

Governance group - Meeting minutes

Meeting title	Whakaraupō Catchment Management Plan Governance Group meeting
Date	Wednesday 6 September 2017
Time	5:00 – 6:30 pm
Venue	Committee Room 1, CCC
Chair	Yvette Couch-Lewis
Invited	Yvette Couch-Lewis, Peter Davie, Kara Edwards, Andrew Turner, Elizabeth Cunnginham, Jill Atkinson, John O'Dea, Christina Robb
In attendance	Yvette Couch-Lewis, John O'Dea, Elizabeth Cunningham, Jill Atkinson, Christina Robb, Matt Ross, Gillian Ensor
Apologies	Peter Davie, Kara Edwards, Andrew Turner

1) Matt Ross opened the meeting with a Karakia.

2) **Apologies**

a) Apologies were received from Peter Davie, Kara Edwards and Andrew Turner.

3) **Confirmation of agenda**

a) The agenda was confirmed and no additional items were added.

4) **Minutes from previous meeting:**

a) The minutes from the meeting held 2 August were confirmed by Jill Atkinson and Christina Robb.

b) Matters Arising from the Minutes.

i) Item 6.2 (community consultation): Elizabeth Cunningham wanted to ensure that Rapaki, Tangata Tiaki and Koukourarata are included in any targeted consultation.

Koukourarata should be included because they have an interest in the wider harbour area. She advised that they have an executive meeting once a month in Christchurch.

ii) Yvette confirmed that Rapaki and Tangata Tiaki have been involved in the drafting of the plan, and Koukourarata are on the list of stakeholders so will be consulted with.

5) **Project Management Update and discussion**

a) Christina Robb provided an outline of the Partners Working Group Update to the Governance Group.

- b) **Drafting the CMP (Items 3-5):** Christina explained the tension between the PWG members around the robustness and confidence the Partners have in the plan and the options for an independent review. There was a lengthy discussion about plan robustness, the science, flow and how the plan hangs together. The Governance group agreed on the following:
- i) Overall they like the point of difference in the style of the plan, and that it tells a story.
 - ii) They see the plan as a foundation document that sets the scene for the science and actions that will be undertaken, and that the plan can be looked at as a programme of works to direct action on the ground.
 - iii) They see the plan as a relationship document, as well as an action document.
 - iv) The plan is not intended to be a detailed scientific document as that would not fit with the style of the plan as drafted. It does however need to be robust from a matauranga maori perspective.
 - v) They want to have confidence in the document, and that the overall style and content will add to the robustness of the document.
 - vi) They are concerned about the implications of a review on the project timeline, however agree that a review should occur before the targeted meetings.
 - vii) It is important that the targeted meetings occur at the end of September/early October and want to stick to the timelines agreed at the last Governance meeting as closely as possible.
 - viii) The plan does not need to be re-written, a review should cast an eye over the plan, provide advice regarding whether there is a clear cascade from the vision to the whaingā/goals and the pou/guiding principles, and on to the key focus areas and actions. Are there any targeted changes that can be made to improve whether the plan hangs together well and provides a framework for the actions?
 - ix) A review also should also ensure that there are no gaps for both Matauranga Maori and western science, and that both are woven through the plan, where necessary.
 - x) Time will have to be spent with the reviewer(s) to explain the style and content of the plan.
 - xi) A diagram to explain how the different parts of the plan fit together would be extremely helpful to the reader and will map out the logic/flow of the plan.
 - xii) **Advice:** The PWG should engage a suitably qualified person(s) to review the draft plan to provide advice as set out above.
- c) Other matters that were raised and discussed include:
- i) Matt highlighted that the plan is not the end point of the project, how we deliver the package and implement the plan is really important. We need to look past the plan launch at implementation (see discussion below about implementation).
 - ii) He also said that there is a need for a regulatory backstop to the plan, are there targeted changes that can be made sooner rather than later that signal the intent of the plan to the community.
 - iii) John highlighted that the plan is written in a style that is different to what people may be expecting. A review may highlight some concerns that will be echoed in the targeted feedback meetings and ensure that we can address them prior to those meetings. The approach and style of the plan will need to be explained carefully.
 - iv) Yvette explained that Rapaki are holding a lot of importance in the plan.
- d) **Community Engagement (Items 6-8):** Christina explained that if the plan is going to meet the final deadline (prior to Christmas) we need to try to have the draft plan finished (including review) in the next couple of weeks so that the targeted feedback meetings can occur late Sept/early Oct, and then engagement on the final draft plan can occur in November.
- i) The Governance Group discussed the risks around timeframes and having the draft ready for targeted feedback meetings by the end of the month. They want to stick to the timelines agreed at the last Governance meeting as closely as possible.

ii) **Advice:** Targeted feedback meetings should proceed late Sept/early October if possible. A governance representative, as well as a Science Advisory Group representative and members of the PWG should attend the meetings.

e) **Ongoing Implementation and Resourcing (Items 9,10):** Christina outlined the PWG advice regarding funding/resourcing for projects, and that there is a big gap with resourcing around the marine biodiversity. Christina explained that MfE have a Community Environment Fund and applications close September 14. She would like the Partnership to apply for funding for the Head of the Harbour Project and thinks she can pull together the application by the end of next week using the information in the FIF application lodged earlier in the year.

i) The Governance Group discussed each Partner organisations funding deadlines and how /when we need to commence discussions regarding the projects.

ii) The implementation of the plan once it is finalised was not discussed further.

iii) The Governance Group are supportive of applying for the MfE fund and suggested that Rapaki could be the applicant instead of Ecan on behalf of the Partnership. Yvette and Christina will discuss who the applicant will be.

iv) **Advice:** The PWG should apply for funding from MfE for the Head of the Harbour project. The Partners will provide letters of support.

f) **Timeframes (Items 11,12):** Christina explained the updated timeframes and the risks around the projected target dates.

i) The Governance Group agreed that the timeframes agreed at the last Governance meeting still apply.

ii) They also agreed that the review should occur prior to the targeted feedback meetings within the next week or two.

g) **Project Risks (Item 13):** Christina outlined changes to the project risks, specifically the risks around an inability to get agreement of the Partners to the draft or final plan.

i) As discussed in Item 5b, the Governance Group agree that an independent review may resolve any concerns about the robustness of the plan.

h) **Budget (Item 14):** Christina explained the budget. There were no questions asked regarding this.

6) Logo and Branding

a) Yvette explained that she has received 5 draft designs for a logo but her view was that they are a bit dull, so she has asked the designers to make a few changes and come up with some alternatives. These should be with her by Friday and will be circulated to the Governance Group on Monday 11th September.

7) Budgets and Resourcing

a) See Item 5h.

8) Summary of Governance Advice and other Actions

a) The PWG should engage a suitably qualified person(s) to review the draft plan to provide advice as set out at Item 5b.

b) Community engagement should proceed as agreed at the previous Governance meeting, with targeted feedback meetings scheduled to occur in late September/early October after the review. A governance representative as well as a representative from the Science Advisory Group and the PWG should attend any meetings.

- c) The PWG should prepare an application and apply for funding from the MfE Community Environment Fund for the Head of the Harbour Project as discussed at Item 5e.
- d) Yvette and Christina to discuss who will apply for the MfE Community Environment Fund on behalf of the Partnership.
- e) Yvette to circulate logo designs early next week.

9) **Next meeting date:** Tuesday 3rd October at Ecan in the Waiau meeting room (ground floor).
Christina will set up meetings for the first week in November and December.

10) The group thanked the Partners Working Group for the draft plan.
The meeting closed at 6pm.