

Notice is given that an ordinary meeting of the Full Council will be held on:

Date: Thursday 9 May 2019
Time: 9.30am
Meeting Room: Tasman Council Chamber
Venue: 189 Queen Street
Richmond

Full Council

LATE / SUPPLEMENTARY ITEMS AGENDA

LATE ITEMS

5 LATE ITEMS

That the late item, 8.14 Mayor’s Activity Report, be considered at today's meeting. The report was late as notification from the Lotteries Commission for additional funding for affected ratepayers and residents of the Pidgeon Valley Fire event was not received until Saturday 4 May 2019. This was after the agenda was compiled, but the Mayor wished to report the decision to the 9 May 2019 Full Council meeting.

That the supplementary information item 9.6, Supplementary Information to Waimea Community Dam - Ngati Koata Partnering Deed and M.A.K Stuart Agreement to Acquire Land, be considered at today's meeting.

8 REPORTS

8.14 Mayor's Activity Report 5

9 CONFIDENTIAL SESSION

9.6 Supplementary Information to Waimea Community Dam - Ngati Koata Partnering Deed and M.A.K Stuart Agreement to Acquire Land 20

8 REPORTS

8.14 MAYOR'S ACTIVITY REPORT

Information Only - No Decision Required

Report To:	Full Council
Meeting Date:	9 May 2019
Report Author:	Richard Kempthorne, Mayor
Report Number:	RCN19-05-18

1. Summary

- 1.1. The attached report is a commentary of the Mayor's activities from 23 March and April for Councillors' information.

2. Draft Resolution

That the Tasman District Council receives the Mayor's Activity Report RCN19-05-18.

1 Activities

- 1.1 On Sunday 24 March I attended the Race Unity Day which was delayed by one week, following the Christchurch event.
- 1.2 On Monday 25 March the Chief Executive and I attended a meeting with the Mapua Boat Club to discuss ongoing issues.
- 1.3 On Tuesday 26 March I attended the Joint Committee Meeting held at Nelson City Council.
- 1.4 Throughout March and April I attended weekly Drought Committee Meetings in Nelson.
- 1.5 On 27 March I attended a birthday lunch celebration for a local resident, Jim Carter's who was celebrating his 100th birthday.
- 1.6 On Thursday 28 March I attended the Full Council meeting held in Council Chambers.
- 1.7 On Saturday 30 March I was involved in the judging of the final applicants for the Trustpower National Community Awards in Tauranga. One of the final presentations was "Beyond the Bridge Riwaka" which was an initiative by Melissa Girvin & Debbie Bowdler, following Cyclone Gita. They did a tremendous job helping their community recover from that massive event.
- 1.8 On Monday 1 April I attended a meeting with the Mayors of Nelson and Marlborough held in Rai Valley discussing possible PGF applications. This was an excellent process with very clear agreement on the priorities across Te Tau Ihu.
- 1.9 On Wednesday 3 April it was my pleasure to officiate for 21 persons at the Citizenship Ceremony which was held at the Richmond New Life Church.
- 1.10 On Wednesday 3 April I was involved in a meeting with Rachel Hyde of Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet who provided an update on the Emergency Management System Reform Programme and provided feedback in relation to the project to amend the CDEM Act. I am going to organise a meeting of key response and recovery personnel and iwi representatives to discuss the excellent support from iwi during the response and recovery from the Pigeon Valley fire.
- 1.11 On Thursday 4 April I attended the Community Development Committee held in Council Chambers.
- 1.12 Following the Community Development Committee, I attended the Council Workshop on Reserves and Facilities.
- 1.13 On Friday 5 April myself, Sandie Hutchinson and Richard Kirby attended a meeting in Wellington with the Lotteries Commission to discuss the application for \$1,000,000 for funding towards land remediation for damage caused by the fire break and not for profit organisations. We were then joined by members of the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet to seek clarification of funding for the remediation of land damaged caused by the firefighting efforts during the Pigeon Valley Fire event.
- 1.14 On the morning of Sunday 7 April I attended the City2Saxton Fun Run.
- 1.15 On Sunday 7 April in the evening, I attended the Left Hand Golf National Champs AGM held at the Motueka Memorial Hall. This event was attended by golfers from throughout New Zealand and a few from Australia.

- 1.16 On Monday 8 April I attended a Local Government Reference Group on Three Waters Review at Department of Internal Affairs followed by a meeting at Local Government New Zealand National Council Meeting on Three Waters. I have discussed the outcomes of this with Councillors on a number of occasions since.
- 1.17 On Tuesday 9 April myself, the Chief Executive and Deputy Mayor met with the Productivity Commission and received a presentation. One of the suggestions from Murray Sherwyn from Productivity Commission to establish a protocol of how central and local government can work effectively together for our respective communities.
- 1.18 In the afternoon of Tuesday 9 April I attended the Cawthron Foundation Meeting of Trustees, held at Waimea Road.
- 1.19 On Wednesday 10 April I was involved in a meeting regarding the Golden Bay Grandstand. The result of this meeting was discussed previous with Council.
- 1.20 On Thursday 11 April I attended the Engineering Services Committee meeting held in Council Chambers.
- 1.21 On Friday 12 April I attended the LGNZ Equip Board Meeting held in Wellington.
- 1.22 On Saturday 13 April I attended the “Thank you Fire Concert” which was organised by Waimea Weekly and other local businesses as a thank you for the volunteers and many organisations who assisted during the Pigeon Valley Fire event.
- 1.23 On Tuesday 16 April I attended the Council Workshop on the District Plan.
- 1.24 On the afternoon of Tuesday 16 April I chaired the Joint Shareholders Committee Meeting held in Nelson before attending the Motueka Community Board meeting.
- 1.25 On Wednesday 17 April I was involved in the announcement from the Provincial Growth Fund (PGF) for their assistance for the Te Tau Ihu 2077 project. You will likely be aware that the PGF have also given financial support to the establishment of a business case for the upgrade of Port Tarohe to support the significant economic development that we can expect as a result of the aquaculture development in Golden Bay.
- 1.26 On Thursday 18 April I attended the Environment and Planning Committee meeting following by the Extraordinary Full Council Meeting held in Council Chambers.
- 1.27 On Thursday 25 April I attended the ANZAC Day Motueka Dawn Service and the Richmond Service at 11am. I observed a significant turn out for the services which is very gratifying demonstrating community support for commemorating those who have served our country in the various armed services over time.
- 1.28 On Sunday 28 April I attended a function to support members in our community who have originally come from Sri Lanka. This was as a result of the bombings that occurred in their country. It was a tremendous show of solidarity with them and reiterated the inclusive, respectful, supportive and loving nature of our community.
- 1.29 On Tuesday 30 April I attended the Sports Tasman Audit, Risk and Finance Committee meeting.
- 1.30 On the afternoon of Tuesday 30 April I attended the Te Tau Ihu 2077 Steering Group meeting held in Nelson.
- 1.31 On Tuesday 30 April I also attended the Cawthron Foundation meeting held at Council offices.

2 Other

Annual Plan

- 2.1 I, along with many councillors and staff, have attended meetings throughout the district summarising the work programme in this year's annual plan. These meetings have been generally very well received with insightful discussions at times.

Remit from Thames Coromandel District Council

- 2.2 I have received a proposed remit from Thames Coromandel District Council which is attached to this report is "That LGNZ request the Government to amend the Camping - Ground Regulations to allow councils to approve remote camp facilities on private property, subject to any such conditions as deemed required by a council, including the condition that any approved campground is x distance away from an existing campground, unless the existing campground operator agrees to waive this condition in writing."
- 2.3 Nature of the issue is that currently the "remote camp site" definition means a camping ground – "in a National Park, State Forest, State Forest park or public reserve or on Crown Land". As the provision is only for public land there is no opportunity to provide such an experience on private property.
- 2.4 I would like Councillors' feedback on this remit so that I may respond to Local Government New Zealand.

Remit from Greater Wellington Regional Council

- 2.5 I have received a proposed remit from Greater Wellington Regional Council which is attached to this report is that "LGNZ recommends to Government that they establish an independent expert group to develop a new policy framework for adapting to climate change impacts as recommended by the Climate Change Adaptation Technical Working Group (CCATWG). This new expert group would be supported by a secretariat and stakeholder advisory group."
- 2.6 I have copied the request for support for this remit from Greater Wellington for your information. The Regional Sector Group which met in Invercargill last Friday, gave unanimous support for this remit. Once we have all the remits that are being proposed for this Local Government Annual Conference, I will circulate these to get your feedback on which remits to support or oppose.

Mayoral Disaster Relief Fund (MDRF)

- 2.7 Update on the fund is that payments are underway for the nearly 100 applications received.
- 2.8 We have 19 applications for a partial off set of transport costs for feed as a result of the drought. The Ministry of Primary Industries have contributed \$50,000 to the MDRF to enable some assistance for the effects of this drought.
- 2.9 The donation of \$1,000,000 has been received from the Lotteries Commission to fund the remediation work caused by the damage from the fire recovery i.e. fire break and not for profit organisations.
- 2.10 We now have four different categories to distribute:
- General assistance for persons directly impacted by the Pigeon Valley fire

- Partial reimbursement of freight costs for those in the district affected by the severe drought
 - Lotteries funding for damage caused by the fire fighting during the fire started in Pigeon Valley
 - Lotteries funding to reduce the adverse environmental impact of the fire and in particular the increased risk of sedimentation.
- 2.11 You can see from this that there has been a very significant amount of work needed to process the applications and distribute funding to assist those significantly impacted. Councillors will receive a full report of this in due course but right now the focus of everyone in recovery is to process and distribute to those in need.
- 2.12 The MDRF process has taken a significant amount of time and effort as we have discussed various needs and sources of funding.

Appendices

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|----|
| 1. Remit: Remote Camp Site Definition | 11 |
| 2. Climate Change | 13 |

Annual General Meeting 2019

Remit application

Council Proposing Remit:	Thames Coromandel District Council
Contact Name:	Mayor Sandra Goudie
Phone:	0274312442
Email:	Sandra.goudie@tcdc.govt.nz
Fax:	
Remit passed by: (Zone/Sector meeting and/or list five councils as per policy)	
Remit:	That LGNZ request the Government to amend the Camping - Ground Regulations to allow councils to approve remote camp facilities on private property, subject to any such conditions as deemed required by a council, including the condition that any approved campground is x distance away from an existing campground, unless the existing campground operator agrees to waive this condition in writing.

Background information and research:

Nature of the issue

Currently the 'remote camp site' definition means a camping ground – 'in a national park, State Forest, State Forest park or public reserve or on Crown Land.' As the provision is only for public land there is no opportunity to provide such an experience on private property.

Background

Ratepayers, through their council, are having to provide areas for camping for increasing numbers of what are being called "Freedom Campers", with associated increasing costs to ratepayers and community both in regard to environmental and financial considerations.

Unfortunately for councils there is nothing for free, and to provide any public facilities there is a range of costs to provide and maintain the facilities including power, water, waste collection, maintenance, cleaning, and compliance monitoring and enforcement etc. Those costs are increasing.

Enforcement for compliance is increasingly problematic and costly and in addition social media is sending the wrong messages for our communities who must contend with freedom campers in their area. The result is that prime beach front sites are being degraded through overuse, and abuse of sites available.

While reserve areas can be either managed or leased for a remote camp facility, councils are constrained by the lack of public land where a remote site can be established, particularly in more remote locations. Remote camps have far fewer regulatory requirements than usual campgrounds.

Relationship to LGNZ work programme

There is work underway in regard to Freedom Camping in NZ which is looking at a range of issues in relation to Freedom Camping.

The Responsible Camping Working Group comprises central and local government representatives, as well as other interested parties, and is currently looking at a number of matters, including the Camping Ground Regulations. A review of the Regulations was one of the recommendations of the Working Group and work is underway specifically on this.

Relevant legislation, policy or practice

The remit seeks an amendment of the Camping - Ground Regulations to broaden the definition of remote camp site to allow councils to authorise remote camp sites on private land, taking into account distance from existing campground facilities. A new definition would enable sites to be established where, for a modest fee, an operator would be able to provide basic facilities and recover some of the cost of provision and maintenance.

In addition the 2016 annual general meeting agreed to ask the Government to:

Change to s14(3) of the Camping Ground Regulations 1985 (made under s120B of the Health Act 1956) to allow broader exemptions to the need for provision of camping facilities for those that wish to freedom camp in all areas and not just at “remote” camps;

This is yet to be actioned but is being considered by the joint officials body.

LGNZ Annual General Meeting 2019 – GWRC remit application 1

Council:	Greater Wellington Regional Council
Contact:	Cr Roger Blakeley
Phone:	0212296928
E-mail:	roger.blakeley@gw.govt.nz
Remit:	That LGNZ recommends to Government that they establish an independent expert group to develop a new policy framework for adapting to climate change impacts as recommended by the Climate Change Adaptation Technical Working Group (CCATWG). This new expert group would be supported by a secretariat and stakeholder advisory group.

Issue

New Zealand will need a new policy framework to enable effective, efficient and equitable long-term adaptation to the many challenges posed by climate change. Any such framework must be comprehensive, fit for purpose, and facilitate flexible and dynamic responses, including funding arrangements.

While there is broad agreement that the current policy framework for climate change adaptation, is inadequate, there has been little attention given to securing a consensus among the stakeholders on the core features of a new framework. Some small initiatives have been taken by a few local councils and academics towards the formulation of a new framework.

There are a large number of separate, yet interconnected, issues that require investigation in parallel or in sequence. It is very likely to take several years to formulate a new, well-designed policy framework, followed by the drafting and enactment of legislative reforms, before the process of implementation can begin. Given the amount of work that is involved and that climate change impacts are already making themselves felt, it is important that this process is started without further delay.

Background

Sea level rise constitutes a particularly serious challenge due to the irreversibility of the near-term impacts. Already many low-lying coastal communities around New Zealand are facing a growing threat to their homes and livelihoods, public infrastructure and private businesses. This and other impacts on human and natural systems related to more intense rainfall, heat, wind, and pathogens and disease vectors, will increase and become disruptive. They will increase the financial burden on the state at all levels and create inequities across society.

For further discussion of the issues and options for developing a new policy framework, from which the proposed remit was derived, see the discussion paper on funding issues by Jonathan Boston (VUW) and Judy Lawrence (VUW), dated 4 February 2019 (appended)

Work already undertaken

A recent report by LGNZ found an estimated \$14B of local government assets are at risk from climate change impacts. It has called on central government to create a 'National Climate Change Adaptation Fund'. It has also recently published a legal opinion by Jack Hodder QC regarding the potential for local government to be litigated in relation to its actions or inaction in relation to climate

change. A key risk raised by Mr Hodder's report was the absence of national climate change adaptation guidance (or framework) in New Zealand, which in effect is leaving it to the courts to decide how to remedy climate change-related harms. This will be an uncertain and inefficient means of doing so.

The Government has received the recommendations of the CCATWG, but is yet to act upon them. The CCATWG recommendation to the Government (quoted below) was to set up a specialist group to define funding arrangements for funding adaptation.

“We recommend that a specialist group of practitioners and experts undertake this action (formulate a new policy framework for adaptation funding). These should be drawn from central and local government, iwi/hapū, sectors such as banking, insurance, and infrastructure; and have expertise in climate change, planning and law, public finance, capital markets, infrastructure financing, and risk management. The group should be serviced by a secretariat with officials across relevant public sector and local government agencies and include significant public engagement.”

Current work

See above. LGNZ has been very vocal on this matter. This remit has a specific proposal to central government on how to carry the work forward. Until the necessary resources are marshalled to do the required work while involving the key stakeholders, there will be limited progress.

Approval

To be confirmed

Suggested actions that could be taken by LGNZ should the remit be adopted.

That LGNZ issue a news release explaining the content of the remit, and that they engage with central government directly (in face to face meetings) to discuss the setting up of an independent expert group to progress the development of a new policy framework for adapting to climate change impacts.

Attachment One

The Funding of Climate Change Adaptation – Options for developing a new policy framework

Jonathan Boston (VUW) and Judy Lawrence (VUW)

4 February 2019

Executive summary

New Zealand will need a new policy framework to enable effective, efficient and equitable long-term adaptation to the many challenges posed by climate changes. Any such framework must be comprehensive, fit for purpose, and facilitate flexible and dynamic responses.

Sea level rise constitutes a particularly serious challenge due to irreversibility of the near-term impacts. Already many low-lying coastal communities around New Zealand are facing a growing threat to their homes and livelihoods, public infrastructure and private businesses. This and other impacts on human and natural systems related to more intense rainfall, heat, wind, and pathogens and disease vectors, will increase and become disruptive. They will increase the financial burden on the state at all levels and create inequities across society.

This paper briefly outlines several options for developing a new funding policy framework for adapting to climate change impacts.

There are five broad options for developing policy on adaptation funding:

1. Establishing an independent expert group of the kind recommended by the Climate Change Adaptation Technical Working Group (CCATWG), supported by a secretariat and stakeholder advisory group;
2. Relying primarily on interdepartmental and inter-governmental working parties;
3. Relying primarily on the yet to be established Climate Change Commission;
4. Mandating and sponsoring an initiative (e.g. led by VUW) with expertise from the academic and policy research community, the practitioners in local and central government, the finance sector (banking and insurance) and professional bodies, to develop the principles and policy design elements for wider engagement; and
5. Some combination of the above, noting that there could be two stages—a) identification and design of policy instruments, and b) engagement with the sectors (central and local government, communities and sector representatives).

Whichever option is supported by the government, there are a large number of separate, yet interconnected, issues that require investigation (see Appendix 1) either in parallel or in sequence. It is very likely to take several years to formulate a new, well-designed policy framework, followed by the drafting and enactment of legislative reforms, before the process of implementation can begin.

Nevertheless, there is some urgency to start the process. Our preference is for the government to set up an expert technical working group, alongside a stakeholder advisory group, with a technically competent secretariat to support the work of the expert group.

Background

Adapting to climate change poses unprecedented technical, administrative and political challenges, which are well documented in the CCATWG reports and elsewhere. New Zealand's current planning, regulatory and funding frameworks are ill-equipped for the scope, scale and duration of these challenges. Without reform, they will deliver neither efficient nor equitable outcomes. They will incentivize sub-optimal planning and policy solutions, increase the burdens faced by future generations, and reduce long-term societal resilience, costs which will fall back on the State. A serious re-think is required as to who should bear these costs and how the funding of such costs can be sustained across current and future generations.

The multiple negative impacts of rising sea levels, more severe droughts and rainfall events, new biosecurity risks, accelerated loss of biodiversity, and changing human disease vectors will be outside the experience of our public and private agencies, challenging their ability to adapt.

New Zealand communities are particularly exposed to coastal erosion and flooding. The scale of the impacts that will compound with hazards already experienced will affect tens of thousands of people – and perhaps more. Eventually requiring resettlement on higher ground. Large investments will also be required to redesign, reposition and future-proof public infrastructure, especially transport and utility networks, and water services. On top of this the damage caused by climate-related natural disasters will impose growing financial burdens – on citizens, businesses and public authorities. Already the annual cost of repairing land transport networks damaged by weather-related events has more than quadrupled over the past decade, while the economic impact of major floods and droughts is increasing. The series of major rainfall events which afflicted parts of New Zealand in early 2018 are merely a foretaste of what lies ahead with successive more minor frequent events. Likewise, the visibility of recent plant pathogens impacting our native trees (e.g. myrtle rust and kauri die-back) on top of the stresses our natural ecosystems are exposed to from the combination of exotic animal pests (e.g. deer, possums, stoats, and mice and deer), are a portend for the future facing New Zealand.

As the CCATWG noted in its Report in 2018:

New Zealand lacks a strong record of investing in risk reduction. Most funding is directed at pre-disaster readiness or post-disaster recovery. For example, the Earthquake Commission (EQC) and private insurance provide natural disaster insurance for land and contents of residential homes. This includes cover for residential land against storm and flood damage and from fire resulting from natural disasters. This has created an expectation that compensation will be available for any events exacerbated by climate change. This becomes a barrier for effective adaptation as it acts as a disincentive for risk reduction. Furthermore, risk-based insurance is likely to become increasingly expensive and/or harder to obtain in high-risk locations, placing pressure on public agencies to fill the gap, which has the potential to create inequities if the gap is not filled.

Anticipatory funding to reduce risk and prevent future losses is largely non-existent. Current funding arrangements are generally applied after the event and in an ad hoc manner. Hard choices will have to be made about land use in low-lying areas as sea and groundwater levels rise, and the intensity and frequency of rainfall events and droughts, increase. To avoid the worst disruption, planned investment in risk reduction measures will be required. These are likely to be beyond the financial capacity of local government and its ratepayers alone. Access to adequate and sustained funding is therefore essential.”

The issues posed by sea level rise and the related impacts of climate change (e.g. more severe storms, heavier precipitation events and more frequent nuisance flooding) are becoming ever more pressing. The longer it takes policy-makers to respond and rethink existing policy settings, the greater the long-term costs are likely to be.

Developing a new policy framework

While there is broad agreement that the current policy framework for climate change adaptation, and especially sea level rise, is inadequate, there has been little attention given to securing a consensus among the stakeholders on the core features of a new framework. Some small initiatives have been taken by a few local councils and academics towards the formulation of a new framework.

There are understandable reasons for the limited progress. The policy focus over the last several decades has largely been on climate change mitigation (i.e. reducing emissions) which has overshadowed discussion of who will pay for the inevitable – and very large – adaptation costs. Every stakeholder, whether public or private, would prefer the costs to fall on parties other than themselves. However, there is a way though this that could develop clear signals ahead of damage through the design of policy that brings the stakeholders together.

Developing a new policy framework requires extensive analysis, additional research, and significant public engagement and will require multiparty agreement if the new regime is to endure. Funding issues will require consideration alongside planning, regulation, infrastructure and insurance policy settings. In short, a holistic, systematic and well-integrated approach to policy development is needed.

There are at least five broad options available if the government is to speed up the process of formulating a new policy framework for adaptation funding:

1. Establishing an independent expert group of the kind recommended by CCATWG (see details below), supported by a secretariat and stakeholder advisory group;
2. Relying primarily on interdepartmental and inter-governmental working parties;
3. Relying primarily on the yet to be established Climate Change Commission;
4. Mandating and sponsoring an initiative (e.g. led by VUW) with expertise from the academic and policy research community, the practitioners in local and central government, the finance sector (banking and insurance) and professional bodies, to develop the principles and policy design elements for wider engagement; and
5. Some combination of the above, noting that there could be two stages—a) identification and design of policy instruments, and b) engagement with the sectors (central and local government, communities and sector representatives).

The CCATWG favoured the first of these options for a number of reasons. In particular, the challenges that need addressing are multi-disciplinary and multi-stakeholder in nature; they traverse the responsibilities of both the public and private sectors, all levels of government, and multiple governmental agencies. In such circumstance, an independent expert group is more likely than some of the other options to have the requisite capabilities for the task. Such a group would need to be supported by a competent secretariat and specific technical expertise (as the CCATWG proposed). The expert group could also be supported by a cross-sector advisory group.

With respect to the second option, we are mindful that there are already work programmes underway, or being planned, within the public sector that may contribute in due course to the development of new policy framework for climate change adaptation. However, those programmes have much wider objectives that suggest a risk that the adaptation funding issues will be siloed to consideration only of economic incentives. We know from experience that economic incentives alone will be insufficient for the scale and scope of the

reform required for effective climate change adaptation. There are also many other current demands on officials in the relevant departments suggesting that a largely internal policy-development process would delay expert consideration of the funding issues.

The third option would be to ask the new Climate Change Commission, once it is legally established, to provide the necessary leadership in developing a new adaptation framework. But given that the Commission is unlikely to be fully operational until 2020, this necessarily implies a delay in getting the process started.

The fourth option would be for the government to sponsor – in the sense of mandating and partially funding – an initiative (for example, led by Victoria University of Wellington) that brings together the technical expertise relevant to the funding of adaptation from the policy research community, the practitioners in local and central government, the finance sector (banking and insurance) and professional bodies to develop the principles and policy design elements for wider engagement. Such an initiative would require an appropriate coordinating mechanism, agreed terms of reference, and an agreed timeframe for delivery of defined outputs. A possible model for such an exercise would be the Tax Working Group hosted by Victoria University during 2009 and 2010.

The fifth option would be to combine two or more of the previous options on the basis that there could be two stages in the process—identification and design of policy instruments/ engagement with the sectors (central and local government, communities and sector representatives).

The key CCATWG recommendation on funding:

The CCATWG recommended the first option. To quote.

“We recommend that a specialist group of practitioners and experts undertake this action. These should be drawn from central and local government, iwi/hapū, sectors such as banking, insurance, and infrastructure; and have expertise in climate change, planning and law, public finance, capital markets, infrastructure financing, and risk management. The group should be serviced by a secretariat with officials across relevant public sector and local government agencies and include significant public engagement.”

The CCATWG went on to outline the nature of the issues that such a group would need to consider in developing appropriate funding arrangements:

1. the nature, scope and scale of the costs for adapting to climate change, including the costs of taking no action based on the risks defined in the national climate change risk assessment;
2. the principles and options for who should bear these costs and how they will be equitably shared across the public and private sectors. This includes the extent and nature of Crown responsibility to address situations where it may be neither fair nor realistic to expect businesses or households to act;
3. current funding arrangements, including:
 - a. funding sources and mechanisms, both public and private, capital and operational, domestic and international, and their capacity, accessibility, sustainability and potential to fund the likely costs of climate change adaptation;
 - b. incentives acting on public and private sector investment in climate change adaptation, how they are used, their effectiveness, consequences and sustainability; for example, EQC policy settings, water management incentives, adverse events policies, and the inequities of current funding models for Māori communities;
 - c. broader practices, barriers and opportunities in developing and maintaining funding arrangements and their implications;

- d. the lessons learnt from other countries about funding climate change adaptation;
4. future funding options, including:
 - a. policy and other changes needed to maintain and develop current funding sources, mechanisms, tools and incentives to stimulate and support investment in risk reduction and climate change adaptation;
 - b. policy and other changes to unlock, create and/or stimulate sources of funding that are new to New Zealand;
 - c. frameworks and practice guidance necessary for assessing the beneficiaries of climate change adaptation actions over time and the apportioning of costs;
 - d. the role that a dedicated anticipatory fund could play modelled on the design features of the NZ Superannuation Fund (e.g. flexibility measures such as regular reviews and prefunding, policy commitment devices such as cross-party agreements);
 5. the full range of policy, tools and practices needed to ensure efficient and equitable adaptive responses by businesses, households and public bodies. This includes the prioritisation and allocations of funds available pre- and post-event to help communities' transition from current and increasingly at-risk situations.

Conclusion

This note has outlined options for setting up a process to design a new policy framework for adaptation funding. The issues requiring attention are complex and will need in-depth technical expertise and substantial stakeholder engagement. There is some urgency to begin this process: the adaptation gap is widening all the time. Having policy instruments that are clear for the community and those charged with administering responses is imperative to manage expectations and adjustments in an orderly manner with minimum disruption, ongoing legacy effects, and expense for communities and the state at all levels.

While resolving the funding issues is critical for filling the adaptation gap, funding fits within the other recommendations of the CCATWG that are all necessary for successfully responding to the impacts of climate change.

9 CONFIDENTIAL SESSION

9.1 Procedural motion to exclude the public

The following motion is submitted for consideration:

That the public be excluded from the following part(s) of the proceedings of this meeting. The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution follows.

This resolution is made in reliance on section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by section 6 or section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public, as follows:

9.6 Supplementary Information to Waimea Community Dam - Ngati Koata Partnering Deed and M.A.K Stuart Agreement to Acquire Land

Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Particular interest(s) protected (where applicable)	Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.	<p>s7(2)(a) - The withholding of the information is necessary to protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of a deceased person.</p> <p>s7(2)(b)(ii) - The withholding of the information is necessary to protect information where the making available of the information would be likely unreasonably to prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied or who is the subject of the information.</p> <p>s7(2)(i) - The withholding of the information is necessary to enable the local authority to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations).</p>	<p>s48(1)(a)</p> <p>The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.</p>