

# **Quarterly Report**

## **Financial Year 22/23**

### **1/9/2022 - 31/12/2022**

**Project name:** The Piako River Green Corridor

**Deed number:** 23704

**Project ID:** PJ-0002406

## Official information and privacy

### Official Information Act 1982

Important: Information presented to the Minister for the Environment or the Ministry for the Environment is subject to disclosure under the Official Information Act 1982 (OIA). Certain information may be withheld in accordance with the grounds for withholding information under the OIA. Further information on the OIA is available at [www.ombudsmen.parliament.nz](http://www.ombudsmen.parliament.nz).

Information held by the Minister or Ministry may have to be released under the OIA in response to a request from a member of the public (or any other body) for that information. If you wish to provide sensitive information to the Minister or Ministry which you do not want released, it is recommended you consult with the Ministry as to whether the information is necessary for the application, and whether there may be grounds in the OIA for withholding the information. For instance, if release of the information would disclose a trade secret, or be likely to unreasonably prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied or who is the subject of the information, then there may be grounds to withhold the information. If an OIA request relating to your application is received, the Ministry will endeavour to contact you to discuss it, and what the implications of releasing your information are.

The grounds for withholding information must always be balanced against consideration of public interest that may justify release. Although the Ministry does not give any guarantees as to whether information can be withheld under the OIA, it may be helpful to discuss OIA issues with the Ministry in advance if information provided with an application is sensitive.

### Privacy Act 2020

The Ministry may collect, use, hold or disclose personal information for the purpose of evaluating project funding. Individuals have the right in accordance with the Privacy Act 2020 to request access to and correction of their personal information.

## Introduction

This report provides the Ministry for the Environment with information about how the delivery phase of your project is going.

Your report should be submitted within four weeks of the end of the last quarter of the financial year (ie, within four weeks of 30 June), unless otherwise agreed with your fund analyst.

The document is suitable for sharing with governance groups for approval purposes, and auditors for auditing purposes.

Please note, this information in this report has been exported from information provided in the Enquire reporting portal. However, it does not include any other uploaded documents such as deliverables/evidence of activity competition or the Summary of Expenses (for those who require one). It also currently doesn't include the Work Plan section which provides a breakdown of the projects progress, budget, and expenditure per activity. This can be downloaded in Enquire separately in an excel format.

Once the Ministry for the Environment is satisfied that your report meets the deed funding requirements, your assigned analyst will arrange payment (if applicable) with the Ministry's finance department.

## Progress Details

Progress to date	
Date Reported	Progress Statement
15/01/2023	Fencing along the foreshore that was intended to be completed in Q2 has been delayed. This is partly due to service provider availability and the procurement processes required due to the likely value of the contract. This will need to be coordinated with some broader flood scheme construction work planned for the summer and will be managed by the WRC operations team. Planting maintenance began late in the quarter for Main Stem with some work still to complete. Planning for site preparation is now underway. Discussion around an alternative site, the completion of the change request process for this and developing the operational plan in time for implementation requires attention in Q3 in order to be ready for implementation ideally in Q4 and into Y4.

Planned Activities	
Period Planned	Commentary
31/12/2022	Fencing of Foreshore 4, following procurement process; Procurement process for site preparation services for next planting sections; Progress alternative site change request/deed variation and planning of operational work; Progress pest animal control, ready for implementation late Q2 or into Q3.

## Key Project Indicators

	Red	Amber	Green
<b>Timeline</b>	Project is behind schedule and likely to be delivered late. Project will require re-baselining.	Project is behind schedule but has realistic plans to recover.	No slippage against timelines.
<b>Budget</b>	>10% increase in costs against budget or >10% underspends.	<10% increase in costs against budget or <10% underspends.	Project costs are on budget.
<b>Objectives</b>	If issue(s) are not resolved more than one project objective will not be fully achieved by project end.	Experiencing some issues that could result in not all objectives being achieved – but plans are in place to mitigate.	>100% project objectives will be delivered.
<b>Results – Outcomes</b>	If issue(s) are not resolved most of the stated results/outcomes will not be delivered.	If issue(s) are not resolved some of the stated results/outcomes will not be delivered.	All results/outcomes are on track to be delivered during or post project.
<b>Capability and Capacity</b>	There are significant skill shortages, or lack of resources that are impacting project significantly on project's ability to deliver.	There are significant skill shortages, or lack of resources that are impacting project significantly on project's ability to deliver.	The project is full resourced, and there are no major skill gaps on any of the workstreams.
<b>Risks and Mitigations</b>	Major risks have been identified that are likely to cause severe impacts to project delivery if not adequately addressed. Mitigations are not achievable or currently implemented.	Identified risks and most mitigations have been actions. Risks have the potential to overwhelm the project if not adequately addressed.	Identified risks and mitigations have been actions. Risks are considered low severity to project delivery and low likelihood of occurrence.

	RAG Status	Context	Rectification
<b>Timeline</b>	Amber	<p>Several Y2 activities were deferred into Y3 which means a high workload. The process for an alternative site selection requires urgent attention from the project team, including planning from concept plan to works programme, and operations will be compressed into Y4 and Y5.</p> <p>While planting activities are on track for the financial year, fencing along the foreshore is now delayed into Q3 and will need to coordinate with construction projects.</p>	<p>Project team focus for the next six weeks to the end of February is the completion of the change request process to confirm the alternative site, and to continue discussions with 9(2)(b)(ii) in relation to planting. A key part of this is the development of an operational works programme in line with the concept plan and site conditions. The operations team (flood scheme operations) continue to provide support and will be assisting the project around foreshore fencing. New resource proposed to be brought in for project management to allow current PM to focus on critical operational planning for the alternative site and other tasks requiring technical leadership expertise.</p>
<b>Budget</b>	Green	<p>Although slightly behind schedule, spending is on track for the activities in place in the AWP for this financial year. Some redistribution of funds may be needed and higher fencing costs may be able to be covered by underspends in other activities. Fencing costs are being worked through currently and appear to be a bit higher than budgeted.</p>	<p>Monitoring of budget and redistribution if needed.</p>
<b>Objectives</b>	Amber	<p>No change from Q1: Provided an alternative site is agreed, the objectives for plant numbers should be achieved, which is strongly associated with the employment objectives for the project. Amber status is a reflection of the change to the project away from Foreshore 3 and the need to follow due process for an alternative site. The remaining activities remain on track to achieve objectives, noting the removal of pest animal control through change request process and re-distribution of funds.</p>	<p>Continue to work through alternative site processes to obtain approval from MfE/PGG and agree a plan with DOC and 9(2)(b)(ii). There is a draft concept plan in place for a preferred site.</p> <p>15/01/23: Planning to be completed into early February to develop an operational works plan for implementation in Y4 if no ability to make a start towards the end of Y3.</p>

<b>Results - Outcomes</b>	Amber	No change from Q1: Amber status is a reflection of the change to the project away from Foreshore 3 and the need to follow due process for an alternative site. Original project outcomes may not be achieved if an alternative site is not able to be approved by the end of Y3.	Continue to work through alternative site processes to obtain approval from MfE/PGG and agree a plan with DOC and <sup>9(2)(b)(ii)</sup> . There is a draft concept plan in place for a preferred site.  15/01/23: Planning to be completed into early February to develop an operational works plan for implementation in Y4 if no ability to make a start towards the end of Y3.
<b>Capability and Capacity</b>	Green	Planting contracts are now in place and other contractors are available and either engaged or in discussion around work needs for the programme. There are no skill gaps for the activities in the work programme.	No issues to address; procurement processes needed for services for remainder of year to be undertaken as required. Fencing foreshore sections and Main Stem 2 are the larger pieces to be procured.
<b>Risks and Mitigations</b>	Green	Mitigations are actioned and risks managed.	Continue to monitor and mitigate risks.
<b>Overall Project Rating</b>	Amber	Amber is a reflection of the alternative site process and the need to complete change processes to enable the implementation of works in Y4. This is achievable.	Continue to work through alternative site processes to obtain approval from MfE/PGG and agree a plan with DOC and <sup>9(2)(b)(ii)</sup> . There is a draft concept plan in place for a preferred site.

## Results - Indicators

Metric	Total project target	Total project results (excluding this quarter)	This quarter's result	Comments
FW - Number of people-hours worked	23,040.00	6,808.40	October 2022 - December 2022: 1796	People hours includes 135.25 hours of WRC staff time + 1,661 contractor time.
FW - Number of employment starts	0.00	9.00	October 2022 - December 2022: 0	
FW - Number of people currently employed	0.00	65.00	October 2022 - December 2022: 21	9(2)(b)(ii) reported 18 people employed for the billing period. 9(2)(b)(ii) (site prep) 2, 9(2)(b)(ii) (PM) 1.
FW - Funding paid on wages	1,991,960.00	677,828.01	October 2022 - December 2022: 235005.86	
FW - New fencing constructed or existing fencing maintained	27.00	8.50	October 2022 - December 2022: 0	
FW - Area of riparian or lake or wetlands planting completed	35.00	7.60	October 2022 - December 2022: 0	
FW - Area of animal pest control completed	0.00	0.00	October 2022 - December 2022: 0	

FW - Area treated for weeds	35.00	22.60	October 2022 - December 2022: 0	
FW - Number of plants planted in riparian or lake or wetland areas	252,800.00	60,833.00	October 2022 - December 2022: 0	

## Methodology for Nature based employment

*We would prefer you to use actual counts for nature based employment. If you are unable to provide actual figures, please explain below your methodology for calculating nature based employment*

Actualso provided out of financial reporting system and contractor invoices/information.

## Quarterly Co-Funding Information

Co-Funder name	Period	Planned in-kind contribution	Planned cash contribution	Actual in-kind contribution	Actual cash contribution	Total amount paid towards activities this period
Waikato Regional Council	FY 2022-2023 Q2	0	22500	0	35787.44	35787.44

## Quarterly Funding Information (Payment Request)

Financial Year	Your organisations actual contribution	Actual 3 <sup>rd</sup> party co-funding contribution	Actual MfE contribution spent	Total cost for payment period
FY 2022-2023 Q2	35787.44	0	199830.25	235617.69

## Risk Register

Risk	Category	Impact	Impact Details	Likelihood / Severity	Mitigation	Residual Risk	Status	Justification
There is a risk that the new National Environment Standards (NES) regulations could delay the project while consenting processes are worked through. Note that investigation has concluded that plantings will not be designated wetlands where they are not in areas already defined/delineated as wetlands.	Progress, Benefit	Low	May delay project activities or increase costs	Low /	<p>Undertaken consenting process as early as possible.</p> <p>Ensure planting sites are documented as created with guidelines from RUD where they currently do not meet the definition.</p> <p>Note areas that are already defined as wetlands - ie, the project does not exacerbate the existing implications of natural wetlands in relation to scheme management.</p>	Timeframe for consent application and processing.	Action	Putting consent in place removes the restrictions on area able to be treated ahead of planting and also ensures compliance, rather than risking planting preparation that exceeds areas and becomes non-compliance with the regulations.
There is a risk of accidental discovery of artefacts which could result in delays to the project timeframes, or a change of site scope.		Low	Delay in works	Low /	Cease work in the area concerned and follow 'accidental discovery of artefacts protocol,' advise landowners, relevant iwi and heritage authority			
There is a risk of loss of plantings due to damage from animal pests.	Quality, Benefit	Low	Reduce planting density as a result of planting failures.	Low / Medium	Area will be monitored for browser species. Given area is denuded of vegetation possums are unlikely to be a issue. Browsing by hare or removal of plant by pukeko is likely. It has not been an issue at other scheme plantings. If needed culling will occur.	Ongoing risk	Monitoring	And action: hare damage has been noted on one of the planting sections. A pest animal controller was engaged however has not been able to go out due to weather. The site has been revisited with no additional damage, and the contractor will be requested to undertake at least one night shoot/survey to assess numbers out there.
There is a risk that contractors from iwi will not be able to recruit enough capacity in time to undertake works resulting in iwi expectations not being met in relation to contract award and/or delivery.		Medium	This would not affect project delivery or FTE objectives but would mean that outcomes to support 9(2)(b)(ii) aspirations could not be achieved in full. Relationships with 9(2)(b)(ii) could be undermined.	Medium /	Early communication with iwi/hapū partners on extent of work required so that they can advise if it can be met. Develop an understanding about using alternative contractors if Council approved iwi contractors are unavailable. Having a pool of approved contractors who can take on works as required.		Monitoring	9(2)(b)(ii)

There is a risk that core project team members leave roles during the project resulting in delays to project delivery.		Low	Time delay in replacing staff/contractors and bringing new staff in.	Medium /	To facilitate the delivery of shovel ready projects WRC has established the following to support project managers: • a programme lead overseeing the delivery of shovel ready projects within the relevant geographical area. • a project co-ordinator to assist with project delivery and reporting • a regional shovel ready programme manager to provide high level oversight and communications on the full package of shovel ready projects. This structure ensures that there will be additional staff to the project manager who have a high level of familiarity with the project and key stakeholders, who can support and cover temporary vacancies and the induction of new project team members.			
There is a risk that eco-sourced plants are not available in quantities needed which could result in the project deliverables and outputs not being met.	Progress, Scope, Quality, Benefit	Medium	Potential to cause time delays or an incomplete programme of work.	Medium / Medium	Eco-sourcing in the context of the project was determined and agreed early in the project. Multi-year plant supply contracts secure supply and provide sufficient lead in time for sourcing of seed from the local areas.  Keep year 4 as a backup contingency planting season.		Resolved	Ecosourcing area has been defined for the project and is included in specifications in the plant supply contracts, which are multi-year contracts to the end of the project. If any further plants were required and purchased in addition, the ecosourcing area would again be included as a requirement.
There is a risk that existing land licence agreements cannot be amended or that existing licence holders create issues in regards to changes to lease.		Medium	Potential to cause time delays or additional cost resolving issues	Low /	Existing land licence holders have had leases reviewed and amended to one year lease periods. They are aware of pending change to land management practices for flood scheme areas. Challenges over changes to lease agreement is low risk and unlikely to occur.			
There is a risk that Hauraki District Council do not want work to occur on their land and drainage areas which would result a significant portion of the project not being delivered.	Progress, Scope, Benefit	High	Incomplete programme, plantings damaged/destroyed/growth slowed.	Medium /	WRC operations staff regularly attend drainage committee meetings (HDC is a member) to maintain open communications.  Early discussion with HDC about opportunity, scope and how we can work together on this.	Minimal to none - work has now been completed along those sections of drain and agreement letter provided for the planting. Communications ongoing between operations and HDC through BAU as well as project specific.	Resolved	Work completed, ongoing dialogue, no issues encountered.

					Following required bylaw processes.  Ongoing communications with HDC key staff as required and ahead of works occurring along the foreshore sections.			
There is a risk that native plant establishment fails because of weather (e.g. drought or floods) or plant/planting quality which could result in lower stocking rates than the required minimums and/or damage to plants.		High	Incomplete programme, plantings damaged/destroyed.	Medium /	Plan annual planting programmes utilising long term forecasts. Plant suitable species that can accommodate drier periods. Keep year 4 as a backup contingency planting season.			
There is a risk that restrictions or illness due to Covid 19 will impact project delivery resulting in time delays and increased cost.	Progress, Financial	Medium	Time delays, increased costs.	Low / Low	Ensure local supply of labour and materials wherever possible.  WRC has standard operating procedures to manage covid risk and for working under Alert levels which are adjusted as required.  Ensure that approved contractors have COVID risk management included in their H&S plans.  Native plant nurseries have been considered an essential service in the past and are able to continue to maintain their plants.  Keep year 5 as a backup contingency planting season.	Risk remains the same as covid mandates still require isolation and virus is still impacting team members and communities.	Monitoring	
There is a risk that skilled labour is not available to deliver works which would result in delays in the delivery of works programme		Medium	Potential to cause time delays or incomplete programme of work.	Low /	Plant supply contracts have been awarded for the life of the project, and including planting and maintenance. Earthworks undertaken in the project are able to be done by contractors already on as required contracts. Fencing contractors are engaged as required. Sufficient providers are available for planting preparation work to meet the project needs.	Additional work yet to be planned for our preferred alternative site means we don't know what our service needs are, although earthworks and plants/planting are already covered as outlined above.	Monitoring	Most services have sufficient providers at this point.
There is a risk that the site is inundated due to flooding resulting in reduced planting/earth works times. This would result		High	Incomplete programme, plantings damaged/destroyed.	Medium /	Plan annual planting programmes utilising long-term forecasts. Plant suitable species that can withstand inundation and flooding. Keep year 5			

in needing to reschedule planting and therefore impact timeframes					as a backup contingency planting season.			
There is a risk that there are prolonged periods of drought resulting in loss of plants.		High	Incomplete programme, plantings damaged/destroyed/growth slowed.	Medium /	Plan annual planting programmes utilising long term forecasts. Plant suitable species that can accommodate drier periods. Keep year 5 as a backup contingency planting season.			
There is a risk that COVID-19 alert levels and restrictions will impact project delivery resulting in time delays and increased cost.	Progress	Medium	Could potentially impact labour supply, specific windows for work delivery and access to materials.	Medium /	Ensure local supply of labour and materials wherever possible. WRC has standard operating procedures for working under Alert Levels 2-4. This includes undertaking field based restoration work safely at Alert Levels 2 and 3. Ensure that approved contractors have COVID Alert level risk management included in their H&S plans. Native plant nurseries are considered an essential service can continue to maintain their plants and collect seed under Alert Level 4. Keep year 5 as a backup contingency planting season.	Residual risks relating to illness, including Covid 19 are identified in a separate risk above.	Resolved	Alert levels no longer apply, restrictions around isolation if people contract covid is covered in the risk above.
9(2)(b)(ii) [redacted] have been a key stakeholder in discussions around the Piako River, flood scheme, consents and associated works for decades.		Medium	This would not affect project delivery or FTE objectives but would mean that outcomes to support 9(2)(b)(ii) aspirations could not be achieved in full. Relationships with 9(2)(b)(ii) could be undermined.	High /	Early discussion with 9(2)(b)(ii) around opportunity and scope of work funded from MfE. Set up discussion with Ministry for Social Development to see what other support available and also Te Waka (Economic development)		Resolved	They were a successful tenderer and contracts are now in place.
There is a risk that adjacent landowners who are grazing scheme land/stop banks outside of formal agreements will impact on the project's ability to undertake and maintain plantings along the foreshore toe drains.  Several landowners use those areas to supplement or as part of their farming operation and would like to continue to do so. There could be some issues arising with landowners wanting to hinder access or	Progress, Scope, Benefit, Other	Medium	Potential impact on stakeholder relationships. Also risk to planting where landowners are unwilling to cease and a protracted process is needed to enforce compliance. They do not own the land they are grazing and have not formal lease agreements to do so.	Medium / Medium	Consider land designations and administering bodies in terms of ability to have some control over landowner activities.  Discussion with administering bodies for a way forward.	Non-compliance and damage to plantings.	Action	Letters have been sent to landowners, with two outstanding as their boundary does fall on the outside of the drain. Plan is in place to provide information and meet with landowners.

provide in exchange for formal arrangements around the use of the adjacent land (road reserve administered by HDC and marginal strip administered by DOC), or for one or two landowners to allow stock access and damage the plantings.					Communications with landowners with an aim to come to an acceptable arrangement.  Gain support from the drainage committee/board for the plantings, maintenance and ability to secure with fencing if grazing is not to be removed.  Last resort option is to shift the drain out of their parcel boundaries altogether.			
There is a risk that WRC could be deemed to be failing to meet FTE expectations due to continued requests for changes by MfE as to how those numbers are calculated and reported, resulting in a damaged relationship and poor public perception.				/			Resolved	Agreement was obtained regarding the different count and reduced FTEs.
There is a risk that given there are no formal grazing licenses in place in the foreshore drainage area that when adjacent landowners who graze these areas are advised of the removal of access for grazing (pedestrian access can be maintained) and that all grazing will be ceased that it will create backlash and political intervention.	Progress, Scope, Benefit, Other		Possible reputational risk, delayed operations, damage to plantings.	/	Formal process being followed around ceasing grazing in these areas including detailed ground survey work to better define boundaries on the ground; formal letter detailing the need for landowners to cease grazing, particularly given they are grazing without a lease agreement; operations and catchment staff aware and included in letter development so that it is up to date in terms of discussion had with grazers.	Potential for landowners to possibly continue to graze, although this is considered very small. Sites will be secured with fencing and no gateway access provided.	Action	As above, risk is being managed through communications with landowners. Risk is not yet resolved.
There is a risk of cost increase following further advice and details from MfE re Independent Audit requirements for Upper Waiomou and Piako Green Corridor, as original allowances were 9(2)(b)(ii) per project per annum. These changes could result in cost increases of as much as 9(2)(b)(ii) per project per year that could potentially effect deliverables such as planting quantum.	Financial	Low	Higher cost than budgeted for audits - originally estimated at 9(2)(b)(ii) the audit cost 9(2)(b)(ii) for year 2. This is being absorbed by the project budget due to available unallocated funding, however remains as an impact which reduces potential for other work.	High / Low	9(2)(b)(ii) hired with discussion with and with agreement from MfE, hired for the life of the project. Costs are coming in higher than anticipated, and this is able to be accommodated within the project budget.	That costs continue to increase year on year.	Monitoring	At Q1 the audit was less than 9(2)(b)(ii), however final invoice brought final audit cost to 9(2)(b)(ii).
There is a risk of future COVID restrictions and uncertainty as we move into the 'traffic light system' and risk of staff or contractors having to isolate in large numbers due to being close contacts or at worse off sick. This puts further pressure on resources that are already constrained as identified in the				/			Resolved	Close risk, covered above and traffic light system and other government mandates have ended.

lessons learnt reviews, and may impact ability of projects to deliver agreed outcomes								
<p>There is a risk that adjacent landowners who are grazing scheme land/stop banks outside of formal agreements will impact on the project's ability to undertake and maintain plantings along the foreshore toe drains.</p> <p>Several landowners use those areas to supplement or as part of their farming operation and would like to continue to do so. There could be some issues arising with landowners wanting to hinder access or provide in exchange for formal arrangements around the use of the adjacent land (road reserve administered by HDC and marginal strip administered by DOC), or for one or two landowners to allow stock access and damage the plantings.</p>	Progress	Medium		Medium / Medium	Consider land designations and administering bodies in terms of ability to have some control over landowner activities. Discussion with administering bodies for a way forward. Communications with landowners with an aim to come to an acceptable arrangement. Gain support from the drainage committee/board for the plantings, maintenance and ability to secure with fencing if grazing is not to be removed.		Resolved	Duplicate
Concern raised by WRC drainage scheme stakeholders that the PGC would create regulatory obstacles to maintain the flood scheme	Progress	Medium	May delay project activities or increase costs	Low / Medium	<p>Implications are being investigated and documented.</p> <p>Assess on site ecological values together with policy analysis will be completed.</p> <p>Outcome of this investigation will be reported on in the second quarter report by Q4 Year 2. Implications can then be considered and managed in Year 3.</p>		Resolved	Investigation showed that any regulatory requirements for the scheme already exist and are not exacerbated by the project. Information in this regard was provided in Y2
9(2)(b)(ii)	Progress, Quality	High	9(2)(b)(ii)	Medium / Medium	9(2)(b)(ii)		Planning	
Consents not granted or delayed	Progress	Medium	Delay site prep for planting and further condense time frames to get planting completed.	Low / Medium	Start consent process in Q1 and be thorough in document preparation to ensure less back and forth.		Action	Main Stem planting preparation is a permitted activity under the new regulations which are now operative @ January 2023, and a restoration plan will be

								documented to ensure permitted activity requirements are met.
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---

## Health and Safety activities completed

Reporting Period	Details of health and safety activities completed
30/06/2021 0:00	Site inductions for contractors. Preparation of Health and Safety Plan for site blessing, this included traffic management.
30/09/2021 0:00	Contractors supporting this project (WRC approved/as required contractors) have updated H and S documentation to include COVID parameters for working at different alert levels.
31/12/2021 0:00	Contractors supporting this project (WRC approved/as required contractors) have updated H and S documentation to include COVID parameters for working at different alert levels. - Instruction of works. - H&S plan induction. - Contractor site induction. - Contractors COVID policies provided. - Record of vaccination status of contractors and staff kept.
19/01/23	Contractor engaged to control pest animals (hares?) causing damage to one of the plantings. This involves night shooting. H & S activities so far have included ensuring they have all the correct certifications and checking on all the notifications requirements around this. This contractor will work in January or February and will follow through with requirements at that point.
19/01/23	9(2)(b)(ii) provided site specific safety sheets ahead of the planting on the foreshore - these were checked over and considered sufficient for the purpose.

## Health and Safety incidents

Date of incident	Description	Location	Action taken and outcome	Reported to regulatory authority?	Follow up action taken
No details					

## RMA Notices

Date	Issuer	Reason	Type of Notice
No details			

## Capital Assets

Description	Capital cost	Portion paid for by MfE %	ID Number (if applicable)	Estimated purchase date	Restriction period end date
No details					