



## Kahui Wai Māori meeting minutes, 29-30 April 2019

**29 April 2019 (9:00am – 5:30pm)**

**Venue:** Terrace Conference Centre, 114 The Terrace, Wellington

**Attendees:**

*Kahui Wai Māori:* Kingi Smiler (Chair), Annette Sykes, Hon. Dover Samuels, Dr Jacinta Ruru, Mahina-a-rangi Baker, Millan Ruka, Paul Morgan, Riki Ellison, Dr Tanira Kingi

*Kahui Wai Māori contractors:* Lyn Harrison, Maia Wikaira

*Ministry for the Environment (MfE) officials:* Bryan Smith, Claire Graeme, Irene Parminter, Janice Rodenburg, Jo Burton, Kirsten Forsyth, Dr Lucy Bolton, Martin Workman, Mary-Anne Baker, Mary McCulloch, Dr Matthew Cunningham, Melanie Mark-Shadbolt, Nick Martelli, Robert McLean, Shadrach Rolleston, Vicki Addison

**Apologies:** Dr James Ataria, Traci Houpapa, Tā Wira Gardiner

*Karakia i timata*

**General business**

1. Ms Wikaira advised that a Kāhui Three Waters sub-group have their first meeting with officials scheduled for tomorrow. Mses Sykes and Baker, and Messrs Ruka and Morgan are on the sub-group, although Mr Morgan cannot make the first meeting.
2. Mr Smith gave several general updates on the Essential Freshwater programme:
  - a. Minister Parker's office have forwarded a copy of Te Kāhui's report to MfE officials. Mr Smith praised it as a clear and direct piece of work.
  - b. The Freshwater Iwi Leaders Group (ILG) has written to the Prime Minister and Minister Parker seeking direct engagement to resolve the rights and responsibilities of iwi and hapū in freshwater, similar to the arrangement with the previous government. Ministers are still considering this request. The key priorities which the IGL wish to progress over the next twelve months are:
    - i. Three Waters;
    - ii. Discharges to freshwater;
    - iii. Freshwater for marae, papakainga and communities;
    - iv. Access to freshwater for underutilised lands; and
    - v. Activating existing Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and settlement redress instruments.

- c. Four important briefings have gone to Minister Parker in recent weeks. These briefings contained officials' recommendations on three major components of the Essential Freshwater package. They were included in the package of documents for this meeting, and the authors are scheduled to discuss them with Te Kāhui over the next two days:
    - i. Targeted amendments to the RMA to speed up the process of developing regional plans (background document A);
    - ii. The rural land use recommendations, which officials have recommended be included in a new National Environmental Standard (NES) (background document B); and
    - iii. The suite of changes to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPSFM) (background document C and background document D).
  - d. At-risk catchments will focus on a number of exemplar catchments. While Minister Parker has yet to sign off on the list of catchments, it is likely to be smaller than originally intended. Lake Ōmāpere may not be included in this initial list, but it remains a priority nevertheless.
  - e. Minister Mahuta has agreed to defer decisions on a new Three Waters regulator until August, and controls over wastewater and stormwater discharges will be brought across into the Essential Freshwater programme.
  - f. The allocation paper which is scheduled to go to advisory groups will no longer contain a range of options. It will focus instead on different kinds of approaches to allocation and their advantages/disadvantages. Dr Bolton agreed to advise the members of the timeframes for producing this paper.
3. The members made some preliminary comments about the briefings:
- a. Headroom needs to be provided for the development of underdeveloped Māori land;
  - b. The new NES should use Te Mana o te Wai as its overarching framework;
  - c. More research needs to be done on developing better data and models so that appropriate limits can be set;
  - d. Continued investment in biophysical tools such as Overseer must be accompanied with strengthening non-biophysical tools; and
  - e. Research funding in general needs to be better coordinated.
4. Hon. Samuels also expressed his concern that the authors of the briefings did not appear to understand what Te Mana o te Wai means, and were focused too much on commercial uses of water. Mr Smith reassured Te Kāhui that Minister Parker's intention is to put the health and ecosystems of water above commercial uses, although he acknowledged that he has not taken his recommendations to Cabinet yet.

5. Ms Baker suggested that guidance is needed around what Te Mana o te Wai is and how it should inform all aspects of the Essential Freshwater work programme.
6. Mr Smith advised the members that the Māori-Crown Relations Cabinet committee are meeting on 7 May to discuss coordinating freshwater related work programmes that impact on Māori. When the members expressed some concern that the recommendations in their 'Te Mana o te Wai' report (the report) may be diluted in the advice prepared by officials for this meeting, Mr Smith guaranteed that the full report would be appended to any advice.
7. Mr Smith agreed to provide the members with a copy of the A3 sheet he was speaking to, which outlined the timeframes and the short- and long-term measures recommended as part of the Essential Freshwater package.

### **Meeting with Melanie Mark-Shadbolt (Chief Māori Advisor at MfE)**

8. Mses Mark-Shadbolt and Rodenburg and Mr Rolleston arrived.
9. Ms Mark-Shadbolt gave a brief overview of her role, which is focused on building internal capacity and capability rather than managing external relationships. One of her main objectives is to develop a new, Ministry-wide Māori strategy, which may include:
  - a. A specific team aimed at building internal capacity and capability;
  - b. A single, Ministry-wide Māori advisory group (akin to Te Kāhui Wai Māori) that will comment on all policy development from a Māori perspective;
  - c. A pou tikanga;
  - d. An engagement team which, among other things, will hold regular quarterly engagement hui with Māori (termed the 'engagement reset'); and
  - e. A secretariat.
10. The members discussed a number of matters with Ms Mark-Shadbolt, including:
  - a. Introducing 'dashboard reporting' on MfE's progress in building internal capacity and capability;
  - b. Increasing the number of individuals in senior leadership positions who are fluent in te reo and mātauranga Māori, and who understand Te Mana o te Wai;
  - c. Developing a procurement model for drawing on Māori technical advice from a pool of external experts (thus reducing the burden on in-house staff); and
  - d. Learning from successful secretariats, such as the Maruwhenua unit that used to exist at MfE.
11. Hon. Samuels stressed that, after Te Puni Kōkiri, the Ministry for the Environment is the government department that is of most relevance to tangata whenua. Proficiency in Te Ao Māori is essential if the Minister for the Environment is to receive robust advice. Ms Mark-Shadbolt agreed, while acknowledging that officials are often required to marry the aspirations of tangata whenua with Ministers' instructions.

12. Ms Baker discussed the collaborative process by which members and officials had developed the proposals concerning Te Mana o te Wai, Māori freshwater values and measures, and mātauranga Māori. She suggested that, while this process had its flaws, it has the potential to be a best-practice model for future policy collaboration. She added, however, that Māori would need to be appropriately resourced to co-design policy before it could become a business-as-usual approach.
13. Mr Morgan agreed that the best outcomes are reached when Māori are involved from the design stage. He suggested that MfE should plan collaborative processes in advance based on its anticipated work programme. Ms Mark-Shadbolt acknowledged the need for a long-term work programme, but added that MfE's agenda is also determined by the election cycle, and by the five Ministers it reports to.
14. The members stressed that Ms Mark-Shadbolt needed a commitment at a strategic level to make cultural change across MfE and a body of advisors to support her in this important kaupapa.

### **Communications and engagement plan**

15. Ms Harrison advised that Te Amokura productions had completed the four Te Mana o te Wai vignettes. The members watched them and unanimously agreed to sign them off. Ms Rodenburg and Harrison agreed to have a further conversation about how to distribute the vignettes.
16. Mr Rolleston gave an update on the quarterly regional hui that are being arranged with Māori. The purpose of this 'engagement reset' is to build stronger relationships between MfE and its Treaty partner, and to hold more regular hui where conversations can be had about everything the Ministry is working on (i.e. water, climate change, resource management reform) rather than ad-hoc meetings on individual kaupapa. The first round of hui are scheduled for early May, and one of the main priorities will be to discuss what future hui could look like. MfE is also keen to fit in with existing forums (such as regional council hui) wherever possible.
17. Mr Rolleston agreed to send the members a copy of the regional hui schedule for May, in case there are existing hapū/iwi hui that may coincide with the schedule. Ms Rodenburg added that general public consultation will commence in July/August, subject to Ministerial decisions.
18. Mr Rolleston outlined the structure of the regional hui. They will follow a workshop format: participants will be split into groups to get a chance to engage on each kaupapa in turn. The intention is that the hui will allow MfE and Māori to journey through the policy development process together. Māori will be able to challenge MfE every three months, and see how their feedback is being incorporated into policy.
19. The members suggested that the hui be facilitated by individuals who are familiar with mātauranga Māori, and that bilingual primers be used to facilitate the

workshop discussions. Mr Rolleston noted that MfE wants to encourage Māori to design the agenda and facilitate the regional hui, and to resource them to do so.

20. Hon. Samuels cautioned that the regional hui may not be as well attended if they address multiple kaupapa instead of focusing on water.
21. Mr Smiler recommended that invitations to the regional hui also be sent to the Federation of Māori Authorities so that Māori farm owners, trusts and incorporations have an opportunity to attend. Mr Rolleston noted that MfE will also be meeting with organisations such as the Freshwater Iwi Leaders Group and the New Zealand Māori Council.
22. The members noted that they want to see some commitment from the government to progress their recommendations before public engagement. Hon. Samuels arranged a meeting between Te Kāhui and Minister Parker on 8 May 2019 to discuss their recommendations.
23. Mses Mark-Shadbolt and Rodenburn and Mr Rolleston departed.

### **Options for a new freshwater planning process**

24. Ms Addison and Mr McLean arrived. Ms Addison gave a brief overview of officials' recommendations to amend the RMA to speed up the process of developing regional plans (background document A).
25. The members raised a number of points, including:
  - a. The recommendations do not meet Te Kāhui's recommendations, nor do they appear to address MfE's objectives;
  - b. This proposal only addresses one issue – expediting the planning process – rather than Te Kāhui's broader proposal for establishing a Te Mana o te Wai commission;
  - c. There are issues with existing hearing processes which will not be resolved by speeding up the process – for example, the pool of hearing commissioners generally lacks expertise in mātauranga Māori and Te Mana o te Wai;
  - d. Introducing mechanisms to ensure regional councils comply with regulations is more important than expediting the planning process;
  - e. Māori need to be sufficiently resourced to participate in any hearing processes;
  - f. A Māori Land Court Judge or Waitangi Tribunal member would be more appropriate to preside over the proposed hearing panels than an Environment Court Judge;
  - g. There is a conflict of interest if regional councils are allowed to appoint the hearing panels; and
  - h. The language used in paragraph 35 suggests that Te Kāhui Wai Māori support the recommendations.
26. Ms Addison replied that one of the roles of the proposed hearing panels would be to test regional council plan changes against Te Mana o te Wai. She added that

these panels were an interim measure given the longer-term comprehensive resource management reforms that are being considered.

27. Mr Smiler asked if Minister Parker has already made a decision on the proposed change to the planning process. Mr McLean replied that Minister Parker is interested in progressing officials' recommendations, but is still looking for further advice.
28. The members asked why they had not received this briefing earlier. Ms Addison replied that Minister Parker had requested the advice in a short timeframe, which did not overlap with any of the advisory groups' meetings.
29. Mr Smiler advised that Te Kāhui would provide Minister Parker with written comments on all of the briefings that had been sent to them for this meeting. He also asked Dr Bolton to advise Te Kāhui if there are any other briefing papers containing officials' final advice which have gone to Minister Parker that Te Kāhui have not seen.
30. Mr Morgan suggested that, as a general rule, officials who are scheduled to present to Te Kāhui should be prepared to comment on how their proposals align with Te Kāhui's recommendations in their report.
31. Ms Addison and Mr McLean departed.

#### **Rural package recommendations**

32. Mses Baker, Parminter, Graeme and McCulloch, and Mr Martelli, arrived.
33. Mr Smiler asked how well officials' recommendations regarding rural land use (background document B) aligned with Te Kāhui Wai Māori's recommendations. Ms Parminter thought the alignment was quite good overall. Mr Martelli noted that, while officials had not recommended a moratorium on additional discharges and water-related consents, they were trying to implement the intent behind it.
34. The members argued that a moratorium would be a better way to prevent further degradation, and would provide the space for fundamental system reform to be undertaken. They also stressed that it would send a strong message to New Zealand about the government's priorities. They suggested that one of the key differences between the rural package recommendations and a moratorium is that the recommendations are limited to certain areas – for example, they do not extend to urban spaces, or rural uses outside of intensification.
35. Mr Morgan asked if dischargers would receive a 'credit' for dropping the amount they were discharging by shifting to a less intensive farming practice. Mr Martelli advised that this is not envisioned as part of officials' recommendations.
36. The members and officials had a discussion about the results that are expected to arise from the rural package recommendations. Officials advised that they are expected to halt further degradation of water and achieve some improvements in water quality.

37. The members suggested that Farm Environment Plans (FEPs) could require all farmers to achieve a decrease in their discharges (perhaps 10%), including those who are already at best practice. There was some discussion about whether this would penalise those farmers who have already invested in getting to best practice, versus the need to reduce the overall amount of discharge in overallocated catchments.
38. The members and officials discussed the proposed nitrogen cap, which is proposed to set a percentage cap in a catchment and bring the overall amount of discharge down to that cap. Officials anticipate that this will be a fast mechanism – six months to build nitrogen profiles (such as through Overseer files), followed by a two year implementation period. The members cautioned that this timeframe is very optimistic, citing the amount of time it took for information to be gathered as part of Plan Change 10. They suggested that officials should be talking to industry groups to gather information, such as fertiliser companies.
39. The members and officials discussed the relationship between the intensification restrictions and the nitrogen cap. Officials advised that the intensification restrictions will be the baseline to prevent further water degradation, whereas the nitrogen cap will overlay that in highly impacted areas. The members noted that, if the first right to the water were truly provided for, the standard would be much higher than the current baseline. Officials replied that, as new regulations are implemented over the next five years to improve water quality, the intensification restrictions will become obsolete.
40. The members made a number of other comments on the briefing, including:
- a. Te Mana o te Wai needs to be the overarching framework for a NES, and officials should be assessing their proposals against Te Mana o te Wai;
  - b. Hapū and iwi need to be resourced to exercise kaitiakitanga, including responding to resource consents, on-the-river monitoring for compliance and signing off on FEPs;
  - c. Strong enforcement mechanisms need to accompany the rural package recommendations;
  - d. Farmers and industry groups should be required to provide the data required to set measures and limits;
  - e. Industry buy-in is essential if the recommendations are to be successful; and
  - f. Headroom needs to be provided for underdeveloped Māori land.
41. Mses Baker, Parminter, Graeme and McCulloch, and Mr Martelli, departed.

### **Combined NPS-FM recommendations**

42. Ms Burton and Mr Workman arrived to discuss officials' recommended changes to the NPSFM (background document C and background document D).
43. Ms Baker provided a brief summary of how Te Kāhui Wai Māori had been involved in developing the NPSFM recommendations. While Te Kāhui's involvement had

- been fairly broad and high-level on most of the recommendations, Ms Baker had co-developed the recommendations concerning Te Mana o te Wai and Māori freshwater values/measures and mātauranga Māori. These recommendations were subsequently condensed into four pages within an ‘omnibus’ briefing outlining all of the substantial changes proposed by officials for the NPSFM (document C). Although very limited time was provided for Ms Baker to review the four pages in the omnibus briefing, she was nevertheless reasonably happy with the recommendations, and believed that they could be quite significant for Māori if they are implemented.
44. Ms Burton confirmed that Minister Parker had asked for a more detailed briefing on Te Mana o te Wai and Māori freshwater values/measures and mātauranga Māori, which officials hope to co-develop with Ms Baker.
  45. Hon. Samuels asked if Te Kāhui’s contribution to the NPSFM recommendations would be provided to Ministers as-is or in a distilled form. Mr Workman confirmed that background document C had been provided to Ministers Parker and O’Connor, and that Ministers wanted Te Mana o te Wai to form a fundamental part of the freshwater reform agenda.
  46. Ms Baker noted that, from a purely ecological point of view, she thought that most of the proposals contained in documents C and D looked promising. She added, however, that the NPSFM would struggle to generate positive outcomes for Māori unless a compulsory Māori value is added to the National Objectives Framework (NOF).
  47. The members also suggested that:
    - a. The recommendations relating to monitoring need to be strengthened;
    - b. Te Mana o te Wai is not limited to ecosystem health; and
    - c. Hydroelectric power generation should not be an exception in the NPSFM.
  48. The members reiterated that the NPSFM is only one small piece of the wider systemic reform which Te Kāhui Wai Māori have recommended. They discussed the need to convince Ministers that their recommendations are achievable and clearly identify the negative impacts of not committing to a fundamental step change in freshwater management. They added that most New Zealanders are in support of systemic reform.
  49. The members and officials discussed the proposal to invest money in improving the effectiveness of Overseer. The members suggested that the government should also be investing in alternative tools and methodologies for limit setting (including mātauranga Māori models), and reflecting this priority in how science funding is allocated through a national science framework.
  50. The members supported officials’ proposal in document C to change the NPSFM to direct regional councils to ‘recognise and provide for’ or ‘give effect to’ Te Mana o te Wai, preferring the latter. Mr Workman noted that all of the proposed options for Te Mana o te Wai (maintain status quo, clarify existing provisions, or stronger



direction) need to be tested with Minister Parker first, who will want a clear idea of what the implications of each option will be.

51. The members expressed some concern that there might be some resistance to strengthening Te Mana o te Wai in the NPSFM because of the potential impacts, when the status quo is already having significant negative impacts. They suggested that:
  - a. A robust transition period would mitigate the impacts of stronger direction on farming practices;
  - b. Providing a clear definition of Te Mana o te Wai in the NPSFM would mitigate the risk of extensive litigation over what it means in practice; and
  - c. Strengthening Te Mana o te Wai in the NPSFM would help clarify what section 6(e) of the RMA means in a freshwater context.
52. The members agreed to prepare a concise definition of Te Mana o te Wai based on the diagram included in their report to Minister Parker. They noted that substantial work had already been done with officials in developing this narrative.
53. Ms Burton and Mr Workman departed.

### **Concluding discussion**

54. The members expressed some disappointment that some of the proposals contained in background documents A to D appear to be a step backwards from what had previously been tabled with the Kāhui. They agreed that, apart from document C, the papers tabled for this meeting did not demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of Te Mana o te Wai, despite their authors suggesting that their recommendations upheld Te Mana o te Wai.
55. The members agreed on who would draft advice to Minister Parker in response to documents A to D.
56. Maia Wikaira agreed to draft a response to the Te Taitokerau Māori and Council Working Party declining their request to meet with Te Kāhui Wai Māori at this stage, on the basis that their Terms of Reference directed that they had to maintain the confidence of the work they were undertaking until the material was in the public domain.
57. Mr Smiler advised that he would be absent the following day. The members agreed that Hon. Samuels and Mr Ellison would alternate as the Chair in Mr Smiler's absence.

*Karakia whakamutunga*

## 30 April 2019 (8:30am – 1:30pm)

**Venue:** Terrace Conference Centre, 114 The Terrace, Wellington

### **Attendees:**

*Kahui Wai Māori:* Hon. Dover Samuels (co-Chair), Riki Ellison (co-Chair), Annette Sykes, Dr Jacinta Ruru, Dr James Ataria, Mahina-a-rangi Baker, Millan Ruka, Paul Morgan

*Kahui Wai Māori contractors:* Lyn Harrison, Maia Wikaira

*MfE officials:* Andrew Wharton, Ben Dickson, Dr Chris Daughney, Jo Gascoigne, Dr Lucy Bolton, Dr Matthew Cunningham, Simon King

**Apologies:** Kingi Smiler, Dr Tanira Kingi, Traci Houppapa, Tā Wira Gardiner

*Karakia i timata*

### **Meeting with Minister Davis**

1. Te Kāhui Wai Māori met with Minister Davis at Parliament from 8:30 to 9:30am. Officials did not take notes of this meeting.

### **Debrief on meeting with Minister Davis**

2. Hon. Samuels Chaired the session.
3. The members agreed that the meeting with Minister Davis was positive.
4. The members agreed that it was important to front-foot their report with other Ministers, Māori, industry groups, and the wider public in order to build support for their recommendations. They expressed some concern about not being able to do so yet on account of their report remaining confidential.
5. The members agreed that they need to meet with Minister Parker urgently to discuss their report, and receive a more detailed written response to each of their twelve recommendations. The extent to which his response aligned with their recommendations would determine whether it was viable for the members to continue to be involved in Te Kāhui Wai Māori.
6. Mr Smiler asked Dr Cunningham to draft a letter to Minister Davis following up on their meeting.

### **Environment Aotearoa 2019 (EA2019) report**

7. Dr Daughney and Mr Dickson arrived. Mr Ellison Chaired the session.
8. Dr Daughney handed out a powerpoint presentation summarising the EA2019 report. He stated that the purpose of the presentation was twofold:

- a. To support Te Kāhui Wai Māori's ability to advise on freshwater reform by providing them with the latest findings on the state of New Zealand's freshwater; and
  - b. To identify and explore opportunities for Te Kāhui Wai Māori and officials to work together to better weave Te Ao Māori into future reports.
9. The members advised that there was not enough time to discuss the second objective at this meeting. They suggested that a dedicated session be arranged for a future Kāhui meeting to progress this, which officials supported. Dr Daughney noted that, in general, his team had tried to take an integrative approach to discussing Te Ao Māori in EA2019 rather than having a dedicated chapter.
10. Ms Baker noted that the report contained a lot of useful information. It was honest about the state of the environment, it articulated the connection of freshwater health with mahinga kai, and it mentioned the effects of freshwater degradation on mental wellbeing. She suggested that, in future reporting, it would be useful for Te Kāhui to see commentary on issues of significance to Māori rather than just 'themes of degradation' – for example, the mauri of the water, Māori involvement in decision-making, and the quality of knowledge being gathered about freshwater.
11. The members asked who would be responsible for addressing the findings identified in EA2019. Dr Daughney advised that the environmental reporting team have some responsibility for communicating their findings to the public; however, responsibility for progressing the government's response to the findings lies with policy teams within MfE.
12. The members suggested that officials begin to signal now the kind of reporting they want to do in the future and identify the knowledge gaps that exist so that Māori scientists can start filling them. They highlighted their recommendation to Minister Parker regarding the need for national science strategy to support this.
13. Dr Daughney offered to share any of the data that informed EA2019 which Te Kāhui Wai Māori may find useful.
14. Dr Daughney and Mr Dickson departed.

### **Response to officials' papers**

15. The members reviewed the draft responses they had prepared to documents A through D. They agreed to add three overarching points to their response:
  - a. There is little alignment between officials' papers and their recommendations to Minister Parker;
  - b. With the exception of document C, there is an inconsistent understanding of Te Mana o te Wai across all of the papers, and a lack of strategic understanding of how to apply the framework which Te Kāhui have recommended in their report; and
  - c. Receiving papers in a piecemeal way has required Te Kāhui to respond in a piecemeal fashion.

## **Comprehensive review of the resource management system**

16. Ms Gascoigne, and Messrs King and Wharton, arrived. Mr Ellison Chaired the session.
17. Ms Gascoigne provided a brief overview of the two-phased reform to the RMA. The first phase involves a narrow amendment bill focused mostly on rolling back the provisions added by the previous government. The members expressed several concerns, including:
  - a. They have not had a substantial session with officials on the phase one amendment bill until now;
  - b. The only opportunity for Te Kāhui (and Māori in general) to engage on the amendment bill is through the select committee process;
  - c. The Environmental Protection Authority is not the appropriate body to be tasked with monitoring regional council compliance; and
  - d. The lack of consultation with Māori regarding the narrow bill may result in a backlash from Māori.
18. Ms Gascoigne replied that the decision to progress the phase one narrow amendment bill was made by Ministers prior to Te Kāhui Wai Māori being established.
19. Ms Gascoigne noted that phase two – which will involve a much more comprehensive review of the resource management system – has yet to commence. Once Cabinet have agreed on a process for phase two, officials intend to commence a wider engagement process. She handed out an A3 sheet summarising officials' early thinking on the scope and process for a comprehensive review of the resource management system.
20. The members made several comments on what should be considered in the phase two amendments, including:
  - a. A Te Mana o te Wai commission;
  - b. Affecting cultural change in institutions with vested interests;
  - c. Ensuring that Te Tiriti is not invisibilised through the reform process; and
  - d. Ensuring that the Crown retains appropriate oversight of its Tiriti responsibilities when devolving authority to regional councils.
21. Ms Gascoigne, and Messrs King and Wharton, departed.

## **Closing discussion**

22. The members agreed that Mr Ruka's case study on Poroti Springs should be sent to Minister Parker with an appropriate covering email drafted by Ms Sykes.

*Karakia whakamutunga*

## Appendix A: Action points

No.	Action	Responsibility	Date
1	Circulate a copy of the A3 sheet used by Mr Smith in his general work programme update	Dr Cunningham	Done (3/5/19) – available on the portal
2	Confirm the timeframes for the draft fair allocation blueprint	Dr Bolton	Done
3	Ensure that Te Kāhui Wai Māori's final report is appended to the advice that is sent to Ministers for the Māori-Crown Relations cabinet committee meeting on 7 May	Mr Smith	Done
4	Schedule a meeting with Minister Parker to discuss Te Kāhui Wai Māori's final report	Hon. Samuels	Done – meeting scheduled for 8/5/19
5	Send Te Kāhui Wai Māori the schedule of regional engagement hui being held in May	Mr Rolleston	Done (3/5/19) – available on the portal
6	Coordinate with Mr Rolleston on the pānui and the structure of the regional engagement hui in May	Ms Harrison	
7	Invite the Federation of Māori Authorities to the regional engagement hui in May	Mr Rolleston	
8	Discuss how to make use of the Te Mana o te Wai vignettes in the Essential Freshwater public consultation programme	Mses Harrison and Rodenburg	Done – will update Te Kāhui at their next meeting
9	Provide Minister Parker and MfE with a written response to the briefing papers tabled for this meeting	Te Kāhui Wai Māori	Done (30/4/19)
10	Advise Te Kāhui Wai Māori if there are any other briefings containing officials' final advice that they have yet to see	Dr Bolton	Done (3/5/19)
11	Provide Hon Samuels and Mr Ruka with a hard copy of Te Kāhui Wai Māori's final report	Dr Cunningham	Done (30/4/19)
12	Prepare a definition of Te Mana o te Wai based on the diagram in the report to Minister Parker	Te Kāhui Wai Māori	
13	Draft a letter responding to the request from the Te Taitokerau Māori and Council Working Party to meet with Te Kāhui Wai Māori	Ms Wikaira	
14	Send a letter to Minister Davis following up on his meeting with Te Kāhui Wai Māori on 30 April	Dr Cunningham	Done (30/4/19)
15	Schedule a follow up workshop between Te Kāhui Wai Māori and MfE's environmental reporting team	Dr Cunningham	Ongoing

In-confidence

NOT GOVERNMENT POLICY

<b>No.</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Date</b>
16	Send the Poroti Springs case study to Minister Parker and MfE officials (with an accompanying cover email from Ms Sykes)	Dr Cunningham	Done (3/5/19)