

## **Minutes of the Freshwater Leaders Group meeting 29 January 2019**

**Date: 29 January 2019**

**Attendees:** Allen Lim (from 2.30 pm), Bryce Johnson, Corina Jordon, Graeme Gleeson (from 11.08 am), Marnie Prickett, Alison Dewes, John Penno (Chair, from 1.23 pm), Tom Lambie, Hugh Logan (after 2.30 pm), Nicola Shadbolt (Acting Chair until John Penno arrived), Stephanie Howard (from 11.08 am)

**Officials in attendance:** Martin Workman (part of meeting), Katherine Meerman (part of meeting), Jo Burton (for part of meeting), Roger Bannister, Nick Vincent, Sarah Lowry (note-taker)

### **Standing Items (Agenda items 1-3)**

#### **Agenda item 1 - Apologies**

1. Apologies were noted for the following people: Marc Schallenberg, Traci Houppapa, Lees Seymour, Mandy Bell (flight delayed and unable to attend), Gary Taylor (apologies for today and tomorrow (via Martin) due to flight disruptions).
2. The meeting commenced at 9.44 am. Due to weather-induced (fog) travel disruptions, some attendees were delayed or unable to attend the meeting. (Refer apologies). Nicola Shadbolt identified as the Acting Chair (given the absence of John Penno in earlier part of the meeting).

#### **Agenda item 2- Conflicts of interest**

3. No conflicts of interest were raised.

#### **Agenda Item 3— Minutes of previous meeting (and related discussions)**

4. The following members were present for this section of the meeting: Bryce Johnson, Corina Jordon, Marnie Prickett, Alison Dewes, Tom Lambie, Nicola Shadbolt. Additionally Adam joined the meeting around 9.50 am.
5. The minutes of the 6 December 2018 meeting were discussed and accepted by those present with the following amendments (underlined):
  - Amend page 6 of minutes — 'the Group finished by identifying three different views of the revised ARC project'
  - Add to page 8 of minutes (following STAG bullet): "Some members stressed that nutrient management is essential to setting limits for ecological health".
6. Issues in accessing information on the portal were noted. In future, any reference papers for the meeting will be included in the meeting papers pack. Officials noted that the Group will receive weekly updates on what has been posted to the portal.
7. In response to a query about whether the Water Taskforce had minuted meetings the Group was advised that the Taskforce reviews the minutes of FLG meetings and that the Water Taskforce (the Taskforce) and the Water Directorate referred to the same entity, but Water Taskforce would be used as the definitive name in future.
8. The Acting Chair noted 'how we function' actions could be removed from the summary actions table eg, action 10 from 6 December.
9. One group member queried why bundle of briefings did not include feedback from FLG.
10. Officials clarified the process for including FLG:
  - The Taskforce have provided high level papers to Ministers for their feedback on options to be presented to advisory groups.

- This Minister's comments would then inform proposals brought to FLG for feedback.
- FLG feedback would in future be included in briefings making recommendations to Ministers for consideration.
- Detailed proposals had not been presented to FLG yet. But the February 2019 FLG meeting would bring more concrete proposals to get FLG member feedback.

11. FLG comments included:

- One member noted the value of feedback from FLG, Kahui Wai Maori (KWM) and Science and Technical Advisory Group (STAG). They suggested if Ministers are not reading the minutes of FLG meetings, they were missing important feedback.
- There was no transparency in what was being communicated to ministers on behalf of the group. It was noted that to date this was communicated by the Chair and through officials, but the group had no visibility of what was being communicated on their behalf.
- One member requested a section be added to each briefing to identify which of the Essential Freshwater objectives the briefing contributed to.

12. Officials' comments included:

- When the specific recommendations are made to Ministers, FLG comments would be included.
- FLG could make a statement for Ministers on what their views were to date (working with officials).
- Roger noted the group had contributed to the Agriculture Package and their comments were being considered as more detailed proposals are developed.
- Officials would come back to the FLG with options and seek feedback.
- The Taskforce were not yet near briefing ministers on the final proposals.
- Briefings identify how the proposal contributes to the Essential Freshwater objects.

13. Officials said that the range of options presented to Ministers would reflect the different views across the advisory groups (FLG, KWM, STAG).

14. Comments from FLG included:

- A query regarding what information other advisory groups were getting and what weight the FLG had in this process (ie developing proposals) compared to other bodies eg, Federated Farmers.
- It would be good to bring comments from other groups to FLG (for their information).
- The group wanted to provide the greatest value to the process for the Ministers' benefit.

15. In response Officials noted:

- The Taskforce was consulting with a variety of groups.
- The purpose for the FLG was to be part of the journey for development of these proposals.

- The Group has been appointed by Ministers and they want and value its advice.

**ACTIONS:**

- (1) Amend pages 6 and 8 of 6 December 2018 Minutes to reflect revised wording (as above).
- (2) Remove 'how we function' actions from Summary of actions table eg action 10
- (3) Anything to be discussed at future meetings is to be included in meeting papers pack (rather than refer members to portal)
- (4) Nick Vincent to advise members weekly of what material has been added to the portal.
- (5) FLG to work with officials to document their position on proposals for Minister
- (6) Copy of nitrogen over-allocation map to be provided to FLG

**Agenda item 4- Update on Essential Freshwater**

*[Katherine Meerman, Co-Director Water Taskforce with Martin Workman joined the meeting around 10.40 am]*

16. Officials noted Ministers agreed pre-Christmas to change the consultation date — now July 2019.
17. A reset of meeting dates as follows was led by Martin with reference to A4 paper and A3 Roadmap. These documents are attached:
  - Next FLG meeting scheduled for Feb 25 (with STAG meeting on 26 Feb) moved to 27 and 28 February. It was noted KWM are penciled in to meet with the Minister on 28 February.

*[Graeme Gleeson and Stephanie Howard joined the meeting at 11:08 am]*

18. Officials noted briefings would be going up to Ministers mid-March onwards. Staging of briefings is to allow ministers time to consider proposals.
  - March meeting 19th and 20th March will be FLG only, and remove joint meeting on 20th. If need to meet jointly, keep to afternoon only.
  - April meeting moved from late to mid-April (16th and 17th, prior to Easter).
  - 1st May meeting now replaced by 8th and 9th May.
19. There was a request from FLG to follow-up Minister O'Connor's Integrated Farm Planning package and share with FLG.
20. Officials noted:
  - Officials would provide a more detailed schedule of briefings at a future date.
  - A 3 waters Cabinet paper is due in June with similar timing to the Essential Freshwater programme.
  - By end of April, a paper will go to Ministers for their consideration in May, followed by Cabinet decisions in June.
  - There will be multiple opportunities for FLG to feed into the process to develop proposals for Ministers.
21. FLG comments included:

- One FLG member stressed the importance of Nitrogen (N) for the Agricultural Package and queried work programme timing.
  - Another member noted nutrients are important and we need to know what we are trying to achieve before talking about a National Environment Standard (NES).
  - One member promoted discussing NPS at February meeting, then consider if the Agricultural Package and NES support this. Another member also supported this position.
22. Officials asked Jo Burton if it was possible to change order of work programme to consider the NPS earlier.
23. Comments from the Group in support of the proposal to change the order of work included:
24. That it was difficult to test the efficacy of the Agriculture Package if FLG hadn't had the NPS discussion earlier.
- Another member noted interest in outcome from the STAG group.
  - A further member noted that we need to understand what assistance Regional Councils need.
25. Jo noted work on the NPS workstream would run in parallel with other workstreams. The focus was on what outcomes we want to see, and a NPS or a NES may be the best tool, subject to the required outcome.
26. It was agreed officials would provide clarity at next FLG meeting on what they are trying to achieve here (objectives); whether the issue could be addressed by a national or regional solution. The NPS would be Item one for February meeting agenda, and needs to be informed by STAG group discussions prior to this meeting.
27. It was noted:
- Papers/update from STAG would not be available five days before as per standard practice.
  - Marc/Adam would need to attend FLG to inform and be part of the conversation.
  - Adam noted STAG have a lot of work to do and have not yet discussed Ecosystems health in detail. One Group member noted STAG needed to prioritise where their efforts are put.

### **Agenda item 5 - Update on impact assessment workshop**

28. Peter Nelson provided an update on January 17 workshops. Key points noted included:
- Information for key decisions needs to be provided by April with information for final decisions due by October 2019.
  - There was discussion at the 17 January workshop about policy impacts and how things might be implemented.
  - Officials are preparing the approach to impact analysis incorporating the feedback received.
29. Member comments included:
- A query regarding what was meant by 'farm-scale impacts' — it was clarified this included a proposal to look at 50 farm case studies, including benefits and costs.

- Some pushback on approach - cannot generalise from 50 case studies.
  - All parameters should be considered in analyses — not just N (ie, take a system approach).
  - Cannot generalise from Waikato to other regions.
  - Measures of success also needed to feed into other measures (eg, climate change, biodiversity).
  - It is a 'moving feast' and cannot take today as the baseline measure, as there are already plans in place that will have effect in the future.
  - One member requested a diagram for each region to illustrate issues and learnings; and what each region is working to improve for example ecosystem health, toxicity etc
  - What has been done in terms of E coli work; what is happening in terms of copper and zinc and why is interest elevated now?
  - Another member noted want to know why some things have been prioritised over others and why there was not 'appropriate attention' being given to controls.
30. Officials responded that prioritisation was on the basis of previous science advice. They noted that as a result of group feedback N control is now added to the work programme.
- One member suggested some people do not understand difference between N toxicity and ecosystem health. Other members concurred. One member noted it was concerning that toxicity was set at 6.9 in some areas.
  - It was noted ecosystem health was only recently been discussed at STAG — reflecting the amount of work STAG has to do.
  - One member noted there are on-the-ground challenges for farmers seeking funding for longer term mitigations eg, might only be able to get a five-year, high interest loan to implement mitigations that are implemented over a longer timeframe than that.

**ACTIONS:**

- (7) Officials — Follow-up Minister O'Connor's Integrated Farm Planning package and request this is made available to FLG.
- (8) Officials to provide a more detailed schedule of briefings.
- (9) Officials will bring what we are trying to achieve here (objectives) back to the next FLG meeting. This will be Item 1 for February FLG Agenda.
- (10) Officials to create a diagram or table with each region covering issues and learnings, what the region is working to improve for example ecosystem health, toxicity etc.

**Agenda item 6- Discussion about the draft allocation objective framework**

[Clare and Sam joined the meeting at 1.05 pm.]

31. 'Annex One: Draft proposed framework for assessing options for water and discharge allocation privileges and responsibilities' was discussed.

32. Claire spoke to the fair allocation objectives framework paper. It was noted that the purpose of the framework is to assess a set of allocation options and make sure we have the best fit and all options. She noted there may be some reassessment of this over time.
33. Comments from FLG included:
- One member queried if the 'bucket of nitrogen' across the landscape had been quantified. Claire responded this required limits to be in place, so there is an interplay between the allocation framework and setting limits.
34. The principles that 'the first right of water goes to the water itself' (4a), as well as the priority for drinking water (6c) were noted.
35. Member feedback included:
- One member noted there is some confusion due to two allocation systems (ie, one about allocation of water and the other about discharges to water).
  - There may be confusion around what is consented and what is actually used. One member gave an example of a large consent 14,000L where only 20% of the consent is actually being used.
  - One member queried about how officials will deal with over-allocated catchments.
36. Officials noted:
- Wording in the framework was based on quantity takes and original wording of Kahui Wai Maori and may need to be more explicit. This covers taking water and the ability of water to absorb contaminants.
  - Not every area has limits set.
  - There are different tools that can be used to deal with over-allocated catchments, and it is not just about over-allocation, but also where this is happening.
  - Map showing order of magnitude of over-allocation is based on what is consented and not what is used.
- [John Penno joined the meeting at 1.23 pm, but Nicola retained the Acting Chair role at that time.]*
37. During the discussion:
- It was clarified limits are either input limits or output limits, and tools will vary depending on the type of limits. For example sediment is more difficult to trade and may be suited to an alternative tool.
  - Noted there is a relationship between the two systems (eg, if lower amount of water available, this lowers the assimilative capacity of available water).
  - Cap and trade scheme was discussed briefly. Acting Chair reiterated FLG role is at national level, while regional councils are managing at their level.
  - It was noted the Framework removes discussion at a local level and provides extra tools for regional councils to allocate in a potentially different way, depending on catchment scale.
38. Group comments included:
- Whether 'offsetting' within a region was a tool that might be considered?

- The Group should take a first cut look at discharges, then look at takes as a second step. (Officials noted it was hard to separate the two).
- It seemed the Group wanted the framework to differentiate what applied to takes from what applied to discharges (or both) in the framework.
- The Group queried what 'The first right of water goes to the water itself' means and whether this was a 'surrogate' for ecosystem health. An explanation in plain English was requested.
- One member noted no focus on natural capital (eg, focus seems to be on the user and not the landscape).
- One member noted need to acknowledge the value of nutrients to the production of goods.
- It was noted there were no soil scientists on the STAG group. Cautioned use of Land Use Classification (LUCs).

39. Officials commented that:

- in some cases over-allocation was from ground water
- water quantity limits were being set by Councils
- officials are considering water quality and quantity together, but bearing in mind Ministers may want to see progress on N first and look at quantity later, and it was hard to separate water takes from discharges.

### **Sanitation Needs**

40. There was a discussion about sanitation needs and comments from FLG included:

- a suggestion that discharge for sanitation takes priority over other allocation, citing Darfield example, where lots of lifestyle blocks at the top of the catchment have septic tanks.
- A note that urban growth is placing increased demands on receiving environments.
- A suggestion that the principle should be that sanitation water should be given priority for takes, but not primacy for sanitation discharges.
- A suggestion that charging for water/paying for use, would address some problems.
- Clarification that this covers both diffuse discharges and point source discharges to land.
- One member noted concern at 7d ('whomever user water needs to prove they have the systems/processes in place to care for it'). They suggested this will require many farms who do not already have reticulation to install it, and to assess discharges from stock. They also foresaw other unintended consequences.
- The format should be "allocation principles", then "conditions of use", but it was also noted the two terms might be confused.
- One comment was that human health needs to be at the top. Another that this couldn't just look at Nitrogen, but needed to look at ecosystem health also.
- One member noted this relates to:
- What are the principles on where we set limits?

- Now we know the limits, how do we then allocate?

41. There was a reminder that some of the proposed principles (eg, 5c) were there to ensure those with less financial resources are not disadvantaged. Bridge Pa was mentioned in relation to ecological justice — where at times people's basic access to water was not met. One member noted some councils have established a 'reasonable' per person use — free at one level and charged beyond that.

### **'Te Tiriti o Waitangi te tahuu o te wai' (9f) and 'Certainty' (11f)**

42. There was a discussion about the meaning of 9f (ie, Te Tiriti o Waitangi te tahuu o te wai) and 11h (Certainty). One member suggested the conversation around this could be challenging officials noted they are seeking further clarification about expectations from KWM.

43. A member reiterated there is no allocation to the land and they and others did not think this is fair. In some instances Maori have land but there is no water allocation, and this results in them not being able to use the land.

*[Hugh Logan and Alan Linn joined the meeting at 2.45 pm.]*

44. John Penno (reinstated as Chair) led a discussion around 'Equity' (13j):

45. He sought clarity from the Group on their position and whether 13j is within the group's terms of reference, and how a response/no response might be seen by others.

46. The Chair suggested Equity was about who owns the water and is outside the group's terms of reference. Feedback from the Group was varied and included:

- One member queried if it was appropriate to be silent on this topic.
- Another member agreed this is outside of the Group's remit.
- Another member suggested the Group was attempting to comment on another group's work without having its own position on allocation.
- The Chair proposed to park the conversation today, and return to this tomorrow when the allocation team could talk through the five options and offer real-life examples.

#### **ACTIONS:**

- (11) Officials to identify what part of the framework applies to allocation takes and what applies to discharges. Bring revised table back to FLG by end February 2019, to be discussed at March meeting. This next update will include potential design options.
- (12) Officials to provide a plain English explanation of "the first right of water goes to the water its self."

### **Agenda item 7- Discussion about proposed changes to National Direction**

*[Jo Burton, Nik Andic, Vikki Addison, Kirsten Forsyth joined the meeting.]*

47. Officials spoke to various aspects of flows and limits.

48. FLG member's comments included:

- A group member questioned how to progress the N discussion at STAG.
- Jo noted the team were ensuring STAG had all they needed to progress the N discussion.

- Specific reference was made by one Group member to a map showing where N is over-allocated.
  - Officials confirmed this was part of a suite of information to be provided.
  - Another member noted different measures were used for over-allocation eg, nitrogen toxicity in one location compared with ecosystem health in another.
  - Officials noted over-allocation is determined by where the objective is not met or the limit exceeded. Officials confirmed maps would be by attribute (eg, nitrate toxicity across New Zealand).
  - Officials confirmed they would pull together what information we have.
  - One member queried if we are agreed on the questions: (eg, 'Are the current limits (1-low do they need to be applied') and 'Are the standards the same across the country?'. If either answer is 'No', what is the 'right way' to do it?')
  - One member noted the Ministry should intervene where it sees gaps, and that for a range of reasons this hasn't happened.
49. 49. Officials offered a quick summary of the intervention logic for the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management, and also a summary of how this has been implemented. This included the following points:
- The NPS included two compulsory values — ecosystem health and human health.
  - Freshwater Objectives are what you want for your water body.
  - Limits are the restrictions on resource use that happens in the catchment (eg, water quality and nitrates, to achieve your objectives).
  - Another requirement is that water quality will be maintained or improved overtime. A limit is not correct or incorrect: it is based on a catchment setting and a community's values.
  - Nitrates can be measured in-stream, can extrapolate this to the whole catchment and determine loadings, then use Overseer to track this to land holdings.
50. There was then a discussion about where bottom lines are set and what happens if limits are exceeded.
51. Officials noted the following:
- The NPS says you should pick which attribute is most stringent in achieving the values.
  - As it stands things can decline within a band and this will be addressed in future.
  - This latest round of NPS-FM amendments will clarify what is in and what is required. For example — 'how to set limits' will be clarified.
52. 52. Comments from the FLG included:
- A series of technical questions for STAG regarding whether attribute tables were '01<'; being applied consistently; and if not OK, what needed to be changed?
  - One member clarified ecosystem health is a compulsory value and the other workstreams were aware of this (eg, specifically the impact assessment team).

- Another member noted attenuation is an issue and queried how this will be managed.
- It was noted Overseer is not yet addressing this. Some models allow for attenuation, but estimates may be imperfect and vary between different soil types eg, 50%.
- One member noted irrigation could be a means of creating economic opportunities. Another member noted there are other methods for creating such opportunities.
- One member noted the importance of discussions around N to the Agriculture Package.
- Another member suggested there was a lack of understanding of the agricultural area amongst the officials working on the Agriculture Package. This view was also endorsed by another group member.
- Another member noted that national monitoring indicates N is increasing, and there is a danger if councils are focused on sediment and ignoring N.
- Another member noted sediment is now a focus as it had previously been ignored.
- It was suggested by a member that councils may not be monitoring to achieve an ecological outcome.
- It was also suggested the issue of enforceability needed to be considered.
- One member commented farmers have not been involved in the conversation and there is no certainty for them regarding sediment —the farmers want further clarification. Their take is that they need to be involved in planting trees. If 20% sediment is the target, what does this look like for them?

**ACTIONS:**

(13) The following questions to be asked of STAG and their feedback reported back to the Group:

- Are attribute tables 'OK'?
- Are they being applied consistently?
- If they are not OK, what needs to be changed?

53. Comments from officials included:

- Sediment is a significant issue in rural settings and this is a big component of the Agriculture Package.
- Councils are required to manage to an appropriate periphyton level, although not all councils are doing so (eg, Northland).

**Sediment:**

54. Stephen Fragazy spoke on the topic of sediment and related ecological decline. Some of his key points included:

- Levels of ecological degradation are to be presented to STAG. The work will examine deposited sediment and suspended sediment.
- Other options are intended to support implementation of an attribute, options B (NPS-FM monitoring requirements for in-stream sediment) and C (NPS-FM direction

on integrated catchment management for sediment objectives) would help to implement an attribute. Proposed attributes might contribute to different limit-setting processes.

- It was noted that what someone does or does not do on a farm is determined by what the regional approach is for that region.
- LUC is one of the building blocks being used for sediment. Land Use Suitability (LUS) takes into account additional elements (eg, discharge pathways, and economic development opportunities, cultural monitoring etc).

55. Feedback from the Group included:

- Use of the word 'options' was confusing when 'the options' are complementary and form a package.
- One member queried how officials are accounting for different sources of sediment. They suggested this is potentially as complicated as nitrogen, and was concerned if we implement ahead of understanding the issues.
- One member noted their concern was around timescale (eg, the current push is to 'hold the line' and make measurable improvements).
- One member suggested these options make sense and there is an order to this. The solution is in the Agriculture Package where relevant. Some members noted that vegetable cropping and winter cropping may or may not affect sediment.
- One member noted the document looked good and that problem definition had improved. However, they asked officials to amend this to include consideration of natural landscapes, wetlands, etc.

56. Officials clarified:

- Their recommendation was to develop and implement all three 'options'.
- This is a long term process — not something to be achieved in 5 years.
- The process would follow the same processes for setting limits.

57. Further Group member feedback included:

- support for the proposed approach
- missing role of tailored farm environment and farm system planning
- also could make use of land use capability (LUC) mapping as part of toolbox to address issues of measuring sediment across our landscapes
- liked the approach of risk management framework
- Need more focus on non-regulatory measures.

58. Officials noted:

- As part of budget bid, officials are looking at development of (LUC) tools.
- Councils are increasing staff who do 'extension' services/farmer capability building activities.
- Catchment collectives are already operating eg, Pomahaka, King Country, Rangatikei.

59. Timing was discussed and the question 'What is expectation around timing for the 16 councils doing this work; how could central government deliver to a more ambitious timeframe?' was asked. There was further discussion and the following points noted:

- One member of FLG suggested implementation might not be until 2030 and this seems far away.
- Officials noted an NES could have instant effect, and could be used for input control.
- Limit setting is catchment community based.
- Officials clarified all councils have PIPs (Progressive Implementation Plans), but may or may not meet these. Officials current understanding is all but one council are planning to have plans in place by 2025; one by 2027. An evaluation by officials is underway to determine whether it is realistic for councils to achieve their PIPs. (It was noted it takes around seven years to get a plan change through the system.)

60. Further FLG feedback at this point included:

- One member noted the urgency of the issue around sediment and the vulnerability of farmers.
- Another noted the rural package will provide regional councils with the means to implement.
- One Group member suggested industry bodies are not in the discussion. There are known problems around eg, Southland sediment issue ('foot of sediment across estuaries') known about since the start of farm conversions in Southland.

Another member noted regional councils are asking for the tools to address the issues.

- One member noted need to make distinctions between high risk behaviours — NES is used to address this.
- It was also noted there is a tension that as these things come in, there will potentially not be time for farmers to adjust.
- One member queried if there was a role for central government to accelerate the implementation of the NPS. They also noted NES could be a way to deliver more quickly.

61. Officials noted:

- 16 regional NES were not a practical solution.
- It was noted that an NES was likely to include wetlands and an agricultural package.

### **Ecological Flows**

62. Kirsten Forsyth spoke to the Ecological Flows NES proposals and key points included:

- 2008 NES for flows was initiated but was 'parked' with change of government.
- NPS requires councils to set objectives for the two compulsory values — ecosystem health and human health.
- Flow regime is mostly done to maintain flows within the river (it is not likely bespoke flows will be set for each river).
- Councils are generally managing flows to protect historic flows or retain habitat for particular species.

- Need to be specific about managing for ecosystems in the river.
- Methodology would sit outside the NPS.
- Wetlands is a separate package and is more appropriate to management by NES (as not changing water levels).

63. FLG comments included:

- What are the implications of doing this?
- What is the problem we are trying to solve?
- The NPS requires councils to set limits for quantity in terms of the two compulsory values — they are managing for trout, which covers all biota
- If change, could end up managing at a lower level than currently.
- The Chair commented 'This doesn't seem broken — why fix it?' He summarised there was limited support for what's proposed.
- One member noted Cawthron had published information that flows are not well managed in NZ.

64. There was then a discussion around hydro generation:

- One member noted there may need to be more investment in renewable energy hydro generation.
- Another member commented may need to treat some man-made structures as if they are natural — as they have been there for so long and have changed the characteristic of waterways.
- Another member noted the NPS needs a further appendix (which is in progress).
- One member queried whether storage could assist allocation.
- Another member was concerned at this statement and indicated further discussion (at another time) was warranted.

65. General:

- A member queried why copper (Cu) and zinc (Zn) had been elevated as an issue and why officials were targeting urban and not rural; and wanted to see the science behind it. It was agreed officials would bring information on Cu and Zn back to the group.

66. Officials noted:

- Appendix three of the NPS was in progress of being populated.
- Need to avoid discouraging renewable electricity generations.

**ACTIONS:**

(14) Officials to bring information on Copper and Zinc back to the Group, including why this has been elevated as an issue and the science behind it.

**At risk catchment work**

67. The Chair noted he had spoken with Minister Parker, who was quite clear he was expecting a range of catchments across the country that are at 'tipping point'. The Chair noted his understanding that the Minister wanted in the region of 10 [exemplar?] catchments.
68. Officials noted they didn't want to raise expectations about the at risk catchment work as this was 'not yet landed'