



## Collaborative Stakeholder Group (“CSG”) Workshop 1 Notes

(Day one) 27 March 2014, The Link Community Centre, 6 Te Aroha Street, Hamilton, 1.45pm – 6.30pm

### Attendees:

CSG: Alan Fleming (Env/NGO), Alastair Calder (Tourism and Recreation), Chris Keenan (Horticulture), Evelyn Forrest (Community), Garry Maskill (Water supply takes), Gayle Leaf – part (Community), George Moss (Dairy), Gwyneth Verkerk (Community), Hone Turner (Community), James Bailey (Sheep and Beef), Jason Sebastian (Community), Matt Makgill (Community), Patricia Fordyce (Forestry), Paul le Miere (Rural Advocacy - delegate for James Houghton), Phil Journeaux (Rural Professionals), Rick Pridmore (Dairy), Ruth Bartlett (Industry), Ruthana Begbie (Community), Sally Davis (Local Government), Stephen Colson (Energy), Tony Roxburgh (Env/NGO’s), Weo Maag (Maori Interests)

Other: Bill Wasley (Chair), Helen Ritchie (Facilitator), Jo Bromley (WRC), Wendy Boyce (WRC), Janine Hayward (WRC), Will Collin (WRC),

Other staff (part): Justine Young (WRC), Erin Wilson (WRC), Emma Reed (WRC), Ruth Lourey (WRC)

### Apologies:

CSG: Gina Rangī (Maori Interests), James Houghton (Rural Advocacy), Brian Hanna (Community), Topia Rameka (Maori Interests)

Item	Description	Action
	The two day workshop commenced with a Powhiri at 12.30pm to welcome CSG members to the Healthy Rivers Wai Ora Project, followed by lunch.	
1.45pm	Workshop commenced with a Karakia by Hone Turner	
1.	<p><b><u>Overview:</u></b></p> <p>Introductions by Helen Ritchie (Facilitator) and Bill Wasley (Interim Chair of the CSG).</p> <p>The Purpose of the meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Getting to know each other</li> <li>- Understanding the project</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Set CSG processes – how are we going to work together effectively?</li> </ul> <p>The facilitator covered off the Health and Safety briefing.</p> <p><u>Recording of meetings:</u> Discussion on the workshop being recorded for the purposes of accurate note taking. The process of recording meetings was to be discussed in more detail at the second day of the workshop.</p> <p><u>Outcome:</u> Agreement on the workshop being recorded in the interim, for the purposes of accurate note taking with further conversation on meeting note taking to be had on day 2.</p> <p><u>The group noted the common themes of why they are involved in the project:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water quality</li> <li>• Viable business</li> <li>• Bring/contribute personal experience</li> <li>• Bring peoples voices, communities</li> <li>• Representing parts of our catchment community</li> <li>• Collaborative</li> <li>• Future generations</li> </ul>	
2.	<p><b><u>Introductions</u></b></p> <p><u>Waikato Regional Council ('WRC') staff involved in the project:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jo Bromley – Project Manager, Healthy Rivers Project</li> <li>• Wendy Boyce – Community Engagement Workstream Leader</li> <li>• Janine Hayward - Event Co-ordinator, Community Engagement Workstream</li> <li>• Will Collin – Analyst, Community Engagement Workstream</li> <li>• Justine Young – Senior Policy Advisor</li> <li>• Erin Wilson - Acting Pou Tuhono</li> <li>• Emma Reed – Policy Advisor</li> <li>• Ruth Lourey – Senior Policy Advisor</li> </ul>	
3.	<p><b><u>Chairpersons opening statement:</u></b></p> <p>Bill Wasley – Interim Chair</p> <p>Bill acknowledged the work done to date by everyone. He is still in the process of gaining an understanding of the process and project detail. Bill has lived in Tauranga for 30 years and has a planning background. He has a consultancy firm that focuses on strategic development and independent chairing. Bill is currently a Hamilton City Council Hearings Commissioner.</p> <p>Some notes on Bill's preferred style:</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Keep an open mind</li> <li>- Keep things simple as possible and jargon to a minimal level</li> <li>- Healthy dose of pragmatism</li> <li>- Approachable/discuss matters/work through. Transparent manner. Focussing on listening, patience with process</li> <li>- Understanding perspectives and views. Respect for ability to present alternative views</li> <li>- Willingness to participate/contribute</li> <li>- Not here to impose personal views, here as an independent chair. Distilling issues/summarising issues and not to participate</li> <li>- The working arrangements are that the Chair is the primary contact for raising matters/emerging issues. Encourage contact amongst the CSG</li> <li>- Available on phone and email</li> <li>- Don't want surprises/work through corrective action</li> <li>- Key element in the process is to have a proactive approach/making most of particular opportunity. Maintain momentum.</li> <li>- Risk in using a collaborative approach – not achieving outcomes and compromise the ability to use this type of process going forward</li> <li>- Reliance on an evidence based approach</li> </ul> <p>Bill acknowledged the CSG members for contributing their time and resources and concluded that he is looking forward to working with everyone.</p>	
4.	<p><b><u>Hopes and Fears exercise</u></b></p> <p>The group were asked to record on paper their hopes and fears for the project. Some of these were:</p> <p><u>Hopes:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chance to express views</li> <li>• Achieve good outcome</li> <li>• Restoration of riparian margin</li> <li>• River is at the heart of everyone – an icon</li> <li>• Achieve agreed outcomes</li> <li>• Learning</li> <li>• Work well together</li> <li>• Practical outcomes</li> <li>• We collectively agree sound policy outcomes</li> <li>• Learn from contribution experiences of others</li> <li>• Vibrant, healthy, wealthy society and community</li> <li>• That broader communities feel well heard</li> <li>• We are brave enough as a group to make big changes/decisions that will really make a difference</li> <li>• Consensus</li> </ul> <p><u>Fears:</u></p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (going in) circles</li> <li>• Environmental Court</li> <li>• Lack of investment to make changes happen</li> <li>• Process will get bogged down – too slow</li> <li>• Certain individuals dominate</li> <li>• No consensus</li> <li>• The collaboration fails</li> <li>• That the overall focus on the river is derailed by sector issues</li> <li>• Fear of failure: that we cannot reach consensus</li> <li>• That we undergo large changes and impositions for no benefit to river or community</li> <li>• That our thinking is too narrow and we miss opportunities</li> </ul>	
5.	<p><b><u>Project Scope – Presentation on Context and Drivers (Justine Young)</u></b></p> <p>Presentation: Doc 3009786 CSG Scope Discussion March 2014</p> <p>Drivers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To ensure the Regional Plan meets it's requirements to give effect to the Vision and Strategy</li> <li>- NPS Freshwater Management - to be consistent with the direction of freshwater reforms</li> </ul> <p>Scope:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Waipa and Waikato Rivers including lakes</li> <li>- CSG to make recommendations on the plan change, could include regulatory and non-regulatory methods</li> <li>- Focus on water quality, not quantity</li> <li>- Focus on discharges of four key contaminants: sediment, bacteria, nitrogen, phosphorus. Point and non point source, to surface and groundwater, including lakes in the catchment. This will produce some secondary benefit for ecology, habitat and fisheries (e.g. as a result of riparian and wetland management) but these are not the focus of the work.</li> </ul> <p>The focus for the project is on the four contaminants as this is what the Project Partners, (the Regional Council and five Waipa and Waikato river iwi) have selected to focus on because the biggest gap in the Regional Plan is the management of activities that result in diffuse or non-point source discharges). The Regional Plan will be reviewed, in full, next year and this review will focus on other areas and aspects not included in this plan change.</p> <p>More information is required about the RMA reforms, National Objectives Framework (NoF).</p> <p>The CSG were advised that in the 'takeaway pack' they will receive at the end of the workshop, there is a 'cause and effect' document which shows that the four contaminants are the key items to focus on. Temperature and weeds are not in the scope. The focus is on the quality of water.</p>	<p><b>Additional information regarding the project scope decision to be put onto CSG member's portal by WRC.</b></p> <p><b>Justine Y to prepare a one page document with what might come out of the RMA reforms NoF to be provided to the CSG.</b></p> <p><b>Justine Y to provide reference</b></p>

	<p>The CSG noted that they would like to see more issues addressed in the scope instead of just the four main contaminants. The group would discuss scope further.</p>	<p><b>document of Regional Plan gap analysis to put on CSG portal.</b></p>
3.45pm – 4pm	<p><b><u>Afternoon Tea</u></b></p>	
6.	<p><b><u>Observations at the river</u></b></p> <p>CSG members walked to the Waikato River (Parana Park) to observe the river and bring back observations to the group.</p>	
7.	<p><b><u>Project Structure: collaboration and co-management in this project – Jo Bromley</u></b></p> <p>Presentation: Doc 3009299 CSG1 Project structure, collaboration and co-management 27 March 2014</p> <p>Discussion on the relationships with the decision makers (co-governance), Iwi Trusts and Council, roles of Healthy Rivers Wai Ora Committee ('the Committee'), Te Roopuu Hautuu ('TRH')(which includes Waikato River Authority ('WRA')). The Technical Alliance (which consists of the Technical Leadership Group ('TLG') and Technical Support Group ('TSG'), the Chairpersons role and the role of WRC staff.</p> <p>The CSG noted that they would like to see a contact list on the CSG member's only webpage with everyone's details. It was noted the Healthy Rivers Wai Ora Committee meeting minutes and committee reports are publicly available on the Council website.</p> <p>Discussion and clarification on reporting lines and communication structure. The goal is for everyone to be clear of decision making lines.</p> <p>International Association for Public Participation (IAP2) definition is used as the definition of collaboration by the project.</p> <p>The CSG noted that the project timeline is too condensed, particularly in the develop limits and targets phase. There have been delays in establishing the TLG which may lead to further unrealistic timeframes. There may be some changes to the proposed project timeline. However, the group will aspire to work to this timeframe.</p> <p><u>Technical Leadership Group</u> The Technical Leaders Group ('TLG') will be used to maintain dialogue/evidence based discussion. The TLG will be decided on 7 April 2014 and the group set up one month after. The TLG Chair will attend the CSG meetings and the CSG Chair will attend the TLG meetings. The TLG has financial constraints. When setting up the TLG, the GETS website was used to ensure a fair process.</p>	<p><b>Janine H to place a contact list for CSG members on the CSG members portal (also as .vcf file)</b></p> <p><b>Janine H to add to CSG member's portal a link for the Healthy Rivers Committee Reports (design of CSG).</b></p> <p><b>Janine H to load a library of technical information onto CSG member's site, including (NPSFM), tech reports, review of regional plan, map of catchments</b></p>

9.	<p><b><u>Further project scope discussion</u></b></p> <p>The Chair noted that there was good robust discussion prior to afternoon tea and that the group are not in the position to conclude their discussions on the scope by the end of the workshop tomorrow. The group need to further reflect/time to think and read and understand material before the next workshop where there will be more discussion on the topic.</p>	
	Meeting closed at 6.30pm, followed by dinner	

APPROVED



## Collaborative Stakeholder Group (“CSG”) Workshop 1 Notes

(Day two) 28 March 2014, The Link Community Centre, 6 Te Aroha Street,  
Hamilton, 8.30am – 5pm

### Attendees:

- CSG: Alan Fleming (Env/NGO), Alastair Calder (Tourism and Recreation), Brian Hanna – late (Community), Chris Keenan – late (Horticulture), Evelyn Forrest (Community), Garry Maskill (Water supply takes), Gayle Leaf (Community), George Moss (Dairy), Gwyneth Verkerk (Community), James Bailey (Sheep and Beef), Jason Sebastian – part (Community), Matt Makgill (Community), Patricia Fordyce (Forestry), Paul le Miere (Rural Advocacy - delegate for James Houghton), Phil Journeaux (Rural Professionals), Rick Pridmore (Dairy), Ruth Bartlett (Industry), Ruthana Begbie (Community), Sally Davis (Local Government), Stephen Colson (Energy), Tony Roxburgh (Env/NGO's), Topia Rameka – late (Maori Interests), Weo Maag (Maori Interests)
- Other: Bill Wasley (Chair), Helen Ritchie (Facilitator), Jo Bromley (WRC), Wendy Boyce (WRC), Janine Hayward (WRC), Will Collin (WRC)
- Other staff (part): Jackie Fitchman (WRC), Stephen Ward (WRC), Jacqui Henry (WRC), Tracey May (WRC)

### Apologies:

- CSG: Gina Rangī (Maori Interests), James Houghton (Rural Advocacy), Hone Turner (Community)

Item	Description	Action
8.30am	Workshop opened with a Karakia by Ruthana Begbie	
1.	<p><b><u>Reflect on Day One:</u></b></p> <p>The group were asked to raise their hands above their head if they were familiar with the subject matter from day 1. Most people in the room raised their hands with a small number keeping their hands low, indicating that they were unsure of some aspects of the discussion yesterday. It was noted the group will need to be mindful that there are a variety of backgrounds and experiences in the room.</p>	<p><b>Bio's to be loaded onto CSG members portal by Janine H</b></p> <p><b>Each CSG member will be</b></p>

	<p>On reflection the CSG agreed it was a good first day that was well organised and it was good to hear people's views on different matters. The group noted however, that they would like more time to get to know each other and have further discussion on scope.</p> <p><b><u>Recap on scope process</u></b></p> <p>It was suggested that the CSG have more discussion on scope and that WRC provide more information to the CSG before the next meeting.</p>	<p><b>given the opportunity to present about themselves/summary of interests/background for ten minutes at CSG2.</b></p> <p><b>Provide CSG clarity around Chair and Facilitator role</b></p> <p><b>WRC to provide more information on project scope to CSG and information on areas that are out of scope.</b></p> <p><b>CSG to discuss project scope prior to CSG2.</b></p>
2.	<p><b><u>Group introductions:</u></b></p> <p>The CSG noted that they would prefer to hear more about CSG members and their backgrounds at this time, so each person was given a few minutes to talk about who they are and who they represent.</p>	
10.45am – 11.15am	<p><b><u>Morning Tea</u></b></p>	
	<p><b><u>Introductions:</u></b></p> <p><u>Jackie Fitchman</u> (WRC Communications Advisor) and <u>Stephen Ward</u> (WRC Senior Communications Advisor) were introduced to the group to provide information regarding the group agreement/code of conduct section.</p> <p><u>Councillor Alan Livingston</u> (co-chair of the Healthy Rivers Wai Ora</p>	



	<p>Committee) joined the workshop. He passed on apologies from his Co-Chair of the Healthy Rivers/Wai Ora Committee, Roger Pikia from Te Arawa River Iwi Trust. On behalf of the committee he congratulated CSG members on their appointment and thanked them for being part of the CSG. He recognised that each person is contributing valuable time in this important role. Cr Livingston. He is looking forward to the decision making to come. Cr Livingston also welcomed Bill Wasley the Chair, bringing this all together to achieve pragmatic, achievable outcome for the community.</p>	
3.	<p><b><u>Creating a group agreement/Tikanga/Protocols/Code of Conduct: How do we want to work together?</u></b></p> <p>Exercise in groups to come up with how the CSG want to work together. Some of these items were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No surprises, informed by best information, equal access to information</li> <li>• Feel safe, in faith we honour the process</li> <li>• Integrity, good faith, trust, openness, honesty, mutual respect, courtesy, polite &amp; respectful</li> <li>• No dismissing of others ideas, balanced opportunities to express views, equal speaking time, understanding for everyone, considered decision making i.e. time for consideration feedback.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Guidelines for balancing transparency and confidentiality:</u></b></p> <p><u>Handout:</u> The Media Protocol document was handed out to the group to review : Docs 2931631 and 2989958 Statement of the recording of the CSG meetings and the LGOIMA</p> <p>The CSG agreed to not go to the media as individuals, without consulting with and getting permission from the Chair.</p> <p>Discussion on how the CSG has 17 sector representatives/memberships and part of this process is communicating with them what the CSG is doing. This is a public process and members have to be comfortable to participate in an open sort of way. There is a need to balance openness with robust discussion.</p> <p>It was also noted that the media may also be one of the ways in which the community representatives talk to the community. It was noted that the CSG is not a committee of council and it was preferred to have CSG only workshops to enable free and frank discussion. Possibility for parts of workshops to be open to the public.</p> <p>The CSG agreed on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Media agreed strategy (agree on what's going out)</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Speak with one voice – Chair</li> <li>• Sectors – need to be able to communicate to our sectors – keep channels open</li> <li>• Prefer CSG workshops rather than publicly notified meetings (part meeting open to public)</li> <li>• Community spokespeople – use the media after checking with the Chair</li> <li>• Decision makers attending where suitable (TRH - Committee)</li> <li>• Technical Alliance: present for technical dialogue (as appropriate)</li> </ul> <p>The group discussed recording the workshops so that these can be used for accurate note taking.</p> <p>The group agreed on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recordings are not suitable for allowing free and frank discussion</li> <li>• Agreed summary points –a short list of summary points to be generated by the CSG at the end of each workshop and loaded onto the CSG members portal/website (That any notes generated by the group on the day (through workshop activities or summarised by the facilitator on paper at the front of the room) be typed up directly and loaded onto the CSG members portal)</li> <li>• Public notes – prefer workshop notes to be for CSG only, however further discussion and a request for a presentation on LGOIMA at CSG2 (meeting notes to be confirmed at next CSG meeting)</li> <li>• 1 – 2 monthly progress reports. The Chair delegated to produce</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Talking about others perspectives:</u></b></p> <p>The CSG discussed how to communicate with others, how to explain other group’s perspectives i.e. what are their concerns/issues and how to bring information back to the group?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We want our sectors/communities to understand the range of perspectives, issues, and values. We want to follow our principles. Ok to challenge others ideas, respectfully</li> <li>• Disassociate comments with individuals (Chatham House Rules)</li> <li>• Communicate to sectors about the wish to avoid indirect communications to media</li> </ul>	
4.	<p><b><u>Delegates</u></b></p> <p>The group discussed expectations from some members that delegates would attend each meeting. This would be helpful with keeping delegates up to date, however it would increase the size of each meeting and there would be less opportunities for core CSG members to interact. Each representative has the role to</p>	

	<p>update their delegate.</p> <p>It was noted that community members did not have delegates.</p> <p>It was also noted that the LAWF (Land and Water Forum) process did not have any delegates. LAWF did however, have a number of people sitting around the outside of the room. Observers did give a view when asked and this was valuable to have these extras in the room.</p> <p>The following was agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alternates can come if the main member is unable to come</li> <li>• Alternates cannot come as observers. To be revisited after 'brown boxes' in project timeline</li> <li>• Members to send alternates information but no access to CSG members portal (webpage)</li> <li>• Also bound to Code of Conduct</li> </ul>	
5.	<p><b><u>Project Partners:</u></b></p> <p>The group discussed that any agreements must be sorted out at a CSG level.</p> <p>The CSG recognise that there are four members of the group (in attendance) that have connections to the project partners. The group noted that no others have a declaration of interest.</p> <p>It was noted that Cr Livingston's presence at the meeting for a short period of time was positive and the group hoped that this would continue throughout the process.</p> <p>CSG members were asked when they would prefer to have WRC members in the room for specific issues, in addition to Technical Alliance.</p> <p>The CSG agreed the Chair is the reporting line.</p>	<p><b>CSG members to consider when they would prefer to have TLG or WRC members present at meetings for specific issues.</b></p>
	<p><b><u>If not complying with code of conduct:</u></b></p> <p>The CSG agreed on the following process if a CSG member is not adhering to the Code of Conduct:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In the first instance, the Chair is to intervene – offline first</li> <li>2. Then contact is made to their nominator(s)</li> <li>3. The group noted that if the issue continued, the ultimate result could be expulsion from the group</li> </ol>	
1.30pm – 2.30pm	<p><b><u>Lunch</u></b> (Jason Sebastian apologies for rest of workshop)</p>	
	<p><b><u>Waiata Practise</u></b> (Ehara and Te Aroha)</p>	
6.	<p><b><u>How will we review our effectiveness? Jacqui Henry</u></b></p>	

	<p><u>Handout:</u> Doc 3011922 Overview of evaluation process for CSG1</p> <p>The group listened to the proposed process/approach to be used to review the CSG's effectiveness during the project. Evaluation is not just about gathering information at the end of the process. It's about thinking of what you need at the beginning of the process and embedding it as a way of improving as we develop. This will enable real time data throughout the process.</p> <p>Tools such as survey monkey may be used to gather information. The CSG noted that it would be helpful to have comments boxes next to the questions so that they could add additional information. Also use S.M.A.R.T goals for questions (Specific, Measureable, Attainable, Realistic, Timely)</p>	<p><b>CSG wants feedback processes established over time on the implementation of outputs.</b></p>
7.	<p><b><u>Draft Terms of Reference (DTOR)</u></b></p> <p>The group was split up into smaller groups and given a section of the Draft Terms of Reference to look at and suggest any changes:</p> <p>The following changes were suggested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.1 Project Purpose, paragraph 3 should state the project scope</li> <li>1.1 Project Purpose, paragraph 4 'The project plays a part'... should be changed to 'The project plays a part contribution of a long term project....'</li> <li>1.1 Project Purpose, paragraph 4, Which part v regulation of fish e.g. natural fishery effect</li> <li>1.2 The Stakeholder Engagement Strategy is being developed and will need to be reviewed and operationalised once the group reach the 'green phase' of the project timeline.</li> <li>1.1 Purpose and role of the CSG, reordering of bullet points required. Bullet 2 should be moved down to the section; the main features of the CSG,' <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>bullet 3 'reflect that the broader community involvement follows much later on,</li> <li>add in another bullet point to reflect the CSG are the 'media for broader community consultation'</li> </ul> </li> <li>2.1 Paragraph 'Decision makers...' should be swapped around with the paragraph below 'the role of the ...'</li> </ul> <p>No changes to 2.2. (Page 2) Benefits of the CSG</p> <p>2.5 (Page 5) No issues with role of chair. Chair to take more of a lead in workshops. Role of facilitator overlaps with role of chair for duration of process.</p> <p>2.6 (Page 6) General agreements with duration, frequency and attendance. May need to extend this timeframe.</p> <p>3.0 (Page 7) Reporting and linkages. The diagram needs to be replaced using the project structure.</p>	

	<p>4.0 (Page 7) Givens. The word 'suggest' in bullet point 1 is too weak. Bullet 5, CSG as 'central channel' – needs to link with community engagement in the plan process rather than now.</p> <p>4.1 (Page 8) Activities. Bullet 1 - Make clear the values are already identified (Page 6). Need to understand the wider values of all contributors – need more discussion on this. Include the Vision and Strategy for Waikato River. What values are to be reviewed? Are the values i.e. as per the objectives set out in the Vision and Strategy of the Waikato River Authority to be applied to the entire length of the two rivers or are they selectively applied? Can additional values be identified at the sub catchment level to inform the issues debate?</p> <p>Bullet 6, need to decide what we mean by <u>consensus</u>. When is it achieved, if it can't be achieved does the process go to a vote? What are the parameters around this?</p> <p>Concerns about 'local community events' and 'engagement events' – is this appropriate now, or should it be part of the plan process.</p> <p>4.4.1 How will we know if the CSG is successful? Add 'dialogue with Technical Alliance to fill information gaps'</p> <p>4.2 (Page 9) Outputs</p> <p>5.0 (Page 10) Resources to support the CSG</p> <p>Bullet 3, Technical Alliance in a timely manner</p> <p>Bullet 4, Does scope include iwi/hapu/stakeholders setting community values?</p> <p>Bullet 5, Include 'Chairing'</p> <p>Add in the ability/flexibility of the Technical Leaders Group to go beyond the Technical Alliance for expert advice if required (i.e. if there are gaps).</p> <p>Also require a clear understanding of how the process/outcomes fit within the existing and changing legislative process e.g. relationship to the proposed RPS.</p>	
8.	<p><b><u>Honorarium – Will Collin</u></b></p> <p><u>Handout:</u> Honorarium Policy Doc 2995397 Honorarium Policy</p> <p>Discussion on who is eligible for the honorarium payments. It is likely that if a CSG member is not paid to be at the workshops then they may be eligible for the honorarium. Most members will be eligible for the honorarium for attending community engagement activities, as these may well be out of hours. The Chair and Project Manager will approve the applications on a case by case basis.</p> <p>Each person will need to complete and return:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A reimbursement form</li> <li>• Bank account form; and</li> <li>• IR330 form.</li> </ul>	

	The reimbursement form needs to be submitted by the 15 <sup>th</sup> of each month. It is anticipated it will be paid by the 15 <sup>th</sup> of the next month. Each person eligible will need to send in a separate reimbursement form after each meeting.	
3.45pm	Tracey May, Project Sponsor and Acting Group Manager Policy and Transport (WRC) entered the workshop	
	<b><u>Afternoon Tea</u></b>	
4.15pm	<p><b><u>Summing up session – what can we share?</u></b></p> <p>The group discussed whether it was too soon to put out summary points as they have just met for the first time. The project scope will need to be discussed more and there are concerns with the tight project timeline.</p> <p>Each member was asked to complete the flip charts on the wall, noting workshop attendance over the next 12 months and who can host a workshop.</p> <p><u>Handout:</u> Homework cards</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Each person was asked to bring an object to CSG2 to symbolise what they value about the rivers or their catchment. Come prepared to briefly explain what the object is and why it was chosen (1 – 2 minutes). Alternatively you can do a 10 minute presentation about you and your sector.</li> <li>2. Visit the CSG member's portal and click on the homework section, to view presentations/clips about the history of the Waikato and Waipa Rivers.</li> </ol> <p><u>Handouts:</u> Takeaway Pack Doc 3005494 Takeaway Pack CSG1</p> <p>The group requested the any technical information was provided to the CSG prior to the workshop so that there was time to digest the information.</p> <p>The Code of Conduct document was shown to the group. The agreed process for the code of code of conduct was:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Email the code out to CSG members to get feedback</li> <li>• Summarise the feedback</li> <li>• Bring the summary back to CSG2 for discussion and sign off by the group</li> </ul>	<p><b>Janine H to have map of whole catchment made available to CSG.</b></p> <p><b>Will C to implement the approval process for the code of conduct</b></p> <p><b>CSG requested further discussion on consensus and that it needs to be defined.</b></p>
	<p><b><u>Chairperson closing reflections – Bill Wasley</u></b></p> <p>The Chair acknowledged the first meeting is very much a settling in process and acknowledged the contribution from everyone. The Chair noted that he intends to contact everyone before CSG2 to talk on a one on one basis. There is further discussion to be had on the project scope. It is also important to develop collegial relationships, which are important for the process. It is important to receive feedback on what worked well and didn't work so well. It was also valuable to take the time to work through</p>	<p><b>Chair to contact each CSG member prior to CSG to discuss any feedback.</b></p>

	<p>the setting up of the group and give everyone the opportunity to contribute/discuss.</p> <p>Meeting closed at 5pm</p>	
	<p><b><u>Next workshop:</u></b></p> <p>CSG2 to be held 6/7 May 2014 at The Link, 6 Te Aroha Street, Hamilton. Commence 9.30am</p>	

APPROVED