



OIAD-596

9(2)(a)

Dear 9(2)(a)

Thank you for your email of 30 March 2023 requesting the following under the Official Information Act 1982 (the Act):

On 29 June 2022 I submitted OIAD-327, of which the third component was a request for: any and all information detailing/containing the Ministry's consideration of Para Kore's submission (e.g. analysis and consideration of the issues raised in it, the Ministry's position on each issue). This was refused by Glenn Wrigley on 05 August 2022. The email below refers. The reason for refusal given was: I am refusing this under section 9(2)(f)(iv) of the Act, to maintain the constitutional conventions for the time being which protect the confidentiality of advice tendered by Ministers of the Crown and officials As Para Kore's submission was made on or about 09 December 2021 and well over a year has since passed, along with the Waste Strategy now being publicly released by the minister, I submit that section 9(2)(f)(iv) no longer applies to this request. That is, advice has been tendered to the minister, he has had sufficient time to consider it and act upon in, and indeed has now publicly announced the outcome and strategy. It appears there is no longer any good reason to refuse release under section 9(2)(f)(iv). Please would you treat this as a fresh request for that information that was previously refused and re-assess the information for release under the OIA?

After reviewing a substantial number of documents to ensure we have captured all formation that is in scope of your request, the Ministry for the Environment has identified two documents, as listed below:

- Environment Weekly Update for the week starting 13 December 2021
- BRF-1800: Revised proposals for waste strategy

Some information within these documents is redacted as out of scope or withheld under section 18(d) of the Act, as the information is publicly available (this applies to a draft summary of submissions and draft waste strategy appended to briefing note BRF-1800).

In terms of section 9(1) of the Act, I am satisfied that, in the circumstances, the withholding of this information is not outweighed by other considerations that render it desirable to make the information available in the public interest.

You have the right to seek an investigation and review by the Office of the Ombudsman of my decision to withhold information relating to this request, in accordance with section 28(3) of the Act. The relevant details can be found on their website at: www.ombudsman.parliament.nz.

Please note that due to the public interest in our work the Ministry for the Environment publishes responses to requests for official information on our [OIA responses page](#) shortly after the response has been sent. If you have any queries about this, please feel free to contact our Ministerial Services team: ministerials@mfe.govt.nz.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "G. Wigley". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looped "G" and "W".

Glenn Wigley
Director - Policy and Regulatory



Environment Weekly Update

For the week starting 13 December 2021

Hon. David Parker, Minister for the Environment


Hon. Kiritapu Allan, Associate Minister for the Environment

Hon. Phil Twyford, Associate Minister for the Environment

Hon. James Shaw, Associate Minister for the Environment

Minister's comments

Out of Scope



5. Waste

Out of Scope



5.3. Update – consultation on waste strategy and legislation

As of 7 December, we have received 175 unique submissions, mainly from individual members of the public, and approximately 940 form submissions from individuals submitting via Greenpeace's website. We expect most waste sector, local government, and NGO submissions to arrive in the last few days of the submission period. Consultation closed on Friday 10 December.

High-level feedback received via submissions includes:

Proposed waste strategy

- Broad support for the proposed vision and core principles, with some suggestions for changes to principles
- General support for the three proposed stages, but with faster initial action
- General agreement that the proposed 2030 targets focus on the right areas.

Issues and options for new legislation

- Support for new legislation requiring central government to produce a waste strategy and regularly review it
- Support for the strategy to have a strong influence on local authority planning
- General support for a duty-of-care model, a nationwide licensing regime, right to repair, and strengthening product stewardship provisions
- A variety of ideas about managing waste levy revenue; improving compliance, monitoring and enforcement; and roles and responsibilities in the waste system.

There has also been growing social media activity over the last two weeks from waste reduction advocacy groups including Greenpeace, Para Kore and The Rubbish Trip, created a video about the consultation, which has had over 1,000 views.



Revised proposals for waste strategy

Date Submitted:	26 August 2022	Tracking #: BRF-1800	
Security Level	[REDACTED]	MfE Priority:	Not Urgent

	Action sought:	Response by:
Hon David PARKER, Minister for the Environment	Provide feedback to officials	5 September

Actions for Minister's Office Staff	Return the signed report to MfE.
Number of appendices and attachments #	<ol style="list-style-type: none">Working draft of new waste strategySummary of submissions (ready for publication)

Key contacts

Position	Name	Cell phone	1st contact
Principal Author	Nicola White	021 283 6669	
Responsible Manager	Amanda Baldwin	022 3625798	
Director	Glenn Wigley	027 4917806	

Revised proposals for waste strategy

Key Messages

1. This briefing seeks your feedback on a working draft of the proposed waste strategy, including on some specific points raised by the public consultation and emerging issues.
2. Cabinet approved a consultation document with proposals for a new waste strategy and legislation in August 2021. Consultation ran from 15 October to 10 December 2021. We received 628 substantive submissions and 1862 template submissions using a Greenpeace form.
3. The draft summary of submissions is now ready for publication and is attached for your information.
4. Officials have revised the strategy proposals in light of the feedback received, further analysis, the evolving work programme on waste and related issues (eg, emissions reduction and energy), as well as emerging issues (eg, waste to energy).
5. A working draft is attached for your general feedback on the presentation, tone and content. In addition, we would like your feedback on some specific issues discussed in the briefing.
6. Once we have addressed your feedback, we will engage with other relevant agencies as we finalise the proposals to ensure alignment (in particular, MBIE and MPI given the close links with their work on circular economy, bioeconomy and energy).
7. We will then prepare a Cabinet paper for you to take the final proposed strategy to Cabinet in mid to late October.

Recommendations

We recommend that you:


- a. **Sign** the attached briefing and provide feedback
Yes/No
- b. **Advise** how you wish to coordinate and sequence the Cabinet approvals for the policy decisions on the beverage CRS, kerbside reforms, content of the new legislation and this overall strategy:
 - i. Proceed as scheduled, with the strategy being approved in October and policy decisions on the other projects in November, recognising that there will always be a cut-off point for what can be included in a strategy of this kind
Yes/No
 - ii. Take the strategy to Cabinet in October as scheduled, and seek agreement for you to approve an updated text incorporating those imminent policy decisions
Yes/No
 - iii. Defer the Cabinet approval of the final strategy until immediately after that set of policy decisions, so that it can be adjusted to incorporate them.
Yes/No

- c. **Meet** with officials for further discussion, if required

Yes/No

- d. **Note** that the summary of submissions on the consultation for a new waste strategy and legislation has been finalised and we will work with your office on timing for its publication

Signatures

Glenn Wigley Director - Resource Efficiency Regulatory & Policy	
Hon David PARKER, Minister for the Environment	
[Date field]	

Purpose

8. This briefing seeks your feedback on a working draft of the proposed waste strategy, and on some specific points raised by the public consultation and emerging issues.

Context

9. The project to develop a new long-term waste strategy is one part of the “waste foundations” workstream, that followed from the decision to increase and expand the waste levy.
10. It links closely to the work on new legislation, a long-term infrastructure plan for waste, and the waste parts of the Emissions Reduction Plan (ERP) in particular. The Prime Minister and you have identified it as a key priority for this year.
11. Across government, the waste strategy work also links closely with the overall ERP, MBIE’s work on a circular and bioeconomy strategy, and energy strategy.
12. The Waste Minimisation Act 2008 does not currently require there to be a strategy. However, if there is one it has some statutory force. Section 44 states that when a territorial authority is preparing, amending or revoking a waste management and minimisation plan, it must “have regard to the New Zealand Waste Strategy” or any equivalent government policy. The government may also direct a territorial authority to amend its Waste Management and Minimisation Plan to help achieve the waste strategy, under section 48. The proposals for the new legislation would give the strategy much stronger legal effect in future, and require local authorities to give effect to it.
13. Cabinet approved a consultation paper with proposals for a new waste strategy and new legislation in August 2021. Public consultation ran from 15 October to 10 December 2021. There was a good level of response, and key points are summarised below.
14. Other developments we have taken account of in revising the strategy proposals include:
 - a. The consultation response and finalised ERP, especially the waste emissions aspect and associated Climate Emergency Response Fund (CERF) funding the Ministry has received to support its work on waste emissions, and confirmation that MBIE will begin work on a more general circular and bioeconomy strategy.
 - b. Progress in the waste work programme, including consultation on transforming recycling, and the changes to the investment framework for levy and other central government sources of funding.
 - c. Rapidly growing interest in the potential of chemical recycling and waste to energy technologies, and relevant cross-government work on related possibilities eg, energy and forestry initiatives.

The 2021 consultation proposals

15. The strategy proposals included five main elements, summarised in table 1:

Table 1: Summary of consultation proposals

Vision	<p>A circular economy for Aotearoa New Zealand in 2050</p> <p>We look after the planet’s resources with care and responsibility. We respect and understand our inseparable connection with the environment.</p> <p>A land where nothing is wasted.</p>
Principles	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Design out waste, pollution and emissions, and unnecessary use of material 2. Keep products and materials in use at their highest value 3. Regenerate natural systems, so the environment is healthy for future generations 4. Take responsibility for the past, present and future condition of our natural environment 5. Think in systems, where everything is interconnected 6. Deliver equitable and inclusive outcomes
Stages	<p>2022-2030: Catching up</p> <p>2030-2040: Pushing ahead</p> <p>2040-2050: Embedding a new normal</p>
Stage 1 priorities	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Complete the foundations for transformational change 2. Stimulate innovation and redesign for long-term change 3. Establish long-term information and education programmes 4. Get resource recovery and recycling systems working well 5. Reduce emissions from organic waste 6. Understand the scale of past damage and best approaches for remediating it
Targets	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Nationally, reduce waste generation by 5-10% per person 2. Reduce public sector waste generation by 30-50% 3. Reduce business waste disposal by 60-70% 4. Reduce household waste disposal by 60-70% 5. Reduce biogenic waste methane emissions by at least 30% 6. Reduce litter by 60%

Overall consultation feedback

16. There were some clear overall themes to the feedback. We have also reviewed the feedback on the ERP consultation, given that it took place at the same time and the topics overlap. The overall themes of the ERP consultation were consistent with the feedback we received on the waste consultation.

17. At an overall level, there was very strong support for:

- a. the need to act and address New Zealand’s waste problems urgently

- b. the need for a national strategy taking a broad and long-term view to set the direction for change
 - c. circular economy as the right goal
 - d. the importance of education and behaviour change campaigns to embed a circular economy culture as a normal way of life
 - e. solutions that are equitable and fair, with people being supported at a local level.
18. The main overall suggestions for improvement were:
- a. simplify and tighten the content and language, using more practical and positive language where possible to encourage engagement (eg, however accurate, some regarded the 'catching up' language as unhelpful)
 - b. strengthen the connection with emissions reduction and climate change, in particular by including low emissions in the vision
 - c. include more detail on what some of the high-level statements mean, especially for the first stage of activity, to help people understand what it will mean for them.
19. The biggest criticisms of the proposals were:
- a. The lack of any te ao Māori framing in the proposals, which many saw as a significant missed opportunity
 - b. The proposed pace of change and perceived lack of ambition in the early stages, with many wanting stronger emphasis from the outset on the higher levels of the waste hierarchy (reduce consumption, redesign, reuse, repair)
 - c. The attempt to set targets before we have good data to draw on, so that we are not yet able to specify how progress will be measured or how we will set baselines.
20. For more detail, see the attached final draft of the summary of submissions.

General changes proposed following consultation

21. The strength and breadth of the general support for the proposals is very encouraging. Submissions included many useful detailed suggestions. We have reworked the proposals to take account of the overall points noted above as well as the more detailed comments. In particular, we have:
- a. Proposed a title for the strategy that clearly grounds the work in waste while linking to the circular economy goal
 - b. Simplified the language and structure of the vision and made low emissions explicit, while keeping the core elements of circular economy, low waste, connection of people with the environment, and responsibility
 - c. Simplified and tightened the principles, and removed some overlap
 - d. On the content of the principles, brought in the waste hierarchy as its own principle, more explicitly referenced the context of finite planetary resources, introduced the possibility of there being a place for extracting value from waste during end of life disposal (ie, waste to energy technology), and explicitly referenced financial sustainability and market dynamics

- e. Kept three broad stages, but made them simpler, more positive and more general, with more obvious scope for overlap and movement between and around them (including using the softer term phases, as some submitters had taken them as having quite hard boundaries between them)
- f. Reworked the goals in each phase to clarify and make them more specific, where possible
- g. For phase 1, added another level of detail under the proposed goals and priorities, drawing on the current work programme and spelt out what will be needed to deliver the goals.

22. More substantive topics and changes are discussed below.

Pace of change and ambition in early stages

23. As noted above, the consultation paper proposed three broad stages.

- **Stage 1: Catching Up (2022-2030)** – getting the basics in place and working to sow the seeds for transformational change, bring our resource recovery systems up to global standards, and reduce emissions from waste.
- **Stage 2: Pushing Ahead (2030-2040)** – increasing support and pressure for widespread changes in mindset, systems and behaviour; optimising the resource recovery system for growing circular systems; and a major effort to remediate and regenerate.
- **Stage 3: Embedding a New Normal (2040-2050)** – embedding circular systems and behaviours across society, integrating resource recovery systems into closed circular loops, and integrating regeneration into modes of production and use.

Response in submissions

24. While most submitters supported the three stage approach, there was some concern that the pace of change was too slow. Many read the proposals as concentrating initially on recycling, and postponing significant focus on the top layers of the waste hierarchy (reducing generation in the first place) until after 2030. This provoked concern, as submitters variously noted that:

- a. those more challenging changes needed time to build (especially if they needed research, innovation and sustained behaviour change effort)
- b. there was a risk of investing in equipment for recycling for materials that could become redundant in future if changes further up the waste hierarchy reduce the amount of material to be recycled
- c. the perceived tone was out of step with current thinking and efforts across many sectors and businesses.

Analysis and comment

25. The proposals did not intend to convey that effort to promote change towards the top of the waste hierarchy would not be a focus until stage 2, but we accept that they were not sufficiently clear. We have revised the content of what is now the first phase to make clear that all levels of the hierarchy will be addressed from the outset. For example, the revised draft:

- a. Has the development of a comprehensive supply chain or network of infrastructure for collection and processing as a distinct goal under a heading of “key enablers”, and makes clear it should support the full range of circular activity (eg reuse), not just recycling
 - b. Reorganises what are now goals 4 and 5 to have a clear initial focus on top of the hierarchy “circular activities”, alongside resource recovery
 - c. Includes more detail on the priorities and actions proposed under each goal to make clear the types of changes that are intended over the next decade.
26. More generally, we have brought forward the pace of change where feasible.

Treaty of Waitangi and te ao Māori framing

27. As you know, the Ministry worked with a rōpū of Māori advisers in the early stages of the project to help develop the underlying conceptual framework and values. That group also participated fully in the general sector advisory group.
28. The core concepts of connection, responsibility, intergenerational perspective, equity and regeneration owe much to those early discussions with the two advisory groups, as do the overall level of ambition and focus on circular economy concepts as the solution.
29. However, other aspects of the rōpū’s ideas were not taken forward, and the final consultation proposals had little if any visible framing in te ao Māori.

Response in submissions

30. This was the most criticised aspect of the proposals, across a wide range of submitters. Many recognised that the concepts in the vision and principles aligned well with te ao Māori, but thought the proposals were weaker and less engaging for not firmly grounding themselves in both world views. This criticism came from Māori, most local government submissions, several in the waste industry (Enviro NZ, Waste Management, most WasteMINZ groups), many NGOs, several individuals and at least one business submission (Countdown).
31. At its strongest, the “collective Māori voice” submission led by Para Kore rejected the entire process and asked for it to start again, following a partnership approach grounded in the Treaty. This submission was signed by 169 organisations and individuals, and many other NGOs endorsed its comments in their own submissions.
32. At least 17 separate councils commented on this issue, as well as the WasteMINZ Territorial Authorities' Officers Forum and Taituarā (formerly SOLGM). Auckland Council gave the overall strategy “conditional support”, stating that it needed to be developed in partnership with Māori and embed key Māori concepts in the vision and principles. The Tāmaki Makaurau Mana Whenua Forum (linked to Auckland Council) commented that “All six principles are in alignment with mātauranga Māori, yet there is no acknowledgement of Te Tiriti partnership or the richness of mātauranga.”
33. In a joint submission, Waste Management and Enviro NZ recommended that policy thinking include the principles of kaitiakitanga, manaakitanga and whanaungatanga.

34. The widespread support for a partnership approach, and for the work to be grounded in mātauranga Māori, echoes the responses to the Emissions Reduction Plan proposals (consulted on at the same time). The ERP submissions analysis report also recorded that:

Many submitters, including Māori and other submitters, emphasised the need for the Government to consider and support a kaupapa Māori approach – which is more holistic – and integrate mātauranga Māori concepts. (p 5)

Analysis and comment

35. There are two connected but distinct strands to these comments: ideas for more of a partnership approach grounded in the Treaty of Waitangi, and concern about the absence of mātauranga Māori content.
36. At an overall level, we are comfortable that the way the work on this project has proceeded is consistent with the Crown's Treaty obligations, when assessed against standard guidance such as that contained in CO 19(5), *Te Tiriti o Waitangi / Treaty of Waitangi Guidance for Agencies* and *Te Puni Kokiri, He Tirohanga ō Kawa ke ti Tiriti o Waitangi; A Guide to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi as expressed by the Courts and the Waitangi Tribunal, 2001.*
37. It would be desirable to have greater engagement with Māori in our work, but that is challenging. We note that, shortly before our public consultation in 2021, the Ministry contacted all post-settlement iwi organisations to go through the list of policy topics for consultation and ask which were of particular interest so that we could make specific engagement arrangements. Although some iwi expressed interest in the waste reforms, none regarded it as of sufficient priority to warrant a specific session.

Targets

38. The consultation paper proposed a set of six strategic targets to be achieved by 2030 as a useful place to start, to create focus and motivate action. The paper acknowledged that the current state of data meant it would take time to properly define the targets and work out how to measure progress.

Response in submissions

39. The proposed targets attracted a lot of criticism, especially from those in the waste management sector engaged with the detail. Most of those who criticised the targets were not against setting targets, but were concerned that they had been developed before reliable data was available. They felt unable to comment meaningfully when there was no information on what the baseline data would be for percentage improvements, or on the methodology for assessing progress.
40. Some also expressed concern that the proposed set of targets focussed too much on waste, rather than measuring progress further up the waste hierarchy.

Analysis and comment

41. This issue has been challenging. From a strict data perspective, it is arguably premature to set targets when we are not yet able to define them, set a baseline or say how we will measure progress. However, from a completeness and motivation perspective, overall targets can still be powerful tools, even when they are not immediately measurable.

42. Our overall preference is to keep some targets in the strategy for 2030, but we have reduced them to the three most critical topics:
- a. Reducing the overall generation of waste by 10% per person (ie, effectively a sinking lid on the material entering the waste management system for recycling or final disposal)
 - b. Reducing the amount of waste needing final disposal (eg, in a landfill), by 30% per person (which implicitly means the proportion being recycled is increasing)
 - c. Reducing waste's biogenic methane emissions by at least 30% (putting us on track for the ERP target of 40% by 2035).
43. The draft says we will keep working to develop supporting targets on waste generation and disposal for different sectors.
44. We have omitted the proposed litter reduction target at this stage, which was not a good fit with how the strategy and goals were framed. It had also attracted some negative comment from some of the main litter organisations, on the grounds that the topic was better suited to a more aspirational 'zero' type of goal, rather than a percentage reduction. We intend to look at setting a litter target through other parts of the work programme (for example, alongside the proposed beverage container return scheme).

Waste to energy

45. The consultation paper identified waste to energy technology as a key strategic issue for the future, but remained largely neutral on which technologies might be a good fit for New Zealand.
46. As you know, there is considerable interest in and debate on the potential role of waste to energy in New Zealand at present, from potential suppliers of technology, those looking to dispose of waste (including some councils), and from sectors that are looking for new sources of fuel or energy.

Response in submissions

47. We received several submissions that were strongly supportive of waste to energy as a general solution for the problem of waste disposal. Some submissions from individual companies advocated for their particular technologies.
48. Other submissions were strongly opposed, often on the grounds that its widespread adoption for municipal waste would undermine waste reduction efforts further up the waste hierarchy. There are also concerns about its effect on emissions.

Analysis and comment

49. The existing guidance from the Ministry on waste to energy technology highlights the complexity and range of technologies and the need for careful case by case assessment of proposals. Given the level of interest and debate, we consider that it will be important for the strategy to include some further guidance on the types of technology that might be useful in New Zealand and those that are unlikely to fit with broader policy settings.
50. The revised draft includes a holding section and goal (goal 6) that specifically creates space for a discussion on the potential to extract remaining value from residual waste, before

or during its final disposal. This section would cover the potential of chemical recycling as well as waste to energy.

51. The Ministry has provided you with a briefing note specifically on waste to energy (BRF-1911, “Understanding the role of waste-to-energy in New Zealand”). We will prepare the text for this section of the strategy based on the information in that briefing note and your feedback, if you agree.

Waste collection and processing infrastructure

52. The consultation paper discussed the need to improve our supporting infrastructure as a sub-point under the priority of “getting resource recovery and recycling working well”. That contributed to the reaction in submissions that our focus was too heavily on recycling in the first stage. People wanted to see that any infrastructure was created with an eye to the longer term and more transformational changes.
53. At the same time, the ongoing work on the Long-term Infrastructure Plan (LTIP) for waste highlighted the potential for a collection network to support a wide range of circular activities (ie, including collection and washing plants for reuse, return systems, repair processes). It also identified the collection and sorting network itself (distinct from any particular processing facility) as a key gap.
54. In response, we have restructured the goals for phase 1 to create three “key enablers” goals, one of which is about creating the network of facilities and services to support more circular management of materials (see goal 2). It sits alongside goals on regulatory, data and investment systems (goal 1), and a goal on changing attitudes (goal 3).
55. Identifying this infrastructure goal explicitly raises an issue that underlies several different workstreams: who should do what on waste infrastructure in future between central government, local government and the waste industry.
56. Traditionally, infrastructure has been created by a mix of local government (particularly for residential waste) and industry (for residential and all other waste), depending on the approach taken in different territorial authorities. The mixed role of local government as an owner of assets, service provider, regulator and purchaser of services creates some tensions. The Waste Management Industry Forum regularly raises their concern about this issue. This traditional approach has also limited what can be achieved to either what a council Can afford or where a private sector company can find a profit.
57. Central government has recently become more involved, through the CRRF and CERF funding, and that role is expected to increase further as levy funds grow.
58. There is an opportunity to explore changing the balance of roles, so that more of the investment in new infrastructure sits with central rather than local government, if that would lead to better outcomes. It arises from the combination of this strategy and:
 - a. The legislation project work to redefine the roles and responsibilities of central and local government in the waste management system, as well as the legislative settings on the use and allocation of the increasing levy funds
 - b. The development of this first LTIP for waste management infrastructure
 - c. The ongoing expansion of the Ministry’s waste investment function.

59. Advice on these issues is being provided in other briefing notes on the LTIP and legislation shortly. The outcome of that work and advice will need to be reflected back into this section of the strategy.

Links and sequencing with other waste workstreams

60. Current planning has this strategy going to Cabinet for final approval in October 2022. There are several major waste reform projects that are scheduled for final policy decisions in November, in particular:

- a. Beverage container return scheme
- b. Kerbside recycling
- c. New waste legislation.

61. The draft strategy encompasses all of these, but refers to them in general terms or as possibilities because it is being written before final decisions have been made. The document would be clearer and stronger if it were able to incorporate decisions on those other policies directly.

62. You may wish to consider the overall sequencing of these various policy decisions, the finalisation of the strategy, and how they will all come together for announcement.

63. For the strategy, we have identified three options:

- a. Proceed as scheduled, with the strategy approval in October and other policy decisions in November, recognising that there will always be a cut-off point for what can be included in a strategy of this kind
- b. Take the strategy to Cabinet in October as scheduled, and seek agreement for you to approve an updated text incorporating those imminent policy decisions
- c. Defer the Cabinet approval of the final strategy until immediately after that set of policy decisions, so that it can be adjusted to incorporate them.

64. It is also relevant that the implementation of the kerbside collection reforms may need to rely on the content of the strategy. The proposals to require councils to provide food scraps and specific dry recycling collection services would be implemented by a direction to councils under section 48 of the WMA. This provision enables a direction to amend a WMMP if that would assist in achieving the strategy. We are working with the legal team to ensure the current draft of the strategy will be sufficient. But this issue illustrates the point that the strategy text could be clearer and stronger if it was finalised after the relevant policy decisions.

Other considerations

Consultation and collaboration

65. So far, the revised strategy has been circulated across the Ministry but has not been tested more broadly. We intend to share it with MBIE next week, given their close interest from a circular economy perspective.

Risks and mitigations

66. The main risks are discussed in the body of the paper:
- a. te ao Māori framing
 - b. the sequencing of decisions across the different waste work streams.

Treaty analysis

67. This is discussed in the body of the paper.

Legal issues

68. As noted above, under the WMA the waste strategy influences local authority WMMPs. Implementation of the kerbside reforms may include issuing a direction to councils under section 48 to amend their WMMPs to help achieve this new strategy.
69. The proposals for new waste legislation would require the Minister to publish a strategy periodically and give the strategy much stronger legal effect over the work of the Ministry and councils.

Financial, regulatory and legislative implications

70. Implementing the strategy and the many initiatives it signals will require new waste legislation to be passed and several regulatory programmes to run under it for the foreseeable future.
71. Cost implications will be considered as part of the policy and implementation work for the individual initiatives and work programmes, as they are developed over time.

Next steps

72. The Ministry will finalise the design and layout of the summary document and liaise with your office on a suitable time for this to be published.
73. Once we have received your feedback, we will finalise the strategy and prepare a covering Cabinet paper. We will also share the draft strategy with MBIE to ensure that it aligns with their work on the circular and bioeconomy strategy. We will carry out the usual pre-Cabinet agency consultation at the same time as your office consults other ministers.
74. To prepare the document for publication, we will also work:
- a. With the publications team, on its appearance, graphics, and supporting material
 - b. With your office, on arrangements for its release.



Appendix 1: Working draft of proposed new waste strategy

See separate document

Appendix 1 is withheld under section 18(d) of the Act, as a copy of the final document is publicly available here: <https://environment.govt.nz/assets/publications/Te-rautaki-para-Waste-strategy.pdf>

Appendix 2: Final draft of summary of submissions

See separate document

Appendix 2 is withheld under section 18(d) of the Act, as a copy of the final document is publicly available here: <https://environment.govt.nz/assets/publications/Taking-responsibility-for-our-waste-summary-of-submissions.pdf>