

AGENDA

RĀRANGI TAKE

Kaipara Moana Remediation Joint Committee

**Kaipara Moana Remediation Joint Committee
Thursday 22 July 2021 at 09:30**

Kaipara Moana Remediation Joint Committee Agenda

Meeting to be held in the Te Hana Te Ao Marama
Te Hana 0947
on Thursday 22 July 2021, commencing at 09:30

Recommendations contained in the agenda are NOT decisions of the meeting. Please refer to minutes for resolutions.

NGĀ MANA WHAKAHAERE (MEMBERSHIP OF THE KAIPARA MOANA REMEDIATION JOINT COMMITTEE)

Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Whātua Tame Te Rangī	NRC Chair Penny Smart	NRC Councillor Amy Macdonald
Auckland Council Councillor Daniel Newman	Ngā Maunga Whakahī o Kaipara, Cherie Povey	Auckland Council Greg Sayers
Ngā Maunga Whakahī o Kaipara, Jane Sherard	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Whātua Virginia Warriner	Te Uri o Hau Malcolm Welsh
Te Uri o Hau Willie Wright	NRC Councillor Joce Yeoman	

KARAKIA / WHAKATAU

RĪMITI (ITEM)	Page
1.0 HOUSEKEEPING	
2.0 NGĀ WHAKAPAHĀ (APOLOGIES)	
3.0 NGA WHAKAPUAKANGA (DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST)	
4.0 WHAKĀE NGĀ MINITI (CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES)	
4.1 Confirmation of Minutes - Kaipara Moana Remediation Joint Committee - 25 June	3
5.0 NGĀ RĪMITI (ITEMS)	
5.1 Kaipara Moana Remediation Programme Identity and Brand	8
5.2 Digital Tools Investment - remediation grant management & sediment reduction planning system	11
5.3 Landowner Grants - Further Consideration	17
5.4 Year One Progress Report from Kairuruku (Acting Pou Tātaki) <i>This report will be in the form of a presentation by Alan Wilcox, Kairuruku (Acting Pou Tātaki) which will be tabled at the meeting.</i>	
5.5 Update Report from Kairuruku (Acting Pou Tātaki) <i>This report will be in the form of a presentation by Alan Wilcox, Kairuruku (Acting Pou Tātaki) which will be tabled at the meeting.</i>	

TITLE: Confirmation of Minutes -

ID:


From: Sandra Harris, Administration Kaipara Moana Remediation Programme

Authorised by Alan Wilcox, Kairuruku (Acting Pou Tātaki), on
Group Manager:

Ngā mahi tūtohutia / Recommendation

That the minutes of the Kaipara Moana Remediation joint Committee Minutes meeting held on Friday 25 June 2021 be confirmed as a true and correct record.

Attachments/Ngā tapirihanga

Attachment 1: Kaipara Moana Remediation Joint Committee - 25 June 2021 [↓](#) 

Kaipara Moana Remediation Joint Committee
25 June 2021

Kaipara Moana Remediation Joint Committee Minutes

Meeting held in the Te Whare Oranga o Parakai - 5 Rere Place, Parakai
on Friday 25 June 2021, commencing at 09:30am

Tuhinga (Present):

Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Whātua Tame Te Rangi
NRC Chair Penny Smart
NRC Councillor Amy Macdonald
Auckland Council Greg Sayers
Ngā Maunga Whakahī o Kaipara, Jane Sherard
Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Whātua Virginia Warriner
Te Uri o Hau Malcolm Welsh
Te Uri o Hau Willie Wright
NRC Councillor Joce Yeoman

I Tae Mai (In Attendance):

Jonathon Rishworth	Wikitoria Wright
Micah Butt	Patricia Clark
Brenda Steele	Laura Pollock
Paul Norris	Duncan Kervell
Mina Henare-Toka	Rae Saywter
Shane Paul	Darrell Lambert
Tracy Tristgram	Kevin Adshead
Shona Oliver	Margie Tokerangi
Francine Panui	Helen Woods
Penny Pirit	John Hutton
Alan Wilcox	Jonathan Gibbard
Malcolm Nicolson	Sandra Harris

The Chair declared the meeting open at 11:00am

Karakia Timatanga and Whakatau

Ngā whakapahā/Apologies (Item 1.0)

Moved (Wright/Smart)

That the apologies from Cherie Povey, Daniel Newman for non-attendance be received.

Carried

Nga whakapuakanga (Declarations of Conflicts of Interest)

ID:

1

Kaipara Moana Remediation Joint Committee
25 June 2021

It was advised that members should make declarations item-by-item as the meeting progressed.

Confirmation of Minutes - Kaipara Moana Remediation Joint Committee - 17 May 2021 (Item 4.1)

ID: A1449130

Report from Leah Porter, Trainer

Moved (Warriner/Sherard)

That the minutes of the Kaipara Moana Remediation Joint Committee meeting held on 17 May 2021 be confirmed as a true and correct record.

Carried

Employment Strategy Update (Item 5.1)

ID: A1437936

Report from Alan Wilcox, Kaipara Uri Management Representative

Moved (Wright/Yeoman)

1. That the report 'Employment Strategy Update' by Alan Wilcox, Kaipara Uri Management Representative and dated 27 April 2021, be received.
2. That the Joint Committee receive the Kaipara Moana Employment Strategy.
3. That the Joint Committee adopt the following pathways, as recommended in the Kaipara Moana Employment Strategy, and that implementation plans be developed for each pathway and reported back to the Joint Committee:
 - a) Adopt the set of procurement principles outlined in Attachment One that ensure goods or services procured for the KMR programme are consistent with the Investment Objectives set out in the Kaipara Moana Remediation Memorandum of Understanding.
 - b) Develop an accreditation process built upon the procurement principles outlined in Attachment One and tailored to specific suppliers such as nurseries, fencing and planting contractors.
 - c) Co-design (with the government agencies responsible) and potential establishment of an employment hub to coordinate the various stakeholders involved, to ensure there are sufficient human resources to meet the needs of the programme in a timely manner, and to achieve positive employment outcomes for Kaipara Uri and the Kaipara community.
 - d) Develop and implement an Iwi and community partnership scheme to ensure community groups are able to participate in the KMR programme with the objective that non-productive or marginally-commercial land can access support and resources to carry out necessary mitigation activities.
 - e) Develop and implement a monitoring and evaluation process to capture progress on the achievement of KMR programme's Human Capital and Social Capital objectives.

Carried

ID:

2

Kaipara Moana Remediation Joint Committee
25 June 2021

Kaipara Moana Remediation Programme Joint Committee Meeting Schedule August to December 2021 (Item 5.2)

ID: A1447375

Report from Penny Pirrit, Northland Regional Council Management Representative

Moved (Smart/Yeoman)

1. That the report 'Kaipara Moana Remediation Programme Joint Committee Meeting Schedule August to December 2021' by Penny Pirrit, Northland Regional Council Management Representative and dated 25 May 2021, be received.
(Warriner/MacDonald)
2. That the Joint Committee confirm the dates for formal meetings and workshops from August to December 2021 as set out in *Table 1: Schedule of formal meetings and workshop August to December 2021* of this report.

Carried

Kaipara Maurikura Establishment Update (Item 5.3)

ID: A1449121

Report from Penny Pirrit, Northland Regional Council Management Representative

Moved (Smart/Warriner)

1. That the report 'Kaipara Maurikura Establishment Update' by Penny Pirrit, Northland Regional Council Management Representative and dated 1 June 2021, be received.
(Sherard/MacDonald)
2. That the Proposed Statement of Service Requirements outlined in Attachment 1 to this report be approved with the Joint Committee Chair being delegated the final sign off on any amendment required to include procurement principles adopted in the Employment Strategy.
3. That the Proposed Chief Executive Officer's Responsibilities Agreement outlined in Attachment 2 to this report be approved for signing by the Joint Committee Chair and the Northland Regional Council's Chief Executive Officer
4. That a six-monthly report on the Kaipara Maurikura performance be presented to the February 2022 Joint Committee meeting.

Carried

Year Two Workplan Update (Item 5.4)

ID: A1450792

Report from John Hutton, Auckland Council Management Representative

Moved (Sherard/Smart)

1. That the report 'Year Two Workplan Update' by John Hutton, Auckland Council Management Representative and dated 14 June 2021, be received. **(Wright/Sherard)**
2. That the Joint Committee confirm and adopt the Year 2 Work Plan and budget, subject to minor adjustments between financial years when expenditure for Year 1 projects is reconciled for FY2020-21 and unspent budget is transferred to FY2021-22 as required.

ID:

3

Kaipara Moana Remediation Joint Committee
25 June 2021

Carried

Karakia Mutunga

Whakamutunga (Conclusion)

The meeting concluded at 1:51pm.

Unconfirmed

TITLE: **Kaipara Moana Remediation Programme Identity and Brand**

ID:

From: Penny Pirrit, Northland Regional Council Management Representative

Authorised by Group Manager: Alan Wilcox, Kairuruku (Acting Pou Tātaki), on 15 July 2021

He Rāpopoto hautū / Executive summary

One of the key actions of the Kaipara Moana Remediation Programme's (the KMR Programme) adopted Communication Plan is the development of a unique identity and brand. Such an identity and brand will enable partners, stakeholders and the community to clearly identify what activities, communications and processes are specific to the KMR Programme and not part of any of the Member Parties' other activities which occur across the Kaipara Moana catchment.

The development of an identity and brand has been informed by the history, the stories and the mahi leading up to the establishment of the KMR Programme as well as by input from the working group set up to provide advice and input into the Communications Plan. All of this informed an identity and brand workshop with the Joint Committee on the 19 July.

As that workshop was held after this report was written and the agenda for this meeting closed, a verbal update on the outcomes of that workshop and a recommendation on the identity and brand for the KMR Programme will be provided at the meeting.

Ngā tūtohu / Recommendation(s)

1. That the report 'Kaipara Moana Remediation Programme Identity and Brand' by Penny Pirrit, Northland Regional Council Management Representative and dated 15 July 2021, be received.
2. That the verbal update on the outcome of the Joint Committee's July workshop on brand and identity be received.
3. (a) That be adopted as the brand and identity for the Kaipara Moana Remediation Programme; or
(b) That the current communications working group be delegated to work with Level to finalise and approve the Kaipara Moana Remediation Programme brand and identity.
4. That staff be requested to ensure the approved brand is used for future reports, correspondence and communication collateral.

Horopaki / Context

At its 17 May meeting the Joint Committee adopted a Communications Plan which is the companion document to the Partner and Stakeholder Engagement Strategy (the Engagement Strategy) adopted by the Joint Committee on the 22 March 2021.

The Plan builds on the Engagement Strategy by outlining a framework for the KMR Programme's communications, communication specific objectives and goals, a KMR Programme voice and identity, key messages and channels, risks and opportunities and what is needed to implement the Plan – resources and actions.

One key action in that plan was the development of a unique identity and brand for the KMR Programme.

A workshop in July discussed identity and brand. At the time of writing this report the workshop had not occurred so this report cannot describe in detail the outcome of that workshop.

Instead, the outcome will be reported verbally at the joint committee meeting.

Tātari me ngā tūtohu / Analysis and advice

A key communication outcome is the development of an identity/brand story that shares the aspirational vision of the Programme. Once confirmed, that enables the creation of a brand identity and visual standards guidelines (VSG) for the Programme, including logo, design elements, fonts, colours, language and imagery.

To date this work has involved listening to the history, the stories and learning about the mahi that has already occurred across the Kaipara Moana catchment. Through the working party meetings, a sense of what the KMR Programme is/isn't has started to emerge.

All this information has helped Level to develop some visual concepts for a Programme identity and brand. These concepts are being discussed at the July workshop of the Joint Committee and the outcomes of that discussion will be presented at the July meeting of the Joint Committee.

The Communication Plan expresses the KMR Programme Identity as:

We are:

- representative of – and from – the community
- a voice for Kaipara Moana
- capable, qualified and committed to delivering on the plan
- unwavering in our commitment to the long-term vision
- willing to work through the challenges this programme will face
- supporting a small step in a much longer journey
- helping to bring together shared knowledge, history and learnings
- presenting opportunities to change the way we do things
- wanting to learn from local knowledge (past and present)
- grateful for the willingness of many to share our vision and to collaborate with us
- open to new ideas and new ways of thinking and working
- lean, efficient and effective at both governance and operational levels
- focused on achieving real change in both the short and long term

We are not:

- NRC or AC
- Iwi
- engaging on / representing Treaty claims.

At the July workshop how the above can be represented visually in an identity and brand was discussed.

Considerations

1. Aromātai whāinga haumi mō te oranga / Wellbeing Investment objectives and assessment

Achieving the four wellbeing investment objectives of the KMR Programmes relies heavily on working with many parties who are either already delivering remediation actions or are keen to be involved. Clear consistent and regular communication is key to ensuring that all partners and stakeholders know what the KMR Programme is about and are kept informed of progress, opportunities and milestones. Having a unique visual identity for the KMR Programme will also help distinguish the programme from other environmental and or local government activities being undertaken throughout the Kaipara Moana catchment.

2. Ngā ritenga take pūtea / Financial implications

The budget for the development of the branding and identity for the KMR Programme lies within the Engagement and Communications Strategy budget in the Year One Work Plan. Implementation of the approved brand and identity into collateral to support the KMR Programme will be paid out of the Communications Strategy Implementation budget line (\$240,000) in the draft Year Two Work Plan.

3. Ngā hiranga me ngā hononga / Significance and Engagement

One of the key risks to communicating that the KMR Programme is a partnership between two councils and Kaipara Uri has been the lack of a unique brand and identity that stands only for the KMR Programme. Without that unique identity there still exists confusion over what the KMR Programme is about and who is delivering it.

The adoption of an identity and brand by the Joint Committee that can then be used in all future communications from and about the KMR Programme will be the first step to remove any confusion.

4. Ngā tūraru me ngā mauru / Risks and mitigation

In relation to section 79 of the Local Government Act 2002, the decision arising from this report is considered to be of low significance when assessed against Northland Regional Council's significance and engagement policy. This does not mean that these matters are not of significance to tangata whenua and/or individual communities, but that the Joint Committee is able to make these decisions without undertaking further consultation or engagement.

5. Ngā whāinga mō āmuri / Next steps

Once the Joint Committee approves the brand and identity for the KMR Programme work can commence on ensuring that all communication collateral including future reports, letterheads, panui and emails adopt the brand and identity.

Ngā tapirihanga / Attachments

Nil

TITLE: Digital Tools Investment - remediation grant management & sediment reduction planning system

ID:

From: John Hutton, Strategic Business Manager, Kaipara Maurikura

Authorised by Group Manager: Alan Wilcox, Kairuruku (Acting Pou Tātaki), on 15 July 2021

He Rāpopoto hautū / Executive summary

The Kaipara Moana Remediation Programme requires a digital farm environment and planning solution to administer grants funding and drive targeted remediation work at pace and at scale around the Kaipara Moana catchment.

Under the Year 1 Work Plan budget was approved for a 'Digital tools – design, preparation and procurement' project, to undertake the digital design, preparation and procurement steps before decisions on a more substantial financial commitment on a digital solution were made (ID: A1382391). This work has been completed and a decision is now sought on a recommended approach and suppliers.

The recommended approach is to connect an existing grant allocation and administration engine (configured to meet KMR's specific needs) with a data management and farm planning front-end.

SmartyGrants has been identified as an existing 'off-the-shelf' grant management system, able to meet the immediate and longer-term needs of the KMR programme. For the front-end data-management and sediment reduction planning, which will integrate existing environmental databases, MediaSuite is recommended as a provider who can deliver high-quality services and products, on time and to specification.

The recommended approach leverages existing platforms and avoids the need for investment in a large software development project to deliver the end-to-end solution KMR needs, but which does not yet exist in the market.

The total capital cost of the configuration/build project is proposed to be capped at \$700,000 (+GST), which is the budget approved under the Year 2 Work Plan (ID: A1450792). If approved, it is recommended the Interim Pou Tātaki is delegated the task of finalising commercial contracts with the preferred suppliers SmartyGrants and MediaSuite in accordance with KMR procurement policy.

Ngā tūtohu / Recommendation(s)

1. That the report 'Digital Tools Investment - remediation grant management & sediment reduction planning system' by John Hutton, Strategic Business Manager, Kaipara Maurikura and dated 14 July 2021, be received.
2. That investment of \$700,000 (+GST) for the development, configuration, training, and deployment of a digital system for remediation-grant management and sediment reduction planning is approved.

3. That the Interim Pou Tātaki is delegated the task of finalising commercial contracts with the preferred suppliers SmartyGrants and MediaSuite in accordance with KMR procurement policy.
4. Note that budget to cover (estimated) annual software subscription fees of \$35,000 to 65,000 per annum will be calculated based on grants distributed and support required, reviewed and adjusted annually, with the cost of subscription fees for FY2021-22 being covered through the operational budget for the Kaipara Maurikura under the Year 2 Work Plan.
5. That KMR staff are requested to report on progress to the Joint Committee in November 2021 and April 2022.

Horopaki / Context

The Kaipara Moana Remediation Joint Committee (Joint Committee) has supported in principle development of a digital farm environment and planning solution to enable the Kaipara Moana Remediation programme (KMR programme) to administer fundable property-scale investment plans to drive remediation at pace and at scale around the Kaipara Moana catchment. Under the Year 1 Work Plan budget was approved for the 'Digital tools – design, preparation and procurement' project, to undertake the design, preparation and procurement steps before a more substantial financial commitment (ID: A1382391).

This report summarises the procurement and design process undertaken to date and seeks a decision to proceed with a recommended digital build for the KMR programme.

Tātari me ngā tūtohu / Analysis and advice

Background and market assessment

In early 2021 a project team was formed for the 'Digital tools – design, preparation and procurement' project, led by Andrew Schollum of Puhoi Stour. In February and March, the project team refined its understanding of the digital solution the KMR required by conducting over 30 interviews with representatives from regional councils (regulatory, farm advisory and information technology departments), primary sector groups, digital farm planning and farm advisory suppliers, government departments, and software development companies.

Alongside the interviews the project team reviewed four existing digital farm planning platforms and two 'registration/CRM/grant administration' systems used by regional councils, and engaged closely with central government departments and regional sector representatives working on national standards for digital farm planning and data management.

On 18 March 2021, a KMR Joint Committee workshop discussed approaches to a digital build solution. It was noted that no system currently exists on the market which would meet the KMR programme's needs. Workshop attendees considered high level options for the digital solution and expressed a preference for:

- focussing on core KMR needs while preserving the opportunity to expand the system's functionality if considered appropriate or desirable in the future
- fast-tracking procurement and minimising cost as much as is feasible – accelerating the development of the necessary administrative and technical systems to enable grants to be distributed as quickly as possible.

Procurement Process

In April 2021, the project team began the first phase of the procurement process with a series of workshops with five potential providers considered capable of meeting all or part of the KMR programme's needs.

As these workshops were underway, the KMR Interim Management Team re-emphasised to the project team the need to expedite the procurement and development process and requested the project team do what it could to ensure any necessary tools are in place and grants able to be distributed as soon as possible.

In late April 2021, the project team met with managers from Auckland Council and NRC to discuss options for responding to the Interim Management Team's direction. In early May 2021, the KMR Interim Management Team considered and approved a proposal from the project team to:

- reduce expenditure and development time by revising down the scope and ambition of the digital solution by focussing tightly on KMR objectives, while designing the system so it can either complement regulatory farm planning tools that may be developed by NRC and Auckland Council, or be 'scaled up' by those councils to meet their broader needs as might be desired at a future date.
- expedite the procurement process by developing detailed project specifications and development plans with two 'provisional preferred suppliers', who had stood out during the initial round of supplier interviews as being capable of delivering the necessary tools on time, at the minimum of cost and to the project team's specifications, and anticipating decision-making by the Joint Committee to approve a digital build package.

In June 2021, the project team ran a series of half-day workshops with the provisional preferred suppliers – SmartyGrants and MediaSuite – to co-develop detailed specifications for the system that would include an interim solution capable of very rapid deployment and a full solution to come shortly afterwards. This process generated a development plan for configuring and building the digital solution, and an estimated the cost of delivering and implementing the solution.

Proposal and expected outcomes

The resulting proposal for a digital tool solution for the KMR programme is to connect an existing grant allocation and administration engine (configured to meet KMR's specific needs) with a data management and farm planning front-end (building on a farmer registration and regulatory compliance platform built for another council).

This proposal would involve:

- Configuring the 'off-the-shelf' grant management tool 'SmartyGrants' to meet the immediate needs of the KMR programme (i.e., registration and grant application), and deploy it as quickly as possible so that grantees (farmers, hapū/marae, schools and other community entities) are able to register on the system by September/October 2021 and begin to receive funds for initial actions in late 2021. Taking this approach will avoid the need for a 'paper-based' stop-gap solution which could create a range of complications in terms of data entry, storage and transfer, and reporting.
- Continuing work throughout the third quarter of 2021 and first quarter of 2022 with 'SmartyGrants' to complete configuration of the full range of functions (custom user-interface, payment triggers, reporting etc).

- Delivering through MediaSuite, by March 2022, a custom front-end data-management and sediment reduction planning system that integrates with the NRC and Auckland Council's environmental databases and the SmartyGrants grant administration system, and which provides a highly functional planning system that KMR-certified land advisors can use when engaging with landowners to develop Sediment Reduction Plans.

The proposed system will allow the KMR programme to:

- conduct robust assessments of environmental sensitivity and risk, and identify, prioritise, and schedule farm-specific actions needed to achieve KMR sediment-reduction objectives
- access environmental data and engage with it through user-friendly interfaces – short-circuiting the training needed to ensure new farm advisers are focussing on the correct risks and providing clear direction to farmer and regulators on the nature of actions required to achieve KMR objectives
- audit the delivery of farm-specific actions (i.e., fencing, planting) – ensuring they have been delivered within a suitable time and to specification
- allocate co-funding rapidly, accurately, efficiently, and reliably – satisfying financial probity requirements and supporting reporting on a range of indicators capturing social, economic, and environmental actions and outcomes to a range of audiences
- contribute robust information to NRC and Auckland Council regulatory departments in compliance with anticipated Freshwater Farm Plan regulatory requirements and develop a core system that can be extended to cover additional contaminants and issues if considered desirable and appropriate.

Cost and value for money

The proposed approach allows the KMR programme to capitalise on the core expertise of two suppliers who stood out in the market as being able to deliver high-quality services and products, on time and to specification. The approach also leverages existing platforms and avoids the need for investment in a large software development project to deliver the end-to-end solution KMR needs, but which does not yet exist in the market.

The total capital cost of the configuration/build project is proposed to be capped at \$700,000 (+GST), which is the budget approved under the Year 2 Work Plan (ID: A1450792).

The investment to configure and build this system will need to be supported by ongoing investment in staff to ensure there is sufficient in-house KMR capacity and capability to assist with the development and operation of the system.

Operational costs of between \$35,000 and \$65,000 will be required to cover hosting, maintenance, and annual software subscriptions. For FY2021-22 these operational costs, including subscription fees, can be covered through the operational budget for the Kaipara Maurikura.

The integrated digital solution will provide all the core sediment planning, farm advisory and grant allocation functionality needed by the operational, administrative, and reporting teams of the KMR programme, and offers these key benefits:

- **Speed:** it is possible to configure and deploy this system rapidly, avoiding the need for a 'stop-gap' solution for the second half of 2021

- **Clarity:** ensures KMR programme sediment reduction plans are clear, simple, easy to understand and use, while also ensuring that the process and finished product have a strong focus on practical implantation, resourcing and delivery of actions on-farm (i.e., not just regulatory compliance)
- **Certainty:** the two core components of the system already exist in full or in part, have been designed and refined to meet operational demands, and have been shown to satisfy all relevant financial probity, security and privacy requirements
- **Flexibility:** the system is capable of scaling-up and scaling-down to align with the KMR programme's changing needs and can be modified easily over time to keep the platform current throughout the 10+ year life of the KMR programme
- **Ease:** the system will be engineered to make it easy for advisors to access and use council environmental and GIS data, reducing risk of error and cutting down the time it takes to complete tasks
- **Consistency:** a simple user interface tailored to KMR programme needs will help ensure inexperienced farm advisers access the right information, consider the right factors, and focus on the right issues and solutions when working with farmers
- **Compliance and relevance:** ensures KMR programme sediment reduction plans comply with regulatory FEP requirements as they are confirmed by central government – avoiding councils and farmers having to re-do work for regulatory purposes, having previously completed work for KMR grant-related purposes

Interoperability: can be connected to council farm planning systems if they choose to invest in building them from scratch from the ground up or opt to buy or license a full farm environment planning platform.

Considerations

1. **Aromātai whāinga haumi mō te oranga / Wellbeing Investment objectives and assessment**

The proposed digital build is assessed as being vital to provide efficiency and effectiveness for the KMR programme. Having effective digital tools available for sediment planning, farm advisory and grant allocation functions is critical for effective administrative and reporting requirements of the programme. These efficiencies will assist in all areas of the programme, from delivering environmental outcomes on the ground to achieving employment and related social and cultural outcomes.

2. **Ngā ritenga take pūtea / Financial implications**

Budget of \$700,000 for the development, configuration, training, and deployment of a digital system for remediation-grant management and sediment reduction planning has been approved under the Year 2 Work Plan. No further budget is sought.

3. **Ngā hiranga me ngā hononga / Significance and Engagement**

There are a number of risks in any digital build project which need to be managed. The recommended approach of working with SmartyGrants and MediaSuite was arrived at through a rigorous procurement and options process, where potential market providers were engaged with and assessed. Definition of detailed product specifications has taken place and contracting arrangements will take a realistic and staged approach, while also ensuring timely delivery.

There is some risk to manage with the absence of a significant budget contingency. If the KMR team finds unexpected complications, or if there are disruptions due to changes in operating context (i.e., product specifications change as the project proceeds), the project team will have to juggle priorities and some components of the system may have to drop in order to ensure core functionality is delivered on time and within budget.

4. Ngā tūraru me ngā mauru / Risks and mitigation

In relation to section 79 of the Local Government Act 2002, the decisions arising from this report are considered to be of low significance when assessed against Northland Regional Council's significance and engagement policy. This does not mean that this matter is not of significance to tangata whenua and/or individual communities, but that the joint committee is able to make these decisions without undertaking further consultation or engagement.¹

5. Ngā whāinga mō āmuri / Next steps

It is proposed the Interim Pou Tātaki is delegated the task of finalising commercial contracts with the preferred suppliers SmartyGrants and MediaSuite in accordance with KMR procurement policy. That policy likely means one of the commercial contracts is signed by the NRC Chief Executive, as it will be above the \$250,000 financial delegation provided to the Pou Tātaki.

It is also recommended KMR staff report on progress on the digital build to the Joint Committee in October 2021 and April 2022, either by a memorandum to the Joint Committee or at a business meeting if required.

Ngā tapirihanga / Attachments

Nil

¹ This joint committee operating under the Local Government Act which requires a significance and engagement policy (which identifies when matters require special consultation with tangata whenua and the community) and to have regard to that policy when making decisions. As the administrative support for the joint committee is provided by the Northland Regional Council, it is that council's Significant and Engagement Policy that will apply to joint committee decision making.

TITLE: Landowner Grants - Further Consideration

ID:

From: John Hutton, Strategic Business Manager, Kaipara Maurikura

**Authorised by
Group Manager:** Alan Wilcox, Kairuruku (Acting Pou Tātaki), on 15 July 2021

He Rāpopoto hautū / Executive summary

On 22 March 2021 the Kaipara Moana Remediation Joint Committee (Joint Committee) approved an approach for the delivery of landowner grants funding through Sediment Reduction Plans and a set of criteria for fencing and riparian planting for the same. Staff have now had some experience implementing grants, with number of plans have been considered for funding and around 10 being approved

Feedback has been provided on the criteria by a range of people who have been consulted. This consultation suggests that the key principles relating to the administration of Sediment Reduction Plans need to be more clearly defined and some of the original criteria can be refined or adjusted.

As engagement with experienced Kaipara Moana landowners and agricultural sector bodies to test the workability of the criteria at an on-farm level is ongoing, the criteria should be seen as “provisional” with viable changes that arise being brought back for final approval in November 2021.

Ngā tūtohu / Recommendation(s)

1. That the report ‘Landowner Grants - Further Consideration’ by John Hutton, Strategic Business Manager, Kaipara Maurikura and dated 14 July 2021, be received.
2. That the ‘KMR Programme Remediation Funding Criteria’ in Attachment 1 to this report be refined by the adoption of those Principles and Additional Criteria set out Attachment 2 to this report.
3. Note that consultation with landowners and stakeholders on the criteria will be ongoing and that approval to amend will be sought if changes are proposed.

Horopaki / Context

At its meeting on 22 March 2021 the Joint Committees approved recommendations relating to the provision of grants funding through Sediment Reduction Plans. Among these were:

- “5. That the ‘KMR Programme Remediation Funding Criteria’ in Attachment 2 to the agenda report is approved.
6. Note that the ‘KMR Programme Remediation Funding Criteria’ in Attachment 2 to the agenda report will be tested with landowners and stakeholders and approval to amend will be sought if changes are proposed”

The criteria approved are set out in Attachment 1 related to:

- **Fencing:** types, placement and setbacks; materials, gates; related to topography
- **Planting:** Riparian, wetlands, fencing prerequisites, no poplars or pines, native species, labour, site preparation, maintenance, density setbacks,

- **General guidance:** archaeological sites, annual limits to grant funding contributions at \$40,000.
-

Tātari me ngā tūtohu / Analysis and advice

Suggested Refinements

Since the approval of this report former Integrated Kaipara Harbour Management Group (IKHMG) staff have provided several Sediment Reduction Plans for approval. Discussions have been held with a range of people to test the effectiveness and practical application of the criteria. This has resulted in suggestions for a number of refinements to what was previously approved by the Joint committee.

Key Principles

Overarching principles are recommended to help frame the criteria. It is suggested that the following principles are adopted:

- i) KMR will work with all landowners
- ii) Communications need to be clear that in the case of limited funds over the programme, priority will be given to best sediment reduction outcomes
- iii) Sediment Reduction Plans should be tailored to the sub-catchment environment, with appropriate impact measures consistent with the objectives of the programme.
- iv) Riparian and wetland fencing should be the priority focus of Years 1 and 2 of the KMR programme (with the addition of criteria for Highly Erodible Land and soil conservation work from Year 2 onwards)
- v) KMR finances for projects identified in Sediment Reduction Plan will be for 50% of specified items and described as a 'contribution' - they will not cover \$50% of all work the landowner may want to carry out.
- vi) The severity and the size of the sedimentation issues and the overall impacts will determine the level of support available for a landowner
- vii) Payments for plant stock will be to the designated Nurseries directly upon order from the landowners.
- viii) As the Mataranga Māori Strategy is developed further work will occur on how the strategy will impact on the grants process.
- ix) Payment of grants will be related to stages of work carried out, as soon as possible on completion and sign-off
 - a. Within 3 weeks of formal notification to KMR that work is done, KMR will have the work checked and confirmed
 - b. Payment made as per normal payment processes.
 - c. Conditions such as fences must last 15 years minimum, no removal of fences / improvements for [10] years.

Criteria

The following additions to the adopted criteria are recommended:

- There is a catch-all criteria that, as long as the remediation outcome is achieved, the Kaipara Maurikura can approve a departure from a criteria or rule to cater for local conditions (the exception being where there is a national or district rule)
- If a Sediment Reduction Plan proposal has exceptions to the criteria or rules, then approval by the Amo – Rauora Kōawa / Catchment Remediation Manager employed by Kaipara Maurikura will be sought.
- When a Sediment Reduction Plan identifies remediation work in a specific location, the landowner or contractor can vary the path or location of that work to meet best-practice for health and safety outcomes – an example being, if slope or other factors creates a health and safety risk for fencing, and an alternative route achieving the same outcome would lower risk during work, the landowner and contractor should be allowed to make these adjustments during the work process, and later bring this change to the attention of the KMR advisor
- A size – 20 hectares planting minimum is sought in the next two years unless there is a disproportionate sediment impact (consistent with NES-FW / NPS rules)
- The KMR will not pay for benching. Benching will only be considered in circumstances where no or minimal sediment loss and destabilisation will result if this is not carried out.
- However, the KMR will consider funding a benching project if it is:
 - consistent with national and regional rules; and
 - resource consents have been obtained by the landowner, and
 - it is accepted by the applicant that the KMR will not pay for any resource consent or professional fees.
- The KMR will only contribute funding for water reticulation by way of a per trough (\$500-\$800) contribution for each field that is adjacent to the stream or wetland to be planted where stock is excluded.
- The distance fencing from the stream for planting in the original criteria should be changed to “an average 5 metre distance from stream, with a minimum of 3 metres.”
- Planting criteria – stock exclusion prior to riparian planting is required, but riparian fencing may not be required, depending on circumstances.

Consultation

While discussions have been held with a number of individual landowners and with Fonterra on the funding criteria, there has been no formal consultation at a community level. Feedback to staff is that this should take place to refine the criteria and establish “buy-in”. At the same time, there is increasing demand to accelerate the KMR programme, although staff resources and the processing system are not predicted to be completely in place until sometime in September, assuming no unforeseen delays.

On this basis it is recommended that the criteria adopted by the Joint Committee continue to be seen as “provisional” for the two months from the end of July, in the same way that the rules of a District Plan could be seen as “provisional” during a period of consultation. It is suggested that three landowner hui be held in different part of the catchment over this time, with their feedback considered, after which the Joint Committee can adjust the criteria if need be. In the meantime, the criteria can be used to guide allocation.

Considerations

1. Aromātai whāinga haumi mō te oranga / Wellbeing Investment objectives and assessment

Providing financial support to landowners in the Kaipara Moana catchment to undertake work on their properties that reduces sediment loss is fundamental for the KMR Programme to

meet Tiaki taiao (Natural Capital) and Ōhanga (Physical & Financial Capital) investment objectives. The criteria for allocation will assist with a fairer, more flexible and more focused distribution of resources to where there is most benefit.

2. Ngā ritenga take pūtea / Financial implications

There are no more financial implications from this report than was proposed in the March Report on this subject, and from what has been budgeted for remediation works through Sediment Reduction Plans under the Year 2 Work Plan

3. Ngā tūraru me ngā mauru / Risks and mitigation

The decisions sought in this report are a refinement of the criteria approved on 22 March 2021. These will assist in reducing risk of misaligned application, contributing to the protection of cultural sites, and enabling buy-in from affected Landowners while continuing with the sediment mitigation programme.

4. Ngā hiranga me ngā hononga / Significance and Engagement

In relation to section 79 of the Local Government Act 2002, the decisions arising from this report are considered to be of significance when assessed against Northland Regional Council's significance and engagement policy and for this reason a consultation process and timeframe is suggested.

5. Ngā whāinga mō āmuri / Next steps

Public access to the criteria of the Landowner Grants Scheme is likely to be sought after the hui on the 29 July. Information on the criteria will be placed on the KMR web site, and, as staff are brought into the Kaipara Maurikura and contracted to assist with applications and the digital tools are configured to process them, they will be increasingly relied on. A period of consultation with landowners is therefore recommended for no more than two months to assess concerns hear suggestions for improvement and obtain buy-in. After this the provisional criteria can be confirmed by the Joint Committee.

Ngā tapirihanga / Attachments

Attachment 1: KMR Programme Remediation Funding Criteria [↓](#) 

Attachment 2: Proposed Key Principle and Additional Criteria [↓](#) 

Attachment 1: KMR Programme Remediation Funding Criteria

KMR Programme Remediation Funding Criteria

- The purpose of this document is to provide structure to any incentivisation packages within the KMR Programme, to enable funding to target the key mitigations for sediment control and provide a consistent engagement approach with landowners.
- Experience of regional sector suggests that grants funding packages need a disciplined approach to ensure consistency and fairness across all projects, and different farmer interactions with KMR Programme staff or contractors.
- A common approach is to provide criteria and standards. This also ensures national and regional regulations or environmental standards are met and “Good Management Practices” on-farm are achieved. ([2018: Good Farming Practice Action Plan for Water Quality link](#))
- Review of criteria and related standard costs of implementation will be required, drawing on experience and ongoing engagement with landowners.

Hapū, Marae and Community Partnership Projects

Remediation projects involving fencing and planting undertaken by, or facilitated through hapū, marae and community groups, rather than directly with individual landowners.

Criteria/question	Recommendation	Rationale
Funding to support hapū, marae and community groups to implement projects aligned with KMR Programme objectives.	Yes	<p>Working collectively requires greater initial engagement but can provide economies of scale and help build community focussed outcomes alongside environmental outcomes.</p> <p>KMR Programme will seek applications for projects from hapū, marae and community groups, including to undertake remediation works involving clusters of landowners, and land in multiple ownership.</p> <p>KMR Programme staff will help structure/design projects and provide advice and ensure funding contracts are completed.</p> <p>Preference is for projects that use key mitigation approaches (as below for individual landowners).</p> <p>KMR Programme will need to ensure there is a legal entity to sign funding agreements with.</p>

Table 1: Fencing Criteria

Fencing criteria and recommendation to ensure KMR Programme funding support to landowners is effective, efficient and readily taken up by farmers. The table below sets out details surrounding funding of fences activities of riparian margins for permanent and intermittent waterways and wetlands, to result in sediment reduction.

Assumption is that funding supporting is done on a 50-50 basis for projects, with landowner contributions being by cash or in-kind (i.e., farmer labour, using existing materials).

Criteria/question	Recommendation	Rationale	More detail
Require minimum setback for riparian fencing	Yes. 3 metre setback on permanent and intermittent waterways (including naturalised drains). 1 metre setback on drains and artificial waterways.	Match national and regional regulations that now apply to stock exclusion of all new pastoral permanent and intermittent waterways. Will ensure compliance for landowner.	Applies to natural and straightened natural waterways. Applies to bankfull discharge as per RMA and s360 revisions. (See Appendix One for annotated examples)
Fund variety fence types	Yes. Funding linked to stocking class (e.g., 2-wire dairy; 4+ wire beef; 5-7 wire sheep/ mixed age stock)	Differing stock types require different fencing, and all stock exclusion is beneficial to water quality. However, fence type needs to match site specific function and flood risk.	Clarify which types for each stock type or landowner preference. We are aiming for function rather than gold plated.
Fund boundary fences	Yes, if riparian or wetland boundary can be determined, and only of fence types above (e.g., not battening or more stock-proof than minimum).	Support cost of boundary fence if it is linked to an improvement in water quality. Cost of normal boundary fences should be borne by the landholder.	No fencing of bush blocks unless a riparian forest with stock access.

	No funding if upgrade to existing boundary fence.		
Minimum setback is absolute or average for riparian planting	Absolute setback required. Average setbacks must be greater than absolute setback.	Important to create corridors of shade and vegetation rather than thin and thick pockets. Absolute Minimum of 3m from bankfull is easier to apply in field. We can promote wider setback based on site by site evaluation (considering slope, drainage and intensity of land use). If riparian planting to be undertaken with woodier species a 5m setback is required (see Table 2 below).	3m setback should generate roughly 50% reduction in runoff-delivered sediment of a 10m buffer, according to literature, and therefore aligns generally with KMR targets. Minimum rather than average is easier for contractors and auditors to understand and apply.
Fund coastal marine area fencing	Yes, but minimum 10 metre setback from mean high water spring mark, and no contribution to reticulation costs.	Sediment loading from coastal erosion is direct to harbour ecosystems so high priority for KMR. Greater setback reflects need to be cautious of storm-surges damaging fences, harsh environments and accommodate for coastal retreat. On a case-by-case basis, even higher setbacks may be advisable.	MHWS10 layer can be incorporated into FP tool to guide advisors, but otherwise compliance is not easy to force, and flexibility will be required.
Fund drain fencing (i.e., artificial waterways, excluding straightened natural waterways)	Yes, but minimum 1m setback with reduced fencing choices or co-funding. Fencing natural waterways are prioritised over drain fencing.	Drains also critical source of contaminants but generally more numerous and less able to be setback from without large productivity (opportunity) cost. Drains also lack minimum setback distance requirements in national regulations.	Note straightened natural waterways require minimum setback of 3m as per natural waterways. Need to avoid spending more on drain fencing than natural waterway fencing, as latter has minimum 3m setback so achieves more water quality benefit per metre of fence and cost.
Vary funding by slope	Yes. This will be considered during pre-fencing assessment and reflected in specified price.	Steep fencing proven more costly than flat-rolling land due to inability to use tractor/machinery. Funding package will need to reflect that to ensure fairness.	Need to for advisor to clarify which lengths of fencing are “high” and “low” slope. Inappropriate to rely on GIS layer to constrain farmer.

			Can compare fencing data generated from FEPs to regional LiDAR slope map to determine if advisors are being accurate and consistent (e.g., part of continued accreditation).
Vary funding by setback	No.	Retain simple criteria for farmers and advisors. If a larger setback is required, support should be available for planting. That will help encourage more and greater setbacks.	
Fund benching as part of fencing	No. Will provide advice regarding earthworks in riparian management zones and permitted activity rules depending on regional location.	Benching to install fences is cheaper and easier but may destabilise hillsides and lead to greater erosion. KMR cannot fund actions leading to more erosion.	Cost of benching itself is not funded by KMR, but there is no impediment to the landowner paying for benching if a permitted activity. Provision of information on earthworks should help ensure good decisions are made by landowner.
Require minimum wetland size for fencing	Yes. Minimum fenced area ~500m ² .	Aligns with NPS-FM and NES-FW, and ensures greater area to perimeter ratio (e.g., greater treatment of contaminants per unit length and cost of fence).	Farm Environment Plan outputs will help inform regional layer of >500m ² wetlands to support NPS-FM requirements of NRC and AC (e.g., accounting for changes in area, state and vegetation cover).
Fund fencing in/through archaeological sites	No. Fences not allowed in or through known archaeological sites. If sites are discovered in act of implementation, KMR will be consulted and follow accidental find procedure.	Cultural wellbeing outcome in KMR Programme would be undermined by fencing in archaeological sites	Consider if Farm Planning Tool needs a tick box to ensure no archaeological sites disturbed in action plan. Consider presenting information on location of archaeological sites within FP Tool.

			Opportunity to create archaeological layer with Kaipara Uri for FP Tool. LiDAR and satellite imaged areas of erosion/fencing can be overlaid with archaeological data information to ensure compliance (e.g., Analyse FEP outputs and compare actions with locations)
Fund labour and fencing material	Yes to both, but KMR Programme will only support 50% of total cost of operation.	Provide flexibility for landowners, including farmers being able to do labour themselves, or source cheaper contractors or material costs. Materials are generally about 50% of the fencing cost (irrespective of slope).	Need to fix those by fence type (linear rate) based on type of fence and the conditions of build.
Standardised funding for materials	Yes, with schedule of costs provided.	Prefer consistent price of materials, while tolerating inconsistencies in labour costs.	Varied by fencing type (linked to stocking class). Issues arising in the Auckland region with higher average fencing costs. Consider ways to address by growing supply, or providing certainty of work to contractors to generate lower price.
Funding of plastics, fibre-glass and metal warratahs	No, as latter either short-lived or not proven to be long-lived.	All new fencing should last minimum 15 years. In flood prone areas or steep areas then hand dug wide spaced wooden posts with engineered wire breakaways at flood prone areas are adequate, and costed appropriately.	Will need to check in audits that farmers haven't used sub-standard materials (e.g. excluded materials or very old fencing posts).
Fund water reticulation where riparian fencing has excluded stock from water source	Yes, but limited contribution. Will fully fund troughs (not pipes and pumps).	Significant difficulty in accurately costing and auditing water reticulation. NRC has tested the approach of making a limited (but not inconsequential) contribution by only funding troughs and finds this workable and auditable. Auckland Council has had more success providing 50% funding for water reticulation.	Need to determine how many troughs are funded on per paddock, area, or length basis. The costs of water reticulation may become a barrier to landowners, but it is a capital asset to landowners and

			known to improve stock health.
Fund gates	No. Exception is if gate is required to allow stock to be removed from a waterway, in which case funding limited to 1 gate per every 300m of funded riparian fence.	Discourage access to waterways. Gates risk inappropriate or inadvertent stock being let in to waterways to graze during droughts.	NRC have been let down by landowners using funded gates, especially on lake margins, during droughts and feed shortages to allow stock access to waterways.

Note 1 – Need to develop H&S guidance and output to include in FP digital tool/documents. Ensure latter are a matter for advisor to have noted and farmer paying contractor so liability with former provided H&S requirements are noted in FP Tool by KMR.

Note 2 – Need to involve FANZ on biannual basis to review the base costs of fencing parts and choice of fencing materials to ensure new materials can be used if suitable.

Table 2. Planting criteria

Planting criteria and recommendation to ensure KMR Programme funding support is effective, efficient and readily taken up by farmers. The table below sets out specific details surrounding funding of planting activities of riparian margins for permanent and intermittent streams, and wetland edges.

Assumption is that funding support is provided on a 50-50 basis, with landowner contributions being by cash or in-kind (i.e., farmer labour, using existing materials).

Criteria/questions	Recommendation	Rationale	More detail
Fund riparian planting	Yes, with fencing and minimum 3m setback for sedges/rushes, and 5m for woodier species.	Aligns and if planting is required goes wider than with fencing minimum setback. Planting design will need to site specific based on situation. Advisors and landowners need to consider the buffer size and the minimum distance from fence of 1 m.	Guidance needed for KMR to supply to advisors/farmers/nurseries about which species qualify in what zone (e.g., lower bank; upper bank)
Fund planting without fencing	No.	Stock exclusion is required to ensure survival of plantings (e.g., benefits of KMR investment).	Pre-existing or new fencing required. Need to consider if planting can be funded in same year of fencing, or only year after fencing (e.g., ensure exclusion first).
Fund planting of wetlands	Yes, but restricted to seasonally dryer fringe areas considered the same as riparian.	Viable seed-banks common in the wettest areas of wetlands naturally regenerate once stock is removed. However, this generally applies if permanently or seasonally very wet, and often in complexes with dry knolls that can become kikuyu and weed dominated.	Need to determine maintenance payments for wetlands retired to align with planting maintenance costs for planted areas.
Fund poplars for HEL stabilisation	Not at this stage.	Kaipara Uri partners are concerned about use of exotic cultivars and absence of alternatives. Afforestation / Soil Conservation strategy work	

		required to resolve.	
Fund afforestation of HEL in pine	No. Not at this stage.	Planting in pine can be economically beneficial for landowners and should not attract KMR funding support. Farm advisors should nevertheless identify highly erodible areas and suggest options where areas can benefit from planting in pine or other plantation species. (Economics of forestry requires above 5 ha in scale for planting and good access for harvesting). Planting pine for clear-fell harvesting adjacent to waterways is not considered best practice to meet KMR objectives.	
Funding of native revegetation species	Yes, if native on riparian and wetland edges.	Exotics are currently problematic for Kaipara Uri partners. Natives on riparian corridors are able to deliver benefits.	Inform with Te Paiaka outputs.
Fund planting labour and plants	Yes. Funding to be based on specific spacing and average price of plant and plant in ground. Schedule of maximum costs funded to be provided.	Plants are not typically 50% or greater of cost so need to derive standardised cost to ensure 50% of combined plant/labour/maintenance costs covered. (Presently, funding model is looking at \$4 per tree in ground at an average of 4500 stems per hectare. Need to weave in recommendations of Nursery Strategy).	Cannot readily hold money back or will slow delivery (e.g., farmers have less \$\$\$ available). Need to determine a maintenance contribution.
Fund site preparation and maintenance	Yes. Due to variables on a site to site basis, standard price list is required ranging easy, medium and hard. Provision of maintenance costs will require evidence of 50% in-kind or cash from the landowners for pest control or weed control.	Variable rates for maintenance between \$200-\$400 per ha of planting for 2 years. Clean planting on previously grazed HEL and riparian is easy and cheap. Hard hill country spraying can be more prohibitively costly. Consider natural regeneration funding for afforestation objectives via a mixture of techniques, i.e. site specific, group (0.2ha) fell or weed control on rank grass, or exotic woody vegetation sites for native regeneration. Natural regeneration forest plans will be required from	

		KMR to support learning and good techniques.	
Fund ongoing maintenance	Yes, see above for 2 years funding for easy site, and 3 years funding for hard sites. Schedule of maximum costs funded to be provided.	Need to encourage ongoing maintenance, particularly for weed-prone areas, to ensure planting survival. Will help generate longer-term, more sustainable employment, as there will be a steady requirement for maintenance.	Maintenance costs should only be paid after audits, as relatively modest costs, but will promote auditing of FPs.
Minimum riparian setback of fencing to enable planting for funding	Yes, 3m (sedges/rushes) and 5m (woodier species).	Aligns and if planting is required goes wider than with fencing minimum setback. Planting design will need to site specific based on situation. You need to consider the buffer size and the minimum distance from fence of 1 m.	Guidance needed for KMR to supply to advisors/farmers/nurseries about which species qualify in what zone (e.g., lower bank; upper bank)
Require minimum & maximum density	Yes, 0.5m sedges/rushes, with spacing approx. 1.5m for native revegetation).	Ensure sufficient planting density to find optimised planting density: balancing cost of establishing fast growing species and achieving quick canopy closure and keeping down maintenance costs. Ensure spacing is average of 1.5 m spacing to avoid over-planting and wasted resource (e.g., planting too many when maintenance is cheaper to ensure equivalent outcome for water quality – and generate more long-term jobs)	As above, needs to be captured and explained in advisor / farmer / nursery guidance.
Vary funding by setback	No.	Simple, readily messaged. Plant costs are consistent whether on larger or smaller setbacks (only preparation & maintenance costs vary).	Greater setback qualifies for more funding, but on equivalent basis with minimum rules ensuring planting funds are not wasted on buffers so narrow as to have high maintenance costs and less benefit.
Vary funding by slope	No.	Unlike fencing, little variation in labour costs for steeper slopes (e.g., all plants dug by hand regardless). Funding linked only to plants (e.g., cost of plant independent of slope).	

Minimum area required for funding	0.25 ha in native	Encourage planting of contiguous pieces of land (i.e riparian corridors) that are able to better support biodiversity outcomes and reduce sediment loss at same time.	
Planting in archaeological sites	No, planting not allowed in archaeological sites.	Damages site and believed to degrades cultural wellbeing for KMR. Accidental find procedures need to be developed.	Could create information on locations of to guide FP advisors/farmers in tool. Opportunity to create archaeological layer with Joint Committee iwi members to guide decision-making LiDAR assessment could be aligned to the fencing geospatial/FP data generated.
Standardised funding	Yes.	Simpler and easier to convey to advisors / farmers / nurseries. Plant costs are broadly consistent between Northland and Auckland regions (only labour appears to differ).	
Funding for sub-divisional riparian management	No.	Sub-division generates wealth on sale that can fund fencing and planting costs and is often a consent condition. KMR will not support this.	Need to have a signed contract having stipulation that sub-division within 5-years of funding results in cost-recovery by KMR (extends to fencing investment too)
Funding afforestation without planting plan	No.	Planting plans and implementation plan required for all action funding to assure good practices broadly over entire farm. Farm plans can supersede this once national requirements ascertained.	Need to consider how to incorporate "forest management plan" into FP Tool (e.g., ensure firebreaks, avoidance of excessive erosion risk areas, avoidance of riparian corridors, avoidance of wetlands, minimum setbacks and compliance to align with NES Plantation Forestry.)
Funding afforestation on dunes and dune-lake	No.	Water quality is affected in dune lake catchments from widescale afforestation, as draws down /	Afforestation plan for Dune Lake catchments needs considered,

catchments		modifies hydrology in remnant and highly valued lakes (e.g., concentrates nutrients resulting in degradation of water quality).	setbacks and interaction with national & regional regulation and standards better understood.
Limit annual funding contributions	Yes. Proposed annual \$40,000 threshold per property to distribute KMR grant funding effectively.	Ensures prioritisation of work over four-years and sustainable (long-term) employment (e.g., spreads work overtime evenly). Ensures work is completed and nurseries / fencers / crews can plan for work (e.g., reduces likelihood of projected work not being able to be co-funded b.y farmer)	Need to find what max applies to fencing and to planting jobs. Make relative to size of farm.

Attachment 2: Proposed Key Principle and Additional Criteria

Key Principles

- KMR will work with all landowners.
- Communications need to be clear that in the case of limited funds over the programme, priority will be given to best sediment reduction outcomes.
- Sediment Reduction Plans should be tailored to the sub-catchment environment, with appropriate impact measures consistent with the objectives of the programme.
- Riparian and wetland fencing should be the priority focus of Years 1 and 2 of the KMR programme (with the addition of criteria for Highly Erodible Land and soil conservation work from Year 2 onwards)
- KMR finances for projects identified in Sediment Reduction Plan will be for 50% of specified items and described as a 'contribution' - they will not cover \$50% of all work the landowner may want to carry out.
- The severity and the size of the sedimentation issues and the overall impacts will determine the level of support available for a landowner.
- Payments for plant stock will be to the designated Nurseries directly upon order from the landowners.
- As the Matauranga Māori Strategy is developed further work will occur on how the strategy will impact on the grants process.
- Payment of grants will be related to stages of work carried out, as soon as possible on completion and sign-off
 - a. Within 3 weeks of formal notification to KMR that work is done, KMR will have the work checked and confirmed.
 - b. Payment made as per normal payment processes.
 - c. Conditions such as fences must last 15 years minimum, no removal of fences / improvements for [10] years.

Additional Criteria

- There is a catch-all criteria that, as long as the remediation outcome is achieved, the Kaipara Maurikura can approve a departure from a criteria or rule to cater for local conditions (the exception being where there is a national or district rule)
- If a Sediment Reduction Plan proposal has exceptions to the criteria or rules, then approval by the Amo – Rauora Kōawa / Catchment Remediation Manager employed by Kaipara Maurikura will be sought
- When a Sediment Reduction Plan identifies remediation work in a specific location, the landowner or contractor can vary the path or location of that work to meet best-practice for health and safety outcomes – an example being, if slope or other factors creates a health and safety risk for fencing, and an alternative route achieving the same outcome would lower risk during work, the landowner and contractor should be allowed to make these adjustments during the work process, and later bring this change to the attention of the KMR advisor
- A size – 20 hectares planting minimum is sought in the next two years unless there is a disproportionate sediment impact (consistent with NES-FW / NPS rules)
- The KMR will not pay for benching. Benching will only be considered in circumstances where no or minimal sediment loss and destabilisation will result if this is not carried out.

- However, the KMR will consider funding benching if it is:
 - consistent with national and regional rules
 - resource consents have been obtained by the landowner.
 - The KMR is not paying resource consent or professional fees.
- The KMR will only make a contribution of funding for water reticulation with a per trough (\$500-\$800) contribution for each field that is adjacent to the stream or wetland to be planted where stock is excluded.
- The distance fencing from the stream for planting in the original criteria should be changed to “an average 5 metre distance from stream, with a minimum of 3 metres.”
- Planting criteria – stock exclusion prior to riparian planting is required, but riparian fencing may not be required, depending on circumstances.