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Memo 8 June 2018

To: Environment and Community Committee

Cc: Dean Kimpton, Chief Operating Officer

From: John Mauro, Chief Sustainability Officer

Subject: Update on Auckland Council’s submission to the Productivity Commission’s ‘low emissions economy’ inquiry (draft report)

Purpose

1. To provide an update on the Productivity Commission’s latest report in the ‘low emissions economy’ inquiry and Auckland Council’s response.

Summary

- The Productivity Commission released a draft report of its inquiry into a low emissions economy.
- Auckland Council’s submission succinctly reiterates the points made in the previous (extensive) submission to the Commission’s issues paper, endorsed by committee in September 2017.
- Auckland Council’s draft submission, attached, will be submitted by today’s deadline.
- Committee will have additional opportunities to consider the issues raised by the Commission and addressed in council’s submissions as part of the Integrated Climate Action Plan, approved by Committee and currently under development.

Background

2. The Productivity Commission has released its draft report on the inquiry into a ‘low emissions economy’ with a deadline for response by 8 June 2018 (link). The purpose of the inquiry is to “identify options for how New Zealand could reduce its domestic greenhouse gas emissions through a transition towards a lower emissions future, while at the same time continuing to grow incomes and wellbeing.” This is the second stage of the inquiry and the commission will produce a final report, expected in August 2018.

3. The report, among a number of other inputs, will be considered by Government as it progresses a NZ-wide approach to climate change in line with its Paris Agreement commitment to limit warming to 2°C. Policy direction set by central government has a direct impact on Auckland’s ability to meet its own commitments and vice versa.

4. In October 2017, Auckland Council prepared an extensive submission on the first stage of this inquiry, with contributions from a delegated group of elected members from the Environment and Community Committee, the main Council-Controlled Organisations and input from Local Boards. The submission was endorsed by the Environment and Community Committee on 12 September 2017 (ENV/2017/117) (link). Auckland Council has developed a response to the draft report.

---

1 https://www.productivity.govt.nz/inquiry-content/3254?stage=3
based on the points made in the previous submission. No major changes will be made to our previously stated policy positions.

5. The draft report identifies four key pillars for achieving stable and credible climate policy in New Zealand. Attached is a council-prepared summary of the draft report.

Overview of Auckland Council’s submission on the draft report

6. Auckland Council supports the transition to a low emissions economy for New Zealand and has committed to developing a Climate Action Plan for the Auckland region, including updated emissions reduction targets (ENV/2018’11). Auckland has previously committed to a 40 per cent emissions reduction by 2040 through the Auckland Plan and Low Carbon Auckland.

7. The Auckland Council submission is broadly supportive of the Commission’s draft report and reinforces council’s existing submission across the four pillars proposed in the draft report:
   a. **Emissions pricing**
      The New Zealand Emissions Trading Scheme (NZETS) has a role to play in the mix of measures required across government, business and other organisations to expedite New Zealand’s transition to a low emissions future. It supports inclusion of agriculture into the NZETS. A focus on facilitating a fair and just transition is recommended.
   b. **Laws and institutions**
      Strong and ongoing leadership is required from central government, and central and local governments need to work in partnership. It is recommended that support for local government action be included in the legislative package.
   c. **Regulation and policies**
      To deliver emissions reductions and build resilience in the New Zealand economy, an integrated approach to climate change that seeks to deliver multiple outcomes across existing policy is recommended.
   d. **Innovation and investment**
      A sustainable transition to a low emissions economy requires a coordinated and joined-up approach to ensure that the economy remains competitive into the future. This includes making innovation a strategic priority and ensuring socially responsible investment.

8. Council’s draft submission is attached to this memo. A memo with a summary of the draft report has also been sent to all Local Boards, with any feedback incorporated into the final submission.

Next steps

9. Auckland Council’s submission will be delivered to the Productivity Commission today.

10. Further engagement with the Committee on issues related to the Productivity Commission inquiry will be undertaken as part of the development of an integrated climate action plan. The first of two workshops is scheduled for 4 July.

**Attachments:**
1. Council-prepared summary of the draft report
2. Council’s draft submission

**Contact for Queries or Further Information**
John Mauro, Chief Sustainability Officer
john.mauro@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz 021 221 6502
Submission

New Zealand Productivity Commission (2018)

Low-Emissions Economy: Draft Report

June 2018
Mihi

Ka mihi ake ai ki ngā maunga here kōrero,
ki ngā pari whakarongo tai,
ki ngā awa tuku kiri o ōna manawhenua,
ōna mana ā-iwi taketake mai, tauiwā atu.
Tāmaki – makau a te rau, murau a te tini,
wenerau a te mano.
Kāhore tō rite i te ao.

I greet the mountains, repository of all that has been
said of this place,
there I greet the cliffs that have heard the sea and
flow of the tides of time,
and the rivers that cleansed the forebears of all who
come those born of this land and the newcomers
among us all.
Auckland – beloved of hundreds, famed among the
multitude, ens of thousands.
You are unique in the world.

Overview

1. Auckland Council welcomes the draft report from the Productivity Commission (‘Commission’) and the opportunity to respond to the Commission’s findings and recommendations at this stage of the low emissions economy inquiry. A great level of detail and work has been included in the report and Auckland Council supports the four key pillars identified by the Commission to achieving stable and credible climate policy for New Zealand.

2. Auckland Council broadly supports the findings and recommendations in the draft report and applauds the Commission’s stance that bold action will be needed to sharply reduce New Zealand’s emissions to meet domestic and international emissions targets. The Auckland region has an important and unique role to play in this.

3. The tone of the draft report primarily focuses on achieving emissions reduction up to 2050. Auckland Council would like to re-emphasise that a successful transition to a zero carbon and resilient economy would have longevity beyond 2050 and become a new business as usual across New Zealand.

4. Transition will be challenging and will require buy-in across communities, governments, businesses and investors. The inquiry’s terms of reference asks the Commission to identify opportunities that exist for the New Zealand economy to maximise benefits of transition and options that continue to grow incomes and wellbeing. This is one particular area where Auckland Council believes the draft report has fallen short. The Local Government New Zealand (LGNZ) submission on the draft report identifies a number of areas in relation to wellbeing where the report could be enhanced to add value around the opportunities, benefits and

---

1. Namely emissions pricing, laws and institutions, policies and regulation, and innovation and investment which are classified as ‘pillars’ in the Commission’s A3 summary briefing and are outlined in figures 16.1 and 16.2 of the draft report.
challenges that this transition presents for New Zealanders. Auckland Council supports the LGNZ submission in this area.

5. This submission focuses on the areas where Auckland Council believes further clarity or changes are needed around the four pillars to achieve stable and credible climate policy. It also reiterates the points made in our previous submission\(^3\) on the Commission’s issues paper. In summary, the previous submission supported an integrated approach to climate change (mitigation and adaptation) including effective policies tailored to each sector supported by an enhanced emissions trading scheme (ETS). It acknowledged that local and regional government have a key role to play and stable commitment and leadership from central government is critical. Finally, the previous submission advised that a transformational pathway must ensure an intergenerational just transition that interconnects with other societal goals to deliver multiple co-benefits to New Zealanders.

6. In this submission, Auckland Council suggests that the following areas are considered as additional recommendations in the final report:
   a. reflecting how a just transition could be facilitated and achieved that both preserves and enhances the wellbeing of New Zealanders;
   b. integrating measures to reduce emissions and build resilience to climate change by identifying opportunities, multiple outcomes and attributing value to co-benefits;
   c. embedding mechanisms to support local government leadership in emissions reduction and planning for climate change within the proposed legislative package;
   d. ensuring that the Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS) is not regarded as a blanket solution to achieve New Zealand’s transition to a low emissions economy;
   e. clarifying the Commission’s position around offsetting any regressive impacts of emissions pricing mechanisms on individual and community wellbeing;
   f. achieving economic resilience - particularly through exploring the interrelationship between innovation, changes to the labour market, enabling an inclusive transition and, skills and education; and,
   g. enhancing the regulatory and policy package through:
      i. promoting a circular economy and incentivising reduction across all waste streams;
      ii. embedding climate change and emissions reduction in land use and planning policy as part of a larger package to deliver co-benefits to New Zealanders;
      iii. ensuring that free ETS credits awarded to industry also incentivise emissions reduction.

**Pillar 1: Emissions pricing**

7. Auckland Council supports the enhancement of the current Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS) and the acknowledgment that achieving the more ambitious target of net zero emissions by 2050 will require significantly higher emissions prices. It also agrees with the inclusion of agriculture.

---

\(^3\) Auckland Council submission, approved by the Auckland Council Environment and Community Committee, includes contributions from Auckland Transport, Watercare, Fanuks Development, Auckland and Auckland Tourism Events and Economic Development (ANTEC).
into the ETS as a matter of priority. It is recognised that in its current form, the ETS has been ineffective in both reducing emissions and changing behaviours.

8. The Commission identifies in the draft report that emissions pricing needs a supporting package of low-emissions policies and institutions including legislation and regulation. Effective sector-based policy mechanisms will be required in the first instance to achieve long-term emissions reductions with an enhanced ETS supporting this to incentive change. A mix of measures will be required between sectors and across government, business and other organisations. It is critical that in the final report, the ETS is not regarded as a blanket solution to achieve New Zealand’s transition to a low emissions economy.

9. We suggest addressing the following matters in the final report:
   a. identifying the different trigger points (carbon prices) necessary for action across different sectors;
   b. identifying the associated flow on impacts of this for peoples’ economic and social wellbeing more explicitly; and,
   c. establishing a recommendation related to the Commission’s conclusion that a combination of targeted tax credits and adjustments to benefits could be used to offset any regressive impact of emissions pricing mechanism.

10. The Commission recommends that the Government should establish a system in which emissions are priced at a level that reflects their harm. What constitutes the level of ‘harm’ in the draft report is unclear and undefined by the Commission. Auckland Council believes that there would be value in defining the ‘level of harm’ in the final report. This would more accurately reflect that the impacts of emissions pricing on social and economic wellbeing for New Zealanders is being taken into account in the inquiry. As per our previous submission, we suggest the cost of inaction on climate mitigation be reflected in business cases as standard procedure, particularly across the public sector. Developing and/or endorsing a social cost of carbon would be one way to achieve this (Auckland Council 2017, p.14).

Pillar 2: Laws and institutions

11. We are encouraged to see that the draft report emphasises the need for enduring political commitment and leadership from central government in relation to climate change as an intergenerational issue. Auckland Council has long advocated the need for stable and credible commitment from central government to demonstrate leadership on climate change, and supports the introduction of new climate legislation and an independent body (the climate change commission).

12. We strongly support the recommendations and findings around partnerships with tangata whenua in the development of a legislative framework around climate change. Auckland Council strongly believes that this also applies at a local and regional level. Auckland Council is currently developing a Climate Action Plan for the Auckland region and a number of mechanisms are being used to ensure that mana whenua and mataawaka are involved in
advising, process development and decision-making. The plan development is supported by central government and we would be happy to keep the Commission informed of the plan’s progress.

13. In line with our previous submission, we continue to recommend that adaptation to climate change be included as a critical element of a New Zealand Climate Change Act. Measures to mitigate climate change are interconnected with other societal goals and can provide multiple co-benefits which could be maximised by integrating with climate adaptation and resilience. We consider it a missed opportunity in the Commission’s final report to consider legislation, policies and institutions for mitigation in isolation from measures to build resilience to climate change across New Zealand’s economy, places, and population.

14. The draft report identifies laws and institutions as a commitment device but is less clear in identifying the role of local governments and cities as a key part of New Zealand’s transition to a low emissions future. As per our previous submission, we reiterate that to deliver on national and regional targets, central and local governments need to work in partnership (Auckland Council 2017, p.5). We also suggest that the legislative and institutional package have a clear remit to support the work of local government on climate mitigation (Auckland Council 2017, p.18) and that the Commission therefore include a recommendation to this effect.

Pillar 3: Regulation and policies

15. We agree with the draft report that policy and regulation is critical in achieving New Zealand’s transition to a low emissions economy. Effective sector-based policy approaches are explored in more depth below with regard to the waste, transport, land use and the built environment, and industrial sectors. Responses to some of the Commission’s additional questions are also included.

Waste

16. Auckland Council broadly supports the Commission’s waste recommendations, particularly the introduction of a differentiated waste levy targeting organic waste, amendment of the Waste Minimisation Act 2008 to apply the levy to all consented waste disposal facilities, and better support for local government to regulate the remaining waste dumps.

17. Auckland Council agrees that to date the NZETS has been ineffective in changing waste behaviour. As per our previous submission, we support implementation of an effective emissions price to incentivise reduction of emissions from organics and better management of landfill gas. It also supports an increase in the waste levy as a means to reduce waste to landfill and to encourage the circular economy. Advocating to central government for an increase in the waste levy is one of the 104 actions in the Draft Auckland Waste Management and
Minimisation Plan 2018. This action was generally supported by submitters during consultation.

18. The Commission’s draft report has a significant focus on landfill emissions reduction and solid waste disposal. It is acknowledged that this may provide a relatively easy short-term win for reducing emissions; however, significant action will also need to be focused further up the waste hierarchy, in areas such as waste reduction, where the largest emission savings can be made. Auckland Council strongly reiterates the potential for government to set policy that drives a circular economy to transition New Zealand away from a very narrow and linear approach to waste management. Circular economy principles are increasingly driving how Auckland Council is managing waste by considering waste as a resource. The circular economy represents a viable and low carbon economic solution for New Zealand to show international leadership in transitioning to a low emissions future. In May 2018, an economic study by the Sustainable Business Network and ATEED revealed that by initiating a circular economy Auckland could liberate up to $8.8 billion in additional economic activity while reducing carbon emissions by 2,700ktCO₂e in 2030.

19. Auckland Council does not agree with the Commission’s conclusion that the actions in the Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan are a “circuitous” avenue to addressing emissions and that these plans “offer limited concrete direction for reducing waste emissions in their jurisdictions” (pg370). Within the draft WMMP Auckland Council proposes to provide a food scraps service that will divert 50,000 tonnes of food waste and reduce emissions by around 100,000tCO₂e per annum. The plan is also a crucial element in the governance of Auckland’s transition to zero waste by embedding Te Ao Māori and the tradition of kaitakitanga to sustain and restore our collective resources to enhance the mauri of taonga tuku iho.

20. We suggest the final report:

a. Use the recommendations to drive a path forward for New Zealand to transition to a circular economy by:

i. highlighting the carbon benefits of product stewardship;

ii. emphasising the additional waste and carbon reduction benefits of the waste disposal levy. For example, the funding of waste reduction initiatives and driving circular economy across all waste streams, not just organics.

iii. Including a recommendation that:
The Government should ensure that the broader benefits of incentivising reduction across all waste streams are considered and afforded weight in decision-making.

---


6 The Circular Economy Opportunity for Auckland is the first report of its kind in New Zealand. It has been produced by the Sustainable Business Network in partnership with Auckland Tourism Events and Economic Development (ATEED). The economic analysis was carried out by Sapere Research Group.
around applying waste pricing mechanisms. This approach would reduce embedded carbon from upstream production and processing of materials, while also providing wider social, economic and environmental benefits which promote wellbeing.

b. Reviews the following statements for accuracy to ensure sound evidence base for future policy making:
   i. “Waste represents 5% of New Zealand’s GHG emissions” (pg. 364) – this figure is only based on emissions from landfill. This represents only a fraction of total waste emissions in New Zealand.

   ii. “Organic waste is the dominant driver of CH₄ emissions [from waste]” (pg. 364) – this figure is, again, only based on landfill emissions. Other materials such as textiles, plastics and concrete have an extremely large carbon footprint in any life-cycle analysis. Textiles also have a significant footprint at landfill. Significant carbon savings could be made if waste minimisation principles were also applied to these materials.

   iii. Figure 14.2, “All landfill [solid waste] emissions are from CH₄” (pg. 366) – note that there are also other GHG waste emissions, e.g., from flaring CO, at landfill. The narrative below Figure 14.2 also states that “all solid waste in NZ is processed at landfills.” However, solid waste is also received at other fills (illegally or as a permitted activity, e.g. farm dumps) and processed at transfer stations, recycling centres, etc.

   iv. “The main drivers of emission reductions in the UK are improvements in landfill standards” (pg. 373) – from Auckland Council’s discussions with cities, including those in the UK and from experience working in the UK system, waste reduction, increases in recycling and incineration (i.e. waste diversion) have all played a larger role in reducing GHG than landfill mitigation measures. Additional information can be provided on request.

Wastewater
21. Auckland Council reiterates its previous submission in relation to the ETS:
   “Government could better leverage the Emissions Trading Scheme to set an appropriate price on emissions for key sectors such as transport, stationary energy generation and industry (e.g. thermal generation of heat and electricity). There is a strong need for certainty about the final form of the NZ ETS, its details and when these will occur in order to send the right market signals. Ongoing reviews around the form of the NZ ETS weaken Auckland businesses’ ability to effectively plan for the future and their obligations and impacts on the region’s economy.” (Auckland Council 2017, p.36 & 51).

Transport
22. Auckland Council broadly supports the Commission’s findings and recommendations in the draft report around transport. In particular, we support setting emissions standards for New
Zealand’s vehicle fleet, broadening the scope of the GPS on Land Transport to cover the whole land transport system and including emissions reduction as a strategic focus, encouraging the procurement of low emission vehicles across government, and government support to develop a more comprehensive charging infrastructure especially in lowly populated regions.

23. This submission reiterates Auckland Council and Auckland Transport’s previous position that while EVs are part of a balanced solution, the sole reliance on an EV transition for transport would not address critical issues and costs, like congestion. There is a need for a more comprehensive and integrated transport policy approach, specifically: “A practical policy approach could deliver better integration of transport and land-use including better transport-oriented development; rapidly increased and sustained uptake of public transport, walking and cycling; promotion of shared mobility and travel demand management; and improvement of fleet fuel efficiency – including but not limited to increasing electric vehicle (EV) uptake (including vehicles other than private cars).” (Auckland Council 2017, p.10).

24. Auckland Council commends the Commission’s specific consideration of transport policy and pricing mechanisms in relation to the policy landscape for an inclusive transition. In particular, the conclusion on page 232 that Government should continue to monitor the impacts on the mobility of lower income households. Auckland Council suggests that before implementing these policies, central government and local governments will need to fully understand what effect this will have on people’s travel costs so that issues of equity and affordability are understood and addressed.

25. Auckland Council recommends that in the final report the Commission explores:

a. Strong and clear targets for transport emissions to inform future legislation and emphasises the range of localised economic, social and environmental benefits that an integrated and systemic approach to reducing transport emissions would provide. These are needed both across the sector and in Auckland to meet our national obligations under the Paris Agreement.

b. Measures to encourage more efficient use of transport through travel demand management and tools such as road pricing, network optimisation, shared mobility (including ride sharing and car sharing) and encouraging walking, cycling and public transport to reduce the need for single occupancy vehicle trips (particularly in relation to findings F11.14 and F11.16).

c. Embedding research from the Auckland Transport Alignment Project\(^6\) (ATAP) and the Congestion Question\(^7\) (formerly known as the Auckland Smarter Transport Pricing Project). This work has identified that congestion pricing has significant potential to manage travel demand and reduce congestion, when used in conjunction with implementing a wider


strategic approach. This is particularly relevant to recommendation R11.5 (a pricing system for transport).

d. Establishing a robust and transparent monitoring regime that can specifically identify the issues and impacts experienced by different household types as a result of transport policies introduced to transition to a low emissions economy.

e. Accelerating and extending a low emission, rapid public transport network.

f. Encouraging integrated transport and land use outcomes across agencies and government through funding signals in the GPS and National Land Transport Plan (NLTP).

g. Implementing land value capture funding mechanisms which link infrastructure costs directly to the benefit/value created by that infrastructure.

Land use and the built environment

26. Auckland Council broadly accepts the Commission’s recommendations in the land use chapter, particularly those in support of accelerating afforestation on both government and private owned land and inclusion of agriculture in the NZ ETS. However, we reiterate that in addition to changing agricultural uses, shifting towards low emissions land uses in urban areas will play an important part in transitioning to a low or net zero emissions economy (Auckland Council, p15). This position is also highlighted by Local Government New Zealand as a missed opportunity within the draft report, and is supported by a number of local and regional government organisations.

27. In line with LGNZ’s submission, Auckland Council also recommends that legislative provision be made for regional spatial planning as a mechanism for contributing to delivering emissions reductions (as well as delivering other co-benefits). This would be consistent with the recommendations previously made by the Productivity Commission in its 2017 Better Urban Planning Inquiry.

Emissions through life-cycle of a building

28. Auckland Council recommends that both the embodied and operational emissions of buildings should be addressed to both transition to a low emissions economy and deliver co-benefits associated with energy efficient buildings. Forthcoming reviews of New Zealand’s Building Code should not only assess whether there is scope to materially reduce peak demand for electricity through the introduction of more stringent energy efficiency standards ($15.2) but also consider the wider co-benefits that more stringent energy efficiency standards can deliver.

29. Auckland Council strongly agrees with the draft report that co-benefits are an important consideration when examining emissions reduction strategies relating to the built environment. The draft report states that it does not try to assess the extent of all co-benefits, and instead focuses on the main options to reduce emissions. It also states that improving the energy efficiency of buildings does not hold the same importance in an emissions mitigation strategy as

---

Attachment B

Item 14

It does in other countries. By not addressing improvement in the energy efficiency of buildings, the opportunity to deliver co-benefits and enhance wellbeing is greatly reduced.

The relationship between urban form and transport emissions

30. The draft report states that there is not a strong case to use urban planning policies to reduce emissions. Auckland Council asks that this position be reconsidered for the final report. The opportunity to reduce emissions through promoting a quality compact urban form should be reconsidered in the context of:
   a. reducing transport emissions and the need to travel by private vehicle;
   b. enabling viable transit-oriented development;
   c. the ability for urban design and placemaking to enhance wellbeing through physical and social health benefits such as encouraging more active lifestyles, encouraging active transport and creating community spaces that build social cohesion; and;
   d. avoiding the need to build infrastructure that would otherwise be required to service new outlying development and potentially lock-in additional carbon.

31. The Commission's position that intensification has proven difficult to accomplish and runs counter to the living preferences of many New Zealanders, should be considered in the context of a growing and urbanising population, an improvement in the quality of medium density housing and the need for an efficient use of land. The highest growth in New Zealand has occurred in the CBD of Auckland, with approximately 80 per cent of the dwellings consented in 2017 located within the Urban Area 2016.

32. Research undertaken for Auckland Council in 2015 shows that many Aucklanders value location highly, whether buying or renting, and a large number of respondents will happily trade off typology to rent or buy in their preferred location. Although detached housing is the preferred choice for most Aucklanders (52%) there is a willingness to live in other housing types such as attached housing and apartments (48%) especially where it means they are able to secure a place in the location of their choice.

33. These preferences are reflected in the changing Auckland housing market. In 2016/2017, 43 per cent of all new dwellings consented were attached dwellings. The ratio of attached housing being consented across the region is increasing steadily (see Figure 1 below).

---


34. The Commission’s report refers to the following statement from the New Zealand Council for Infrastructure Development to inform finding F15.2:

“...With the decline of conventional engines (and their replacement with electric vehicles), the basis for urban planning to manage down private vehicle use is greatly reduced.” (pg. 394). Auckland Council encourages the Commission to consider this within the wider context of congestion highlighted in paragraph 35 (below), especially in New Zealand’s urban areas.

35. There is still a strong case for urban planning to manage down private vehicle use, even if electric vehicles displace internal combustion engine (ICE) vehicles. A reliance on electric vehicles may reduce emissions but issues relating to traffic congestion and lost productivity will persist and potentially worsen as population increases. Traffic congestion is costing Auckland up to $2 billion a year in lost productivity according to a report by the New Zealand Institute of Economic Research. Urban planning can promote viable alternatives such as rapid transit and reduce the need to travel through promoting a quality compact urban form that provides access to amenities within convenient walking and cycling distances. In addition the significant opportunities to improve wellbeing by reducing health issues such as stress, obesity, heart disease and cancer, through increasing active transport mode share will be lost if we do not manage down a reliance on private vehicle use through urban planning.

36. Auckland Council also suggests that the statement “the reduction in vehicle miles travelled in higher density areas is partially offset because, on average, such areas have a greater concentration of road infrastructure, which induces more travel.” (pg. 392) be reconsidered as per paragraph 30 above.

---

Industrial Emissions

37. Auckland Council agrees with the Commission’s findings around industrial emissions that replacing high temperature energy is currently a challenge. It also supports the conclusion that there are opportunities to reduce industrial emissions through recycling steel, glass, aluminium and paper, which is not common practice in New Zealand. These findings correlate with research commissioned by Auckland Council on the potential for emissions reduction from process heat across Auckland’s industrial sector (undertaken by University of Waikato).^12

38. As per our previous submission (Auckland Council 2017, p. 40-41), we reiterate the need to explore both the capacity of recycled waste to reduce the carbon footprint of New Zealand’s industrial sector, and, barriers to collecting and using these recycled materials in industrial processes.

39. The draft report suggests that an increasing emissions price will act as the main driver to reduce emissions from industry in New Zealand. It also states that higher carbon prices should not cause carbon leakage by displacing production overseas. Auckland Council agrees with these findings, but also reiterates that awarding free ETS credits should encourage the reduction of GHG emissions as part of the regulatory package offered to industries. Examples of how this could be achieved are included in Auckland Council’s previous submission (Auckland Council 2017, p. 41-42) and reiterated below. Auckland Council recommends that industries who receive free ETS credit should:
   a. demonstrate by benchmarking that they are the lowest carbon emitter per unit of production; or,
   b. show that they are investing in research (with tax breaks) that would lower their carbon footprint.

40. Recommendation 13.3 of the draft report proposes that new regulations be introduced for carbon capture and storage and its role under the ETS. Auckland Council seeks clarification around whether synthetic fuels^13 would also be considered under the ETS (i.e. allocated carbon credits if they replace natural gas or other non-renewable fuel). This could incentivise the use of these fuels to replace natural gas (or coal) to generate high temperature process heat.

Pillar 4: Innovation and investment

41. Auckland Council supports the Commission’s findings and recommendations that the Government should establish innovation as a strategic priority with clear low emissions objectives and supporting investment. Auckland Council also supports the conclusion that environmental, social and governance investing is a more proactive form of socially responsible investment than divestment. Green bonds provide an example of this.

---


^14 Synthetic fuels include biofuels, landfill gas, sewerage gas or new fuels such as hydrogen, synthetic natural gas, and ammonia.
42. Auckland Council agrees that there is a need for a cohesive innovation system that supports the uptake of new technology and that the existing innovation system requires extensive economic transformation and restructuring to achieve this. As per our previous submission (Auckland Council 2017, p.19), Auckland Council supports an increase in central government investment in innovation and technology, and in building deep capacity through partnerships with universities and research institutions. We suggest that the final report:

   a. identifies the trigger points and problem areas within the current system. This would highlight how the public, private, and third sectors currently apply for innovation investment and could build awareness around possible policy impacts.

   b. Sheds light onto how local and regional governments could best support testing, piloting and rapid adoption of new technology. For example, the Auckland region poses a significant opportunity for technological deployment and demonstration within New Zealand.

43. In line with our previous submission, we continue to reiterate the importance of investing in education and upskilling as part of achieving a just transition (Auckland Council 2017, p.59). We believe the Commission’s final report would be strengthened by reflecting a stronger emphasis on the interrelationship between innovation, changes to the labour market, enabling an inclusive transition, and skills and education, including:

   a. What the low-carbon transition might mean for young people, the current education curriculum, and for the future of work.

   b. The impact of climate change and a low emissions economy on New Zealand’s labour market. The International Labour Organization (ILO) categorises the impact of climate change on labour markets into four areas: job substitution; job elimination; transformation and redefinition of existing jobs; and job creation. Auckland Council suggests that these are considered for the New Zealand context. The ILO defines a just transition as:

      "the conceptual framework in which the labour movement captures the complexities of the transition towards a low-carbon and climate-resilient economy, highlighting public policy needs and aiming to maximize benefits and minimize hardships for workers and their communities in this transformation" (Rosenberg 2010, p.141).

   c. How to ensure that resources are allocated to upskilling people who are part of the existing workforce and who will need to transition into other types of employment.

44. In response to Question 6.1, Auckland Council answers that yes, the investment policy of the New Zealand Venture Investment Fund should be updated to identify low-emissions investments as a sector of interest.

---

Appendix 1:
Waitematā Local Board feedback to Productivity Commission on Low Emissions Economy Draft Report

Waitematā Local Board supports the transition to a low emissions economy for New Zealand. In line with our efforts to become a low carbon and sustainable community, the local board is committed to the goal of setting a target of net zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2050 and zero waste by 2040.

We note that the Productivity Commission has released its latest report on the “Low Emissions Economy” and wish to provide feedback on the draft report aligned to the four pillars proposed in the draft report.

Emissions pricing
- The local board wish to express concern over the current value of New Zealand Emissions Trading Scheme (NZETS) due to its ineffectiveness at lowering net emissions economy to date.
- If NZETS is to remain it needs to be reviewed to ensure its stable, well designed and is made credible and effective.
- NZETS has allowed participants to buy-out of having to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. This essentially limits the effectiveness of changing firm and household behaviour.

Laws and institutions
- The local board supports the need for there to be strong, clear and ongoing leadership from central government to achieve change. Stability and confidence about longer-term objectives and policy settings are critical to promoting the transition to low emissions.
- We seek a Zero Carbon Act that promotes a zero-carbon transition which is fair, cost effective, environmentally sustainable and supports the Te Aranga principles.
- We support putting in place clear, legislated and quantified emissions reduction targets. These targets should be reviewed and set every five years to reinforce accountability and action. To support the delivery of the Act there needs to be appropriate funding from central government to transform economies.

Regulation and policies
- We support an integrated approach to climate change that seeks to deliver multiple outcomes across existing policy to deliver emissions reductions and build resilience in the New Zealand economy.
- We support the development and plan for a just transition for people working (and their representatives) in carbon intensive industries to employment in other areas and urge the government to start work on this now.

Innovation and investment
- There is a need for central government to provide the necessary public backing and funding to support innovation to mitigate emissions and ensure targets are achievable.
- In relation to the national context Auckland’s emissions reduction position is unique and therefore a one size fits all model is not appropriate.
- We acknowledge that transport is one of the largest contributors to greenhouse gas emissions in Auckland and therefore will be a critical contributor to any national emissions reduction strategy. Local government has a role to play in the management of public transport services, encouraging active modes of transport and local roading. We seek assurance that local government will be appropriately included in national climate change strategies.
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Productivity Commission Inquiry into a Low Emissions Economy:

Getting to Zero

Draft Report overview 2018

Low-emissions economy
Draft report
What?

Why is Auckland Council responding?
- **Continuity**: Auckland Council submitted on the issues paper in 2017
- **Advocacy**: Opportunity to highlight Auckland’s unique emissions reduction position in relation to the national context.
- **Forward thinking**: Preparatory/ground work for the Zero Carbon Bill (expected June)

Submission timeline:
Draft submission for comment: Monday 28th May 2018
Submission deadline: Friday 8th June 2018
Final report due: August 2018
Draft report: At a glance

- A net zero target for NZ looks challenging but achievable
- Emissions prices are a critical motivator of change (must rise to >$70/tonne)
- Three key drivers are proposed:
  1. Replace fossil fuels with renewable electricity
  2. Reduce emissions intensity in agriculture
  3. Use afforestation to change land use substantially.

18 references to Auckland Council’s 2017 submission
Four pillars to achieving stable and credible climate policy in NZ
Auckland Council submission (stage 2)

- Broadly supportive of draft report
- Reinforce existing AC submission under 4 pillars:

  **Emissions pricing**
  - **Reiterate:** Concerns around current NZETS.
  - Facilitating and achieving a just transition.
  - Embedding social cost of carbon.
  - A mix of measures will be required across government, business and other organisations.

  **Laws and institutions**
  - **Reiterate:** Adaptation to climate change is also a critical element for a NZ Climate Change Act.
  - Strong and ongoing leadership from central government.
  - Include support for local government as part of the package.

  **Regulation and policies**
  - **Reiterate:** Prioritise a just transition and improving wellbeing.
  - The link between urban land use and emissions reduction.
  - Proposed policy approaches across waste, transport, built environment and process heat sectors from previous council submission.

  **Innovation and investment**
  - **Reiterate:** Making innovation a strategic priority.
  - Ensuring socially responsible investment.
  - The potential for green bonds and other climate finance.
New questions relevant to Council

**Investment**

**Q6.1** Should the investment policy of the New Zealand Venture Investment Fund be updated to identify low-emissions investments as a sector of interest?

**Waste**

**Q6.1** Should the NZETS be extended to cover waste water treatment plants?

**Transport**

**Q11.1** How could NZ signal a commitment to a widespread transition away from fossil fuel vehicles?  
E.g. should NZ explicitly aim to phase out the importing of fossil-fuel vehicles by some specified future date?

**Transport**

**Q11.2** Should a price feebate scheme cover vehicles within the heavy vehicle fleet? What other policies are appropriate for incentivising the uptake of low-emission heavy vehicles?
Appendix:
Overview of previous submission from Auckland Council family (stage 1)
Key points

- **Strong leadership from central government** is needed to provide to support New Zealand’s transition to a low emissions future.
- New Zealand’s **local governments and cities are a key part of the transition** to a low emissions future.
- To reduce emissions and build resilience, the transition will **require an integrated approach that delivers on multiple outcomes**.
- New Zealand and Auckland must sharply reduce emissions to meet national and international carbon budgets.
- **Research and innovation is an important pillar in the mix of measures required** to enable New Zealand to meet any new domestic targets.
- The **transition requires concomitant investment from businesses and financial institutions.**

U:\CPO\ASP\Chief Sustainability Office\Priority 2 - Implement Low Carbon Auckland\2017\Productivity Commission\Final Submission
Sector by sector positions

Transport
NZ requires a practical policy approach to deliver:
• better integration of transport and land-use including better transport-oriented development;
• rapidly increased and sustained uptake of public transport, walking and cycling;
• promotion of shared mobility and travel demand management;
• improvement of fleet fuel efficiency – including but not limited to increasing electric vehicle (EV) uptake; and,
• an integrated approach to transport, energy and built environment.

Policy approaches were proposed for the inquiry to explore and Auckland highlighted as a unique case.

Agriculture and Forestry
Imperative that agricultural emissions and practices are addressed as part of the package of responses in the transition to a low carbon economy.
Main opportunities lie in land use change and technological innovation.
Key barrier to forestry is uncertainty around NZETS.

Waste
Creative and integrated solutions that consider the full life-cycle of materials can reduce waste emissions in a cost-effective manner.
• e.g. targeted regulation to reduce commercial waste to landfill should also be considered.

Buildings
A cost-effective path to a lower emissions future involves direct emission reductions in buildings. Multiple co-benefits highlighted.
Proposed policies and initiatives to promote the design and use of buildings that produce low or no GHG emissions, including (amongst others):
• to review and update the building code; and,
• allowing local government to mandate standards higher than building code.
**Electricity generation**

Government can create greater reliance on renewable sources through a variety of means, including:

- Regulatory changes and considerations e.g. more ambitious renewable energy target (up to 100 per cent renewable).
- Considerations for infrastructural and operational resilience, such as ensuring grid capacity for future demand and input from further renewable energy sources.

Proposed “decongestion” charging and use of local grid batteries to facilitate the effective use of intermittent local renewable power (such as wind and solar PV) by providing storage and shifting of demand.

**Cross-cutting issues**

Non-sector specific considerations relevant to all areas include:

- **A just transition** – mitigate the disproportional impacts on our most vulnerable groups. Must consider cross-cutting issues including health and wellbeing, resilience to climate change, impacts on Māori, equity, and air quality.
- **Accounting for operational emissions** across business and local governments
- **Setting and standardising robust baselining, measuring and monitoring** of emissions. Benchmarking against international standards
- **Valuation of the wider co-benefits** and the cost of inaction on climate change.
- **Strong alignment of carbon reduction with other societal goals** - develop and/or endorse a social cost of carbon for use in business cases across the public sector.

Other interrelated considerations:

- Shift towards low emissions land uses in urban areas in addition to changing agricultural uses.
- Consider availability and preservation of prime and elite soils.

---

AC position reflected in draft report.
Memorandum

To: Environment and Community Committee

Subject: Environmental Protection Authority submission regarding brown marmorated stink bug biocontrol

From: Dr Imogen Bassett, Principal Biosecurity Advisor

Purpose

1. To note that a submission was provided by Auckland Council staff to the Environmental Protection Authority on 31 May 2018 regarding a proposed biocontrol agent to be used in the event of a brown marmorated stink bug incursion in New Zealand.

Summary

- Brown marmorated stink bug has been identified as one of the highest risk biosecurity threats currently facing New Zealand.
- The Samurai Wasp Steering Group sought pre-approval from the Environmental Protection Authority to release the Samurai wasp as a biocontrol agent to manage brown marmorated stink bug, if the stink bug were to arrive in New Zealand. Submissions on the application were sought from 11 April 2018 to 31 May 2018.
- A submission was provided by staff on behalf of Auckland Council and is shown in Attachment A for the Environment and Community Committee’s information.
- The submission did not oppose the application for use of the biocontrol agent but did seek conditions to assure protection of native insect species.

Context/Background

2. Brown marmorated stink bug (Halyomorpha halys) has been identified as one of the most significant biosecurity threats currently facing New Zealand.
3. Interceptions of brown marmorated stink bug entering the country are frequent during summer months; approximately 2,000 individual bugs were intercepted at the border between December 2017 and February 2018. Stink bugs were intercepted through a variety of import pathways. Given the high interception rate, climatic suitability and availability of host plants, the chance of brown marmorated stink bug establishing in New Zealand is high.
4. Native to Asia, brown marmorated stink bug has recently invaded the USA and Europe causing severe economic damage to horticultural crops and proving to be a significant nuisance pest, with considerable infestations recorded inside homes during winter.
5. Based on overseas experience, if it becomes established in New Zealand, brown marmorated stink bug is predicted to have severe impacts on many commercial horticultural crops. Nuisance impacts are also highly likely and impacts on native plants are possible though less well understood.
6. Management of brown marmorated stink bug is exceptionally difficult and requires repeat high-dose application of broad spectrum insecticides. This is costly, has high environmental impact and can limit access to international markets. Biocontrol offers a more environmentally friendly management tool and has been the most successful approach to date for managing brown marmorated stink bug overseas.
7. Industry, science and government representatives have collaborated to form the Samurai Wasp Steering Group to advance biocontrol pre-emptively, prior to a brown marmorated stink bug incursion in New Zealand, because of the high risk that invasion will eventually happen.
8. All new biocontrol agents to be released in New Zealand must first be approved by the Environmental Protection Authority in a process that provides safeguards against potential adverse side effects.

9. The Samurai Wasp Steering Group recently applied to the Environmental Protection Agency to release the samurai wasp (*Trissolcus japonicus*) as a biocontrol agent for brown marmorated stink bug. Public submissions on the topic were open from 11 April 2018 to 31 May 2018, during which period council staff lodged a submission.

**Discussion**

10. The submission was of low significance in terms of the Significance and Engagement Policy and was technical in nature. The associated political risk with this submission is also low. Therefore, staff considered that the submission did not need to be approved by Environment and Community Committee before it was provided to the Environment Protection Authority.

11. The submission did not oppose the application for pre-approval to release the proposed biocontrol agent as the risks posed by brown marmorated stink bug are severe and the proposed biocontrol agent is the most effective and environmentally friendly control option available.

12. However, the submission did not fully support the application due to concerns regarding potential adverse impacts on native insects, and risks to social acceptability of biocontrol. These could adversely impact council’s use of other biocontrol agents if the risk is not adequately managed.

13. Notwithstanding this, the submission stated that, given the potential economic, social and ecological impacts associated with brown marmorated stink bug establishing in New Zealand, the benefits of releasing the biocontrol agent would outweigh any risks of adverse effects.

14. Relief sought included monitoring to assist in identifying any adverse impacts which might occur on native insects. Relief sought also included further research in relation to a native stink bug species which is closely related to brown marmorated stink bug and thus may be particularly at risk of adverse impacts.

**Māori Impact Statement**

15. Working on behalf of the Samurai Wasp Steering Group, Te Tira Whakamātaki Māori Biosecurity Network have provided tailored packages on the stink bug and biocontrol agent to inform Māori about this issue.

16. The Environmental Protection Authority also sought a review of Māori perspectives through Ngā Kaitiakitanga Taiaroa (their Māori advisory committee). Ngā Kaitiakitanga Taiaroa noted that brown marmorated stink bug poses a substantial risk to Māori economic and cultural values, but also raised concerns about lack of information about potential biocontrol agent non-target impacts, especially in relation to native species.

17. In the future, if council is required to manage brown marmorated stink bug, council may undertake direct mana whenua engagement.

**Next steps/implementation**

18. The submission was submitted via an online submission form to the Environmental Protection Agency on 31 May 2018, as per Attachment A to this memo.

19. No further steps required by council.

**Attachments**

a) Submission by Auckland Council to the Environmental Protection Authority on the release of the samurai wasp (*Trissolcus japonicus*) as a biocontrol agent for brown marmorated stink bug (*Halyomorpha halys*) should it arrive in New Zealand.
Submission Form
For Hazardous Substance and New Organism Applications

Once you have completed this form
Send by post to: Environmental Protection Authority, Private Bag 63002, Wellington 6140
OR email to: submissions@epa.govt.nz

Once your submission has been received the submission becomes a public document and may be made publicly available to anyone who requests it. You may request that your contact details be kept confidential, but your name, organisation and your submission itself will become a public document.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission on application number:</th>
<th>APP203336</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of submitter or contact for joint submission:</td>
<td>Dr. Imogen Bassett (Principal Biosecurity Advisor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation name (if on behalf of an organisation):</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal address:</td>
<td>Level 2, Bledisloe House, Ground Floor, 24 Wellesley Street, Auckland Central, 1010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Telephone number: +64 21 807 563
Email: imogen.bassett@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

☐ I wish to keep my contact details confidential

The EPA will deal with any personal information you supply in your submission in accordance with the Privacy Act 1993. We will use your contact details for the purposes of processing the application that it relates to (or in exceptional situations for other reasons permitted under the Privacy Act 1993). Where your submission is made publicly available, your contact details will be removed only if you have indicated this as your preference in the tick box above. We may also use your contact details for the purpose of requesting your participation in customer surveys.

The EPA is likely to post your submission on its website at www.epa.govt.nz. We also may make your submission available in response to a request under the Official Information Act 1982.
I support the application

I oppose the application

I neither support or oppose the application

The reasons for making my submission are¹: (further information can be appended to your submission, see footnote).

Kā mahi ake ai ki ngā maunga here kōrero,
ki ngā pari whakarongo tāi,
ki ngā awa tuku kia o ōna manawhenua,
ōna mana ā-iwi taketake mai, tauawhi atu.
Tāmaki – makau a te rau, murau a te tini, wenera a te mano.
Kāhore tō rite i te ao.

I greet the mountains, repository of all that has been said of this place;
there I greet the cliffs that have heard the ebb and flow of the tides of time,
and the rivers that cleansed the forebears of all who came those born of this land
and the newcomers among us all.

Auckland – beloved of hundreds, famed among the multitude, envy of thousands.

You are unique in the world.

This is an officer only submission. Council officers do not wish to oppose the application for pre-approval to release the proposed biocontrol agent Trissolcus japonicus, for reasons detailed below, but would like to highlight a number of concerns around potential non-target host impacts. Also detailed below.

Officers recognise the damaging economic, social and potential ecological impacts that the brown marmorated stink bug (BMSB), Halyomorpha halys, would cause if it were to establish in Aotearoa New Zealand, and are in favour of tools that will aid in limiting its spread. As documented in the supporting cost benefit analysis, economic impacts in its invaded range have been rapid and extensive, particularly in the horticultural sector, and are indicative of how BMSB would behave in Aotearoa New Zealand.

Officers believe the probability of BMSB establishing in Aotearoa New Zealand is extremely high, given the rapidly increasing number of source populations, import pathways and rate of propagule pressure, with 2000 individuals intercepted at the border between December 2017 and February 2018 (Ministry of Primary Industries 2018). Therefore the pre-emptive approach to sourcing a control tool is applauded, especially when considering the amount of resources associated with host-testing and getting biocontrol programmes off the ground. It is acknowledged that there are currently no preferable control tools available to effectively control BMSB, despite its extensive invasion history, and that T. japonicus is regarded in its native and invaded range as the primary candidate for biocontrol of BMSB. Officers agree that biological control can be a more effective, sustainable and socially acceptable means of invasive species management when compared to chemical control. Noting that while there may be some undesirable non-target impacts from the proposed biocontrol agent, as detailed below, these are likely to be less detrimental than the economic, social and ecological impacts associated with the increased use of broad spectrum insecticides required in the absence of an effective biological control programme.

¹ Further information can be appended to your submission. If you are sending this submission electronically and attaching a file we accept the following formats – Microsoft Word, Text, PDF, ZIP, JPEG and JPG. The file must not be more than 8MB.
Regionally, the potential for BMSB to establish in Tāmaki Makaurau Auckland is high due to climatic suitability, availability of plant hosts and rates of propagule pressure associated with high volumes of trade. Consequently, Auckland Council is ultimately likely to have a role in the long-term management of BMSB within the region. This may transpire directly and/or indirectly via community group assistance, requests for service and the provision of education and advice. A pre-existing and effective biological control programme would, therefore, be operationally advantageous as it would not only alleviate BMSB associated impacts within the region, but also reduce costs associated with implementing a biocontrol programme from scratch.

Although officers do not oppose this application, there are some concerns regarding the potential ecological impacts associated with the release of T. japonicus. While the difficulties associated with testing the endemic Hypothrobus hudsoniae are appreciated, it is concerning that the degree to which this species is susceptible to T. japonicus is unknown, taking into consideration its close taxonomic association with BMSB. It is recommended that further research is undertaken to discern this relationship, ensure an effective monitoring programme is in place both pre- and post-release of the proposed biocontrol agent and that a self-sustaining captive insurance population is established.

Further, while the approach to utilise the proposed biocontrol agent as part of a multi-faceted biosecurity response is laudable, the positive results of parasitism in the 'no-choice' host test and overlaps in climate suitability suggest a level of risk posed by T. japonicus to native and endemic pentatomids in the event that eradication of BMSB is successful. The high rates of parasitism on the native species Cercatulus nasicus and Giaucias amyotii in the 'no-choice' host test indicate they would be suitable candidates to sustain a population of T. japonicus. Although these species are widespread and so the species themselves are not at risk, there may be undesirable impacts on trophic food web interactions in affected ecosystems. This may be evident in crop-systems, as both pentatomid species predate on insect crop pests, but also native ecosystems where both species occur and, given its habitat preference for wooded habitats in its invaded range in North America, might T. japonicus (Herlihy et al. 2016).

Often ecological impacts are under explored where there is a perceived economic imperative for biocontrol, and council officers do not consider this to be a satisfactory balance of values. Furthermore, officers are concerned that non-target impacts to native species pose a risk to social licence for biocontrol more broadly, including for management of pest plants, and therefore caution and appropriate follow-up monitoring should be applied when considering release of polyphagous invertebrate agents, even when there is a compelling economic case for their use. Therefore it is again suggested that an effective monitoring programme on non-target hosts is imperative to determine what these impacts are and how to best manage them.

In summary, the application for pre-approval of the proposed biocontrol agent T. japonicus is not opposed as it will 1) reduce economic, ecological and social nuisance impacts of BMSB and 2) reduce the use of broad spectrum insecticides required to control BMSB in the absence of an effective biological control programme. However, officers wish to have on the record concerns regarding the unknown susceptibility of endemic H. hudsoniae and non-target impacts in the event that BMSB is eradicated, given the proposed biocontrol agent is not entirely host-specific to BMSB.
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All submissions are taken into account by the decision makers. In addition, please indicate whether or not you also wish to speak at a hearing if one is held.

☐ I wish to be heard in support of my submission (this means that you can speak at the hearing).

☐ I do not wish to be heard in support of my submission (this means that you cannot speak at the hearing).

If neither box is ticked, it will be assumed you do not wish to appear at a hearing.
I wish for the EPA to make the following decision:

Relief sought:

- An effective monitoring programme to determine impacts on native and endemic non-target pentatomid populations is implemented in conjunction with monitoring populations of the proposed biocontrol agent and BMSB. If the application to release the proposed biocontrol agent is successful, non-target population monitoring should be initiated as soon as possible to determine base level population characteristics prior to the arrival of BMSB and subsequent release of T. japonicus. This should be undertaken in a wide variety of habitats including native ecosystems.

- Further research is undertaken to discern the degree to which the endemic pentatomid H. hudsonae species is susceptible to T. japonicus, and, if applicable, a self-sustaining captive insurance population is established.

- In the event that BMSB is successfully eradicated following a biosecurity response, appropriate levels of surveillance and monitoring are undertaken to determine if a self-sustaining population of T. japonicus establishes and what the associated impacts are.

- Steps to quantify direct and indirect ecological impacts of BMSB and the proposed biocontrol agent are undertaken to inform management and move towards improved quantification of ecological implications of biological control programmes for economic pests.
Memo

2 July 2018

To: Mayor Phil Goff, Councillors, Independent Maori Statutory Board Members, Executive Leadership Team
Cc: Jacques Victor, GM - Auckland Plan Strategy & Research
From: Global Partnerships and Strategy Unit (GPS)

Subject: Global Engagement Activity Update – July 2018 - Summary

This memo outlines the Council’s upcoming global engagement activity during July 2018. It also notes the outcomes of the previous month.

Nick McDonnell began as Manager of GPS on 18 June. Nick has spent several years working across Air New Zealand. He will be engaging Councillors and stakeholders over the next month to discuss and understand the GPS role.

Action: for information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Key Activity – July 2018</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 July</td>
<td>Consul General Mr. Minoru Kikuchi of Japan will call on Mayor Goff</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 July</td>
<td>Mayor Goff / GPS to attend the 242nd US Independence Day event hosted by the US Ambassador and the US Consul General</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-24 July</td>
<td>Six Blockhouse Bay Intermediate School students participate in the 30th Asia Pacific Children’s Convention (APCC) in Fukuoka, Japan. GPS has been sponsored to accompany.</td>
<td>Fukuoka Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-20 July</td>
<td>Introductory call on Mayor Goff and Chief of Strategy, Jim Quinn by the incoming US Consul General Ketelyn Choe.</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29 July</td>
<td>Working group from China’s Ministry of Culture and Tourism to visit Auckland to view potential sites for the establishment of a China Cultural Centre.</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 July – 4 Aug</td>
<td>Auckland Mayor’s visit to Tokyo and Fukuoka to attend the 12th Asian Pacific Cities Summit, sponsored by Fukuoka City Council</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Activity – June 2018

The following is a list of key global activity facilitated by GPS and outcomes achieved:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 8 June  | Fiji’s International School visited Auckland Council to learn about Auckland’s Development Strategy in Plans and Places. | Auckland    | • Strengthened Auckland’s Fijian Partnership and people to people connection.  
  • Educational opportunity for the Fijian students who will now complete a comparative case study on the planning and design of Auckland and Nadi. |
<p>| 13 June | GPS facilitated for Mayor Goff to send a congratulatory video message to the new Mayor of Busan Metropolitan City, Mr. Oh Gee-don. | Auckland    | • The video will be presented at the Busan Mayor’s inauguration on 1 July and help profile the Auckland-Busan partnership in Korea. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 June</td>
<td>UN Habitat &amp; Sustainable Development Goals – Lunchtime Learning Session.</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June-July</td>
<td>Ongoing engagement with stakeholders to prepare for Mayoral visit to Tokyo</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>• The Asia Pacific Cities Summit will have a strong focus on the UN’s Habitat III Agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and the Asia Pacific Cities Summit in Fukuoka, Japan from 29 July to 3 August.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Confirmed bilateral meetings with the Mayors of Auckland’s partner cities in Japan - Shinagawa and Fukuoka and the Governor of Tokyo (Ibaraki).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 June</td>
<td>Danie Buckman, Global Government Relations Manager, San Francisco Automation,</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>• Discussion on current testing in San Francisco with target to deploy first autonomous vehicle (AV) by late 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>met with Auckland Transport and Auckland Council’s Head of Innovation.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Cruise Automation (CA) will maintain contact with Auckland Transport on the advancement of their testing and plans to globally commercialise fleets of their AVs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 June</td>
<td>GPS participated in a Roundtable with a delegation from the China Institute</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>• Opinions exchanged on Belt &amp; Road Initiative, FTA, bilateral relations and the impact of Chinese “soft power” in the Asia-Pacific region. Profiles Auckland to one of China’s top think-tanks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of International Studies (CISS).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 June</td>
<td>Auckland Conversations: Matt Petersen, President and CEO, Los Angeles</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>• Roundtable discussion/best practice exchange with officials on ‘Unlocking Low Carbon Prosperity through Innovation’ and looking into further partnership between LA and Auckland in this space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CleanTech Incubator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 June</td>
<td>Screen Auckland and the NZ Film Commission visited Auckland’s partner cities</td>
<td>Qingdao</td>
<td>• GPS facilitated Screen sector engagement with the Qingdao Foreign Affairs Office and Qingdao Culture, Radio, TV, Press, and Publication Bureau to discuss future collaboration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qingdao, China, Taichung, Taiwan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 June</td>
<td>EU Trade Commissioner Cecilia Malmstrom and delegation visit Auckland to</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>• GPS engaged on EU-NZ Business Council event to outline opportunities/implications for Auckland and the broader NZ economy. Officials updated on relevant chapters to Council: Govt Procurement and Environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>launch EU-NZ FTA negotiations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 June</td>
<td>GPS met with CAPE - the Centre of Asia-Pacific Excellence – leading regional</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>• Information exchanged on key work programmes and Asia engagement strategy moving forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>think tank</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Discussed opportunities for future Auckland –CAPE collaboration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June-July</td>
<td>Guangzhou International Award for Urban Innovation</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>• GPS has facilitated the Development Projects Office to submit an entry based on Freyberg Place and the Efem Meiville Centre Upgrade.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Next steps**

- GPS will provide an update on global activity each month.
- Requests for additional information or queries can be directed to Tao Chen, Advisor GPS; (tao.chen@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz Mobile: 021 853 948).