

Savings scenarios across individual funds

Draft work-in-progress for Te Pūrengi discussion – testing scale and rationale to support ongoing work [also requires further B25 team review]

	Annual average expenditure (25/26-28/29)	WIP view on our proposed action	Low savings options	High savings option	Short form rationale (WIP)
Climate Resilience for Māori	\$2.5M (\$10M in 2025/26 only)	Reduce <i>This reduction would be for the 2025/26 amount (not current year)</i>	0	1.25	<i>Note, this is \$5m for 2025/26, down from \$10m</i> Some current uncertainty of investment logic and expected outcomes 2024/25 investment in pilots would demonstrate progress Commitment in ERP and NAP (stemming from Act) that kaupapa Māori activities will be activated and funded Legal framework not specific to a fund, funding level or length of funding May be unsustainable ahead for a fund to focus solely on resilience of one population group, given broad and diverse impacts of climate change Ahead, likely need to consider the new Cabinet Circular on needs-based service provision Relationship management with tangata Māori, particularly the Iwi Chairs Forum, will be important
UNFCCC contribution	\$0.17M	No change	0	0	Difficult to influence contribution amount Potential to consolidate all expenditure on international agreements into one line item; however this is a tidiness issue so change benefit not material
Environmental Training Programmes	\$1.9M	9(2)(g)(i)			
Water science and economics	\$1.5M	Stop	0	1.5	There is potential overlap (or missed synergy) with the Ministry's separate departmental investment in building data, evidence and insights (tbc) Insufficient scale to likely have significant enduring effect Potentially difficult to justify sustaining a separate fund (regardless of size) to the roles and work programmes of ESR, NIWA & Taumata Arowai (and potentially others) Partitioning different aspects of environmental science will likely compromise long-term investment value (pre-determination of relative value)
Promotion of Sustainable Land Management	\$0.8M	9(2)(g)(i)	0	0.4 (2 years of current funding then funding ends)	9(2)(g)(i)
UNEP Programme Contribution (International Subscriptions)	\$0.61M	No change	0	0	Consolidate all expenditure on international agreements. Tidiness issue so change benefit not material
Kaipara Moana Remediation Fund	\$3.525	Bring 2028/29 into Waste Levy	3.525	3.525	No regrets change

Freshwater Improvement Fund	\$2.75M	Bring into Waste Levy	2.75	2.75	Note there may not be sufficient surplus levy revenue in 2024/25
Freshwater Improvement Fund (Essential Freshwater Fund)	\$1M	Bring into Waste Levy	1.0	1.0	A move into the waste levy appears to be a no-regrets option, constituting a fiscal saving Longer term, there is potential to consider a broader fund such as: <i>Enhancing local and regional ecosystems</i> . This fund could be open to all aspects of environmental management, to place greater emphasis on environmental interdependencies and the benefits and costs across the whole environmental system.
Waikato River Co-Governance Contribution	\$0.98M	No change	0	0	Crown commitment with no savings potential
International Subscriptions Multilateral Environmental Agreements	\$0.15M	No change	0	0	Difficult to influence contribution amount Potential to consolidate all expenditure on international agreements into one line item; however this is a tidiness issue so change benefit not material
Indigenous biodiversity fund	\$0.738m (2027/28 only)	Save (not needed or justified)			\$2.95m (\$0.738m four-year average). Unsure at this time (tbc) – further discussions required
Regional planning implementation – delivery partners (First Tranche Regions)	\$0.075m (2027/28 only)	Save (not needed or justified)	0.075	0.075	A move into the waste levy appears to be a no-regrets option, constituting a fiscal saving. Through Budget 24, 2025/26 and 2026/27 already came under the levy and, now with a different forecast period, 2027/28 should as well.
Regional planning implementation – NGOs	\$0.1m (2027/28 only)	Save (not needed or justified)	0.1	0.1	A move into the waste levy appears to be a no-regrets option, constituting a fiscal saving. Through Budget 24, 2025/26 and 2026/27 already came under the levy and, now with a different forecast period, 2027/28 should as well.
Regional planning implementation – Regional readiness	\$0.396m (2027/28 only)	Save (not needed or justified)	0.396	0.396	A move into the waste levy appears to be a no-regrets option, constituting a fiscal saving. Through Budget 24, 2025/26 and 2026/27 already came under the levy and, now with a different forecast period, 2027/28 should as well.
Indicative totals (subject to further work)			9(2)(g)(i)	9(2)(g)(i)	