

One hundred and fiftieth meeting of the  
**New Zealand Fish and Game Council**  
17 & 18 April 2021  
West Plaza Hotel Wellington

---

**PRESENT**

**NZ Councillors:**

Ray Grubb (Chair), Debbie Oakley, Noel Birchall, Andy Harris, Dan Isbister, Nigel Juby, Bill O'Leary, Dave Harris, Richard McIntyre, Dave Coll, Gerard Karalus.

**NZC Staff:**

Paul Shortis, Acting Chief Executive, Carmel Veitch Finance, Brian Anderton Senior Advisor, Jack Kós Policy Advisor.

**Guests:**

-

**1. Welcome and Chairperson's Introduction**

- Meeting started 3:10pm Friday 17<sup>th</sup> April.
- Chair celebrated the 150<sup>th</sup> meeting of the NZC.

**2. Apologies received**

- Greg Duley

**3. Conflicts of Interest**

- Chair announced standing conflict in respect of any Ombudsman investigations
- Richard McIntyre declared he is Federated Farmers Dairy Vice Chair and trustee of the Dairy awards.

**4. Approve minutes for meeting 149**

*That the minutes of meeting 149 be approved subject to below corrections*

**Moved: Crs. Birchall/Oakley**

- P6 – Meeting Sunday was 14<sup>th</sup> March, not 14<sup>th</sup> February.
- P13 – Under NRL part of original resolution was 'and put out for consultation to the regions'

Matters arising from minutes:

- Comment on contract for elections, which was to go out to regions.
- Note: NZC agreed that all regions are to have ARF budget.
  - CV noted need to revise ARF system.
  - **ACTION:** Chair requested report to NZC on state of ARF budgets across regions to next meeting.

**5. Health and Safety**

*That the report be received.*

**Moved: Crs. Grubb/Oakley**

**Motion Passed**

## 6. Review Action List

- **ACTION:** Once actions are completed and reported back to one meeting they should fall off.
- The Chair indicated his future intention is to attend contentious negotiation meetings such as the one with NCFGC accompanied by another Cr.
- **Action:** Delete action on joint research with MPI & Fisheries on trout farming.
- **Action:** Delete P. Wilson Gaant schedule.

*That the report be received.*

**Moved: Crs. Karalus/D. Harris**

**Motion Passed**

## Additions to agenda

No additions.

## 7. Ministerial Review

- Deferred due to review not released.

## 8. NZC Budget Approval (Combined NZC & National Budget)

- Confirmed that NZC budget had been separated from National budget. Agreed this was administrative detail and didn't need resolution.
  - CE spoke to NZC budget:
    - Net result is savings of \$32k, subject to a couple provisos. May change slightly with personnel/structure.
  - Noted that figures in recommendation are round the wrong way.
  - Confirmed that website is budgeted for this financial year and has not been spent yet.
  - Query around what the website and social media budget line was for. CE clarified that there is ongoing maintenance with a new website and associated costs.
  -
1. *That the budget of \$1,999,057 be approved as presented in Table 1. With the breakdown of \$896,450 to the National Budget and \$1,102,607 to the NZC budget.*

**Moved: Crs. Grubb/McIntyre**

**Motion Passed**

- Discussion around the RM/Legal budget line and CE noted that Managers had recommended an increase in the RMA/Legal application to \$500,000.
  - Managers didn't think \$314k sufficient to meet the challenges over the next year.
  - Clarified that the \$500k does not include the RM staff application for \$100k.
  - Confirmed that this year there were not sufficient funds to allocate to regions that didn't have sufficient reserves to cover.
  - Clarified that the Wellington and NM applications were subject to there being a resource at NZC. If that -resource was provided via national budget, these CF bids would be withdrawn.
2. *That the Contestable Funding applications for \$500k RMA/Legal and \$100k for an RMA position for the National budget be approved.*

**Moved: Crs. Birchall/Juby**

## **Motion Passed**

- CE spoke to cookbook proposal and clarified that this was seed capital and there was a high probability of recovering the cost.
- Managers were very comfortable with this as a good proposition and recommended it.
- Confirmed that we will get usage rights to all content, but that release would be staggered.
- Confirmed that this is a dual-purpose proposal – marketing and revenue generation.
- Chair discussed inherent conflict where game is harvest based and angling is frequently catch and release based. Noted potential on the fish front to be counterproductive.
- CE suggested that providing recipe book will not be an issue for people practicing catch and release.
- Noted that this was part of a whole cycle of promoting our sports and ultimately licence revenue.
- Significant support for the harvest of sports fish given the ethical difficulty around exclusive catch and release.

3. *That the Contestable Funding application for the Fish and Game Cookbook for the National budget be approved.*

**Moved: Crs. Oakley/Coll**

Against – Juby/Grubb

**Motion Passed**

- CE spoke to purpose of Staff Development Grant fund . Noted strong recommendation from Managers.
- CE spoke to the re-estimation of the National Angler Survey and suggested that we need to budget annually significantly more for the NAS to accrue sufficient funds for the seven year cycle.
  - Queried whether this was a \$20k increase or a \$30k increase from status quo. Confirmed \$30k increase.
- CE spoke to the increase of \$30k to the research reserve and noted the need to leverage \$ for \$ research.

4. *That the Contestable Funding Application for the Staff Development Grant (\$10k), the National Angling Survey (\$30k) and the Research Grant (\$100k) for the National budget be approved.*

**Moved: Crs. Karalus/A. Harris**

**Motion Passed**

## **9. Completing 2021/22 Budget Round Decisions**

- Loss of interest income – CF bids 01, 12, 17, 23, 35, 41, 50, 55:

- Confirmed that all regions with reserves over 20% will fund this from reserves. Taranaki does not have 20% reserves, so this will be funded from licence fee.
- Clarified that Taranaki's lost interest income is in a dedicated reserve and the interest income is able to be used for operational matters. This lost income is what they are claiming on.

○ .

**Moved: Crs. Juby/O'Leary**

Chair abstained

**Motion Passed**

- CPI on salaries – CF bids 02, 08, 11, 18, 36, 40, 47, 54:

**Moved: Crs. Juby/D. Harris**

**Motion Passed**

- General:

- Confirmed that there is no ability to oppose the use of restricted reserves.
- Noted that when regions dropped budget by 5% some core functions simply were not able to be completed and some of the smaller CF applications are a product of this.
- Queried why NM's small operational costs were not taken from reserves?
- Is this a unique position NM finds themselves in or is this across the board? Noting that NM only region to have applied. Request for NM applications to be dealt with separately to consider recommending they take from reserves?
- Confirmed CV spreadsheets are based on not funding anything rated 1 or 2 by Managers. NZC job is to decide if:
  - There are any 3s and 4s that we should not approve.
  - There are any 1s and 2s that we should approve.

- RM applications for NM and Wellington – CF Bids 24 & 39

- *1. NM (\$20k) and Wellington (\$30k) CF bids for RM Planning advice removed given the funding of an NZC RMA staff position.*

**Moved: Crs. Grubb/Juby**

**Motion Passed**

Abstained: Crs. O'Leary/McIntyre

- Bulk consideration

- *1. That the remainder of CF bids rated 3s and 4s by Managers be approved.*

**Moved: Crs. Grubb/Oakley**

**Motion Passed**

- Debate

- Suggestion that some applications that are one-offs should be considered as [ongoing one-offs](#).
- Clarified that in light of the Ministerial Review and the potential to start again next year it was decided to consider these on a one-off basis.

#### Funding for North Canterbury:

- Chair stated that NC was asked to submit a budget on same basis as other regions – base budget and CF bids for increases (which could also be translated if

approved into an ongoing base funding increase). Chair invited NC to have a special funding application for current financial year 2021 if they wished to do so on the basis that there was general consensus that the employment of an RMA officer in NC is a priority. Email/Docs in agenda and wrote confirming both offers/invitations to them and the separate offer that Chair personally made to have a special funding application for 2020. Offer not accepted. NC put in budget for \$945k for 21/22. Only council that has chosen this novel route contrary to normal process. Individual region not conforming puts entire system at risk. Fair to say that Chair would deem situation that NC council has chosen confrontation rather than consultation. However, there are two things happening. One, they need an RMA officer and may not be able to do within current budget. Two, have ministerial review coming up that may affect basis on which we work. Chair recommends, as a means to start the NZC debate on this matter, that we recommend a budget increase of \$90k for NC for 2021/22, which is ongoing funding from licence fees to be added to their base budget to fund an RMA position.

*1. That the NC base budget be increased by \$90k on an ongoing basis from licence fee.*

**Moved: Crs. Grubb/Isbister**

Cr Isbister asked that it be recorded that he also did not support the proposal but supported the motion solely to provide focus to the debate.

Cr. Coll abstained.

- Debate comments:
  - Is there room in NC budget to employ RM position on base budget?
  - CV suggest yes.
  - Concerns about approving any money to NC without going through the formal CF bid process detailing what money will be spent on and subject to assessment of Managers.
  - Concern that the \$90k may not be spent for the purposes that it is allocated.
  - Peer review by managers refused by NC is a risk management process.
  - NC argument is they have the legal right to set their own budget without interference from NZC. The Chair noted he had given NCFGC the Geddes legal opinion on the interpretation of the Conservation Act which confirmed that by setting the Levies the NZC set the Regional budgets and that is both a legal right and a statutory obligation on NZC to manage the national finances.
  - NC able to propose own budget, but it has to nominate this and have it go through the proper process.
  - Options:
    - Seek detailed budget from NC based on \$775k and with CF bids to bring up to \$945k
    - Approve \$90k for RMA position.
    - Status quo and require them to stick to \$775k budget.
  - North Canterbury appointee stated personal view is that what NC have done is the budget we require i.e. a baseline budget of...whether it's \$770k+\$90k or \$945k. Everyone agrees NCFGC need RMA. To give

someone a reasonable contract we shouldn't have to apply each year for a CF bid, need to get it each year. He was advised NC had been informed that the base budget can be adjusted in this way so there would be no need for an annual application.

- Confirmed that there is a detailed budget, but at \$945k as opposed to using the accepted process to increase a base budget via CF bids.
- Managers confirmed that NC had not followed due process by putting in a base fund budget plus putting in CF applications. Second feedback is Managers did analyse the \$945k budget and that it did not pass muster. General feeling is the budget at \$945k has considerable fat and could employ RM and strip back from \$945k. Several managers happy to contribute to putting together budget from \$775k+RM position coming in around \$865k. Problem is NC budgets have come in late and no one has been able to assess or assist with this analysis.
- Chair has written to NC and proposed guidance and training for NC Manager.
- Noted process of budget setting is a cooperative process and if we don't have co-operation, we don't have a workable process.
- Suggested that could be better to wait till after review, then consider this on a zero budget basis.
- Point that region can establish own budget is correct – they can establish own budget within the approved level. Then seek change through the established process of CF bids and peer review, the essential steps in managing funding across a complex Organisation.
- Noted it is not Dave's NC Rep role to carry requests back to NC – any request must come from NZC to NC.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00pm. Due to recommence 8:30am.

Meeting recommenced 8:32am Saturday 17<sup>th</sup> April.

- Chair offered the opportunity for further debate and sought individual comment:
  - Two aspects – what they need and what they have applied for. Issue with supporting or rewarding bad behaviour – if they haven't played by the rules that behaviour shouldn't be rewarded. What will happen next year if we give them what they need. Opposed to \$90k – stick with \$775k.
  - Careful as governors to follow the rules we set in place. Process has been not followed so why should we give them any money?
  - Need to follow systems we have in place.
  - Be disrespectful to interfere with regional autonomy by giving them something they haven't asked for – this undermines their autonomy.
- Discussion around NC appointee's involvement in this, but Chair suggested that he can provide information but not argue the case for NC and therefore there is not a conflict of interest.
  - Difficult to speak to this without being conflicted. Appreciate that I have spoken to most of you personally and haven't lobbied. Point again the 10y increase in budgets across all regions and that NC have fared badly. Average base budget of 12 regions increased by 19% but NC budget only increased by 6%. Just keep that in mind.

- Think a little differently. Within their budget for this year but can't see how they can meet their current budget if it's 48% spent. Is there any reason why can't meet current years budget? NC a very sensitive area with a lot of pressure from salmon and trout fishery under pressure. I'm prepared to support motion for \$90k even though they haven't gone through the right process. Need to move on -and give them a chance to start acting in a better manner. Prepared to support motion.
- Opposed to motion. Not because of figures but because of lack of process and compliance. Tied in and overriding is the collateral damage and the effect on the other 12 councils if someone can disregard the process generally followed and that is followed by all others.
- Not prepared to support it. Can counter DC's argument about budget, because continually they have ignored the budgeting process. If they had put in CF applications their budget would have gone up like everyone else. Continued doing same thing even though we've been told new council new management and everything to improve. Believe that some items on budget would not succeed through contestable fund process with managers.
- Two minds – need to draw line under this. Identified that NC need RMA specialist, and the process would suggest they put up a case and we look at it. In that situation I would be in favour, but not the way it is currently happening. Necessity that it is peer reviewed, preferably by regional managers.
- Been enough comments – don't support the motion because it doesn't follow the process.
- Acting CE: Speaking on behalf of managers – essentially managers were completely in agreement. They were worried about NC's budget and that it needed external review, probably (in comparison with own budgets) number of line items overstated and quite happy to assist with reviewing. Secondly, they were incensed by the fact that there were no CF bids but a budget of \$945. Managers intend to write to NZC that there is a process and that everyone else follows it. NC given opportunity to follow and chosen not to. The \$170k effectively taken from national pool to their detriment without justification.
- Chair: Over the last 6 months I have been very conscious this is an issue to be addressed. Done a lot of homework on prior actions that have taken place. Commented that NC haven't applied for increases in the past and used reserves instead and eroded them. Reviewed actions of NZC and believe acted appropriately with support of around 442k to enable NC continuing operation. In terms of current impasse NZC acted appropriate giving NC opportunity to increase budget on receipt of application and specific written offers to enter into CF bid noting that if approved the approved amount would be added to base budget for years ahead. Want to emphasises that this is a management exercise, not about NC or the people in NC. About us following the required process and behaving in a corporate fashion in respect of one of our

federate. Following a process established for a number of years. Benefit of process is managers can review day to day operations and provide advice and guidance – not always welcome but for the good of the organisation and its efficiencies – NC chosen not to follow for reasons of its own. Making these comments because risks to us are that there could be independent review of process. We need to be explicit that our processes have been followed and that we have gone over and above our processes in seeking to assist NC. Genuinely mean to assist them to get resources they feel they need.

1. *That the NC base budget be increased by \$90k on an ongoing basis from licence fee.*

Moved: Crs. Grubb/Isbister

**Motion lost**

Crs. Coll & Isbister abstained.

- Comment that we have committed \$70k to NC to restore their reserves. Has been a surfeit of NC licence income. But CV confirmed we are still committed. Regions would typically be asking for this top up about now but because of increased licence income this has not come through. One good option would be to reduce their last levy by \$70k at the point their reserves come under 20%. Important point is that reserves are below 20% at 31 August at the end of financial year. NC not below that threshold currently. Amount topped up to reach 20% may either not be required or not be \$70k. If increase in licence income it goes to reserves and not available for use. Need to be clear on two things – NC do not have approval to spend reserve that is accumulated through increase in licence fees and the assessment needs to be made at EOFY whether they have fallen below guaranteed 20%. If so NZC obliged to top up to 20%. Confirmed this is 20% of approved budget.
- Query on NZC resolution – suggested that only obligated to top up if region followed their approved budget. Confirmed that for the last financial year they did. Resolution for last year's financial year, and assume carries on. Discussion around resolutions from 149a.
- Query whether we should pass motions with a specific dollar figure or whether it should simply be a motion to top up to 20%?
- Confirmed that NC topup was for year ended end of August 2020. Other discussion as whether to remove loan was conditional on the levies being paid on time as arranged and working to the budget. NZC was advised that it will pay \$71k to NCFGC when their final levy payment is to be made (August 2021) by adjusting that final payment.

1. *NZC staff to research the recommendations or motions on bringing reserves up to the 20% threshold in sequence and report back to NZC with recommendations to be agreed by email or zoom.*

Moved: Crs. Birchall/Juby

**Motion Passed**

Licence Fee Consideration:



- CE clarified that in having made the decisions on CF bids we are now in the position to consider the licence fee.
  - Managers recommended that we increase the licence fee from \$133 to \$137 and that we increase the game licence fee to \$96 (+\$4GBHT), with same proportionate licence fee increases across all categories.
  - CV explained implication of various permutations on the overall finances of the organisation.
1. *That the fishing licence fee be set at \$137 with a proportionate increase across all licence categories.*

Moved: Crs. Oakley/Coll

- Noted that the ratios may need fine tuning as we are approaching cap on day licence price and may need to increase non-resident licence fee.
- Noted that budget does not include NR licence sales.
- Suggest that set licence fee and then consider categories.
- Process of categories explained and suggested that changing that process without further information is risky. Confirmed that this is a recommendation to go out to regions for feedback.
- CE confirmed that comment of short-term licence sales was pre-covid and that there has been huge growth in this. Steve Doughty has confirmed that he has no read on what the tolerances are.
- Suggest that feedback could be sought explicitly from LWP.
- SFC suggested that there be a review of licence categories and fees.
- Noted that there is precedent for change

Motion amended to:

1. *That the fishing licence fee be recommended to regions for feedback at \$137 with a proportionate increase across all categories except the NR category.*

**Moved: Crs. Juby/Grubb**

**Motion Passed**

~~Abstained~~Against: Cr. Birchall

Game Licence:

1. *That the game licence fee be recommended to regions for feedback at \$96 with a proportionate increase across all categories.*

Moved: Crs. McIntyre/Karalus

- Suggested this is a time of increasing costs generally.
- There is a rounding exercise here and the public perception of \$99 is that it is about \$100.
- Analysis done of the total impact of raising the game licence \$2 - \$50k impact on total finances.
- Chair noted that we need to give mind to the impact of this licence fee in rural communities and for mahinga kai and Te Ao Māori.
- Chair suggested that we have a better chance of getting approval on angling licence where we are not increase game.

- If MoC rejects it can she suggest amendments? Effectively yes. Implications of MoC rejection detailed by NZC staff.
- Suggested that we have created problems in the past where we have not increased fee in the past and have had to put up by substantial amount. This creates more concern for licence holders than incremental increases. Important thing is that we have a process to establish the fees and we have that. When we have put our request in to the Minister we provide the justification to the Minister – this is the amount required to run the organisation and even setting at this level we will draw \$500+k from the reserves. Only once turned down for the licence fee application. If we have sound justification, no reason shouldn't be putting through at \$100.
- Strong support for this view and noted there is support out there amongst regions and managers.

1. *That the game licence fee be recommended to regions for feedback at \$96 with a proportionate increase across all categories.*

**Moved: Crs. O'Leary/McIntyre**

**Motion passed unanimously**

Discussion on NR licence fee deferred till later in the meeting.

## 10. Commercial Origin Salmon Release Policy

- 
- 1. *Agree to adopt the amended Commercial Origin Salmon Release Policy as national policy.*

Moved: Crs. Coll/Harris

- Confirmed that feedback from regions had been incorporated.
- CSI occasionally given commercial salmon and placed in Tekapo – is that high risk? Suggested it likely is not.

1. *Agree to adopt the amended Commercial Origin Salmon Release Policy as national policy.*

**Moved: Crs. Coll/A. Harris**

**Motion Passed**

## 11. Game Bird Guide's Licence Latent Provisions

Moved:

1. *Agree to advise DOC that NZC accepts the removal of the latent provisions for game bird guide's licencing*

Moved: Crs. Grubb/A. Harris

Motion lost.

- Confirmed that Southland and NC had not given feedback but were in favour of retention.

2. *Agree to advise DOC that NZC supports the retention of the latent provisions for game bird guide licencing.*

**Moved: Crs. D. Harris/Karalus**

**Motion Passed**

- **ACTION:** That NZC staff advise DOC that NZC supports the retention of the latent provisions for game bird guide's licencing.

Staff noted that it is very unlikely for DOC and PCO to retain this provision based on this recommendation. However, if NZC was to direct council to look at licencing scheme for game subsequent to the sports fishing licence this might be more likely.

1. *That NZC staff to work with regions to produce a proposal on a game bird guide's licence subsequent to the completion of the sports fishing guides licence process.*

**Moved: D. Harris/Karalus**

**Motion Passed**

- **ACTION:** That NZC staff work with regions to produce a proposal on a game bird guide's licence subsequent to the completion of the sports fishing guides licence process.

## 12. Ranger Policy

- CE noted this is just for feedback to regions.
- Support to put to regions and consider subsequently.
- **ACTION:** That NZC staff circulate to regions for consultation and bring back to NZC.

*That NZC approve this as draft policy and seek feedback from regions.*

**Moved: Crs. Birchall/D. Harris**

**Motion Passed**

## 13. Legal/RMA Fund Application NCFGC Selwyn District Plan

- Chair spoke to this and specifically the significance of ONLs for the high country. What we have is an isolated application to establish rules for a part of the high-country area. Chair discussed this with Forest and Bird and EDS noting the NPS-IB has provision to establish consistent set of rules across the whole of the high country. Think it is important in obtaining this advice NC seek to work with EDS and Forest and Bird to expand to the whole of the high country via the NPS-Ib and that the Selwyn case be of sufficient quality to have national standing.
  - Suggest support be contingent on NC working with Eds and Forest and Bird to apply this across the high country.
  - Noted that there is significant game bird hunting in the high country and that it is critical that our approach to the high country also advocates access for hunters. It was suggested we could support NZDA and FMC with their interest in hunting too – potential to lose this targeted advocacy support for game bird hunting.
  - Debate around the extent to which we phrase our language in support of recreational hunters or recreational game bird hunting.
  - NC encouraged to also focus on game bird hunting in the commission of this advice. **ACTION:** NZC to communicate this to NC.
  - Confirmed that it is for this financial year and may require the overcommitted RMA fund to be balanced against next year.
1. *That \$8,000 be allocated from the RMA/Legal fund and that NC is encouraged to liaise with EDS and Forest and Bird to maximise the national impact of this advice.*

**Moved: Crs. Grubb/Isbister**  
**Motion Passed**

Meeting broke for morning tea at 10:10am.

Meeting resumed at 10:30am

**14. Policy Review**

- Chair spoke to this and noted whole bunch of impending legal matters i.e. RMA review, Conservation Act review, review of National Parks and need to have legal skills within office allowing us to devote time to that. Don't see that we have the time or the resources to devote to this kind of extensive policy review, particularly in light of the Review coming out.
  - Suggestion that all policy review deferred till after the review.
  - Staff left the room at 10:35am.
  - Staff returned to the room at 10:45am.
1. *That NZC defer all policy work until after the release of the Ministerial Review and an initial evaluation of the impact of the Review.*

**Moved: Crs. Oakley/McIntyre**

**Motion Passed**

Confirmed that Policy Manual has not been issued since 2017 since it had not been reviewed since 2006.

**17. Chair's Report**

- Chair confirmed that F&G, not an individual, has been added as a separate seat on FIG. Noted ENGO has an agreement they will represent all of the ENGO network, but that F&G has an independent position as a statutory body and can represent its own individual position.
- NZFFA update provided, clarifying that offending content has been removed and/or amended. Support given from council for how the Chair has handled this situation.
- Noted need to schedule the approach to the RMA review and commission work on this.
- **ACTION:** Request for NZC office to provide a list of acronyms for councillors.
- Conservation Act review starting and will keep updated on that.
- Research group – like to see NZC add Councillor direction to research group.
- Query around the Lake Onslow battery project
  - Lake Onslow has 600m of fall but is a tiny lake and doesn't generate 1kWh of electricity – what are they trying to do? Real risks to the fishery.
  - Chair responded – If Tiwai closes power and power reverts to national grid forecast is that Manapouri will be used up in 5 years. If intention is no fossil fuels this scheme designed to produced 5TW power and insulate wind and solar generation capacity of NZ against dry years and climate change for next 30 years. Pushing uphill to try resist this and better to set bottom line and shape to our interests.
  - If there is no intensive irrigation from this, and a legislative guarantee there is no further hydro power schemes approved for our lakes and rivers

for the 30 years anticipated life of the Battery Project, this could be positive. The Chair made a bid for this on behalf of Fish and Game at the meeting with Ministers and Officials and the subsequent submission by the combined eNGOs included that. He requested that NZC make this a policy position.

- CE advocated for environmental impact analysis to be undertaken at the start of the process. Chair confirmed that eNGO network has two persons nominated for the evaluation team and the specs for the environmental impact assessment are being written now.
- Query whether there had been a meeting with Irrigation NZ?
  - Chair confirmed they have had a discussion with Irrigation NZ. This included a positive outcome for NCFGC regarding irrigation race screens and secondly negotiations on limiting further irrigation expansion. Chair had written to NCFGC recommending follow up with Irrigation NZ. He was yet to hear if that had happened. He noted that it was essential that when such opportunities are created they are made use of:
  - Discussion around tipping point and beginning a reversal of land use intensification.
  - Noted that there is a mindset change amongst farmers on their environmental impact, and as a result there's a view to amend action to improve environmental outcomes.

*That the report be received.*

**Moved: Crs. Grubb/Juby**

**Motion Passed**

### **18. Acting-CEO Report**

- CE updated NZC on NZC office tenancy and the potential shift to the other side of the current building floor.
- NZC noted the need for a section in the magazine on the actions that NZC have undertaken.
- CE noted the excellent work that the NZC team have done over the last 4 months since he took over and the way the team has come together. Particular thanks extended to Carmel Veitch for the work that she has undertaken around the budgeting cycle.
- Councillors noted that they have had very positive feedback from their regional staff on the NZC staff and positive feedback from Managers on the acting CE.
- NZC staff noted that a workshop will be undertaken ahead of this round of angling regulations.

*That the report be received.*

**Moved: Crs. Birchall/Grubb**

**Motion Passed**

### **19. CEO Recruitment Update (oral)**

No recommendation put.

### **20. NZC Finance Report**

- CV spoke to report and noted accounts receivable have been paid. Regards schedule of commitments, the contract for website development is due to be signed next week.
- Chair clarified intent for schedule of commitments to give a complete picture of available funding.
- Query why levy income comes under NZC income not national?
  - CV noted that NZC receives and pays levy/grants. Has to be accounted for somewhere.
  - Suggestion that this might inflate NZC budget from a perception basis Support for retaining current approach until post-review.

*That the report be received.*

**Moved: Crs. Oakley/Grubb**

**Motion Passed**

## **21. Finance Report – National**

- Confirmed that at time of writing national budget was at 44% spent against 50% of the year gone.
- Main reason for this is that website fund has not been spent yet. Simply timing.
- Confirmed that even if website money spent it remains under 50%.

*That the report be received.*

**Moved: Crs. Grubb/Isbister**

**Motion Passed**

## **22. RMA/Legal Update**

*That the report be received.*

**Moved: Crs. Karalus/Isbister**

**Motion Passed**

Meeting adjourned 12:00pm

Meeting resumed 12:50pm

## **23. Research Update**

- **ACTION:** Staff to seek update on NM report and to seek comment from Wellington on native/sports fish interactions.

*That the report be received.*

**Moved: Crs. O’Leary/Juby**

**Motion Passed**

## **24. Correspondence Register**

- The chair noted that NZC staff were going to work to update the correspondence register process to provide a more complete register for councillors.
- Suggestion that this may be undertaken via SharePoint in the future.
- Suggestion that correspondence register could be moved to earlier in the agenda as it might inform the discussion on agenda topics.

- Discussion on the future of sea-run salmon committee:
  - **ACTION:** That NZC staff circulate CSI's letter for consultation and bring back to NZC June meeting.
- Late correspondence regarding starting of the fish season from Eastern. Suggest this is referred straight out to regions for consultation.
  - **ACTION:** That NZC staff circulate Eastern's letter for consultation and bring back to NZC June meeting.

## 25. Fish and Game Website RFP

- CE spoke to process and its robustness.
  - CE thanked Steve for the impressive work he undertook in managing this process.
  - Comment that it is critical to get regions to use the website for statutory functions with annual reports, board papers, etc.
1. *The CEO be authorised to sign the contract with Hothouse up to a maximum cost of \$116,78709 comprising the \$96,780 as part of the RFP and up to the \$20,000 for functionality identified in the discovery process.*

**Moved: Crs. Grubb/O'Leary**

**Motion Passed**

Non-resident licence:

- The meeting returned to consider the non-resident licence fee.
- Noted that based on the current ratio the NR licence fee would be \$185.
- Query on what we are trying to achieve by raising licence fee above a ratio of 1.35?
  - Both revenue, as well as selling a licence fee increase to local residents.
- CE:
  - Caution on two things; first following process and secondly an increase on NRL is probably harder to pitch to this government than an increase in duck shooting. They are optimistic at prospect of borders opening and will look microscopically at any price gouging.
- Normal process is to put paper up proposing to change the ratio. Need a sound management reason for an increase in that ratio.
- Chair:
  - This Govt will be open to a change in licence fees given its clear policy intention to increase the quality of the tourist revenue return to NZ.
  - Currently NRL doesn't recognise difference in contribution to overall management of freshwater that is paid for by residents through taxes.
  - Cheapest part of the trip to fish NZ is the licence.
  - Need to pay for cost of research into NR anglers.
- Staff comment on political implications:
  - Tied up with wider govt issue in tourism space, particularly in conservation. Big policy work on concessions and with international tourism and visitor levy being non-existent. Wider work programme going on, plus PCE proposal to levy people leaving NZ. At some point someone will look and say this is a lot of expense being put on tourists. BUT not a reason to not make a change provided a case is being made and may be the best time. Remembering though there are about 600 people in NZ on working visas that have been here pre-covid and are still buying NRL. Sudden price increase penalises them and may be worth grandfathering

these individuals in. These individuals are not the intended targets of the increase in fee.

- Suggestion that there is a need for supporting information, probably via LWP, before we increase the ratios. Before we start making decision on a fee without any backups it is a dangerous place to go. Stay on existing situation of 1.35.
  - Issue as to how much to increase the licence fee to NR's could have a lot of questions. Standard you could use is differential DOC puts on huts for great walks.
  - Suggestions that justification can come back from the fact that average NR anglers spend more time fishing than resident anglers.
  - Need to look at why increase – group in Southland that would like to add a few zeros – but actually even a significant increase in fee isn't going to substantially change NR angler behaviour. Amount of money above standard licence fee allocated to separate reserve. Have \$1m in that, so hard to justify seeking more money for research.
  - DOC differential during trial period was 2x, feedback suggested this may have been too high and 1.5x may have been more appropriate.
  - Chair suggests going to have extensive debate on what the NR licence length and fee should be at some time before the next season. Suggest carry out the suggestion to stay the course this season but to undertake research from which to make a more informed decision.
1. *That NZC recommends to regions for feedback that the differential for the non-resident licence remains at 1.35x for a total of \$185.*

**Moved: Crs. Grubb/D. Harris**

**Motion Passed**

One opposed – Cr. Juby.

General business:

- No general business.

**Meeting Close**

Meeting closed at 1:40pm