Section 10.2 should provide a reasonable indication of changes in source water quality, provided that a good understanding of baseline quality is established per Section 3.1 (page 13-14). Given that water quality can change throughout the year, an initial year of quarterly sampling would be useful in establishing that baseline understanding.

Section 10 of the proposed Drinking Water Quality Assurance Rules covers the Compliance Rule Modules. Section 10.5 provides the Source Water Rules for the S2 module. Do you agree with the proposed Source Water Rules for the S2 module?

17. The Source Water Rules for S2 and S3 provide more detailed monitoring and increase the ability of the water supplier to detect changes in source water quality, for larger and more complex supplies. This seems appropriate. It may be that some of the monitoring is overly conservative. For example, many supplies will have no issues with alpha or beta radiation, and if this is established in baseline sampling, then such issues are unlikely to develop for that source water in the future. However, testing once every five years is not onerous and may help to give added assurance. We suggest that the Sanitary bore head requirements for S3 would also be helpful for S2 supplies.

Section 10 of the proposed Drinking Water Quality Assurance Rules covers the Compliance Rule Modules. Section 10.8 provides the Source Water Rules for the S3 module. Do you agree with the proposed Source Water Rules for the S3 module?

18. Similar to our comment above for S2, the S3 requirements seem appropriately more rigorous for these larger supplies. Again, some may be overly conservative. For example, monthly monitoring for iron and manganese may not be necessary once a good baseline understanding of these parameters is established. However, as above, the testing is probably not overly onerous for these larger supplies, and it provides added assurance.

Additional feedback

19. Five-metre fencing is consistent with the 5-metre restriction in Source Water Risk Management Area 1 in the proposed changes to the National Environmental Standards for Sources of Human Drinking Water and seems a reasonable distance over which to exclude animals, noting that this requirement only applies where farm animals are present and for larger (S3) supplies.

Drinking Water Aesthetic Values

20. Environment Canterbury has no comment to make on this document as it does not include any regional council responsibilities.

Drinking Water Acceptable Solution for Roof Water Supplies

21. Environment Canterbury has no comment to make on this document as it does not include any regional council responsibilities.

Drinking Water Acceptable Solution for Spring and Bore Water Supplies

Do you believe that the proposed Drinking Water Acceptable Solution for Spring and Bore Water Supplies will provide assistance to water suppliers to comply with the Water Services Act 2021?

22. Yes, however, there needs to be alignment with other freshwater and drinking water regulations. See comments below on Section 6.2.
23. We would like to highlight that the Acceptable Solution will not be a panacea for small supplies in Canterbury that source their drinking water from groundwater with high nitrate concentrations (i.e. concentrations greater than 50% of the Maximum Acceptable Value (MAV), as set out in the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand 2005 (revised 2018).

Section 6.1 of the proposed Acceptable Solution for Spring and Bore Drinking Water Supplies covers the requirements before the drinking water acceptable solution can be adopted by a supplier. Do you agree that the proposed requirements before the drinking water acceptable solution can be adopted by a supplier are appropriate?

24. Section 6.1 sets out source water parameters to be tested for prior to installation of an Acceptable Solution. Testing is intended to demonstrate the suitability of the cartridge filtration and UV disinfection in removing contaminants of concern.
25. Clarification is needed that the Acceptable Solution can only be used if the broader suite of parameters to be tested for in monitoring requirement SB4 show no issues (exceedance of MAV).
26. If the range of contaminants tested for is too narrow, water suppliers may install inappropriate treatment systems and make assumptions as to the safety of “treated water”. In addition, water suppliers may find themselves in the position of having to upgrade treatment systems if subsequent testing demonstrates non-compliance with MAVs.
27. Given the prevalence of high nitrate concentrations in groundwater in Canterbury, testing for nitrate should be a pre-requisite prior to the use of an Acceptable Solution. Where nitrate concentrations exceed the MAV, the use of an alternative Acceptable Solution for the removal of nitrate should be required or an alternative source found.

Section 6.2 of the proposed Acceptable Solution for Spring and Bore Drinking Water Supplies covers the requirements the bore or spring source for the drinking water supply must meet before the drinking water acceptable solution can be adopted by a supplier. Do you agree that the proposed requirements before the Acceptable Solution can be adopted by a supplier are appropriate?

28. We note that section 6.2 of the proposed Acceptable Solution is not currently aligned with proposed amendments to the National Environmental Standards for Sources of Human Drinking Water (NES-DW) in several respects. We suggest that Taumata Arowai and the Ministry for the Environment discuss alignment between the Acceptable Solution and NES-DW on setback distances and prohibited activities where possible to avoid confusion or make clear which instrument or requirements prevail. Examples of misalignment include:
 - a. The proposed Acceptable Solution requires that springs and bores must not be located within 50-metres of specified activities whereas the proposed amendments to the NES-DW propose a setback distance of 5-metres for “aquifers” (bores) for

Source Water Risk Management Area (SWRMA) 1 and a 1-year travel time (up to 2.5 km) for SWRMA 2.

- b. The proposed Acceptable Solution includes spring supplies. It is unclear whether springs would fall under “rivers” or “aquifers” as in the NES-DW.
 - c. The proposed Acceptable Solution specifies that bores or springs must not be located within 50 m of 7 listed activities¹ whereas the NES-DW is currently seeking feedback on activities to be controlled or prohibited within SWRMA 1 and 2. Care should be taken to ensure the activity descriptions and controls/prohibitions do not conflict between the two instruments
 - d. The proposed Acceptable Solution does not specify whether the bore or spring requirements apply to existing supplies retrospectively, and if they do, the timeframe for compliance. We suggest this is made clear.
29. We also note slight inconsistency in language between the proposed Acceptable Solution and Drinking Water Quality Assurance Rules with respect to stock exclusion. The Acceptable Solution states that “Farm animals must be excluded (e.g. with a fence) from within 5 metres of the headworks...” whereas the Drinking Water Quality Assurance Rules (S3 Source Water Rules) state at least five metres (see s10.8.2 Sanitary bore head requirements). These should be aligned.

Drinking Water Acceptable Solution for Rural Agricultural Water Supplies

- 30. Environment Canterbury has few comments to make on this document as it does not include any regional council responsibilities.
- 31. However, we would like to reiterate the same comments made in relation to nitrate testing and treatment as for the proposed Acceptable Solution for Spring and Bore Drinking Water Supplies. Namely, that the proposed Acceptable Solution is not a panacea for rural agricultural water supplies in Canterbury that abstract their water from groundwater that has elevated nitrate concentrations.
- 32. In this Acceptable Solution, it is also unclear who the water supplier is and therefore who has legal responsibility for providing safe drinking water and treatment to meet the MAVs for nitrate and other contaminants in the Section 9 (Table Rule RA3). Is this the owner/operator of the water supply (e.g. an irrigation scheme, or other entity) **or** is it the farmer who receives the water onto the farm, **or** is it both? If it is both, then some form of legal agreement will likely be required to set out responsibilities of both parties.

¹ Acceptable Solution s6.2 - sewage disposal field or effluent discharge, an underground storage tank, a waste pond, a landfill, an offall pit, areas where pesticides or animal effluent is applied to land, urban aquifers contaminated with or at risk of contamination with sewage from exfiltration and/or pump station overflows.

Do you agree with the proposed supply monitoring requirements?

33. See comment below in relation to Section 10.

Do you agree that the incident and emergency response plan requirements are appropriate?

34. Yes.

Drinking Water Network Environmental Performance Measures

Do you agree that the scope of environmental performance should include the entire network, from source to discharge?

35. Yes. We agree that an entire network approach is required to drive system efficiency and good practice.

Do you have any suggestions for how we could give effect to Te Mana o te Wai through the drinking water network environmental performance measures and the Network Environmental Performance Annual Report?

- 36. In many ways, several of the proposed performance measures contribute directly or indirectly to Te Mana o Te Wai, e.g. reducing network water losses will mean less water needs to be abstracted from the environment. We recommend that measures requiring water use efficiency and water services demand reduction are incorporated.
- 37. We note the need to ensure alignment of the objectives with the proposed Natural and Built Environment Act and alignment of the performance standards with the proposed National Planning Framework.
- 38. However, consideration could be given to an additional measure on 'Delivery of key regional or national projects that contribute to Te Mana o te Wai' for example projects to restore sustainable levels abstraction, or catchment initiatives to protect source waters.

Do you agree with the proposed outcomes and principles?

- 39. Outcomes as drafted are focussed on the use of information to support decision making. A key outcome should be evidenced-based good practice and continual improvement to service delivery and environmental outcomes.
- 40. We support the principles of working together to ensure clarity of roles and ensure efficient sharing of accurate and relevant information.

Do you agree with the insights and measures we have proposed?

- 41. Broadly yes. However, we recommend that the 'insights' might be more correctly termed 'outcomes'. For example, the outcome of 'Environmental and public health are protected', 'Resources are used efficiently' etc.

42. We note that targets and standards are to be developed later, and we look forward to contributing to their development. We suggest that 'targets' should also be built into the framework for reporting against performance measures in Table One and Appendix One e.g. "100% compliance with consent conditions or Action Plans in place to achieve compliance"
43. We note that several of the performance measures are required by other regulatory requirements, for example, fish screens and measuring and reporting of water takes. The timeframes for reporting on performance measures should align with these requirements and monitoring priorities of regional councils. Preferably, these data would be provided to one agency (i.e. Taumata Arowai **or** the regional council) and then shared between agencies. As these activities are primarily regulated by the regional council, it would be our preference for the regional council to make these data available to Taumata Arowai, provided that automated reporting is available.
44. To ensure that automated reporting and sharing of data can be possible, some of the timeframes may need to be adjusted, or allow for iterative improvement/automation of the reporting. The adjustment of monitoring programmes and collection of additional data may be required to support this.
45. We note the need for consistency in compliance monitoring and grading between regional councils to ensure meaningful comparison, particularly in areas where an Entity is regulated by multiple regional councils.
46. Though possibly beyond the scope of this document, if the intention is to report on comparative performance using a traffic light type system, the methodology, including performance thresholds, data collection, data verification, and calculations, will need to be transparent and applied consistently across the country. We recommend development of guidance on measuring and reporting on metrics and a quality assurance process.
47. We support proposals to incorporate mātauranga māori into the measures and insights. Again, regional councils and iwi partners are exploring mātauranga māori monitoring frameworks, so alignment of these would be preferable.

Do you agree with the proposed phasing of the measures over three years?

48. Yes. We recommend that engagement with network operators and councils is undertaken to ensure consistent understanding and ability to deliver on the measures to be reported in the appropriate format and quality. As stated above, if automated reporting is desired, timeframes may need to be adjusted for some parameters.

Do you agree we should include the insight: Is the environment and public health protected?

49. Yes. We note inconsistency in the insight wording between Table One and Appendix One.

Do you agree with the 1 July 2022 measures and data associated with the insight: Is the environment and public health protected?

50. We broadly agree with the proposed measures for reporting in July 2022 but note the challenges in obtaining consistent information from all providers within that timeframe if data and metrics have not been confirmed.
51. We also consider that some of the data is also required to be supplied to the regional council. As the regulator of water abstraction, we consider that these data should be supplied first to the regional council, and then shared with Taumata Arowai. Alternatively, a common data sharing methodology should be developed.
52. Based on Environment Canterbury's compliance monitoring of water take consents, additional data points could include the following, noting that this data would ideally be supplied to the regional council by the service provider, and then shared with Taumata Arowai by the regional council, or supplied to a shared data space:
 - a. Number of water takes, water abstraction points (WAPs), consented rates of takes and volumes
 - b. Water meter installation status (number and % water meters installed for water abstraction points (WAPs))
 - c. Water meter verification status (to ensure the water meter is calibrated to meet accuracy requirements) – number and % complete and up to date (compliant), expired (non-compliant), not verified (non-compliant)
 - d. Data availability – number and % WAPs for which telemetered data is provided (in accordance with the Measurement and Reporting of Water Takes Regulations), and data completeness
 - e. Compliance with consented rate of take and annual or return period volume
 - f. Compliance with low flow restrictions
53. In our experience, it has been a challenge to collect some of this information and Taumata Arowai's support in ensuring this information is provided to regional councils for compliance assessment would be valued.
54. Longer-term, an additional indicator could be '*Delivery of key regional or national environmental initiatives related to source water*'. This could be projects to reduce water demand and restore sustainable levels of abstraction, measures to ensure security of supply, or initiatives to protect source water, etc.

Do you agree with the 1 July 2023 measures and data associated with the insight: Is the environment and public health protected?

55. The introduction of data points regarding fish passage and fish screens adds to the list of information required by both Taumata Arowai and the regional council. Allowance for fish passage and adequacy of fish screens are assessments that will be required to gain resource consent for an intake structure. We consider that 'compliance with resource consent

conditions' should be adequate information for Taumata Arowai's metrics on this matter, and that these data should be provided by regional councils.

Do you agree with the 1 July 2024 measures and data associated with the insight: Is the environment and public health protected?

56. Refer paragraph above – construction impacts are assessed when resource consent is sought for a structure in a stream. Equally, abstraction within environmental flows is a condition of resource consent that will be monitored by the regional council.

Do you agree we should include the insight: Are services reliable?

57. Yes.

Do you agree with the 1 July 2022 measures and data associated with the insight: Are services reliable?

58. The performance measure and data points for the conditions of above ground assets should include water meters and associated infrastructure (it is assumed this would be the case at a more granular level when it comes to data collection).
59. Water meter data is also collected by the regional council as part of the resource consent, therefore, data relating to this could be shared with, or provided by, the regional council.
60. Note that water restriction could be a function of low river flows or low groundwater levels; this is information that would be valuable to regional councils.

Do you agree we should include the insight: Are resources used efficiently?

61. Yes. We support performance measures to ensure water is used efficiently and promote lower water use, especially in high urban growth districts and water stressed areas.
62. Regional councils are required to receive water use data from all takes; this can be summarised and provided to Taumata Arowai for specified drinking water abstractions. We note that there have been challenges with data quality that result in these measures being uncertain but this will improve with the implementation of the amended Resource Management (Measurement and Reporting of Water Takes) Regulations.

Do you agree we should include the insight: Are services resilient?

63. Yes. To achieve the performance measure from 1 July 2024 "Ability to withstand drought" will require planning. We note that in other jurisdictions there are statutory requirements to produce and maintain drought plans. These set out how water resources and the supply system will be managed during droughts of different severity, extent, and duration.
64. We recommend an additional data point "a drought management plan is in place to manage water resources and the supply system during periods of drought".

65. We recommend that drought planning also includes consideration of droughts where the effects may be focussed on the environment as well as on public water supply.
66. For reference, Schedule 25 of the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan sets out the components of a Water Supply Strategy. This includes a drought management plan which outlines methods to reduce consumption during water shortage conditions, particularly consumption by non-essential agricultural, residential, industrial or trade processes, and a description of methods to ensure water conservancy during times of drought, including but not limited to public education programmes and compliance and enforcement measures.

Do you think we have missed any insights, measures or data that fall within the environmental performance definition scope?

67. We note the absence of source water monitoring – in order to respond to the insight ‘is the environment and public health protected’ there may need to be a performance measure relating to source water quality; the document notes an interface with LAWA, or this information could be obtained from regional councils.

Do you have any comment on the likely impact of complying with the data requirements in the timeframe outlined (i.e., will compliance require operators to employ more people or purchase new software)?

68. In our experience, data provided by suppliers has been variable and it may take some time to achieve good quality data. An approach similar to water use regulations may be useful where the requirements are first met by priority suppliers (based on risk, take size, etc.).

Do you want to be contacted when targeted consultation on the drafting of the rules begins?

69. Yes. We wish to be involved in developing measures and targets.

Have we missed any other pieces of work that may interact with drinking water environmental performance?

70. The Environmental Reporting Act regulates central government roles and responsibilities (rather than local government). However, there is the need for better alignment between environmental reporting that occurs at the regional scale (e.g. State of the Environment Reporting) and that which occurs at a national scale. There is also the need for the government to consider cost and resource impacts that can occur as a result of the need to adjust monitoring programmes. This reinforces our suggestion that there needs to be a shared data platform.

If you want to provide any additional feedback on environmental performance and/or the drinking water environmental performance measures please provide this here:

71. It is critical that that the role of regional councils in management of the water resource, compliance monitoring, data collection and flow of information for the purposes of national reporting is clear. There is a need to be specific about what performance indicators Taumata

Arowai, the economic regulator, and regional councils are responsible for. This should be supported by clear national guidance, templates, and systems.

72. We also support clarity over which agency has primary responsibility to drive system and regulatory improvements. For example, regional plans or consent conditions include timeframes and standards, including to reduce over-allocation for water quantity and quality.
73. We also note again the overlap between regulatory instruments and support clarity for monitoring and driving compliance e.g. fish screens, water metering.
74. We note that the UK Environment Agency reports annually on the performance of water and sewerage companies in England and includes a range of performance measures, including (amongst others) pollution incidents, compliance with environmental permits, restoring sustainable abstraction, security of supply, and water resource planning. [Water and sewerage companies in England: environmental performance for 2020 - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/water-and-sewerage-companies-in-england-environmental-performance-for-2020).

9. Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Council Meeting is scheduled to be held on Wednesday, 13 April 2022 at 11.00am. Any changes to this time will be publicly advertised and updated on the Environment Canterbury website.

10. Mihi/Karakia Whakamutunga - Closing

The meeting will conclude with a karakia by a member of the Council Meeting.