

One hundred and forty-seventh meeting of the
New Zealand Fish and Game Council
Friday 21st – Sunday 23rd August
NZFGC Office Wellington

PRESENT

NZ Councillors:

Noel Birchall, Lindsay Lyons, Dave Harris (via Zoom), Paul Blewman, Paul Shortis (Chair), Bill O’Leary, Andy Harris, Rainsford Grubb, Roy Knight, Dan Isbister (arrived 10:30am Friday 21st August) and Greg Duley.

NZC Staff:

Martin Taylor Chief Executive, Carmel Veitch Finance, Brian Anderton Senior Communications Advisor, Richie Cosgrove Senior Communications Advisor, Steve Doughty Business Development Manager, Jack Kós Policy Advisor and Debbie Mair Policy Advisor.

Guests:

Jeff Niblett and Bruce Bates 11:00 - 11:30am Friday 21st August.

1. Welcome and Chairperson’s Introduction

- Meeting started 10:00am.
- Chairperson welcomed Cr Grubb to his first in person NZC meeting.
- Discussion surrounding meeting recording. Cr Grubb & Knight expressed concern at the recording of the meeting. The Chair identified that this is a public meeting, not a meeting of a commercial board, and that the circumstances are different.
 - Following discussion, it was determined that a voice recording will be retained for the purpose of accurate minutes, and for the recording to be destroyed once the minutes are approved.
- The Chair reminded Crs to not email in and out of the room during the meeting.
- CE set out the health and safety considerations for COVID Alert Level 2, and emergency procedures.

2. Apologies received

- Cr. Juby apologised for his absence.
- Cr. D. Harris apologised for being unable to attend in person.
- Cr. Isbister apologised for late attendance.

Recommendation

That the apologies be accepted.

Moved: Crs. Blewman/Knight - Carried

3. Conflicts of Interest

- Cr. Duley registered a conflict of interest in respect of the fact that he is the Hawke’s Bay appointee to NZC, and that the Hawke’s Bay council is in favour of pheasant preserves.

4. Minutes – Approve minutes for meeting 146

Recommendation:

That the minutes of meeting 146 held in July 2020 be approved.

Moved: Crs. Birchall/A. Harris - Carried

5. Health and Safety

Recommendation:

That the report be received.

Moved: Crs. Blewman/Knight - Carried

6. Review Action List

- It was noted that the first three bullet points from 143 have been met. These were:
 - Principles to apply to this year's budget
 - Principles to apply to next year's budget
 - Principles to apply to reserves management
- CE queried whether the principles on setting budgets had actually been codified into one document. Clarified that the principles for this year and next year were discussed at SFC, then sent out recommendations to NZC. It was then suggested these be summarised into one document. The SFC asked for a written request from CE so that there is a paper trail.
- The Chair detailed his meeting with the new Federated Farmers President and detailed the invitation from Federated Farmers for both boards to meet. He has pencilled this in for the November NZC meeting.
- It was asked what the purpose of the meeting was. Chair responded that it was to discuss what we agree on and disagree on.

Recommendation:

That the action list be received.

Moved: Crs. Blewman/O'Leary - Carried

7. Resource Allocation Project

- Chair noted we have a paper supporting the resource allocation project from the CE and a draft Terms of Reference (TOR) prepared by the Chair and that the draft TOR is currently being considered by Mervyn English.
- Chair noted that there is scope to get some funding from DOC to assist the review, around \$20,000, and that DOC would recommend individuals to NZC, but the NZC makes the appointments.
- CE spoke to his paper saying the project must be up and running as soon as possible and the project must be anchored in principles and an accepted methodology.
- It was noted that the draft TOR does not have a goal and that the goal must be the starting point and proposed the one suggested in the paper.
- It was also pointed out the key principle is that money needs to be spent where activities take place or have potential to take place, while still enabling councils to meet statutory functions.
- It was suggested an amendment to the goal to recognise 'current, potential and future anglers and hunters.'
- Chair noted that CE's paper was the basis for his TOR, but that they had been refined.
- It was expressed that it was unlikely to be able to be finished by the end of the year.

- It was stated it's largely a desktop exercise, and that once data is given to external reviewer it could happen quite quickly.
- It was raised by NZC staff about whether the regions needed to be consulted on the TOR.
- Comment was made that this process could be substantially elongated by multiple rounds of consultation.
- It was further suggested that there is time to consult at this stage, and that consultation should come at the end of this process.

Recommendations

The NZC agree to the goal as follows:

To ensure that all funds received and held by Fish and Game are used in the most effective and efficient way in the short, medium and long term interests, of all current, potential and future anglers and hunters.

Moved: Crs. Blewman/Lyons - Carried

The NZC agree to appoint independent external assistance.

Moved: Crs. Lyons/Duley - Carried

The NZC agree to make this project a priority.

Moved: Crs. Grubb/Blewman - Carried

The NZC agree to endeavour to have the draft policy for consultation ready by December 31, 2020.

Moved: Crs. Blewman/Lyon - Carried

Recommendation - Amend the Terms of Reference:

- *Add 'retaining capability in restoration and habitat'. To point 3*
- *Move point 8 in outputs to point 8 in considerations.*
- *Adding in the goal from MT paper at the top.*

Agree that the NZC adopt the draft terms of reference subject to the above amendments.

Moved: Blewman/Lyons - Carried

10 for 1 abstention (Cr. Isbister)

- Cr. Isbister noted his abstention was on the basis of the lack of consultation with regions and the possibility for a rushed process.

Exclusion of the Public: Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

Recommendation

That the Council, pursuant to the provisions of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, exclude the public from the following part of the proceedings of this meeting namely public be excluded from the following part of the proceedings of this meeting, namely:

GENERAL SUBJECT OF EACH MATTER TO BE CONSIDERED	REASON FOR PASSING THIS RESOLUTION IN RELATION TO EACH MATTER	GROUND(S) UNDER SECTION 48(1) FOR THE PASSING OF THIS RESOLUTION
Hawke's Bay Audit	Section 9(2)(f)(iv) OIA The withholding of information is necessary to maintain the constitutional conventions for the time being which protect the confidentiality of advice tendered by Ministers of the Crown and officials.	Section 48(1)(a)(ii) That the public conduct of the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist.

And that staff and representatives of Hawke's Bay, Bruce Bates and Jeff Niblett, remain to provide advice to the Council.

Note

Section 48(4) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 provides as follows:

“(4) Every resolution to exclude the public shall be put at a time when the meeting is open to the public, and the text of that resolution (or copies thereof):

- (a) Shall be available to any member of the public who is present; and (b) Shall form part of the minutes of the Council

Moved: Crs. Isbister/O’Leary - Carried

Recommendation

That the NZC move out of public excluded.

Moved: Crs. Blewman/ O’Leary - Carried

Meeting broke for lunch at 12:50pm Friday 21st August.

Meeting recommenced at 1:25pm Friday 21st August.

8 (a). Reserves Policy (late paper)

- Cr. Grubb spoke to his paper and stated the SFC have had the first round of consultation with regions and 16 responses received. Next step is to finalise input from NZC and SFC and put it out as a final discussion document to go to regions for deliberations. Now seeking feedback from NZC on this paper.
- It was suggested by the CE that there are two competing principles running through the paper that are not reconciled: the collective principle v individual regional control. Difficult to make decisions for the benefit of the collective when all decisions are made at an individual regional level.
- In relation to point 6, it was suggested that allowing regions to set regionally specific upper and lower levels of reserves makes it very difficult to coordinate reserve levels around the organisation.
- It was also suggested that the paper is going away from the principles and stepping into the policy. A possible conflict was observed where paper says the regions

generally make their own decisions on the use of reserves, but they accept that there is going to be an overall view of the system by the NZC to ensure regions aren't diluting the reserves.

- There was a short discussion on how to approach large fixed assets, for instance OFGC's land in Wanaka, and that Otago was about to sell 5 sections to prop up their reserves to fund the Lindis case. No conclusions were reached at this time.

Recommendation:

That the report be received.

Moved: Crs. Blewman/A. Harris - Carried

8 (b)(i). Update on Contract signing (oral)

Recommendation:

That the report be received.

Moved: Crs. Birchall/Blewman - Carried

- It was noted there is no report from the remuneration committee and that the remuneration committee has not met because of COVID and Cr. Weatherall's stroke.

8 (b)(ii). Licence Sales System Policy

- CE spoke to his paper and noted that now the licence sales system has been signed off, need to address some of the issues raised by regions during this process particularly around database access. CE stated that the NZC office cannot meet our statutory obligations if we cannot go out to licence holders when required without seeking the agreement of regions.
- A discussion followed in which it was detailed why NZC staff require access to the database. It was suggested by councillors that it makes sense NZC needs access to it and that regional concerns can all be dealt with through the communications strategy. There were a number of competing views, with some councillors believing that it was impossible for the CE and NZC staff to do their jobs without database access, whilst one councillor suggested NZC staff need the permission of regions because NZC only has the function of coordinating and consulting.
- The CE outlined that there are circumstances that are urgent and require the ability to act more immediately, and other instances where consultation/permission is appropriate.
- The Chair suggested all of the challenges could be met through a comprehensive MOU with the regions on database access.
- After further discussion it was agreed the CE pursue an MOU with the regions.

Recommendation:

Agree that the NZC has access to the national database in order to represent the interests of anglers and hunters and to meet its national advocacy and national research functions subject to a policy and/or MOU negotiated with regions.

Moved: Crs. Grubb/Duley - Carried

7 for 4 against (Birchall, Lyons, Blewman, A. Harris)

Meeting adjourned for the day at 3:03pm Friday 21/08/2020

Meeting recommenced at 8:30am Saturday 22/08/2020

Recommendation:

Agree the Licence Sub-committee continues to lead the development of the Licence System and establishes internal policy on the licence sales system.

Note: The day to day work of the subcommittee will be undertaken by national and regional staff, and all decisions will be made by the NZC on recommendation from the License Sub Committee.

Moved: Crs. Birchall/Harris - Carried

9. NZC Strategic Communications Policy

- The CE spoke to the paper and noted it was the result of detailed consultation with regions based upon paper written with Mike Jaspers. The CE noted that the proposed policy is logical, concise and has a flow. He proposed that based upon this new draft we go back out for consultation with regions.
- There was a general discussion around the policy, and some Councillors suggested that consultation on the updated draft will come back with the same issues. It was noted that the proposed policy had a requirement to 'inform' regions, rather than consult with, on regional issues. CE agreed to change inform to consult in the proposed policy.
- The CE noted that this policy sits at a high level. NZC would not be doing a PR on someone doing earthworks at a local level. Instead NZC would be doing a PR on something like a national EPA report on estuaries, showing that estuaries are the breeding ground for trout and ducks then listing two degraded estuaries.
- Following the discussion there was a request for an overarching policy document to be produced for NZC approval, which will sit above the more substantive strategy. Councillors asked if the policy could be an overarching policy that is approved by NZC and then have a communications strategy that will be a more substantive process document that sits under that. The strategy would reflect the national policy. The chair suggested that this document could be considered over email or zoom before being sent out to regions for consultation.

Recommendation:

That a simplified policy document is produced and brought back to NZC.

Moved: Crs. Isbister/Duley - Carried

10. Pheasant Preserves

- CE spoke to the paper and stated it is based on getting a position on whether it is acceptable to commercialise a public resource and that NZC need to respond to the DOC paper. Feedback received by regions was outlined, particularly the recently received letter from Hawke's Bay. CE took NZC through the response to the HB letter and specifically noted the implications at paragraph 5 about himself and Simon Lusk. CE further explained Simon Lusk was engaged by the NZ Game & Conservation Alliance to do their lobbying, which is how he came to be in contact with Mr. Lusk. CE concluded by stating that apart from two technical errors the Hawke's Bay paper does not undermine the NZC paper.
- Chair set out his engagement with parties interested in pheasant preserves and explained that he met Wendell Phillips (Chair of the NZ Game & Conservation Alliance) on two occasions, initially to understand what the issues were from their perspective and subsequently in conjunction with Michael Gee [DOC Policy Advisor]

to consider the options available for resolution as presented in the DOC briefing paper to the Minister of Conservation dated 6 April 2020.

- There was a discussion around the status of pheasants currently in which the chair suggested that based on his meetings with the NZ Game & Conservation Alliance he was confident they had abandoned their intention to seek legislative change because the law changes could take years to come before Parliament. CE clarified that the Game & Conservation Alliance had employed a QC to draft legislation and sought his comment on this which he refused on our lawyers' advice. He noted legislative change is likely in the Wildlife and Conservation Acts in light of recent judicial decisions. CE then stated that at a fundamental level this is about is commercialisation. Does the NZC support the commercialisation of a game bird and wish to open this door?
- Background information on pheasant preserves was provided, noting that pheasant preserves were developed as an opportunity to improve upland game hunting and have operated for 20 years without issue. It was further stated that without commercial preserves there will be no breeding of a sufficient volume to stock non-commercial preserves, which will effectively end them too.
- The impacts of losing pheasants as a game bird were discussed and was suggested there would be minimal impact on licence sales but that there could be substantial backlash from licence holders. A counter point was put, suggesting that if the NZC moved to end game preserves this would also result in backlash from licence holders as there would be fewer pheasants on the peripheries of the preserves. CE suggested that if the NZC agree to let a discrete group set rules they want on a particular game bird we are giving away Fish and Game's control and that precedent has the possibility to flow through to other areas. He further suggested that it is the thin end of the wedge if you allow a small group of people to continue this and allow people to charge for access to a game bird.
- The potential flow-on effects of this decision, and the significance of this decision, were then debated. It was suggested that this decision has the potential to impact all fishing and hunting resources where there is a requirement to cross private land and it was also observed that in the governance manual it states Fish and Game are opposed to the commercial use of the wild sports fish and game resource. The CE noted that there is no legal difference between a duck and a pheasant, and queried if NZC allow commercial pheasant preserves what the argument for not allowing commercial duck shooting was. The chair suggested that from DOC's perspective there is a policy distinction in that pheasants are there by release, whereas ducks can fly in and out.
- It was then discussed whether pheasant preserves increased or decreased hunting opportunity, with one councillor suggesting that Fish and Game is about enhancing hunting and the use of a shotgun and that game preserves serve this purpose. It was mooted whether this legitimised the charging for access in light of the potential implications for other species.
- Following from this, the risks to the social licence of game bird hunting were discussed. There was a divergence of opinions, with some councillors suggesting that hunters go hunting and that people on the pheasant preserves go shooting whilst others believed that anti-hunting proponents were not nuanced in their perspectives but were simply opposed to all forms of hunting.
- There was then a discussion on what the implications of each option put forward in the DOC paper were. Following a show of hands it was agreed to skip the recommendations at paragraph 29 of the NZC paper and move on to the recommendations at paragraph 30.

Recommendations:

Agree to advise the Minister that the New Zealand Fish & Game Council endorses Option 1.

Moved: Crs. Lyons/Blewman - **Lost**

5 for 5 against, 1 abstention (A. Harris). Chair used his casting vote to decline the motion.

DOC Option 1 reads:

‘One option is to continue with the status quo. Under this option all commercial game preserves will close in 2 years’ time when the Wildlife Order 2019 expires. Non-commercial preserves may also need to close at this time, or the NZ Council may recommend to you that non-commercial preserves continue to be provided for in Open Season for Game notices for hunting seasons after 6 May 2022.’

Agree to advise the Minister that the New Zealand Fish & Game Council endorses Option 2.

Moved: Crs. Lyons/Blewman - **Carried**

7 for 4 against

DOC Option 2 reads:

‘A second option is that proposed by the NZ Game and Conservation Alliance – to amend the Wildlife Order 2019 by Order in Council to remove its expiry date. Pheasants and red-legged partridge would then remain listed on Schedule 3 when on game preserves until such time as the Order was revoked by Order in Council.’

Meeting adjourned for morning tea at 10:40am Saturday 22nd August.

Meeting recommenced at 11:05am Saturday 22nd August.

11. Trout Farming

- CE spoke to the paper and set out the context around this paper, including the increasing push from iwi for the legalisation of trout farming and a recent select committee report that supports trout farming. He noted that this needs to be distinguished from pheasant preserves, as this is not about charging for access.
- There was a discussion on the specific environment in which the Lake Rotoaira Trust Board were proposing to farm trout, and in particular interconnected nature of this environment with inflows from the Whakapapa River through Lake Otamangakau and outflows into Lake Taupo through the Poutu Canal and Tongariro River.
- A debate was then had on whether the best approach was to oppose trout farming in an absolute sense or to engage with the process so as to influence it to mitigate Fish & Game’s concerns. It was noted by many councillors that they strongly disagreed with trout farming. There was also a strong voice expressed that if we do anything but oppose trout farming we will upset every one of our licence holders.

- The CE noted that the PGF etc means that groups will get money and will be looking to spend it and the majority of the country will look on this opportunity favourably, meaning we may not be able to prevent it. CE continued that, whilst we know there's a biosecurity risk, there is no record of Fish & Game ever having commissioned research to quantify that risk. Notes that he is fairly confident the biosecurity risks of trout farming are being researched currently through channels that we aren't part of. Fish and Game needs to either undertake our own research or graft into existing research. Also need to be aware that when we receive the risk analysis, someone will point out our releases from open systems and ask what the biosecurity systems are like in our hatcheries. CE further queries the relative biosecurity risks of anglers bringing fishing gear in from overseas vs open or close trout farming systems and suggests these are the questions we need answered.
- Noted by NZC staff that there are currently three large closed recirculating systems operating in NZ and that they could overnight change to trout farming. Currently these systems are farming whitebait.

Recommendations

Agree to reassess Fish and Game's opposition to trout farming based on further independent research establishing the risk profile of different types of trout farming systems;

Moved: Crs. Blewman/O'Leary - Carried

10 for 1 against (Cr. Isbister)

Agree to reject and advocate against the importation of trout flesh;

Moved: Crs. Blewman/Grubb - Carried

Agree to consult with regional Fish and Game councils on the outcome of this paper.

Moved: Crs. Blewman/Isbister - Carried

12. Non-Resident Levy

- Cr. Birchall spoke to his paper, noting that the levy was originally set aside for backcountry fisheries but that this was not a directive from the Minister. Since then the Minister has formally come back and said that the money can be used for any sports fish purpose. Currently there is over \$1million in NR reserves.
- A query was raised whether under the proposals in the Reserves paper the licence fund money would go into the whole pot to be split evenly or stay in the regions it was incurred in. It was clarified that the money in the reserves will remain in the regions where it is currently but that it will become part of the general reserves and considered in terms of applications for funding.
- There was concern expressed by some councillors that treating it as licence income would mean that it could be levied, as opposed to being spent in the fisheries directly pressured. It was confirmed that the proposal is that the existing reserves stay in the region they are in, but that the NR income is treated as normal income going forward in the interests of an open, transparent and simple financial system.

Recommendation:

That we rescind the previous motions on Non Resident Fish Levies and agree that the Non Residents Levy be treated as licence income for the budgeting

process and that all Non Resident Reserves become general reserves in the regions in which they are currently held.

Moved: Crs. Birchall/Blewman - Carried

9 for 2 against (Crs. Knight & Isbister)

- Clarification sought on date this applies from. Chair confirms that it is from today and that regions would be told through a letter from Carmel.
- Subsequent debate around wording. Motion was put to a revote.

Recommendation:

That we rescind the previous motions on Non Resident Fish Levies and agree that the Non Residents Levy be treated as licence income for the budgeting process and that all Non Resident Reserves become general reserves in the regions in which they are currently held.

Moved: Crs. Birchall/Blewman - Carried

8 for 3 against (Crs. Knight, Isbister, Grubb)

13. Mallard Research Fund Allocation

- Cr. Birchall spoke to his paper and set out that historically the licence fee was increased on the basis that a proportion of the additional money would be going towards research. He stated that the NZC have already agreed that we are not going to put anything into the Mallard Research Fund this year and that in the past we have spent far in excess of the amount of \$1 per licence. His paper proposed that all projects should be assessed on their merits.
- There was a general consensus that all research projects should be assessed on their merits, and it was noted that this approach doesn't preclude mallard research but simply removes a small discrete bucket of funding allocation.

Recommendation:

That we rescind the previous motion on mallard research contribution and agree to discontinue the separate mallard research fund and consider mallard research applications on their merit as funds allow.

Moved: Crs. Birchall/Lyons - Carried

14. NZC Finance Report

- Carmel Veitch spoke to her paper and noted that whilst it looks like we are 'flush' with money we need to remember not all of the money allocated to research and RMA/legal will get spent in the year, goes back into reserves so the expenditure doesn't occur this year. i.e. RMA legal much of it is already allocated and may be an expense next year. So, looking at dollars on RMA legal and research they are dollars from previous years that are already approved.

Recommendation

Approve the Financial report as at 31 July 2020

Moved: Crs. Birchall/Lyons - Carried

15. National Finance Report

- Carmel Veitch spoke to her paper and explained that one table was inclusive of the wage subsidy, and one exclusive. Further noted that Auckland/Waikato are moving to Xero in the New Financial year.

Recommendation

Accept the National Financial Report as at 30 June 2020.

Moved: Crs. Blewman/Isbister - Carried

Meeting adjourned for lunch at 12:30pm Saturday 22nd August.

Meeting recommenced at 1:10pm Saturday 22nd August.

16. Annual meeting timetable 2021/2022

- Carmel Veitch set out the different meetings, noting that with budget changes we have reduced face to face NZC meetings from 5 to 3 and 1 face to face managers meeting, all others will be via zoom. Paper lists where we have to make decisions. Detailed meeting dates proposed.
- Discussion held on the best way to organise and conduct Zoom meetings.
- It was noted the Ministerial Review is scheduled to deliver its recommendations to the Minister on 31 December and this may necessitate another face to face meeting at some stage in the New Year.

Recommendation:

1. *Agree that the proposed NZ Council meeting dates for 2020/21 become:*

- *November 20th -22nd in Wellington 2020*
- *February 16th and/or 18th by Zoom 2021*
- *April 16th and 17th in Wellington 2021*
- *June 17th by Zoom 2021*
- *August 27th and 28th in Wellington 2021 or other location?*

2. *That this paper goes out to Regions for feedback.*

3. *These dates may be subject to change due to the Review and other meetings may be required.*

Moved: Crs. Blewman/A. Harris - Carried

17. Economic Impact Analysis Proposal

- Jack Kós spoke to his paper, setting out the options and noting that, whilst this research is valuable, there is a question of whether this is the right time to do it in light of budgetary constraints.
- CE noted that the purpose is to come up with a figure to support national advocacy so we can speak to the value of the fishery as a counter point but while he thinks this is important, he doesn't think it is vitally important in light of our scarce resources.
- Chair proposed that we defer it for consideration at the April contestable funding round 2021.

Recommendation:

That the NZC defer the decision and that the paper is refined based on feedback from council.

Moved: Crs. Grubb/Blewman – Carried

18. National Angler Survey

- CE noted that Helen, Jack and he are working on a Business Plan and will have it to the November meeting. Noted we are waiting for information from NIWA and for a discussion with managers on how the regional staff hours are going to be covered, i.e., donated by regions or charged.
- Also noted that Helen is not an NZC employee so there needs to be a management group set up that she responds to with her manager which has some responsibility for delivery of the project.
- There was a view that this is a national project and that the CE has to be accountable for the overall management and delivery of the project.
- CE replied he has no problem doing that, but if he was to be fully accountable for delivery then he needs full management control.
- Chair suggested NZC defer a decision on this pending a further paper to come in November. The paper to cover accountabilities and mechanisms for managing the project.

Recommendation:

Defer decision and bring paper back in November.

Moved: Crs. Blewman/Knight - Carried

19. Legal/RMA Applications

- There was a discussion around each proposal and its significance on both a regional and national level. CE also noted a number of other upcoming challenges that NZC had to be cognisant of, namely the Lindis appeal and the NPS FM.
- Chair stated we have limited resources and agreed with the CE that in the next year we are likely to face our first NPS FM regional plan and we cannot miss the bus because we don't have the money. While we need to look at both of the applications in front of us it needs to be in the context of knowing there is a third thing in the background that we have to provision for.
- CE noted that we have done a good job so far working with Helen Marr and Sarah Ongley and that we need to make sure we defend what we have got in the NPS FM and defend ecosystem health. Complexity of this is immense and it will necessitate a significant investment of time and research.
- There was then a discussion on the exact finances available to fund these applications in which it was noted that we have unspent money this year in the Legal/RMA budget and some other existing projects have finished and not used all their allocation resulting in a total of \$100k available from this year in conjunction with the budgeted amount for the next financial year.
- Chair detailed that in the 2020-2021 year there is \$415k available for RMA/Legal comprised of \$315k (original budget) plus \$100k unallocated from current financial year. In terms of costs we have \$230k from the applications, as well as a probably \$100k from Lindis and \$200k for NPSFW support, making a total of \$530k. Chair suggested that one answer is that NZC could allocate \$410k in total – based on Lindis \$100k, NPS \$150k, Southland \$60k and Auckland \$100k for example.
- It was then suggested that if we are not going to pay full requests we need to prorate reductions at same rate, with applications with national significance taking precedence over applications with predominantly local impact meaning \$55k for

Southland, \$110k for Auckland Waikato, Lindis \$100k, NPSFW \$150k (given it is unlikely the full \$220k will be needed in the next financial year).

- It was agreed to write to the regions concerned and communicate that the amount provided is based on the total amount available and that the projects need to be tailored to the amount supplied.

Recommendation

That the NZC allocate funds from the RMA/Legal fund on the following basis:

- *Southland application: \$55,000*
- *Auckland/Waikato application: \$110,000*
- *Lindis: \$100,000*
- *NPS-FM: \$150,000*

Moved: Crs. Isbister/Knight - Carried

10 for 1 abstention (D. Harris)

Meeting adjourned for afternoon tea 3:00pm Saturday 22nd August.

Meeting recommenced 3:20pm Saturday 22nd August.

20. Policy Review Timetable

- CE spoke to the paper and noted the purpose of the paper is to show how out of date our policies are and that they need a complete overhaul. Previous resolutions record some policy was updated in 2006 and that there was a review done in 2011/12 but there were no resolutions to adopt those policy papers. Robert confirmed this. With nothing confirmed, we have to default to what has been confirmed.
- Discussion ensued about what policies are needed and that we need to start with a one page summary on each. A councillor requested that the audit policy be reviewed.
- It was suggested that staff will come back in November with relevant policies prioritised and a brief description of what they contain.
- It was also noted that there should be a distinction between operational policy, and a higher level of strategic policy that sits above it. Currently, this is not clear in our existing policies.

Recommendation:

That this report be received.

Moved: Crs. Birchall/Blewman - Carried

27. CEO and Staff Activity Report

- Discussion about whether governors needed this and the different approaches taken in the regions. Noted it is a requirement in our Standing Orders. Suggested that this type of reporting could be addressed in process-oriented zoom meetings.

Recommendation:

That this report be received.

Moved: Crs. Isbister/Grubb - Carried

28. Legal/RMA Report

- CE noted that in light of previous decision NZC need to make the decision that the remaining of the uncommitted funds from Auckland/Waikato healthy rivers and Northland regional plan allocations returns to the pool for reallocation.

Recommendations:

1. *That the \$13,791 from AW and the \$38,861 from Northland regional plan of funds that are no longer required will revert to the legal/RMA fund for the next financial year.*

Moved: Crs. Grubb/Blewman - Carried

2. *That this report be received.*

Moved: Crs. Blewman/Lyons – Carried

29. Research Report

- Discussion around some outstanding projects and it was agreed that a letter be sent following these up asking when the funds are going to be used or, if not used, whether they could be withdrawn.

Recommendation:

That this report be received.

Moved: Blewman/Knight – Carried

Meeting adjourned 4pm Saturday 22nd August.

Meeting recommenced at 9:08am Sunday 23rd August.

21. Exclusion of the Public: Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

That the New Zealand Fish and Game Council:

(a) pursuant to the provisions of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 exclude the public from the following part of the proceedings of this meeting, namely:

GENERAL SUBJECT OF EACH MATTER TO BE CONSIDERED	REASON FOR PASSING THIS RESOLUTION IN RELATION TO EACH MATTER	GROUND(S) UNDER SECTION 48(1) FOR THE PASSING OF THIS RESOLUTION
Confirmation of Public Excluded Minutes	Section 9(2)(i) OIA The withholding of information is necessary to enable a Minister of the Crown or any department or organisation holding the information to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities.	Section 48(1)(a)(ii) That the public conduct of the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist.
Discussion: Governance and Management Roles and Responsibilities	Section 9(2)(j) OIA The withholding of information is necessary to enable a Minister of the Crown or any department or organisation holding the information to	Section 48(1)(a)(ii) That the public conduct of the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the

	carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations.	disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist.
Discussion: Strategic approach for the next 12 months	Section 9(2)(j) OIA The withholding of information is necessary to enable a Minister of the Crown or any department or organisation holding the information to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations.	Section 48(1)(a)(ii) That the public conduct of the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist.

(b) And that staff remain to provide advice to the Council.

Note

Section 48(4) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 provides as follows:

“(4) Every resolution to exclude the public shall be put at a time when the meeting is open to the public, and the text of that resolution (or copies thereof):

(a) Shall be available to any member of the public who is present; and (b) Shall form part of the minutes of the Council

Moved: Crs. Isbister/Blewman - Carried

Recommendation:

That the NZC move out of public excluded.

Moved: Crs. Blewman/Knight – Carried

Recommendation:

That the remuneration committee motion be moved out of public excluded into public.

Moved: Crs. O’Leary/Grubb – Carried

Recommendation:

That the remuneration committee is disbanded, but there is an expectation that work is continued during or after the resource allocation project and the ministerial review.

Moved: Crs. O’Leary/Blewman - Carried

30. Meeting close

- Chair thanked everyone for the opportunity to sit around the table, and for working through a huge agenda. Specific thanks were extended to Cr. D. Harris for attending remotely. Thanks also extended to the staff also for the work that they have done.

Meeting closed at 11:37am Sunday 23rd August.

Next Meeting details

Next meeting the 148th 20/21/22 November

Summary of Public Resolutions from Meeting 147

2. Apologies received

Recommendation

That the apologies be accepted

Moved: Crs. Blewman/Knight - Carried

4. Minutes – Approve minutes for meeting 146

Recommendation:

That the minutes of meeting 146 held in July 2020 be approved.

Moved: Crs. Birchall/A. Harris - Carried

5. Health and Safety

Recommendation:

That the report be received.

Moved: Crs. Blewman/Knight - Carried

6. Review Action List

Recommendation:

That the action list be received.

Moved: Crs. Blewman/O’Leary - Carried

7. Resource Allocation Project

Recommendations

The NZC agree to the goal as follows:

To ensure that all funds received and held by Fish and Game are used in the most effective and efficient way in the short, medium and long term interests, of all current, potential and future anglers and hunters.

Moved: Crs. Blewman/Lyons - Carried

The NZC agree to appoint independent external assistance.

Moved: Crs. Lyons/Duley - Carried

The NZC agree to make this project a priority.

Moved: Crs. Grubb/Blewman - Carried

The NZC agree to endeavour to have the draft policy for consultation ready by December 31, 2020.

Moved: Crs. Blewman/Lyon - Carried

Agree that the NZC adopt the draft terms of reference subject to the above amendments.

Moved: Blewman/Lyons - Carried

10 or 1 abstention (Cr. Isbister)

8 (a). Reserves Policy

Recommendation:

That the report be received

Moved: Crs. Blewman/A. Harris - Carried

8 (b)(ii). Licence Sales System Policy

Recommendations:

1. *Agree that the NZC has access to the national database in order to represent the interests of anglers and hunters and to meet its national advocacy and national research functions subject to a policy and/or MOU negotiated with regions.*

Moved: Crs. Grubb/Duley - Carried

7 for 4 against (Birchall, Lyons, Blewman, Harris)

2. *Agree the Licence Sub-committee continues to lead the development of the Licence System and establishes internal policy on the licence sales system.*

Note: The day to day work of the subcommittee will be undertaken by national and regional staff, and all decisions will be made by the NZC on recommendation from the License Sub Committee.

Moved: Crs. Birchall/Harris - Carried

9. NZC Strategic Communications Policy

Recommendation:

That a simplified policy document is produced and brought back to NZC.

Moved: Crs. Isbister/Duley - Carried

11. Pheasant Preserves

Recommendation

Agree to advise the Minister that the New Zealand Fish & Game Council endorses Option 2.

Moved: Crs. Lyons/Blewman - Carried

7 for 4 against

11. Trout Farming

Recommendations

Agree to reassess Fish and Game's opposition to trout farming based on further independent research establishing the risk profile of different types of trout farming systems;

Moved: Crs. Blewman/O'Leary - Carried

10 for 1 against (Cr. Isbister)

Agree to reject and advocate against the importation of trout flesh;

Moved: Crs. Blewman/Grubb - Carried

Agree to consult with regional Fish and Game councils on the outcome of this paper.

Moved: Crs. Blewman/Isbister - Carried

12. Non-Resident Levy

Recommendation:

That we rescind the previous motions on Non Resident Fish Levies and agree that the Non Residents Levy be treated as licence income for the budgeting process and that all Non Resident Reserves become general reserves in the regions in which they are currently held.

Moved: Crs. Birchall/Blewman - Carried

8 for, 3 against (Crs. Knight, Isbister, Grubb)

13. Mallard Research Fund Allocation

Recommendation:

That we rescind the previous motion on mallard research contribution and agree to discontinue the separate mallard research fund and consider mallard research applications on their merit as funds allow.

Moved: Crs. Birchall/Lyons - Carried

14. NZC Finance Report

Recommendation

Approve the Financial report as at 31 July 2020

Moved: Crs. Birchall/Lyons - Carried

15. National Finance Report

Recommendation

Accept the National Financial Report as at 30 June 2020.

Moved: Crs. Blewman/Isbister - Carried

16. Annual meeting timetable 2021/2022

Recommendation:

1. *Agree that the proposed NZ Council meeting dates for 2020/21 become:*
 - *November 20th -22nd in Wellington 2020*
 - *February 16th and/or 18th by Zoom 2021*
 - *April 16th and 17th in Wellington 2021*
 - *June 17th by Zoom 2021*
 - *August 27th and 28th in Wellington 2021 or other location?*
2. *That this paper goes out to Regions for feedback.*
3. *These dates may be subject to change due to the Review and other meetings may be required.*

Moved: Crs. Blewman/A. Harris - Carried

17. Economic Impact Analysis Proposal

Recommendation:

That the NZC defer the decision and that the paper is refined based on feedback from council.

Moved: Crs. Grubb/Blewman - Carried

18. National Angler Survey

Recommendation:

Defer decision and bring paper back in November.

Moved: Crs. Blewman/Knight - Carried

19. Legal/RMA Applications

Recommendation

That the NZC allocate funds from the RMA/Legal fund on the following basis:

- *Southland application: \$55,000*
- *Auckland/Waikato application: \$110,000*
- *Lindis: \$100,000*
- *NPS-FM: \$150,000*

Moved: Crs. Isbister/Knight - Carried

10 for 1 abstention (D. Harris)

20. Policy Review Timetable

Recommendation:

That this report be received.

Moved: Crs. Birchall/Blewman - Carried

27. CEO and Staff Activity Report

Recommendation:

That this report be received.

Moved: Crs. Isbister/Grubb - Carried

28. Legal/RMA Report

Recommendations:

That the 13,791 from AW and the 38,861 from Northland regional plan of funds that are no longer required will revert to the legal/RMA fund for the next financial year.

Moved: Crs. Grubb/Blewman - Carried

That this report be received.

Moved: Crs. Blewman/Lyons - Carried

29. Research Report

Recommendation:

That this report be received.

Moved: Blewman/Knight - Carried

Recommendation:

That the remuneration committee motion be moved out of public excluded into public.

Moved: Crs. O'Leary/Grubb - Carried

From PE:

Recommendation:

That the remuneration committee is disbanded, but there is an expectation that work is continued during or after the resource allocation project and the ministerial review.

Moved: Crs. O'Leary/Blewman - Carried